Track 2: *Community Engagement Task Force*

August 15 2007 *Meeting #7*

Post-meeting Task Force member comments

Comments by line:

#6 & #10 – In a just and fair world I would agree with this language. However, I know there are mean and hateful people out there and I'm not sure how we make our language as inclusive as it needs to be and still leave room for anyone to say, when it may need to be said, "you can't say that and be a part of this forum".

#12 – I would like us to say "appropriately broad". As we've discussed many times, some notifications may not need to be "broad".

#13 – I still don't know how we're using these terms – formal and informal.

#20 & #21 – these seem to contradict each other. Are we limiting the ability of participants in designing how they participate if we already have established expectations and roles?

#24 – I think I understand what the intention is here and if I do, I don't disagree with that. But I had an immediate "skin crawling" reaction to the language. I fear many will read this as a statement that says the city can control what citizen's can and can't do. Better language needed.

#37 – If I have no problems with that final document, then I would have no problems with this item.

#41 – I guess I have no objection to this – I just don't put a high value on it.

#49 – I need much more definition. Is this not redundant to what we already have? Is it available–or could it be–through 311?

#50 – I generally agree with the principle. However, I'm a little nervous about what kind of notice might be required.

#52 – I would like a better definition in the added section. What do we mean by "a community"?

#53 – Does this conflict with #52? I would read this to say you couldn't just represent Somali Immigrants, for instance.

Other comments - I appreciate the additions in the introduction. However, I think it's not quite there yet. Under track 3 (the NRP piece) I would like to see some who, what, where, & when added. This is an important piece for many people in the community, and as I said before there are many who assume that this is part of the current process. People need to understand what that process will be and how they can be a part of it.

New suggested recommendations:

 1. Cultural communities that do not have a city advisory committee should have the opportunity to do so, providing equal access.

2. Non-geographic community organizations should be notified about city community engagement processes as well as geographic community groups (neighborhoods).

3. The cultural community organizations should provide information on how to participate in city processes to the community they represent.

4. Maintain an updated, centralized and inclusive list of contact information on community organizations (both geographic and non-geographic) for notification and outreach.

5. Provide cultural orientation training for city staff.

6. Greater levels of participation can be achieved when the city is able to coordinate with community events (i.e. gather input at community festivals, events, regular meetings, etc.)