

All comments (“raw data”) categorized by question/idea

[Includes 10/9 Group 1 & Group 2, 10/10 meeting, 10/16 meeting (Alicia & Tamara’s notes), 10/17 meeting, 10/18 meeting, e-mail comments from 9/29 -10/22, Whittier Alliance meeting, Gordon’s roundtable, SCAC meeting, handwritten input-September, handwritten input-October, Lyndale Neighborhood Association, comments received by task force members]

Overall themes from collected comments

(See comment sections for all detailed comments received & more detailed themes.)

- A--The ambiguity (of the process and report) is difficult for people.
- C--City communication tools and strategies (such as the website) need to be refined and better organized to be more user-friendly, consistent and easy to navigate.
- D--Definitions for recommendations need to be fleshed out. For example, how will community engagement and adequate representation be defined?
- E--There are certain baseline things that the City should expect and receive from orgs and vice versa. The City should do more around CE and orgs can also be held to certain standards.
- F--There are funding issues for neighborhood organizations-they need more funding and need it to be extended farther into the future.
- H--The high level nature of the report is important to its durability.
- I--The dedication of the task force is impressive.
- L--The timeline for the process is too short and so it is hard for people to have time to discuss the information and mobilize others, or to hold local meetings in neighborhoods.
- M--There are some important elements and points of clarification that are missing from the report.
- N--Neighborhood organizations are better situated/equipped to deal with CE than other groups.
- P--Existing NRP Policy Board vs. new Citizen Commission on CE: NRP Policy Board already serves the function of the proposed CE Commission.
- S--CE is not one size fits all in the City-different strategies are needed in different neighborhoods and within the City
- T--There is a lack of trust from some people in the City, this process and the report.
- V--The task force should envision the future, not be bounded in thinking by the NRP funding sunset in 2009.
- X--There are strategies and neighborhood groups that are working well. The City should examine, build upon and replicate them.

Comments that regard to a specific section/element of the Report.

A—Ambiguous: The process to address CE and the report itself are too ambiguous, limiting understanding of the potential implications.

- A--The report and process feel very academic. It is hard to anticipate what tangible results they will lead to.

- A--The report is vague, and thus it is difficult to anticipate what it will mean for the community when it is administered. (What are the details?)
- A--Comments to strengthen draft to Mayor and City Council? It's clear a lot of time and thought and organizing have gone into this report. But the report is vague and it's difficult to see that new territory has been broken.
- A--I think we've heard the confusion about this process. There could be a better job at the beginning of the report laying that out. Maybe an executive summary. Make people feel like it is more transparent.
- A--I've followed the process and I've followed the work. What does it mean if the funding is not attached? What are the action steps? How is it going to look?
- A--Community engagement meetings tend to be too ideological for community members, especially non-English speakers. This is why there is low participation in the meetings.
- A--It feels like I'm late to this process...
- A--This report is too philosophical, theoretical-it needs more detail.
- A--The report is confusing.
- A--Pretty vanilla. I don't see real, usable, recommendations to strengthen the process.
- A-- Have an outside editor review the document. It seems opaque in several sections.
- A--Clarify up front that the document does not address funding although it is in the Track 2 title.

C—City communication and outreach strategies to organizations and residents should be adapted to meet the needs of the people and organizations and the City should work to be more responsive to resident input/concerns. The City should also work to demonstrate to residents that they take resident and organizational concerns and needs seriously, and should establish more consistent points of contact within City staff. This includes exploring new/different communication styles/tools and considering timelines, meeting places and times that better meet the needs of the people. Council members should also make these efforts. The City website should be easier to navigate.

- C--All council and council committee meetings take place downtown Minneapolis, and at inconvenient times during the day for citizens to be able to attend. The City should consider holding meetings sometimes in different neighborhoods, such as on the north side. This would demonstrate their interest in the community and would make it much easier for people to be able to observe/participate.
- C--The 311 system is a nice idea but is too distant for people. You get a different person each time you call, and it would be better to talk with the same person each time about an issue.
- C--There are so many points of contact within the City for people; this feels like/acts as barrier to people. Too confusing to figure out how to navigate the system.
- C--Council members should be involved more in neighborhood work. The City should work on reducing conflict between council members and neighborhoods/neighborhood organizations and accountability to neighborhoods should be increased for council members.
- C--The City's website is not user-friendly: it is very difficult to find information on the site unless you know exactly what you are looking for.
- C--How were the community engagement meetings advertised? What methods were used and who was contacted? The turnout for the CE meeting is very small in comparison to population of North Side.
- C--How about considering alternative communication methods, such as blogs, for orgs to communicate with residents?
- C--It would be helpful for there to be a regular a point of contact within the City for community organizations (such as a City Planner) and vice versa, a regular point of contact at community organizations for the City, as opposed to having to talk with a different person each time/each issue.
- C--Residents often aren't afforded the opportunity to give feedback about potential decisions or find out about a decision until the decision has already been made or sometimes they don't find out what happened at all.
- C--Organizations need more lead time from the City to convey information to residents. (i.e. Many organizations send quarterly newsletters, and timelines and deadlines require more advance notice for communications.)
- C--City calendars and schedules should recognize neighborhood calendars and schedules and vice versa. Planning efforts should be calibrated more so that information is able to flow to residents and between City and community organizations more easily and timely.

- C--I would like one Master Calendar, and not Internet based necessarily because not everyone has a computer and library computers have a waiting time. It can be hard to get on at the library.
- C--We need to have timely notification.
- C--There is a lack of coordination between different agencies. Multiple meetings on the same night, etc.
- C--Note: It's slightly amusing that after all the talk in the report about being inclusive, the section with numbers to call to translate the materials is hidden in the corner on the bottom of the second page of the summary. There is no mention of what the material is about in this section. It just says 'If you want free help translating this material call [this number].' Who among us is going to call to have something translated if we don't know what it's about! I'm sure there was other outreach to non English speaking communities. But, this note strikes me as gratuitous.
- C--Thank you for exploring community engagement with the public in Minneapolis. I have at least one example of how the city could have communicated better with residents in the past few years. When the trees were replanted several years ago, I do not remember having any input of what type of trees would line the boulevard. We got Hackberry trees. Too bad for us. When the psyllids (a genus of plant lice) appear on them every September, I am unable to open the windows on my house without having them enter. Since this only seems to affect the people on Minnehaha Avenue, the city doesn't seem to be too concerned about it. I did not get a lot of help from my council member on this issue, nor was the park board much help. Their response was that there was nothing they could do about it. I was told that they were "harmless," however they have proven to be an incredible nuisance. Had the city engaged the public on this issue, I may have been able to sell my house before it was invaded by plant lice. Not only does the city have an inability to engage the community on issues that will affect them, but an inability to adequately address situations that do occur.
- C--How can the City work better w/ community orgs? Remember the City staff works for the citizens of Minneapolis. Instead of hearing "That's not how it works," I'd love to hear, "That's an interesting idea. We'll see what we can do."
- C--I believe the NECP should have a greater ability to relate crime and safety information between me and the City. Please include NECP.
- C--Before the CE plan and task force move to implementation, they should reach the people, because the attendance at the meeting is not representative of the community. Some reasons why people might not have come is that the meeting topic is too esoteric for many in the community and many community members also feel burned by the City.
- C--To illustrate a point of how it is difficult for the City to react to public interest and input around a topic, a resident shared an example of a community organization working on a redevelopment issue with lots of feedback from the community and hundreds of community members involved/showing up for community meeting, but then it was very hard to find a City staff who could/would use the information/input. (i.e. The City seems to be asking for a very particular type of community engagement, but when residents decide to mobilize around an issue, their input isn't always valued or doesn't find a forum within the City.)
- C--I think we as neighborhood groups have failed miserably in that we have not let the City know all that we do.
- C--I think neighborhood organizations would like to have a more developed relationship with the City because relationships with developers do vary.
- C--There are multiple and changing city plans. Why can't they make up their minds and stay on course. I would like them to report to us and be responsible for their planning. It's four years and you're out. What we're getting is politics and not planning. I would like long-term markers that we can see as a community.
- C--We're still stuck in the language of city decisions going to neighborhoods. The language is, "we're going to come up with a plan. We'll listen to you a little bit and then we'll tell you what we decided."
- C--Is this a process for the neighborhoods to the City, or the City to the neighborhoods? The City, in the past, has made it difficult for our voices to be heard because they're busy doing other things. (It was noted that it was for both.) All you're creating is a schematic. Much of this is covered in the democratic process.
- C--If the City is interested in engaging certain groups, it should sit down and make a list of the groups it wants to engage.
- C--I know the City has set up a variety of committees to capture some of those groups input on a citywide basis to make sure their voices are heard.
- C--The deadline for getting in comments is very close to when the community meetings end, which doesn't give much time to go to a meeting and then take information back to groups to gather input in time for the

deadline. (It was noted that the deadline is in place to give staff time to compile information for the Task Force in time to meet its deadline, but that staff will do its best to incorporate input that comes in after the deadline.)

