



Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission
October 27, 2009 Meeting Notes

North Regional Library, 1315 Lowry Ave North, 55411

NCEC member attendees: Tony Anastasia, Crystal Johnson, Doron Clark, David Crockett, John Finlayson, Bill Helgeson, Mark Hinds, Melanie Majors, Marcea Mariani, Matt Massman, Ed Newman, Matt Perry, Karen Lee Rosar, Breanne Rothstein, Jeffrey Strand, Ami Thompson

NCEC members absent: *None*

City staff: Jennifer Lastoka, Pa Vang

Guests: *David Rubedor (NCR Staff)*

Agenda Item	Content	Outcomes/Next Steps (Person Responsible)
1. Welcome and introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Introductions - Name, neighborhood you live in ▪ Overview by facilitator of how the meeting will run: facilitator may skip over people who have spoken if someone else who hasn't spoken wants to ▪ The City Coordinator has appointed David Rubedor as the NCR Director 	
2. Meeting notes and agenda (Action)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator asked commission members if any changes were needed to finalize the August meeting notes. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A suggestion made later in the meeting was to clearly indicate where the group reached consensus. • Facilitator asked if everyone was okay with today's agenda as it has been presented. No changes were requested, however, a comment was received later that a previous request for designating time at the meetings to hear from community members still isn't on the agenda. 	<p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff will clearly indicate on meeting notes when consensus was reached <p>Next Step:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Staff remove "DRAFT" from Sep. meeting notes ▪ Facilitators will consider adding time on agenda to hear from community
3. Bylaws (Informational)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Facilitator announced the work of the Bylaws Task Force can be followed online through Google group and asked commission for clarifying questions. No questions received. 	<p>Next Step:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bylaws Task Force will continue work

Underlined content indicates a general consensus was reached

<p>4. 2010 Transition Fund (Discussion)</p>	<p>Task Force member presented information captured in corresponding memo 4</p> <p>Task force presenter opened the floor for feedback/input on the transition fund outlined by the task force.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commission member asked what 6-8 organizations are identified as potential receivers of transition funds. Presenter did not feel comfortable naming. • Staff clarified that the intended approach is for neighborhoods to assess and identify if they need funds and not have City approach specific neighborhoods • A commission member asked if the review committee as outlined would have the final authority on who is getting funded. Staff responded that the intention is for the review committee to have that authority. • A commission member asked how the composition of the review committee as outlined was determined. Staff and task force members responded it would be beneficial to have various staff who previously have been involved with neighborhood organizations (NRP staff, Development Finance staff and NCR staff) on the committee and that the NCEC members on the review committee will be volunteer-based. • Commission members commented that neighborhoods should only be allocated transition funds once. • A commission member commented one round is preferred and that since the previous funds ended in 2009 and the new funds do not begin till 2011, the transition funds are clearly one-time funding so any transition fund allotted to neighborhoods should not be seen as borrowing from future allocations. • A commission member commented 2 rounds are preferred. • A commission member commented the commission is setting policies when it's not clear what the future will be. There is a need to push this topic to the neighborhoods. The group is trying to set policy without neighborhood input. • Facilitator summarized direction of discussion that one round is preferred and asked for confirmation (Comments received are sub-bullets below) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commission member commented two rounds may be better as something may change in mid-year. Perhaps at the front end neighborhoods with due diligence assess that they do not need funds but later realize they do, doing two rounds could address this. Commission member agrees that neighborhood should only receive transition funds once. • Another commission member expressed preference in doing one round and that transition funds should be treated as part of the total program allocation so that neighborhoods think long and hard about whether they want to apply for transition funds or not. • A commission member commented that there are a small number of 	<p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>General consensus reached that neighborhood organizations may only be allocated transition funds once</u> • Majority agreement that any transition funds allocated to neighborhood organizations should be deducted from future program allocations • Agreement to vet the outline with community members and neighborhoods for input before final outline is approved <p>Next Step:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition Fund Task Force will update outline. Staff will post it on Google groups and send an email to neighborhood folks asking for their input. Staff will also include information on accessing the commission's public roster so neighborhoods can also have information on how to reach the
--	---	---

	<p>organizations in Phase II and a large number of organizations not yet approved in Phase II.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commission member commented the first time transition funds were available for Phase I and Phase II, transition funds allocated were counted against future program allocations. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff commented the recollection of this is that no transition funds were used between Phase I and Phase II. • A commission member commented that there was no year gap between Phase I and Phase II like there is with Phase II and the future neighborhood program. • A commission member commented it's an equity issue and to look at the NRP precedent- Have transition funds allocated to neighborhoods be deducted from future program allocations. • A commission member commented the commission may be going to great lengths for a problem that may not exist. • A transition task force commented the idea the task force tried to capture is to look forward and not backwards and asked if this was not clear in the transition fund outline. Another commission member commented that this motive is captured in the second to last bullet point in the "Other Factors" section. • A commission member commented the task force define what "keep the lights on" means. • A commission member commented that if the commission always wants to ask the public for input on everything, it would be hard to get things done. Another commission member later responded that if the process is slow then that's just the way it is. • A commission member commented that if the decision is to not deduct allocated transition funds amounts from future program allocation, no feedback is necessary but if the decision is to deduct allocated transition funds from future program allocations, feedback is necessary. • A commission member commented vetting process should be with neighborhood organizations and not individuals. • A commission member commented in respect of the City staff, perhaps the NCR director could help facilitate and gather neighborhood comments in the vetting process. • A commission member commented the commission members know what district they represent. They can help with vetting and bring back any feedback received. • A commission member commented that not all neighborhood organizations 	<p>commission members</p>
--	--	---------------------------

