



---

## Track 2: *Community Engagement Task Force*

---

**Oct. 29, 2007 Minutes**

**(Approved Nov. 8, 2007)**

**4:00 p.m. - Room 132 City Hall**

**Task Force attendees:** Diann Anders, John Bernstein, Mark Fox, Diana Hawkins, Jeremy Iggers, Matt Perry (co-chair), Jeffrey Strand, Joyce Wisdom, Long Yang, Shirley Yeoman

**Task Force attendees absent:** Russ Adams, Mohamed Ali, Kathleen Anderson, Don Fraser, Elena Gaarder, Mary Keefe, Anne McCandless, Repa Mekha, Chris Morris, David Rubedor, Jessie Saavedra

**City staff in attendance:** Tamara Downs-Schwei, Council Member Cam Gordon, Council Member Diane Hofstede, Jennifer Lastoka, Cara Letofsky, Barb Lickness, Council Member Robert Lilligren (co-chair), Alicia Scott

**City staff absent:** Erik Hansen, Luther Krueger, Greg Simbeck

**Facilitators in attendance:** GrayHall - Nora Hall, Karen Gray

### Outreach overview

Co-chair Perry asked task force members to share information from outreach activities.

#### Specific outreach activities:

- A task force member said she gave presentations to some business associations. The groups went from a handful of people to several dozen or more. Folks were very interested. Council Member Colvin Roy was at one of the meetings at Longfellow where they weren't happy about the list of types of community organizations the City should engage with. They thought it was counter-productive. (It was noted that the list is not part of the recommendations, but was a brainstorming session.) The task force member said the business associations have seen how they work with their neighborhood organizations and they are concerned about maintaining our geographic groups. Another task force member noted that including a list that we don't want to include is confusing to people. It was noted that if the list goes away there may be more support for the report overall.
- A task force member said she was at the outreach session organized by Council Member Gordon's office. There was a discussion about accountability of how our neighborhood groups engage. There's a lot of conversation that some neighborhood groups are struggling to engage but also that in some cases there's "we don't want to include some," such as renters. So the City needs to look at that.
- A task force member gave an update from the community forum held in northeast Minneapolis on Oct. 9. He said he counted 14 residents, 6 staff and 5 task force members. He said it was very productive and gave huge amounts of input. The main points stressed were: keep a neighborhood-based system, fund groups and create a master calendar to avoid conflicting meetings so residents are pulled and tugged. He said there was a strong sense that many of those in attendance were affiliated with neighborhood organizations. He was surprised how many people came from other parts of the city.
- A task force member said she talked about the report at the West Broadway Business Association and one of the biggest questions was about NRP.
- A task force member said she went to the community forum meeting at the Downtown Library. She said it was very interesting to look at the report after hearing from people where we missed the mark. She said the participants were very heavily weighted with neighborhood people. The main point was that we missed the mark with addressing funding.

#### Outreach attendance:

- A task force member said he went to 3 of the five community forum meetings. He said if he was blindfolded he would have thought he was at a save the NRP meeting. He was disappointed with turnout and that some of the groups we're trying to include in the community engagement process were not included.
- Co-chair Perry noted that it's amazing what 15 years of funding can do to an organization—they get very-well organized. Another task force member noted that it is easy for those established groups to get the information.

- A task force member said he didn't see many "civilians" at the meetings and that there seemed to be a sense of animosity; that the neighborhood groups feel like they're under attack. Another task force member noted that those involved in the NRP are civilians; they are people who have chosen to be active. She also said there is a lot of fear.
- Council Member Hofstede noted that she often sees the same people showing up at meetings. We have a core group of community activists. They're consistent. It's not unusual to see the same people. She said when she asks others why they didn't go they say it's because so and so goes and I trust them to represent me.
- Staff Lickness said that for those who were present when Archon Fung presented, he described this group as informed stakeholders. Because they're engaged, they're more informed. There is a group of citizens who come out. It's a lot of work and they don't get paid for it. They do it because they care about the city and they go back and share the information.
- Staff Lastoka said she has a spreadsheet that shows the activities that we did for outreach. It wasn't just the five community meetings (included seniors and business associations, etc.) She will email it out. We have a multicultural service department and talked with that group about how we could reach out. On this particular issue, the multicultural staff did some individual work to reach out as time permitted. In the future we can do more of this.
- Council Member Gordon he said that at his roundtable there were some people who were more critical of the way things have been going. One NRP critic asked 'why don't you hold these groups accountable for representing?' A task force member agreed that there seemed to be a good cross-section at this event.