- C--The Lowry East neighborhood has a process for communicating with the City, but it's hard to get the ear of City staff. Staff is busy.
- C--Your relationship with the City often depends on who you are dealing with.
- C--There should be a more formal process for dealing with the City to make communicating more clear and consistent.
- C—There is concern about the timing of these meetings and whether they are a formality.
- C--There are too many City meetings to go to around the same time.
- C--There seems to be conflict for CE between CPED, Public Works and the Community Engagement Coordinator—all seem to be addressing it (or not) in different ways. There should be more attention to this in the report.
- C--There are too many City meetings to go to around the same time.
- C--There seems to be conflict for CE between CPED, Public Works and the Community Engagement Coordinator—all seem to be addressing it (or not) in different ways. There should be more attention to this in the report.
- C--The three track process isn't working to frame this conversation.
- C--Is this about the City better communicating with neighborhood organizations?
- Avenues- do a "daily ground"
- C--City does not use newer technology and should. For example, blogs. That way people don't have to attend meetings and it still has an open dialogue.
- C--CE is implied by broad representation of members. This seems built in to ways groups are set up. I would like it if there were better ways to let the City know what the City is doing
- C--What is going on in the City government is not being covered well in the local news in general and specifically on environmental "stuff". Should there be another mechanism to communicate what the city is doing?
- C-- City processes are hard to understand
 - getting approved the pedestrian overlay district in their area was cited as an example
 - city specialists need to use language that a lay person can understand and be proactive in stating the implications of decisions
 - it is important to have city representatives at meetings where discussions occur that would involve city action
 - return to the days where city employees were at neighborhood meetings
- C--Create a master calendar where people are able to view all of the things that are going on. Also make it available on 311 where you could call in and hear today's calendar or tomorrow's calendar. This would be helpful.
- C--Last year the City sent out postcards to addresses in this area (Keewaydin) announcing that East 50th St. would be reconstructed and that there would be public meetings to discuss the project. I thought that notification was timely and thoughtful- especially since it was sent to my P.O. Box. I went to the first meeting, which was quite well-attended. A lot of people there wondered why 50th St. was being repaired when they (and I) could think of so many other streets in the City which seemed to need it more. Was it too late to change the decision? The representative from Public Works answered that, yes, it was too late. He tried to explain how 50th St. was chosen; it had to do with monies from the State and we have to use them when they're available and there's a formula and 50th St. got such-and-such a score and other streets might get lower scores but there's a formula and. . . we were all looking at each other and scratching our heads. It was hard to tell whether this fellow was trying to defend an unpopular decision and a silly process by making everything as confusing as possible, or whether he was just bad at explaining things. Either way, folks seemed pretty annoyed and suspicious. On the other hand, this same gentleman told us that decisions as to the details of the reconstruction had yet to be made, and he invited our input (regarding bike lanes, sidewalks, cutouts, etc.) at that meeting. The City then held at least two more public meetings (I went to one) before the reconstruction started, to get more input and keep us apprised of the plans. I think Sandy Colvin Roy took responsibility for notifying us, and that was good. So what's the larger lesson here? Well, timely notification is important. In this case the City didn't go through groups but went straight to individual citizens, and that

seemed to work well. If both the City department and the City Council Member can be involved in the notification and the meetings, that's good. On the other hand, public input can only be used up to a point. If there are statutory, administrative, bureaucratic or political reasons why a particular decision must be presented as fait accompli, then it's a good idea to be able to present those reasons as precisely and clearly as possible.

- C--one other example, and then I'll shut up. During the past year or so, when the library Board and City Council (among others) were trying to figure out what to do about the library system, I thought the outreach from City officials to concerned citizens was really outstanding. There were meetings all over the City; the issue and problems were well publicized and explained; at each stage I felt I understood who would take the next action in the process and thus whom I should try to influence. Public officials were being open to the opinions of the public, but they were also being honest about what was realistic to expect and where they stood on larger questions. Again, this was an issue in which S. Colvin Roy took a special interest, so maybe that explains why we were so well informed in this corner of the City; but I thought everybody involved in the process (including the Friends and simply concerned citizens) treated the situation with seriousness and didn't try to inflame things- or minimize things.
- C--Usually if I want to give my opinion on something to do with the City I try to figure out by myself whom to contact and what form the contact should take. I've actually found that folks who work for the City are pretty accessible and will at least listen.

D—Definitions will be very important to interpretation and implementation: definition and detail should be added, especially about who qualifies for funding.

- D--How will inclusivity be determined? For instance, how much effort will be expected of organizations, what will be deemed adequate or truly inclusive, at what point in the process will this occur?
- D--How does the City and CETF quantify community engagement? For instance, what is "adequate" and how will input received via e-mail be considered in comparison to input received at meetings.
- D--Neighborhood organizations are community-based, which works well with them being property tax funded. How would community groups and their representation be defined? Would a group such as the "Park Watch Group" qualify for community engagement funding?
- D--Structure and funding for the process and recipient organizations should be discussed in more detail.
- D--Funded community organizations should have the ability to demonstrate how they are representative/representing residents. Geographic representation makes this easy. How will the determination of how well an organization is representing residents be carried out and defined? It is difficult to demonstrate that a group claiming to represent community members such as an ethnic group or renters/owners is actually representative.
- D--Regarding representation, how will "best effort to include" be defined? Will making a best effort be enough?
- D--Business organizations should be considered agents of community engagement.
- D--Community development corporations should not be considered agents of community engagement-they are developers.
- D--Would religious and social/affinity groups be able to serve the CE function as well as neighborhood groups? How would their eligibility be determined?
- D--Common good is what we're looking for.
- D--How do you determine common good? A few people argue (are articulate and intelligent) and stand up for common good. We depend on this.
- D--What is common good? I think common good is God, country and family
- D--A distinction should be made between "decision-making" and "policy-making."
- D--A distinction should be made between "principle" (policy) and "program" (project).
- D--How can informal groups be involved if they want to be?
 - On the matrix, are we looking at ranking according to how effective groups are?

