

# Community Input on the draft “Framework for the Future”

---

**Presented by Jennifer Lastoka,  
Community Engagement Coordinator**

April 3, 2008

# Context

---

## ❖ **Dec 20, 2007**

Draft “Framework for the Future” presented to City Council

CE Coordinator directed to facilitate gathering input from community stakeholders

## ❖ **Jan 2008**

5 informational sessions held

Neighborhood organizations asked to coordinate gathering feedback from their neighborhoods.

## ❖ **Feb – Mar 2008**

Approximately 45-days for submitting written input

# 35 responses from neighborhood organizations

---

## **MANY...**

- ❖ Used standing board or committee processes
- ❖ Presented a consensus viewpoint to present
- ❖ Indicated a 45 day process is generally not enough time

## **SOME...**

- ❖ Coordinated joint meetings with other neighborhoods
- ❖ Presented full range of views (possibly with conflicting points)
- ❖ Suggested sufficient resources need to be made available (*materials, publications, translation, staff*)

# Summarizing the input

---

- ❖ Segmented by individuals and neighborhood groups
- ❖ Categorized into sections
- ❖ Identified themes & minority viewpoints within each section
  - *both represented here*

# Administrative Funding

---

- ❖ Important component of a program
- ❖ Proposed \$2 Million is insufficient
- ❖ Should use allocation formula similar to current NRP formula

# Discretionary Dollars

---

- ❖ Neighborhood Investment Fund, without a secured source, is insufficient
- ❖ “Weighted formula” should reflect neighborhood population and need
- ❖ Competitive funding will discourage neighborhoods
  - The process itself will skew funding
  - Neighborhoods reactive not proactive
  - Forces negative competition

# Funding in general

---

- ❖ “Regular, committed funding” more than annual basis
  - Not part of City’s political budgeting process
  - Not adequate time for planning
- ❖ Funding should be flexible
  - Neighborhood-identified priorities
  - No mandates
- ❖ Neighborhoods should not have to compete with basic services such as police, fire, public works, etc

# Minority viewpoints on funding

---

- ❖ Only neighborhood organizations should be eligible for funding  
*(administrative and discretionary)*
- ❖ Administrative \$ without discretionary \$ has limited use
- ❖ Funding for NRP is not a good use of public funds

# Governance

---

- ❖ Independent from City Council
- ❖ Composition
  - Multi-jurisdictional
  - Neighborhood-elected representatives that constitute a majority
  - Other appointments limited or prohibited
- ❖ Direct oversight and enforcement responsibilities
  - Director & staff
  - Budget
  - Long-term strategic planning

# Community Participation Division

---

- ❖ Not cost effective
  - 33% of total administrative costs
- ❖ Reporting to City Coordinator removes a valuable buffer from political environment
- ❖ Unnecessary addition of bureaucracy

# Minority viewpoint on CP Division

---

- ❖ Support improvements to the City's administrative structure
  - opportunity for neighborhoods to interact with the City
  - better support to community participation efforts
  - streamline common services

# Neighborhood organizations

---

- ❖ Effectiveness achieved through their independence
- ❖ Should not be penalized or rewarded for partnering or consolidating
- ❖ Minority viewpoints
  - Should be more accountable for work and representation
  - More “neighborly” when not focused on \$

# City Service Delivery

---

- ❖ Variety of responses
- ❖ A few examples:
  - Include neighborhood relations in City staff members' job descriptions
  - Ensure City staff is cross-departmentally informed
  - Evaluate – projects & staff
  - Training to neighborhood employees or volunteers on City functions (how questions get routed, services of each of the depts)

# Comments on the Framework

---

- ❖ Too many open issues
  - % of competitive \$ in discretionary funds
  - timeline of funding commitment
  - Allocation formulas
  - Organizations eligible
- ❖ Proposes a new program, not continuing NRP

## *Minority viewpoint*

- ❖ Did not include community in development

# Comments about NRP

---

- ❖ Nationally/Internationally recognized
- ❖ Promotes collaboration
- ❖ Prioritizes neighborhood needs
- ❖ Engages and empowers residents