August 29 2007 *Meeting #9 Minutes*
(Approved Sept. 12, 2007)
4:00 p.m. - Room 319 City Hall

Task Force attendees: Diann Anders, Kathleen Anderson, John Bernstein, Mark Fox, Don Fraser, Diana Hawkins, Jeremy Iggers, Mary Keefe, Anne McCandless, Repa Mekha, Matt Perry (co-chair), David Rubedor, Jessie Saavedra, Jeffrey Strand, Joyce Wisdom, Long Yang, Shirley Yeoman

Task Force attendees absent: Russ Adams, Mohamed Ali, Elena Gaarder, Chris Morris

City staff in attendance: Council Member Cam Gordon, Erik Hansen, Council Member Diane Hofstede, Luther Krueger, Jennifer Lastoka, Barb Lickness, Greg Simbeck, Alicia Scott

City staff absent: Bob Cooper, Cara Letofsky, Council Member Robert Lilligren (co-chair)

Facilitators in attendance: GrayHall - Nora Hall, Karen Gray

Administration

* indicates comments by non-voting members

The meeting was preceded by a presentation from Professor Archon Fung.

➢ **Minutes:** The minutes were approved after a vote to remove names.

➢ **Work plan:** Matt Perry (co-chair) noted that the work plan has been modified to reflect our next meeting on Sept. 12th. The steering group discussed this and decided to skip a week because on the Labor Day holiday and staff schedules.

➢ **Voting:***It was noted that the dotmocracy results indicate the changes that will be made on the report based on the votes from last week. *A facilitator asked everyone to vote one dot per item.

➢ **Opening comments about the Matrix:**

- I think voting on the matrix is premature as there are repetitive comments and conflicting information. He said he'd like to see more input from people.

- I made some comments about it.

- I'm not clear what the proposition is – what would a green dot or a red dot mean?

- I assumed there would be a lot of yellow dots and it that would be a point of conversation.

- I recommend skipping the voting and making it a conversation. (There was no formal vote but the group indicated agreement and the matrix was removed from voting).

➢ At the request of the several Task Force members including John Bernstein who has been the primary contact for matrix revisions, co-chair Perry removed the matrix from the dotmacracy voting with discussion of the matrix content to be held at the end of the meeting.

➢ **Miscellaneous**

- One member handed out proposed text for a resource section.

- I have a question about the new recommendations. Up until now we've been voting on things that have had discussion. How will these things be incorporated? (It was noted that we will incorporate them just as we have in the past.)

- They're kind of out of context now so we may need to vote on them again. It was noted that Council Member Lilligren is working on how we will vote on the whole report for the final voting. Let's discuss the yellow items and then let's have a discussion on the matrix.

- I share the discomfort with the new recommendations. It feels like they dropped in out of nowhere.

- Co-chair Perry responded that at each one of the past CETF meetings he had encouraged Task Force members to seek out comment from the constituencies they represented and to bring that input back into the CETF discussion. He also noted the dotmacracy voting sheets provided each week included sections

for comments and new recommendations. The new items that the group was looking at today were a combination of material that had been presented at the previous week's CETF meeting by him as a voting CETF member (recommendations for culture organizations) and new items which he had brought back from meeting with neighborhood leaders in the capacity as one of five neighborhood representatives on the CETF. He again encouraged voting CETF members to bring input back from their respective constituencies both during this phase as well as during the community outreach phase.

Review of lines

Line #49c – City commitment to hire full-time staff to maintain a community engagement Web site. (7 green, 2 red, 7 yellow)