- Is there a way of weighing? How would you do the weighing?
- D--Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process. If this means for justice, the people whose lives are to be directly affected by a project or program must be involved in its planning; and for success, the people whose lives are to be affected by a project or program must be involved in its implementation then I agree. But this is not a belief, and being involved is not a passive "right" but an operational imperative -- the affected bring a perspective that is not only progressive but fundamentally fair.
- D--Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision-makers. The final phrase makes the statement nonsensical. Perhaps the draft acknowledges the prerogative of the policy-makers (elected officials) to fund or otherwise enable programs and projects, including the ward equivalent of earmarks or pork. Decision-making is more frequent and fluid and projects and programs are sustained by leadership. Leadership meets objectives, including needs, and when necessary has the courage to prioritize interests.
- D--I have some concerns about non-geographic groups. What are some examples of affinity or other groups that could be included? Has there been a lot of input from other types of groups that they need to be included? The lack of specificity about what groups to include is a deficiency of the report.
- D--The thing that is really missing here is, it says "characteristics for organizations that can receive resources to engage the community," but engage about what? Neighborhood organizations deal a lot with neighborhood issues. Funding that might go to a cultural or affinity group could be about citywide issues.
- D--What is the report using as the definition of community engagement? The reason I'm asking is the city probably has the finest neighborhood organization structure in the country. We have the best National Night Out in the country. We have wonderful neighborhood organizations that have been trying to engage citizens--it's a tricky thing. The fact that the City has undertaken this effort is confusing to me.
- D--"Closing the information loop" could become very expensive. (Time, printing, postage, etc.) It should be determined which kinds of decisions need to be communicated back to the residents and organizations.
- D--How do we know that the core principles of the report will be approved by the City Council? They should be presented in the report in a way that the City Council approves them as a set by approving/accepting the report and doesn't have to approve them one by one or leave it ambiguous as to whether they've been approved.
- D--Opening up qualification for CE funding to interest and affinity groups is contradictory to criteria about openness and inclusivity because interest groups by their nature are bringing together people with a specific interest or similarity.
- D--Principle 3.C: Isn't this a replication of something somewhere else in the report? How is this statement different? Can it be clarified? (i.e. Citywide vs. neighborhoods)
- D--Regarding "resource allocation"- defined as or in regards to what?
- D--Regarding Principle 4.D, which current CE projects should be utilized and supported? How about supporting all CE projects? D--Regarding recommendation 4.H, "points of interaction" depends on what you're interacting about.
- D--Spell out the CE system more. Is there one? What does it look like?
- D--The recommendation about "develop a system to get input into the planning process" is too vague.
- Describe what you mean by "planning process" as opposed to CE in other things that people would be involved in.
- D--What "points of interaction" are there right now? Neighborhood organizations?
- D--What is meant by "process"? (Regarding well-defined points of interaction.)
- D--What is meant by "well-defined points of interaction"?

- D—Defining Engagement

The definition of Community Engagement in the report should be written to reflect that engagement is as much about taking advantage of opportunities as it is about solving problems.

- Be a more positive statement of the power of community members working together.
- That engagement does NOT only relate to city decision making.

Principles: The major flaw in the principles outlined in this draft report is that they seem to start from the premise that engagement starts when someone in City Hall decides that there is a decision to be made.

Minneapolis' system of community engagement should be an asset based model that is focused on achieving outcomes, rather than on creating artificial barriers between City staff and residents. The system should be focused on what we are going to achieve collectively and not around an "us versus them" mentality.

Additional Comments

- The organizational structure for neighborhoods should be focused on building capacity in neighborhood organizations. It is important that Neighborhood Organizations remain their own independent 501 (c) 3 organizations.

- Under characteristics of organizations

- o Number three should be struck this provision would eliminate almost every nonprofit in Minneapolis from being able to participate. Good governance practices encourage nonprofits to establish membership criteria and a clear voting process for organizations

E—Expectations go both ways...there are clear baseline things that should be expected of both.

Expectations for organizations: Openness; results; proper accounting; clearly defined board expectations; inclusivity; communicate with and engage residents, accountability

- E--Organizations often feel like they are expected to enact a City agenda when they are funded- this shouldn't happen.
- E--The City should not assume an ownership role over organizations when it funds them, but can expect results. (Including that certain types of activities be accomplished/conducted.)
- E--Open membership should be expected of community organizations that receive community engagement funding.
- E--Organizations should be expected to follow generally accepted accounting principles and to maintain openness of information. They should keep being audited by the City.
- E--Organizations should be expected to follow the CPED citizen engagement rules.
- E--The organization should be available to the residents and to the City, making clear who is a point of contact, how to connect, where to go, etc.
- E--The City should expect the neighborhoods to give them clear expectations.
- E--The City should expect that neighborhoods are good stewards of City funds (require financial reports.)
- E--I think it would be critical for all community organizations representing specific areas of the city have clearly defined board rules, i.e. length of terms, who can be on boards, how to handle info to their constituency, elections, voting, and specific routes to specific individuals in the city government, etc that are all consistent with one another.
- E--In my neighborhood, Whittier, this happens through the neighborhood organization. Public community meetings are scheduled at regular times and places and widely publicized, including flyers right to people's doors. People make their comments, these go in the public record, the Board of Directors discusses and the neighborhood's recommendation is passed on to the City.
- E--DT: Principles are good. LCC does a good job of meeting them.
- E--Citizen participation guidelines-good-instead of just "representing a point of view/issues," CP guidelines for neighborhoods represent a lot of people.
- E--All groups need to be held to same standards- sense that neighborhood organizations are being held to a higher standard thru NRP- not state laws or City's Citizen Participation program.
- E--Greater emphasis to the words "inclusive deliberation"
- E--Recommendation for enforcement of core principles of community engagement, including annual Engagement Audits
- E--Organization to City
 - something long term in mind that benefits the city
 - something strategic that can be articulated that fits

- E--Select 3-5 people form a group (business and community) to be responsible for the CE.
- E--I think honesty is the essential requirement going in the other direction. Community groups, don't waste or steal the public funds. If you say you're going to do something, do it - or make an honest effort and don't be afraid to tell us why you didn't succeed. If you say you satisfy the "Characteristics" be prepared to show how or have the City stop dealing with you.
- E--How much anyone citizen's input will influence a given decision is always probably impossible to say, even for the decision-maker. Of course, there are groups, like my local neighborhood council, or the Friends of the MPI, who lobby the city for services and changes which I probably support. My experience has been that groups on this scale are usually so happy for anybody's input that, again, you can be quite sure they'll at least listen. Whether the group will then, to my satisfaction, effectively relay and reinforce to City officials my wishes is something I can't know unless I decide to become involved in the workings of the group. We could, I suppose, start requiring of these groups that they provide to their members minutes and transcripts of all their interactions with the City, copies of correspondence, phone records, etc. I don't think that's a road we want to go down - though, in general, transparency in the operation of groups is probably desirable. The Task Force's recommendations include parts about making groups more transparent and accountable, and those strike me as wise. If I see that a particular group has signed off on the "Core Principles of Community Engagement," and thus satisfies the "Characteristics of Organizations..." that's probably as good a vetting process as I can hope for. At least I know that if a group hasn't satisfied these criteria they aren't likely to get anywhere with the City and it would be a waste of time for me to use that group to influence the City.
- E-- Hold mini-public hearings-be representative of the diversity of the community-engage volunteers/residents-community
- E--make a formal recommendation to city on 'every' organize action in their neighborhood.
- E--to give their best effort, given the fact that they're volunteers. If the city provides \$ for staff, those staff should follow city actions and act as a liaison/lobbyist for the neighborhood groups. NRP should be continued because it encourages people to get involved and is effective
- E--Be able to inform their constituents of the issues
- E--Gather residents comments
- E--Fairly represent the community thoughts, pro-con, united-divided, minority report
- E--Accurately describe who they represent and who they don't
- E--They are accountable to the community
- E— I have had concerns that there does not always seem to be an active oversight process of community organizations. Specifically, there does not seem to be any consistent review of action plans and the completion of items in those plans. Perhaps this is happening but I have missed it. I have found some indication that the NRP Board becomes involved in cases of significant problems.
- E—Community organizations should develop an outreach strategy that addresses participation and communication. In nearly all cases, it will be impossible to ensure that the makeup of those actively participating in a neighborhood organization will closely reflect the socioeconomic/ethnic composition of the neighborhood. However, projects must reflect the broad composition of the neighborhood, as should communication.
- E-- I would like to see a requirement that a mission statement and an annual
- self-evaluation report be required for any group meeting the qualification to accept resources or contribute opinions as a bonafide Community Engagement organization. I see self-evaluations no less important than accounting for resources
- provided by the City.
- E--Information should be widely distributed using community media - print, electronic and digital- to reach constituents. Making sure constituents can respond using all available resources will afford city staff and elected officials with more likelihood of hearing from citizens. The West Bank Community Coalition is a great example of ensuring citizens are informed and offered the opportunity to give input to the City. They hold yearly tabling events at a few different West Bank businesses, with information about what they do as a community organization and how they can keep citizens informed--you are invited to be on their mailing or email list, whether you live permanently, in student housing, or just work on the West Bank.