	<p>meet in the interim of the NCEC meetings. Commission member used his neighborhood organization as an example of how a formal opinion from the neighborhood organization is not likely achievable since they don't meet until the evening of the November 17, 2009 meeting, the same date as the next commission meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff suggested there are multiple ways to vet this topic with neighborhood organizations. After Transition Task Force meets again to update the document, staff will post it on Google groups and send an email to neighborhood folks asking for their input. Staff will include information on accessing the commission's public roster so neighborhoods can also a commission member 	
<p>5. Representation (Discussion)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff provided an overview of the open appointments process used for city appointments • A commission member clarified there was not a formal interview process but appointments were part of a public hearing • Facilitator asked group how commission members represent community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commission member responded that the communication too, needs to be addressed because there are no clear communication methods so far on how the commission should do so • A commission commented that neighborhoods don't represent Minneapolis demographically or socioeconomically and that this commission is about going further than representing neighborhood organizations. • A commission member doesn't want the idea that neighborhood organizations aren't representing others. Commission member represents neighborhood organizations and feels comfortable doing so and was elected to do so. The commission member doesn't want the purpose of why the person was elected to be changed by the commission because commission members then would not be holding true to their purpose of why they were elected. • A commission member commented: understands the strength and weaknesses of NRP. Commission member has been president of various organizations here and in other states and believes this commission can create something better and different than what current neighborhoods are and the representation model under NRP. • A commission member commented if it were possible, prefers to stick with NRP, however understands this is the next phase with community engagement. Commission member is responsible to neighborhood organizations and other cultural groups. Commission member was a neighborhood organization director for a number of year starting in 1992 	<p>Outcomes</p> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NCR Department presentation will be added to possible agenda topics • Looking at how each City department engages the community will be added to possible agenda topics

and has a rich history of working with NRP.

- A commission member commented to do the job well in their role is building as many relations with others as possible and helping others (cultural, neighborhood and non-profit communities) to connect
- Commission member commented there is value in place-based organizing.
- A commission member commented this is an opportunity to create something new and different and to look after the interest of all of Minneapolis. Commission member is not here to bring home the pork. There are other jobs for commission members.
- A commission member is part of a small business association shared experience being in the neighborhood where other business associations have asked to partner with neighborhood organization. Commission member's neighborhood area has the largest Somali and Latino population and the neighborhood has had no problem working with those populations- what's being said about representing other communities is what's being done.
- A commission member raised concern about lack of communication from commission members to community members. Not all commission members are walking the walk. One commission members update showed up in the Southwest Journal and the commission member saw another email by another commission member to neighborhoods but what about the rest.
- A commission member commented doesn't believe the individual is representative of the City but of neighborhood and community organizations. Believes none of the commission members' intentions are here to bring home the pork.
- A commission member expressed belief that the commission's selected decision-making process demonstrates the group has already taken a big step
- A commission member appointed shared that the individual does not have allegiance to a specific neighborhood but the whole city.
- A commission member commented that although there is no formal process to engage the NCEC yet, it doesn't mean that commission members aren't walking the walk. It may not show up in the press but commission members are keeping their neighborhoods informed.
- A commission member who was able to attend the NCR Department presentation to City Council commented that council members were interested in the NCEC and asked a number of questions about the commission and what the commission has been doing. Commission member

	<p>recommends a presentation about the NCR vision at the next meeting.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commission member would rather spend time talking about other stuff than representation, such as working towards recommendations so the group can be more productive. • A commission member commented it's important to look at the current processes and use it to improve the city sooner rather than later. It's been long overdue. Recommends that staff and the commission have a discussion about how city departments are doing community engagement work. • A commission member expressed hope that the commission will think beyond organizations to individuals who don't necessarily belong to any particular organization. 	
<p>6. Other Business</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda topics suggested: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More information about the NRP and NRP Policy Board and NCR and NCEC operating at the same time • Alternates • Consistent time for community member to provide input at meetings • 2010 NCEC work plan • Space for new business on future agendas • What support the City provides to neighborhoods (ex. insurance) • A commission member suggested that whoever decided to rename "Phase III" should decide what the new program name should be • MSP Program – is that federal stimulus money? Staff responded that it is not stimulus money • Other businesses aside from future agenda topics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of meeting dates for 2010 • Consolidated TIF Letter has been sent as promised • A commission member suggested promoting Google groups more (ex. adding it to the bottom of emails) • A commission member has offered place for social gathering 	<p>Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Consensus reached that 5-7 p.m. works best for all</u> <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agenda topics suggested will be added to the list of agenda topics for facilitators to choose from • Staff will help organize the social gathering • Staff will follow up about meeting dates proposed