Comments:
- If one of line 46 (department, office or commission) passes then 49c becomes not necessary.
- This is redundant. The city has resources online waiting for people to access.
- We would need to describe what the Web would do.
- We have a lot of language about technology already.
- *There is a piece of this process in another track that is about bringing community engagement pieces together and part of that is Web.
- Maybe "The city commits to maintaining an interactive community engagement Web site."
- *In maintaining, is there a sense of what would take priority? Would this be a higher priority than some other city goal? It's about allocation of resources.
- What we want to say is there's value in that. There are budget meetings that will decide what has to be done.
- *What's not working?
- I find that the City Web site is very difficult to get around. And once you have it down, they change it. You use to be able to find all the vacant lots. There's a lack of consistency. I was trying to find contact information for Bob Cooper. He's not listed anywhere and yet he is the liaison for neighborhood organizations.
- *I think that is the answer. Address those issues.
- Sometimes the problem with information is that there's too much. So I guess simplifying rather than creating a new one makes sense to me.
- I could not find things unless I browse.
- It is important to reinforce the interactive part.
- Maybe we could add to line #47 (Provide information quickly and in ways that are tailored to users' needs.)
- Community engagement is more about sending information out.
- You have to fix what is there before you get interactive.
- I think we have to think beyond technology. Not everyone has access to use technology.
- Refine to include two-way communication.
- How much do we encourage that? Do we include the ability to complete a survey, sign-up for a variety of activities?
- *This might not be the right committee for this. Alicia can craft text for next time. I'm hearing user-friendly.

Line #61 – Mission of the community organization should have as one of its elements community safety. (0 green, 8 red, 7 yellow)

There was no discussion of this item other than a recommendation to strike.

Line #64 – A community organization is one that offers a service or a benefit that would improve the broadest number of people. (3 green, 4 red, 9 yellow)

There was no discussion of this item other than a recommendation to strike.

Line #65 – Goal of a community organization should include the empowerment of all members of the community and not just those in agreement on a particular issue. (5 green, 2 red, 8 yellow)

Comments:
- This confuses me.
- What kind of community organization are you talking about?
- This is way too specific. There are too many exceptions.
- A couple meetings ago you voted me down from empowering. How can we expect an organization to empower?
- There was a recommendation to strike this.

Line #69 – Neighborhood organizations should be strengthened to maximize their ability to serve as "one stop" for local residents needs whether they be geographical or otherwise since having a single source to go to enhances the ability for a neighborhood organization to bringing different groups together, balance diverse needs and create connections points. (3 green, 6 red, 6 yellow)

> There was no discussion of this item other than a recommendation to strike.

Line #70 – Resource allocation should be done collaboratively between the City and the community organization. (8 green, 1 red, 7 yellow)

Comments:
- There are cases when it shouldn't be collaborative.
- To me collaboratively would mean hear my work plan. It's kind of a heavy commitment on the city to demand that.
- I don't understand what that means.
- What he is saying is this means any and all resources would have to be allocated through collaboration.
- There are times when the City is going to have to say this is going here. They get the big bucks and they will take the political heat for it.
- Maybe "when the City agrees to allocate resources, it should be a collaborative process."
- I don't know that this item is actually called out anywhere. There's money and staff that's needed to make community organizations effective.
- *My concern is that this is about future funding. If this was the big picture one, that might be kind of important. If NRP funding is gone in '09. So if this group wanted to help figure that out, this might be it.
- Is it our job to determine if it is funded or not?
- The spirit behind it resonates with me.
- *I did not hear anyone speak out against collaboration.
- *The question is, who makes the decision?

Line #71 – Use council member's office as a resource for enhancing cross community organizational collaboration including those entities outside of City Council such as the Park Board and School Board. (3 green, 4 red, 9 yellow)

> There was no discussion of this item other than a recommendation to strike.

Line #74 – Promote mid and upper levels of CPED to go out into the neighborhoods and work directly with neighborhood organizations. (8 green, 1 red, 7 yellow)

Comments:
- Does this mean encourage?
- As a neighborhood rep, I have talked to some members of this constituency. They said that it would be helpful if mid- and upper-level CPED personnel should be encouraged to interact with community organizations like their staff does. It means encourage an environment where that would happen.
- *What is the mid- to upper level?
- This sounds too specific and detailed to me.
- There was a recommendation to strike.

Line #73 – Neighborhood organizations should be notified at the earliest possible time whenever a change that could affect the make up or character of the neighborhood is being considered. (8 green, 1 red, 7 yellow)

Comments:
- I think that this one needs to be discussed. It has not been discussed. (It was noted that there has also been a request to discuss items 3 and 31, which didn't have votes that meet our discussion threshold.)