Expectations for the City: Allow more autonomy to organizations; acknowledge and inform organizations and residents; be held to same standards as organizations; be flexible and helpful; consider providing hr and accounting services to orgs because of economies of scale that City has versus each individual org for these functions

- E--The City should consider taking on the accounting and hr tasks for neighborhood organizations. Many resources are spent on these functions and they could be done more cost-effectively and efficiently by the City.
- E--Community organizations should expect from the City: accountability and resources.
- E--The City and community organizations could both use and be held to accountability with the matrix of community engagement that is in the draft report.
- E--The City should recognize and respect decisions made by community organizations when they are reasonable.
- E--City officials should acknowledge feedback from residents
- E--Avoid putting the responsibility on community organizations for doing better and not the City with its big budget.
- E--Expectations of City by community and vice versa? Community should expect that they have financial and political clout to make decisions on their own behalf. They should also expect the City to be flexible and provide help when needed.
- E--During policy-making or law-making, City staff must facilitate not advocate, and neighborhood organizations like HPDL, funded by the City or not, should appear before the Council and Mayor from the citizenry not of the City.
- E--Having a mechanism for engagement and communication both ways helps ensure accountability and that people will be asked and listened to. (i.e. by Council Members, City staff, etc.)
- E--If you want increased input from residents, you'll never get it unless you give decision-making power to them vs. just an advisory role, with regard to development projects in their neighborhood. But--At what level should resident decision-making power occur? The City Council Members are elected to represent us.
- E--It's the responsibility of the City to come ask the people.
- E--Overall, there is poor engagement going on of the community by the City. It is exciting that this process is happening because there is a lot of potential for improvement of the system.
- E--Principle 7 is very wise. It is good because the process doesn't end when the City makes its decision. It is good to give people a chance to hear about what happened and to tell the City how it did.
- E--Regarding 5.B, "seek out and include community engagement partners in decisions regarding changes to the community engagement system"- I support it.
- E--Regarding ineffective City staff: "you can't legislate competence."
- E--Some City staff is very helpful to residents and organizations, and some are not helpful.
- E--This report and the task force are not addressing enough of what the responsibility should be of the City, CPED, etc. The roles and responsibilities of City departments and City staff as related to CE and communication need to be outlined.
- E--The City can make sure to send developers and others to the neighborhood far in advance of their hearings at City Hall so that residents and business owners can give their input before things are basically set (i.e. planning commission hearings).
- E--Audit the make-up of department heads and elected officials
- E--Have City departments work better with NRP.
- E--Have City departments use neighborhood organizations to do their work.
- E--Reward City department heads for working with neighborhood orgs and NRP.
- E--There should be a focus of responsibility, not diffusion.
- E--There should be something that all department heads report to.
- E--There should be resources to hold department heads accountable.
- E--If the City thinks they want Somalis (for example) to be more involved, then do that.
- E-- City needs to instruct employees to inform the neighborhood organizations of those who are seeking change [developers?]
- E--City to Organization
 - has a right to hear what the long term vision is
- E--Public hearings need to be in the evenings or weekends so that it is more accessible to the residents offering input.
- E--Council members should work directly with neighborhood organizations to hold a community forum to hear directly from residents on "major" decisions. For example, tax changes.
- E--Without staff, CEAC could not be an intermediary for neighborhood organizations
- E--Fairly "staff" intensive
- E--I think we all have a right to expect that the City be as honest as possible in its dealings with us. Obviously the citizens can't be involved in every picayune decision involved in running a city. But when we are involved, we have to be able to believe what we hear from the City, or else what's the point of involvement? Whether this comes back to

questions of clear communication and lines of authority within the city, or the building of trust between City officials/workers and the public (I'm sure folks on the City end of this whole issue feel their own vulnerabilities); or allocation of resources to make all this doable, I'm not sure. No doubt there is a combination of these factors, and many more. Try to be honest, and not too defensive. The cover-up is always worse than the crime - not that we're talking about crimes here, but. . . you get the point, I hope.

- E--Elected officials are very important
- E--officials come to monthly neighborhood meetings or send a representative
- E--consistent email/mail communication with neighborhood
- E--provide neighborhood with resources for community organizing/ getting people involved
- E-- to be transparent and whole-heartedly listen (come to neighborhood meetings)
- E--encourage Council members to show up to neighborhood meetings.
- E--Work to have a transparent process, manage expectations in terms of the extent people's opinion gets incorporated into decision.
- E--Follow-up by describing the final disposition and relations on allocating resources describe clearly expected results. Required reports, timeline and financial account ability
- E--Use its convening power to bring different city departments together with the community to solve problem
- E--the city will behave as though it HEARD the community
- E—Timely interactions well in advance of needed decisions
- E—Adequate funding to maintain organizational infrastructure to facilitate communication within the community
- E--The City's (CE) system should be: clear, easily understandable, inclusive, and utilize neighborhoods as its fundamental building block.
- E-- Sometimes comments made at community meetings indicate excessive self
- interest, and other times just a lack of understanding of the issues and the
- complications they entail. Just the same, the value of Community Engagement evolves when a range of opinions is tolerated.
- E--Consistently seek feedback via press releases, open forums, interviews on evening news broadcasts on all public radio stations, not just Minnesota Public Radio. City council members should develop working relationships with the community organizations within their constituencies, either through regular contact (monthly or quarterly) and/or through assistants, so these organizations may provide support on their initiatives or provide input to assist in decision-making.
- E-- Community organizations should expect the city to keep them informed about available resources, human, financial and social and pending policies or legislation affecting the ability to serve constituents. The city should expect community organizations to work in tandem with them to serve the community and assist in distributing information to affected citizens.
- E—Support

Additional support should be available to neighborhoods through access to information and expertise. Some examples of the types of information and expertise that should be available are:

Information

- Neighborhood organizations should have access to public information from the city on a timely basis and in an easy to use format to help the neighborhood organizations take advantage of opportunities and to identify problems and their solutions. Some examples of the types of information neighborhoods should have access to, are:
 - 311 Information by property to help identify problem properties/areas early on.
 - Public safety information, in greater detail than is currently available, to help neighborhood organizations identify problem properties and improve public safety.
 - Property information to help neighborhoods plan for their futures.
 - Resident contact information to help neighborhoods keep in touch with everyone in their neighborhood

Access to expertise

- The City should create a culture of engagement where City staff is trained to work with residents on identifying problems and opportunities. LNA believes that Minneapolis will be better off as a city if we can marry the interest, energy, and commitment of community members to the expertise of City staff.

Both City and organizations

- E-- Accountability is very important
- E--IAP2 principles are good.

F—Funding: required funding depends on expectations for organizations; neighborhood organizations need more funding; broadening the definition of qualified CE organizations would jeopardize the existence of some neighborhood organizations.

- F--Regarding funding, non-target neighborhoods should receive one source of funding rather than 2 sources or more, such as \$10,000 received by Waite Park. Target neighborhoods could remain recipients of CDBG funding.
- F--Regarding CETF Draft Report, under recommendation/bullet 4: delete the word “adopted” and insert “phase 2”
- F--Regarding broadening the definition of organizations who qualify for funding: broadening the existing funding to more organizations would spread the funding too thin. If the definition would be broadened, the funding would need to increase.
- F--For budget, are we talking about county, state or federal taxes?
- F--All of this engagement takes resources and that’s something that’s not reflected in here and should be.
- F--It’s about changing demographics and also about the new HUD CDBG maps – some neighborhoods changed from target to non-target. Two neighborhoods went from \$2,000 to \$15,000 to \$20,000 CDBG. Now the crunch is coming and the general fund is where it’s going to come from.
- F--What level of funding is needed depends on what you want. If you don’t want a lot, a barebones structure would suffice. What’s made Minneapolis great is that we’ve gone beyond that. A woman came to my door to tell me her husband was attacked by a pimp. She went to the neighborhood organization to let them know. We’ve seen her grow a lot. She’s involved now. Input is not engagement. I think at the level of engagement that is more than that, you have to be talking serious money.
- F--I spend a lot of time talking to people who are involved in neighborhood organizations. We would love to have the level of phase I money back, but if you look at the amount of funding at phase II, 70 percent is not enough. It’s just skimping by. Somewhere between the level of funding between phase I and the phase II is where it’s going to work. You have to consider, too, that we’ve gotten a lot better at it now.
- F--If I had half a million dollars and four staff people, I could run an amazing organization.
- F--Our neighborhood has a ton of things going on and only 20 percent of our budget comes from NRP, but every organization is different. You can’t say it’s the same across the board. We can leverage money but we’ve got that baseline. Other neighborhoods might not have as much ability to leverage.
- F--NRP did study population and density – funding based on need. And looked at the standard of housing, etc.
- F--Our organization in my neighborhood is in big trouble. The thing on our minds is not how are we going to communicate, but our infrastructure that we need to do anything. If we lose our staff person we are not going to be capable of providing it when the City needs community engagement. It won’t be there like it’s there now.
- F--We have people we pay to make the phone calls, to get the grants. Given the funding we have been told we will have, we will be nonexistent.
- F--I was hoping there would be information about funding. That was the charge and I don’t see that. The three-track charge worksheet that was given to the public doesn’t match the five charges listed in the report. According to the three-track worksheet, funding is one of the main charges.
- F--Instead of support NRP the way it’s written in the report, it should be changed in the report to extend to 2029 and at original funding levels.
- F--The City should look at what it needs from a neighborhood organization and what does that cost?
- F--Expectations tied to the CDBG funding are too high for the level of resources allocated.
- F--Interpretation resources
- F--Need more than the current \$500,000 from the City through the CP program.
- F--Support NRP and fund it. Don’t just erase it.
- F--Need money to get government staff’s attention. One thing that NRP has going for it.
- F--Funding issue: worried that it will go to non-geographical organizations, which means less for neighborhood organizations.
- F--Whittier already has good community engagement, but needs the resources to continue to do be able to do this.
- F-- Neighborhood organization is already providing information to city that they need for the resources they receive.