## Discussion of changes to report

- A task force member noted that on one of our lines we talked about requiring City staff to have training. One of the suggestions she heard was to require neighborhood boards to also have training. I really do think there are some issues in some neighborhoods. One activist I talked to said "we have a good relationship with the police." The Latino and African American community don't and when they hear that, they don't come back.
- Facilitator Hall asked if there will be a listing in the report of the outreach that happened. Staff Lastoka said that for the final we only want to have the recommendations, which is reflected in the handout. We are restructuring the other material, but aren't done yet.
- Co-Chair Perry noted that the group will be voting on some of the recommendations by voting red, green or yellow, similar to past meetings. We will trust the facilitators to keep count. If a majority of votes are green the item will go in the report; for red and yellow we can discuss if needed. With 10 voting members present the magic number is six. If there are six greens we keep it, six reds, it goes, and all other items will be up for discussion. A task force member asked to clarify that at the final meeting for the draft report we had high attendance and now we have a smaller group that can possibly change the report. Perry agreed that that is the case but noted that we will be voting on the final report as a group, so basically we are making recommendations to the fuller task force.
- A task force member asked if the new format is going to stay, noting the she likes it.

## Voting and discussion

The task force was presented with a set of 24 items to vote and 2 to discuss. The group first voted on the 24 items to determine how many were "in," "out" or "up for discussion." The group then went back to talk about and revote on the discussion items as time permitted. Results and discussion:

**VOTE 1: PROPOSED MODIFICATION:** Require organizations that receive resources to engage the community in order to encourage openness to alternative viewpoints by annually adopting the "Minneapolis Core Principles of Community Engagement." Create a report that formally reports back to the City's Community Engagement on their implementation of the Principles annually. (Original text: Require organizations that receive resources to engage the community--to encourage openness to alternative viewpoints by incorporating "Minneapolis Core Principles of Community Engagement" in their work.)

Fail - the vote was against including this modification (keep this recommendation as it was in the draft report.)

● Green "yes" votes –	0
● Yellow "maybe" votes -	4
● Red "no" votes -	6

**VOTE 2: PROPOSED ADDITION:** Design and implement tools that City staff and departments utilize to communicate upcoming projects early in the process to support early involvement of residents. These tools should also assist City staff in identifying ways in which resident input can be solicited and incorporated into the planning processes of upcoming projects.

Pass - the vote was in favor of adding this recommendation to the report.

● Green "yes" votes –	6
-----------------------	---

- Yellow “maybe” votes - 4
- Red “no” votes - 0

**VOTE 3: PROPOSED MODIFICATION: COORDINATE INPUT & ACTIVITIES** - Develop a system to coordinate input from the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) to City departments and between City Departments. (Original text: **SHARE NRP INPUT** - Develop a system to coordinate input from the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) to City departments.)

Pass - the vote was in favor of including this modification.

- Green “yes” votes – 6
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 0
- Red “no” votes - 4

**VOTE 4: PROPOSED MODIFICATION:** Develop a system to permit community organization plans to inform the City’s planning process and contribute to the City’s work prioritization. (Original text: Develop a system to get increased resident input into the planning process.)

Pass - the first vote was to discuss further. The second vote was in favor of adopting the modification with the word “plans” changed to “priorities.”

- Green “yes” votes – 2
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 7
- Red “no” votes - 1

**Discussion points:**

- This would allow organizations to go to the City with plans. It’s a means by which neighborhood organizations can go directly to the City.
- This already exists. An example is the Humboldt Industrial Park Plan. It’s unfortunate that we need to say this, since NRP plans are already reviewed, but including it seems to be a necessity based on input.
- This is a concept. This actually happened at one point but if I give the label, people would react to that. It would give a forum for neighborhoods to give some input to City departments directly.
- We have improved the CLIC (Capital Long-Range Improvement Committee) process through the NRP. I like the language but I think it’s redundant.
- (audience member) The Mayor stated that he wants the CLIC and community organizations to work together. If this is about CLIC, why don’t we just say CLIC?
- (staff Letofsky) I think this is much more broad than CLIC. I don’ like the word “plan.”
- Council Member Lilligren – I agree that it’s broader than CLIC.
- The original text says resident input and we’re supposed to be looking at organizations.
- I see it as the bigger thing – that in this proposal, community organizations specifically broadens past neighborhoods and CLIC.
- Can we change “plans” to “priorities”?