Line #77 - Cultural communities that do not have a city advisory committee should have the opportunity to do so, providing equal access. (5 green, 0 red, 9 yellow)

Comments:
- The city has 52 boards and commissions. I don't think we need to double that. I vote to strike.
- *It is at a majority vote of the city council to create advisory committees. It's also part of another track to review those and try to improve the process. You can lobby the council and say we need representation.
- If we create a community engagement policy that says it includes affinity groups are we going to be changing the need for those advisory councils?
- *It could be that it would change how it happens.
- How would adopting this change what the current system is? I don't see how this changes anything.

- *It just might encourage us to look at creating a few more advisory committees.
- When do all these groups get together and start working together. Are we encouraging people to just be in their own little groups?
- Should neighborhood organizations get citizen advisories committees too?
- There should be an equality. Neighborhood organizations receive a lot of support from the city.
- There are cultural and affinity groups that don't know the system well enough to have access.

Line #81 – Provide cultural orientation training for city staff. (7-4-5) Co-chair Perry suggested that additional time at our next meeting or through e-voting be allocated to voting and discussing the new recommendations addressing affinity groups. With the group's approval, the meeting had been extended to 6:30 p.m. to allow for a lengthier question and answer period for Dr. Fung's presentation that had preceded the regularly scheduled CETF meeting.

Matrix Discussion

- Some other task force members and I have done some work on this. Co-chair Perry noted in addition to John Bernstein and himself that Diann Anders, Mark Fox, Mark Fox, Jessie Saavedra, Shirley Yeoman had either provided input or alternative versions of the matrix.
- *Where does this sit as opposed to the characteristics?
- Another task force member's belief, and I have a difference of opinion, is that we would remove the characteristics and use the matrix.
- Adding page numbers would be helpful.
- I think about this like the ladder that was discussed today by professor Fung.
- We should be looking at characteristics at the same time.
- *Maybe look at this as homework.
- Maybe people just don't understand how it works. The point of it is to help define an organization and issues within an organization and draw a line within that matrix where it would be eligible for resources.
- *It's also trying to address the second charge on expectations. I think the darkened areas are what the city is going to do. The other area is the organization to city exchange.
- I tried to look at this as if I wasn't someone who sat in on this. It needs descriptions and labels.
- It's a way to layout what the expectations are as we try to identify whose formal and informal. I changed it to formal in and our and informal in and out, which you might see.
- What I think is critical is when Archon talked about representative governance but also to engage in discussion. Participatory accountability. So we go beyond representative government. Show how you engage the discussion broadly. (A facilitator asked her to write something on this and she agreed).
- The shaded areas are something we pulled from somewhere. My ah ha moments is, we should be working in those columns – think about the problem. I can think of things to add. We would be recommending to the city that there would be all these levels of engagement.
- I don' think it's been clear. It'd be nice to apply some case studies to this.
- Fung also said there's no magic bullet. I'd like to see it cross referenced with the other matrix that was in the city's other community engagement report. The matrix is not going to solve our problem of lack of participation.
- *It could be used to look at the different kinds of work the city does and does it go into inform, consult. So it would be clear to city staff.
- Maybe we could give some examples of the use of the matrix as was done with the ladder diagram in Dr. Fung's presentation.
- Adding a text section to describe the matrix itself would be something that John would need to answer since he had always stated that the matrix should be able to stand on its own

Conclusion

*A facilitator notes that we have all done a lot of work. Send email about things that have not been incorporated.

*Staff said to identify pieces that haven't been addressed and we can launch some of these discussions.

Somewhere we endorsed the idea that the group should represent diversity of opinion. Maybe even a minority opinion.

*I'm confused about outreach after the 12th. What happens after the outreach? Do we just punt that to staff?

There is a draft of an outreach plan. It assumes that all the members are signed up to have two more meetings to address input from the community.

It was noted that the meeting of the 12th was not in fact the "last" meeting, but the next meeting since there was an expectation that the CETF would be meeting at least one more time to vote on the final report that was delivered to the City Council's Committee of the Whole. The community outreach effort might necessitate more than one more additional meeting after the 12th. It was agreed by the group to note the meeting on the 12th as the "next" meeting of the CETF rather than the "last".

Can we do our dotmocracy by email? (It was noted that this would be done).

Adjourn.