- F--Recommendation to fund community outreach efforts to reach all segments of our neighborhoods
- F--Designate appropriate resources to the constituency
- F— Resources

A second major deficiency in the report is the Task Force's inability to address charge number 5 (official support). Effective community engagement will require the following resources:

Financial

The City and other government funders should continue to fund neighborhood organizations.

The characteristics for neighborhood funding should be: adequate, stable, long term, and flexible.

- Adequate – Adequate funding for neighborhoods means a funding level between NRP Phase 1 and 100% of NRP Phase 2 allocations should be available for neighborhood organizations after 2009.

Adequate funding for neighborhood organizations means that neighborhood organizations will have funding for:

- o General operating support – There needs to be a base level of capacity built into the neighborhood system for there to be consistent long term engagement.

- o Adequate compensation for services rendered to the City by neighborhood organizations.

- o Discretionary Funding – One of the most powerful motivations for neighborhood involvement in the current system is the ability for neighborhoods to initiate, plan, and implement projects at the neighborhood organizations' discretion.

- Stable – Funding needs to remain consistent from year to year

- Longterm

- Neighborhoods are engaged in creating longterm

change, to be successful, neighborhood organizations need to know that there will be funding available to fully enact neighborhood plans.

- Flexible – Funding for neighborhoods needs to be flexible enough to meet the needs of neighborhoods as they evolve.

M—Missing: There are some important elements and points of clarification that are missing from the report.

- M--Add a recommendations section to the report. It wasn't clear how to find the task force's recommendations.
- M--Clarify the who, what, why and how of the Citizen Commission on CE.
- M--I don't see anything in the report about how and whether the efficacy of the CE Commission would be evaluated on an ongoing or occasional basis. This should be added to the report.
- M--The evaluation process for which CE projects to choose to support is missing from the report's recommendations.
- M--There is no evaluation of the perspective of residents who are recipients of City service and of how they think it went. (i.e., service from City staff)
- M--NRP has a focal point. This CE doesn't. It needs a focal point, funding and goals and objectives.
- M--What is the City structure and support for this?
- M--The report misses what the City isn't doing well.
- M--Relating to TF charge: outline current CE system- or not- if the City thinks they have one or not. Show it if they have one- or say that they don't have one.
- M-- People might be confused because they might be looking for a proposed CE structure and this report doesn't give it to them
- M--How can we expect to have a conversation about CE when NRP is still out there? The report and CETF should communicate that to the council.
- M--Report doesn't include benefits that NRP has brought to the City.
- M-- Neighborhood organizations are very dependent on their City Council member -neighborhood organizations need an ability to have a voice independent of the City Council members.
- M--Reference need to include renters and students

- M--For me the essential measure of the success of this Task Force and of the larger Community Engagement initiative will be how much increase there is in the engagement of groups which have to this point been less engaged: the groups identified as less active by several of the outside appraisals of the NRP, for example. Since I'm not really representative of any of those groups, I'm reluctant to suggest what they might want to see in the report. But I would urge you to make an extra effort to emphasize the perspectives of the Task Force members who can speak for these communities. Make an effort to understand and include their recommendations.
- M-- I wonder if there is any danger in the use of the word "citizen" in the report and elsewhere? Do we mean to refer to "citizens" in the strict legal sense? If so, it may be hard to encourage the involvement of non-citizens, whatever their "status". Something you might want to look at. Good Luck! Well done!
- M--The report needs to be more "grass roots" friendly. It is precisely those populations who are NOT represented within organizations that are often most affected. Alternative "connection points" need to be established, e.g. Door-to-door, churches, mosques, community centers etc... These may be additional work but need to be integrated into the system.
- M— This probably doesn't fit in your document, but the concerns about the lack of community engagement in Track 3 should be addressed.
- M— While this is a short report, an Executive Summary might help, perhaps something similar to the purple overview that you passed out at the meeting. This could help with the definition of community engagement, clarify the lack of specific actions, and also emphasize the openness of the process.

N—Neighborhood Organizations vs. other groups for CE: neighborhood groups are better equipped to do CE than other groups; neighborhood groups are accessible and convenient; some people just don't want to get involved. But, zipcode alone shouldn't be the criteria for funding.

- N--Will all neighborhood organizations have to reapply for the CE funding or will they be grandfathered in? Automatically funding existing neighborhood organizations could alleviate anxiety from the neighborhood organizations.
- N--Regarding CETF Draft report, Appendix C should not be included. All of those organizations should not be recognized as agents of community engagement. Only neighborhood organizations should be recognized for CE purposes.
- N--Funding should go to neighborhood groups, not affinity groups.
- N--Track one is working as it is-leave it as is.
- N--I was surprised the report included affinity groups. I like geographic. I think it works. If it's not broke, don't fix it. Affinity groups open a huge can of worms. It could work against the system we have now.
- N--The best connections are geographic (proximity). Affinity groups are another layer. Don't strip out the power that is geographic.
- N--What about block clubs?
 - Yes
 - They are controlled by police and that's the problem.
 - I think you can get too small as well. Most blocks don't have block clubs.
 - Strong blocks make strong neighborhoods
- N--What if you had a neighborhood group that you didn't feel represented your interests?
 - whole system.
 - The route is there now to get It happens. It's incumbent upon me to make my voice known.
 - In a democracy, sometimes you're not going to get your way.
 - Sometime, one person doesn't get their way and they want to do away with the elected (will the affinity groups be open?)
- N--What do people think about the matrix?
 - I'm against affinity groups with contracting but surely everyone should be engaged, can call 311, etc.
- N--Are neighborhood groups representative?
 - The report says you have a right to be involved. You also have a right not to be involved.
 - Some people are just never going to be involved.
 - Neighborhood groups could be more creative but they need more funding.