**VOTE 5: PROPOSED MODIFICATION: ALLOCATE RESOURCES** - Develop a system to allocate resources to organizations that are asked to engage the community. *Add to the end of the recommendation the following text:* (Resources may include but are not limited to administrative funding, training or staff assistance, or professional technical assistance to eligible groups that desire to work to engage the community.)

Pass - the vote was in favor of including this modification.

- Green “yes” votes – 7
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 2
- Red “no” votes - 1

**Discussion points:**

- This could end after the word “assistance.”

**VOTE 6: PROPOSED ADDITION:** Utilize and support current community engagement projects and initiatives, including the NRP and the City’s community engagement system as defined **BELOW/ABOVE**. [as a task force we have not defined this so it would require additional time/work] (Original text: Utilize and support current community engagement projects and initiatives, including the NRP.)

Fail - the first vote was to discuss further. The second vote was against including this modification (keep this recommendation as it was in the draft report.)

- Green “yes” votes – 2
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 3
- Red “no” votes - 4

**Discussion points:**

- I don't think this adds anything. I move to keep the original text.
- It's the same as earlier when we talked about adding a greater level of detail—it's not everywhere. I'd like more detail. If I end up voting against the whole report it's because there's not enough detail.
- The City Council is looking at Track Three. I just think we keep the language as is.

**VOTE 7: PROPOSED MODIFICATION:** Identify or create locations around the city for meetings, etc. **This should include City Council meetings, boards and commissions.** (Original text: Identify or create locations around the city for meetings, etc.)

Fail (however replacement modification approved) - the first vote was to discuss further. The second vote was against including this modification (keep this recommendation as it was in the draft report) and to instead, modify the recommendation about field hearings. (Original field hearing recommendation: Implement a system of field hearings—hold more meetings at times and locations that are convenient to the affected community.) Add: In addition, explore holding meetings of the city council, commissions and boards in the community.

- Green “yes” votes – 3
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 7
- Red “no” votes - 0

**Discussion points:**

- I support this change even though it's extremely difficult logistically. It sends a message that it's a healthy thing to do.
- I'm generally supportive of this too. We heard comments to this effect, especially on the northside.
- I'd like to hear from council members about the complications of this. It seems to me this building is centrally located.
- Council Member Hofstede – As a Library Board Member I was in favor of opening meetings up...no one came. It's very expensive and difficult to move things around. You can't access the information you need. I don't think people realize how tied we are technologically. There are many cameras. It costs money to move and it's a matter of priorities.
- (staff Letofsky) Doesn't' this tie into the recommendation about field hearings.
- Council Member Hofstede – I have seen that most recently we have gone out more broadly than we ever have.
- Council Member Lilligren – This is something we hear a lot from people (shifting times and locations). Some things we have/do shift like liquor licenses, etc. I think it's a good idea. The Council can meet anywhere.
- We need to consider cost.
- There are several council members who have breakfasts and newsletters; they're reaching out.
- (audience member) It's comfortable. We have to get out of the mode. Make it flexible for the residents.
- The NRP has used park buildings. There are opportunities. Should we wordsmith this to say “seek opportunities.”
- What we maybe want to do is wordsmith the field hearing recommendation.

**VOTE 8: PROPOSED MODIFICATION:** Create well-defined points of interaction (**clear processes, contacts within departments, and timing, etc**) between the City and community organizations from the beginning of each process to its ends, including evaluation. **These points of interaction should be established in all City departments.** (Original text: Create well-defined points of interaction between the City and community organization from the beginning of each process to its end, including evaluation.)

Pass - the vote was in favor of including this modification.

- Green “yes” votes – 8
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 1

● Red “no” votes - 1

**VOTE 9: PROPOSED MODIFICATION:** Add to the end of the recommendation the following text: **City boards, commissions and departments should work together – through community engagement work plans – to ensure community engagement activities are properly coordinated with efforts that are cross-jurisdictional.** (Original text: Require City boards and commissions to implement community engagement strategies in their work, providing them with sufficient resources and training. Strategies should include annual evaluation and accountability reports.)

Pass - the first vote was to discuss further. The second vote was in favor of adopting the modification with the following changes: Change “City boards” to “Independent boards” and tighten up the wording to say... Independent boards, commissions, and departments should work together on community engagement work plans that are cross-jurisdictional.

● Green “yes” votes – 5  
● Yellow “maybe” votes - 0  
● Red “no” votes - 5

**Discussion points:**

- This is way too wordy.
- Should this say independent boards?