- I'm very pleased with what I see.
 - I like that you can walk to neighborhood meetings.
- N--Could the bridge collapse be an example of when an affinity group needs to be involved—Somali businesses in the area?
 - In that case, shouldn't the neighborhood groups for that area do a better job representing that group?
- N--I think the neighborhoods here have done a good job reaching out to the business community.
- N--You get a different perspective if you're closer to home.
- N--I agree that keeping it local allows you not to get lost.
- N--In the Saint Paul model you would be more likely to get lost.
- N--Smaller organizations keep the community perspective.
- N--Planning districts do work well for that purpose.
- N--Maybe the boundary lines for neighborhoods could be drawn differently if there are some groups that are really small
- N--Or, maybe neighborhood groups could pool together for certain things (joint newsletter, etc.)
- N--The City could offer incentives for sharing resources.
- N--I would like to affirm geographic distribution of funds. Some neighborhoods don't know how to speak for themselves. It should be even distribution. Otherwise the squeaky wheel will get the grease.
- N--What about the lack of ethnic diversity in neighborhood groups? How do you address?
 - Being inclusive is difficult.
 - This is the one thread that is used to criticize neighborhood organizations, and it's legitimate, but the City Council is not necessarily inclusive and diverse. Why are neighborhood organizations held to a different standard?
 - Keep in mind that many seniors will not go out at night. That is a challenge.
 - Great ideas need money behind them.
 - If you're in an area with a high percentage of residents with college degrees, you have more capacity.
 - Some challenges are generational. The next generation will learn the language, for example.
- N--I advocate the task force work within the NRP mechanism to strengthen its representation and financial and political resources rather than creating a whole new system which will likely duplicate the old.
- N--In general, decentralizing decision making and giving neighborhoods the political power they need for self determination will create the best long term policies.
- N --Until some unifying procedure is adopted all info will be haphazardly handled and no effective ways for citizens to have a true and honest way to have neighborhood and city impact!
- N--Why are we not utilizing the NRP process to improve engagement? What has happened to that program? We don't need to replace NRP with this new program. I feel NRP was the best, although changes and improvement are always is ongoing so what! Improvement to NRP should not be replaced with this new effort. We spent so much time and effort and money building neighborhood capacity. It appears as though the city is abandoning NRP why?
- N--How to insure community input is received by City? Important relationships have been built over the past twenty years between participants in the NRP Process and the City. The Task Force has many good ideas on including groups often left out of the process. It makes sense to me to strengthen the current capacities by working w/ NRP to include new groups. It will do more harm than good if the majority of the current capacity/ relationships are destroyed.
- N--The City cannot systematically route, constrain, or filter communities of interest through geopolitical organizations like HPDL.
- N--Neighborhood organizations are the only ones who actively engage everyone in an area. Neighborhood organizations are working hard to connect with the community. Affinity groups are tied to interest, not area.

- N--Neighborhoods should be seen as a hub.
- N--People get involved in neighborhood organization to get involved in all of these other things. That's why you don't see a lot of them here.
- N--Neighborhood organizations should be building blocks, not just for the City, but for other jurisdictions like the County. So citizens don't have to go to all of the jurisdictions individually, they can go to one place.
- N--I think we should maintain the current structure the NRP has already built.
- N--It feels like we're trying to duplicate or replicate NRP.
- N--Knowing I can go to my neighborhood organization, nothing can replace that.
- N--I've met several people familiar with the St. Paul District Council system – you can't get a lot done. It's not enough. The idea to combine neighborhoods to a whole ward with one staff person is not going to be enough.
- N--This should be a neighborhood-centric system. That's where people feel at home and where they are vested.
- N--My neighborhood organization passed its own set of community engagement recommendations: it should be neighborhood-based; the neighborhood groups can combine if they want to; CDCs (community development corporations) are not seen as part of community engagement; business associations are community engagement and can get funding; funding should come from one source, not two, for non-target neighborhoods (not NRP and CPED [Community Planning and economic development]); and target neighborhoods should have two funding sources NRP and the CDBG (Community Development Block Grants) from HUD (Housing and Urban Development). Adding district councils is unnecessary. Neighborhood organizations already serve this function well. Waite Park neighborhood organization is good example.
- N--The only concrete piece of community engagement we've had is NRP and we've had to fight for that the whole way.
- N--I'm afraid of this because I think it's suggesting that neighborhood organizations are going to lose their unique roles.
- N--We're looking at community engagement to do what we in the neighborhoods are doing.
- N--Geographic accessibility is important. If you can't go to all the neighborhoods for feedback, at least go to all the planning districts. If you want feedback, it has to be geographically available.
- N--Most of what the City does is geographically-based, so it makes sense for neighborhood organizations to do the community engagement work.
- N--I got the impression from the CE meetings that there is intention to move away from neighborhood organizations to ethnic groups. This wouldn't be good.
- N--Stability is valuable. There are a lot of NRP-funded neighborhood organizations that are stable, have been around for a while and have learned a lot. It appears that there is an effort to do away with these organizations.
- N--Neighborhood organizations ensure that their members know and understand what the City is up to and how it affects them. It is difficult for information from the City to trickle down to residents, especially those with language barriers and no access to the internet. Community organizations are able to bridge that gap more easily than the City. Also, people are much more likely to go to a meeting that is in their neighborhood than not and more likely to attend a meeting that affects something in their neighborhood directly. Community organizations, by their very nature of organizing geographically, are able to go to the people more easily than the City is with their top-down method. When citizens get together in an area, they can work together to bring their ideas to the City and tell the City what changes are important to them. COs empower residents in a unique way whereas the City has a tendency to feel too big and powerful and hard to change from residents' perspective. Instead of organizing around issues or similarities, which can divide people,

neighborhood organizations organize simply around where people live which draws people together. The City can expect that neighborhood organizations' missions reflect this inclusivity.

- N--I would like to see a strong statement in favor of neighborhoods and fully funding NRP. Neighborhood organizations are the only ones organizing geographically not along religious, ethnic or issue driven lines. They unite all people in their area and do the City's work in an effective and grassroots manner.
- N--Use neighborhoods. Expand into what you want to expand into.
- N--The report references "support what is working" but the report doesn't explicitly say what's working. So, they should add that NRP is working.
- N--Several comments were made that NRP is Minneapolis' community engagement system.
- N--Don't broaden the list of qualifying organizations- keep it the same.
- N--Concern about removing "neighborhood organizations"-it feels like it might be fractioning them. Explicitly add it back.
- N--Concern about expanding support to non-geographically based organizations.
- N--Defensiveness from neighborhoods, but there is room to be more inclusive.
- N-- Balkanization can happen by not representing a cross section but rather smaller, special interests. This is something that is not desired.
- N-- Would like neighborhood organizations to be the organization that brings together different interests.
- N--Accessible ways is often through neighborhood organizations.
- N--I imagine that most of the people who show up at these meetings are going to be neighborhood organization reps because that's who's engaged. But these meetings aren't representative of the community.
- N--Established interest groups should be recognized for their special efforts, knowledge, history, and perspective, not their zip code.
- N--Generally-provide resources for neighborhood level work (through NRP)
- N-- continue NRP
- N— Most of the work of community organizations is geographically based- development projects are tied to locations and the people who live in neighborhoods. The organizations should also be geographically based although some neighborhoods could possibly be combined for purposes of efficiency.
- N--The (CE) system should build on the current system of independent neighborhood organizations that are funded through the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP).
- N—A community member submitted a letter to express that he is not content with the current NRP performance and his letter elaborates on several examples. He believes that the City should investigate the conduct of NRP or bring it to an end. He also has a list of grievances directed at NRP as the last 50 pages refer to his comments regarding PPERRIA's NRP Phase I Plan Review.

Pages 1-6—Comments about community engagement (CE):

- Glad MPLS is considering restructuring CE because NRP has had a "poor performance" partly due to the political process.
- There is an Article from Southside Edition of Insight News that focus on the question of "who can be at the table and who benefits from NRP?" and that has been the same criticism that has been echoed in the past. Where is the answer to that?
- NRP fails to serve the poor and minority.
- I support what the recommendation states: "Measurable outcomes would allow for the development of best practices"
- Cities should investigate the conduct of NRP
- "Public has a right to know how its government operates and the misconduct and financial mismanagement of NRP organizations..." (pg. 4 of his letter)
- Bring an end to problems with NRP

Pages 7-56—Examples of some grievances (see letter for more specifics):

- Implementing neighborhood-wide program to help homeowners and PPERRIA's experience
- Motley Area Improvement Program
- Education and Human Services and SWIM program

- Sidewalk Lighting Project

*This community member submitted his input in hand-written form. Due to the length of the document (56 pages hand-written) a summary is provided here and the full document (15MB PDF) can be made **available upon request**.*

- N— Role of Neighborhood Organizations

A major deficiency in this draft report is that it does not clearly articulate the central role neighborhood organizations play in engaging community members in Minneapolis. LNA's position is that neighborhood organizations should be the focal point for engaging community members with their local units of government. As the focal point for community engagement neighborhood organizations should provide the critical link between the neighborhood issues that engage community members and the larger issues impacting Minneapolis. The following are several reasons why neighborhood organizations should be the focal point of the community engagement process:

- Neighborhood organizations are the only organizations in Minneapolis that are focused on building connections between all the residents in a given geographic area. For Minneapolis to be a healthy city it needs to build connections between the different groups who live and work in Minneapolis.
- The nature of how people invest in where they live puts neighborhood in a unique position to build connections between residents with diverse backgrounds.
- Other than voting, neighborhood organizations currently are the largest source of civic engagement in Minneapolis.
- In general, City decisions are geographically based (i.e. development, infrastructure, transportation), which makes it reasonable that the primary method for community engagement be geographic.
- Utilizing neighborhood organizations as the focal point for citizen participation with the city and other units of local government can provide community members with a one-stop shop where they can address their ideas and issues without having to negotiate the bureaucracy of local government on their own.
- Neighborhoods provide a much easier point of access than the City bureaucracy as a whole does, because neighborhoods are much more accessible and provide opportunities for people to work on issues proactively; where most interaction with the City bureaucracy takes places after people already have a problem.

P—NRP Policy Board vs. Citizen Commission on CE: remove reference to a citizen commission b/c it duplicates the NRP board

- P--Regarding the CETF Draft Report, bullet point 3 in the recommendations section should be deleted: a citizen commission on community engagement should not be created because it would be redundant. The existing NRP policy board already serves this function.
 - P--What about a citizen's commission?
 - What would it add?
 - There's already a lot of commissions.
 - How would you hold it accountable?
 - At Hennepin County they use interns through Step-Up and send them out to do surveys to find out how we're doing. We could send a survey to neighborhood groups (do you feel like you've gotten adequate notice? have you gotten enough support?, etc.). It could be done cost effectively. It requires supervision but builds students' confidence.

S—Different strategies are needed for communicating with and engaging different people and places in the different areas of the City; some neighborhood groups are better at implementing different strategies than others; some City Council members and City staff are more responsive than others.

- S--Community engagement is more complex on the north side. Many people feel more comfortable calling their neighborhood organizations than their council member or city staff.
- S--Most people on the North Side don't have e-mail, so this is an ineffective way to communicate with them. In order to invite participation from these community members, the City or organizations need to distribute flyers to homes and use other communication strategies.
- S--It is hard to get people to participate: sending letters to every household doesn't always mean that people will participate.

- S--If every neighborhood organization were funded to create newsletters that went to everyone, you could have a half page with a calendar, then everyone would get it. (It was noted that not everyone could read it.)
- S--You have to buy ads. Some neighborhood papers do a good job covering everything, but you can't depend just on that.
- S--Some cultural groups might feel like they're excluded because the neighborhood organization in their area might not be a good enough neighborhood organization. One could try to make sure that neighborhood organizations become more culturally sensitive. They could hire people from those communities.
- S--We should formalize the process for how staff from other jurisdictions connects with neighborhood groups.
- S--People want things more localized (i.e.: conversation about planning street lighting in each neighborhood vs. Citywide)
- S--The process should be less formal: different methods of outreach should be used and there should be less meetings in this traditional format.
- S--There is a high percentage of seniors who don't have e-mail access. There should be other methods of communication besides e-mail that the City and organizations use.
- S--Ask Bob Cooper's help to draft guidelines for cultural (non-geographic) communities.
- S-- How do we focus on people's needs
- S-- When it (CE) works, people come together around a common interest
- S-- Consider human needs not currently met by other resources (health/education/economics) (ex. high risk kids in schools)
- S--Recommendation to include outreach and inclusiveness training for neighborhood staff and board members, i.e. White Privilege and Racism Training
- S--E-mailing does not work for all, particularly the senior's group.
- S--Recognize that it may take the combined effort of several organizations to obtain truly representative comments on important issues. Each organization has limited ability to gain participation from particular constituents. E.g. the neighborhoods org-NRP entities- almost exclusively represent white home owners. Currently, renters, immigrants and people of color are un-or under represented with little voice in city discussions. Non-profit community based organization-like Sabathani-have the ability to engage community residents who don't go to the neighborhood organizations and faith-based organizations represent another slice of the community.
- S--The best way to engage is to give the community resources to accomplish the result and let them do it. E.g. Bryant village initiative
- S--I applaud that "cultural or affinity group" organizations be created as recognized groups eligible to contribute opinions and feedback. Although geographical neighborhood groups are valuable and should be continued to be encouraged, they sometimes stifle contrary opinion or new participants. Many groups would rather not come under the umbrella of an existing geographical neighborhood group.
- S--In doing the Health fairs that I did the main question was how would you like to get information and how would you like to give info. Most often it was from friends (getting their info.) Not many interested in reading materials, but also would get information from the corner store or the Laundromat. Not much time for meetings.

T—Build more trust and be more transparent with the process. Make an authentic effort to work to build a legitimate, effective, responsive system.

- T--People are disillusioned with these types of processes and task forces: a resident gave an example of a bike lane task force that he was involved with. A bike lane/route was created as a result of this task force but one month later, a business owner complained to his council member that people could no longer park right in front of the business, and the council member decided to usurp the new bike route and allow parking in front of the business, creating a dangerous area for bicyclists and undoing the work of the bike task force.
- T--Don't expect that people will take this report and process at face value. People have been burned in the past by the City and need to develop trust.
- T--It feels like a power grab. I just think there was an easier, simpler way to go about this.
- T--It bothers me that on the three-track thing that the NRP piece is separate and internal. The community engagement discussion is happening without citizen input.
- T--I've been coming to neighborhood meetings since 1992. I'm amazed at the number of control freaks and how many bible thumpers there are at republican caucuses. The neighborhoods are just plain dying. Everyone's leaving because they can only get five years of welfare. This is just like a republican caucus; everyone in the world should go to my church. Then you've got all the mafia real estate deals going on. And you're paying for that right now.

- T--Some of it's not a mystery. What's behind it that made this so complicated is really important. There isn't transparency about that. I think transparency is really important. City government, if it was straightforward, would be so much better received, instead of feeling like it doesn't matter because someone has already decided.
- T--You have to be careful because some of the politicians would like to get into the National Night Out mailing list and manipulate that and use who they see as community activists.
- T--I can tell a lot of care went into the report, but it goes back to the beginning; what was behind this? Do people not like this guy Bob Miller? I'm still not sure exactly what it's about. Engaging people is not that difficult of a process; you have to make things relevant to people and communicate.
- T--It feels like there's something else underneath all this, and, while that's happening, the infrastructure is deteriorating.
- T--I'm hearing from people that the whole purpose of this is delays to let neighborhood organizations fall apart.
- T--I love the idea of building on what's there. I love identifying the areas where we can improve. But the sense and the feeling I get about what's going on is it doesn't feel straightforward to me. For a city with such a good system to evaluate the system? It makes me a little uncomfortable.
- T--I'm not clear about the background, about how this report and the three tracks came to be. In the end, you want citizens to trust the process and a very important part of that is understanding where it arose, where it's going. If it's as complicated as it seems, it seems designed to keep people out.
- T--I love the idea of "build on what we have," but this community engagement, in its entirety, destroys what we already have because it takes it over--will the power be back downtown?
- T--We've been coming to these meetings for five years. The City keeps asking what we want. People are tired of saying the same things.
- T--This report was written in a vacuum.
- T--Trust NRP. Don't trust the City. Don't trust that they'll want CP ever.
- T--Is this a back door effort to end NRP?
- T--People aren't looking at the recommendations because NRP is still in the room.
- T--Don't profess to do something if you can't
- T—Identify the geographic affiliations of anyone representing a neighborhood or cultural group. Not doing so contributes to suspicions.
- T—There are many suspicions about the reasoning behind the community engagement process. To the extent that you know, spell this out early in the document. Include the reasoning behind the three tracks. If you don't know, acknowledge the suspicions. This is tied to the continuing confusion about the definition of community engagement.
- T--This task force looks like a classic bureaucratic cover your a--, but don't really do anything maneuver. For 20 years the NRP has been the main force to improve the neighborhoods. This came about because of the massive dissatisfaction with downtown getting all the money and most of the attention. So this unfunded mechanism will somehow magically overcome the city's now lack of commitment to the neighborhoods. The cynics always tell me that the city will do whatever it wants and that public meetings to elicit input are window dressings, much fury signifying nothing. That they will do whatever they want. Mostly, the cynics are right. How will this change now? At least with NRP, we got to invest in our neighborhoods and got a lot of good projects completed. This fig leaf of process covers a lack of commitment to put our tax dollars to work in our local community. I smell a rat.
- T--What we have heard from the residents & visitors in South and North East Minneapolis is that people are not sure how this new community engagement will differ from the previous ones they have heard or were involved. The main thing that is an obstacle to sell this idea to the East African community is that this process will be DIFFERENT from NRP PROCESS. Folks have had a terrible experience with NRP PROCESS. I don't how we could erase that bad experience from their minds, but we will keep trying to show them that the City of Minneapolis Engagement Process will be TOTALLY DIFFERENT and trust worthy process led by competent people.