**VOTE 10: CHOOSE ONE OF THESE OPTIONS** (Original text: Create a resident-based commission of community engagement.)

**R22A - PROPOSED DELETION:** Delete this recommendation because the NRP Policy Board already fulfills this role.

Fail - the vote was against deleting this recommendation.

● Green “yes” votes – 1  
● Yellow “maybe” votes - 0  
● Red “no” votes - 8

**OR**

**R22B - PROPOSED ADDITION:** Add to the recommendation some suggested responsibilities and parameters for the commission.

Pass (however additions not defined yet) - the vote in favor of this addition.

● Green “yes” votes – 7  
● Yellow “maybe” votes - 1  
● Red “no” votes - 2

**VOTE 11: PROPOSED ADDITION:** Provide the resources to support a variety of communication strategies known to reach residents directly.

Pass - the vote was in favor of adding this recommendation to the report.

● Green “yes” votes – 6  
● Yellow “maybe” votes - 2  
● Red “no” votes - 0

**VOTE 12: PROPOSED MODIFICATION:** - Require City staff who works in the community, **community organization staff, and community organization board members** to have ongoing cultural orientation and community engagement training. (Original text: Require City staff members who work in the community to have ongoing cultural orientation and community engagement training.)

Undecided - The first vote was to discuss further. The second vote, a motion to keep the original text, didn't pass. Staff was directed to work on rewriting this item for a later vote.

● Green “yes” votes – 4  
● Yellow “maybe” votes - 2  
● Red “no” votes - 3

**Discussion points:**

- We need to delete the ‘s’ in works.
- This seems non-controversial to me.
- I don't like the word ‘require’. I would be happy with ‘encourage.’ I don't know where you're going to get board members.

- This is the one that came out of Cam’s meeting and at one time it included providing resources. You have to look at what board members are getting, too. What you’re giving board members is training.
- When you’re talking about City staff, it’s clear where the resources are coming from.
- (audience member) – What is ongoing cultural orientation training?
- We haven’t identified that specifically and we can’t really go there in the amount of time we have.

**VOTE 13: PROPOSED ADDITION (MOVED INTO RECOMMENDATIONS SECTION): NEXT STEPS** – The Task Force recommends additional work to bring these recommendations to the next level of detail be driven by the public as was the generation of this report.

Fail - The first vote was to discuss further. The second vote was against including this addition.

- Green “yes” votes – 3
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 6
- Red “no” votes - 1

**Discussion points:**

- I question the premise. I think this was about the potential end of NRP. There weren’t people beating down the door saying we need a report on community engagement.
- I agree with it. This was in the report in the “next steps” section and we would be moving it into the recommendations.
- This potentially opens up a can of worms. We’ve seen how difficult it is to come up with detail. Now we’re asking someone else to add the detail.
- One of the things that we have heard is that people are not trustful of the City to take community engagement into their hands.

**VOTE 14: PROPOSED ADDITION:** The City should provide the structure resources for best practices in community engagement to be available to all community organizations receiving city support and all departments interacting with the community. Peer support by those demonstrating best practices should be utilized.

Undecided - The first vote was to discuss further. The task force asked staff to work on rewording.

- Green “yes” votes – 0
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 10
- Red “no” votes - 0

**Discussion points:**

- This needs to say “seeking”

**VOTE 15: PROPOSED ADDITION:** The city should incorporate incentives coupled with quantifiable and measurable goals in its community engagement system to encourage and promote community engagement from department level down to the individual contributor level.

Pass - the first vote was to discuss further. The second vote was in favor of adopting the addition with a couple of substitutions. The final addition reads: The City should incorporate quantifiable and measurable goals in its community engagement system to encourage and promote community engagement from department level to the individual employee level.

- Green “yes” votes – 1
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 6
- Red “no” votes - 3

**Discussion points:**

- Change “down” to “up” or “through”
- I move to strike this.
- This actually came from our Nokomis meeting. A former City employee who was there said there has to be incentives for City staff to do it. We’re not saying it money.
- What’s the incentive?
- There should be incentives

**VOTE 16: PROPOSED ADDITION:** The city should provide adequate resources to city department programs that rely on residents as their primary human resource (such as CCP/SAFE).

Undecided - the first vote was to discuss further. There was not time to discuss.

- Green “yes” votes – 4
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 1
- Red “no” votes - 5

**VOTE 17: PROPOSED ADDITION:** The city should promote more collaboration and improved communication between community organizations and block clubs where their respective goals in community engagement align.

Pass - the vote was in favor of adding this recommendation to the report.

- Green “yes” votes – 8
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 2
- Red “no” votes - 0

**VOTE 18: PROPOSED ADDITION:** These characteristics identify community organizations who should receive city support to empower residents to lead and initiate in the prioritization, planning and action on issues specifically important to their community through that community organization.

Undecided - the first vote was to discuss further. There was not time to discuss.

- Green “yes” votes – 1
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 7
- Red “no” votes - 2

**VOTE 19: PROPOSED MODIFICATION:** The only groups that should be eligible for resources for engaging the community are neighborhood organizations. *(If this modification is approved all reference to cultural or affinity groups would be removed from these characteristics)*

Fail - the vote was against including this modification (keep this recommendation as it was in the draft report.)

- Green “yes” votes – 0
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 1
- Red “no” votes - 9

**VOTE 20: PROPOSED MODIFICATION:** Ensure that membership is open with no barriers to participation or membership (such as mandatory membership dues, requiring attendance at a certain number of meetings before voting rights are conferred, etc.

Undecided - the first vote was to discuss further. There was not time to discuss.

- Green “yes” votes – 0
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 7
- Red “no” votes - 2

**VOTE 21: PROPOSED MODIFICATION:** The group must have a board of directors elected **on a regular basis** by the membership of the organization. The board must represent a fair cross-section of the community. **In the case of neighborhood organizations**, neighborhood residents must comprise no less than 60 percent of the organization's board. An elected board must be in place for a minimum of one year prior to the beginning of the contract year to be considered eligible for funding.

Undecided - the first vote was to discuss further. There was not time to discuss.

- Green “yes” votes – 4
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 6
- Red “no” votes - 0

**VOTE 22: PROPOSED ADDITION:** Organizations that receive resources for community engagement activities should provide an independent auditor's report, expressing the accuracy of the organization's financial statements and effectiveness in community engagement based on measurable goals, to the City on an annual basis.

Fail - the vote was against including this addition.

- Green “yes” votes – 2
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 2
- Red “no” votes - 6

**VOTE 23: PROPOSED ADDITION:** All board leadership of community organizations must demonstrate they have received training in board governance for an incorporated organization such as fiduciary duties, effective director – board relationships and roles and responsibilities.

Fail - the vote was against including this addition.

- Green “yes” votes – 3
- Yellow “maybe” votes - 1
- Red “no” votes - 6

**DISCUSSION 1: Discussion Point...*MORE CLARIFICATION NEEDED: DEVELOP CITYWIDE SYSTEM*** - Develop a system for citywide engagement regarding citywide issues.- It was noted that this recommendation does not seem very descriptive or duplication another rec.

**Discussion points:**

- I heard at several meetings that people were asking for more detail but if we start down this road, there not time. We need to keep this at the 30,000-foot level.
- I don't know what it adds.
- If we add detail in one place we will need to do it throughout.

**Fail - the vote was against adding more clarification (keep this recommendation as it was in the draft report.)**

● Green "yes" votes –	1
● Yellow "maybe" votes -	0
● Red "no" votes -	9

**DISCUSSION 2:** There were comments about lack of specificity of what resources should be allocated. We do recommend allocating resources but do not say what resources. DISCUSSION POINT...Should this report include and how would it include WHAT resources.

**Undecided - there was not time to discuss.**

## Closing

- A task force member noted, for the record, that she had concerns about the process of voting on the report line by line. We didn't step back and look at the report as a whole to see where we might have missed the mark.
- Co-chair Perry said the next meeting is to finish this work.
- Council Member Lilligren asked staff to work on the pending items to try to determine what's missing including Vote 10 (R22B).
- A task force member asked about meeting a half hour earlier and at least one member was opposed.
- Perry noted that it's very important that you come if you can because we'll be voting on this report as a whole. We'll be presenting this report to the Committee of the Whole on the 15<sup>th</sup>. He is working on a set of assumptions that to help with presenting and will send it out to everyone for feedback. Others are strongly encouraged to be at the COW presentation.
- Staff Lastoka noted that others are also welcome to help present the report to the COW. She also noted that she has copies of the materials that were handed out during outreach and about track 3.
- Perry – I want to thank everyone who participated in the community outreach activities. Thank you very much. It helped tremendously to show there are other ways to do community engagement, and in many ways, it was very effective. It also showed that there is strong volunteerism that could be tapped by a CE system.

**Adjourn.**