X—Examine what has been working and build on that: there are some very successful neighborhood organizations who have been inclusive and could share their strategies and model with lower performing groups; SAFE and Crime Prevention Specialists should be considered as a model to build upon;

- X--I'm sure no one talked about increasing the number of crime prevention specialists.
- X--The people who started the SAFE Program—and it wasn't a police department program—really believed in neighborhoods, really believed in participation. When it became part of police, there became teams. But the people

who were hired had a different mentality. It used to be that the CPS (crime prevention specialist) was the first on the scene if you needed help. There were more people. The number is down to a third of what it was. The CPSs are absolutely in touch with each other. More CPSs would be a marvelous thing for community engagement. Citizens relate better to a civilian. Not that there aren't good communicators in the Police Department. If you want to talk about community engagement, there are people who have been involved in SAFE for 25 years.

- X--I know that there are some neighborhood organizations that need continuity and support. The successful ones need to meet with the non-successful ones. Neighborhood organizations should meet and share the good things they do.
- X--There are a lot of neighborhood representatives, especially staff, that do talk to each other and I don't think that is recognized.
- X--And neighborhood organizations do share resources.
- X--Sharing ideas between neighborhood organizations could be more formal. It could save time and money, especially if you have turnover.
- X--Why not examine what's working. Why not examine those that have been successful. And I don't care if it offends those that aren't.
- X--I understand that some neighborhood organizations are good and some aren't. Why haven't we done best practices and pick the organizations that are working very good and work off that?
- X--I was insulted by the remarks at the council meeting about institutionalized racism. That Council Member is from an area that is not diverse, and is more upper middle class, white. My neighborhood is very diverse and we have significant representation in our board and high participation from the community.
- X--The Phillips neighborhood has a large population of refugees and has worked on alternate ways of communication and outreach. For instance, they have worked to identify at least one person with e-mail on each block who then commits to communicating information to their neighbors.
- X--The Phillips neighborhood needs to translate all of their information into at least three different languages. They utilize volunteer translators to translate the information, which doesn't produce perfectly accurate information but helps and people really appreciate it. They could use more support from the City on this. Their neighborhood is learning and adapting to their changing community. Their system is kind of like a "pony express" of information.
- X--We're actually doing pretty well here-we have a fairly responsive City (in comparison to many other cities.) Example of Mpls presentation at Des Moines gathering regarding NRP model and level of City support for neighborhood involvement here. People from other cities were impressed and disappointed that their own cities aren't open to similar endeavors. New relationships and partnerships were made at this gathering and representatives from Minneapolis neighborhood groups are mentoring people from other cities.
- X--Principles are good- what has been experienced through LCC/NRP
- X--Room for improvement with NRP- but sees NRP as flexible enough to address them
- X--"Recognized" groups can be helpful to judge orgs

Other

- I--I was very impressed with how dedicated the people were who served on the task force.
- I--Kudos to Matt for his conducting of the meeting.
- H--If these documents are too specific, they have no "survivability."
- L--Don't like two community meetings in one night
- V--I think it's true that the charge can include the ability to look beyond. As a task force, you have the right to make recommendations about the future.

The input below was not received from the community in time to be a formal part of the task force's discussion related to possible additions or modifications to the CETF draft report. It was sent to task force members to inform them of all community input and factor in through their discussions and voting.

Submitted 10/29/07

Comments on the Community Engagement Task Force Report

- The report does not address any of the charges to the Committee.
 1. It identifies organizations that **could** be recognized but makes no recommendations on organizations that **should** be recognized as formal participants in the community engagement system. The list in the report includes nearly every organization of any type operating in the City.
 2. It discusses possible criteria for assessing organizations for recognition (and by extension what should be expected from these organizations) **but** never addresses what the organizations should expect from the City.
 3. It talks about “connection points” but fails to define them or clarify what they are. The list in the report is so inclusive that it is useless.
 4. The report does not present a single “alternative for an improved organizational structure” or indicate who has the “responsibility for action”. There are “themes” but no indication of the level of support for various themes, any pros and cons of the options or discussion of how they would fit together into an “alternative organizational structure”.
 5. There is no discussion whatsoever of the official support needs for the organizational structure or the potential costs of the approach proposed in this report. What will it cost to provide funds to every organization in Appendix C? What will it cost to assess each of these organizations in accordance with the criteria on page 11? Who will make these judgments? How will this be monitored?
- The report contains 3 pages on the principles of Community Engagement and one page on possible criteria for assessing organizations. It contains 2 pages of individual comments (by Task Force members, but that is not clear). **The largest portion of the report (5 pages) is devoted to Task Force member attendance (for what purpose?) and bios on the Task Force members. This is a Report with more background and self congratulatory material than substance.**
- The definition of Community Engagement is too long, complex and filled with jargon to be of any use in defining the program or to be understandable to the average resident. The City's website and the November 6, 2006 report on Community Engagement contained far superior definitions. Why the need to change them?
- The report shows no evidence that any of the vast array of research available on community engagement, citizen participation or programs in other jurisdictions in this country were used during the Task Forces discussions. Many papers, reports, studies and books have been written on these topics but there is no evidence that this Task Force was given any of these materials as background

for their discussions. Of the 20 items listed as “Background Material” in Appendix A, only 3 contain any materials referencing findings from other studies or jurisdictions. Noticeably absent are scholarly studies from such internationally recognized participation research organizations as Rutgers University, the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, the University of Southern California or the University of Michigan.

- The principles themselves have numerous problems.
 1. For example, Principle #1 appears to be targeted at the community engagement organizations. The IAPP principle upon which this is based was clearly targeted at the governmental organizations that held power and control over citizen participation. If they do not acknowledge and accept this right it will not matter that the community engagement organizations accept it. And the Recommendation is very unclear about “who” is to adopt the “Principles of Community Engagement”. The Qualities of this Principle should identify who is to adopt this “fundamental value” and incorporate it as part of the “regular culture of how things are done”.
 2. In Principle #2, the “promise that the public’s contribution will be thoughtfully considered” by whom? The community engagement organization? The City? The Recommendation for this principle is exactly the same as the recommendation for Principle #1, but with more and excess verbiage. In all of the Qualities, it is unclear to whom they apply. For example, does the second bullet apply to community engagement organizations or to both community engagement organizations and the City?
 3. The principles mix City actions with community engagement organization actions without being clear as to which qualities apply to which parts of the community engagement system. For example, the 6th bullet in the Qualities section of Principle #3 clearly indicates that this is a City responsibility but no such specificity is present in bullets 3, 4 or 5. Similarly, responsibilities such as a), b), c), d) and e) would appear to be City responsibilities with other partners but no such indication is presented.
- In general, the Principles are unclear about who they are written for and who is responsible for what. A great deal of clarification and restatement is needed if these principles are to be understood and incorporated in any community engagement system.
- The characteristics (page 11) should include, besides incorporation, current registration with the MN Secretary of State, Federal tax classification as a 501c3 or 501c4 organization, and current on required reports to the Attorney General. Some provision should also be included that the group must maintain appropriate insurance and receive limited or full financial or compliance audits at least once every two years.
- The commitment of support is that the City “may” provide resources to eligible groups that meet these criteria. Has there been any research on whether or not this possibility for an unspecified level of support is enough of an incentive to induce any organization to meet these requirements? The cost of ensuring compliance or achieving these standards may outweigh the support being provided.