

Appendix A: Core Principles of Community Engagement

- 1) Right to be involved – Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.
- 2) Contribution will be thoughtfully considered - Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will be thoughtfully considered.
- 3) Recognize the needs of all - Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision-makers.
- 4) Seek out involvement - Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.
- 5) Participants design participation - Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.
- 6) Adequate information - Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.
- 7) Known effect of participation - Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.

Copyright IAP2. All rights reserved. Adopted by Minneapolis City Council, December 2007

Appendix B: Engagement Process

MEMORANDUM

TO: Neighborhood and community engagement commission members

FROM: Robert Thompson, NCR staff

DATE: April 20, 2010

CC: David Rubedor, Jennifer Lastoka

RE: Agenda item # 5 - CoW Update

Neighborhood association engagement for community participation program

Action Requested: None. Informational only

Neighborhood organization engagement process

Based on the discussion at the NCEC Committee of the Whole (CoW) meeting on Wednesday, April 14, NCR staff will develop and implement a process for engaging neighborhood organizations starting in early May, 2010. Neighborhood organizations are identified in the draft Stakeholder Engagement Plan (SEP) as stakeholders who should collaborate in the process of developing the allocation formula and guidelines for the Community Participation Program (CPP).

Neighborhood organizations are defined in Minnesota Statutes 317A.435, subd. (4)(c) as a nonprofit corporation “that represents a defined geographic area and has been accepted by a political subdivision as the basic planning unit for the area. ‘Neighborhood organization’ does not include a unit owners’ association under chapter 515B or a planned unit development or homeowners’ association that consists exclusively of property owners within a defined geographic area.” According to the Framework for the Future, neighborhood organizations are the key targets of CPP funds. As outlined in the Draft Communication Plan and Timeline (dated April 7, 2010), there will be two cycles of engagement with neighborhood organizations.

This document is specific to engagement of neighborhood organizations. NCR staff and NCEC Commissioners will continue to engage other stakeholders as per the SEP.

Input and feedback from neighborhood organizations will help the NCEC and NCR to understand their needs; what has worked well and what hasn’t; gather input on funding guidelines; and help them find ways to engage under-represented stakeholders.

1. First engagement cycle: NCR staff and NCEC commissioners will engage neighborhood organizations to get initial input for the CPP allocation formula and guidelines. The purpose of engagement in this cycle will be to identify infrastructure needs and goals of neighborhood organizations, what has worked well or not in the past, how detailed or prescriptive funding should be, and issues/challenges that should be considered in developing an allocation formula and guidelines for the CPP.

- NCR staff will develop a list of questions based on the April 14 CoW discussion, designed to identify neighborhood preferences, priorities, concerns and recommendations for program purposes and CPP allocation formula and guidelines.
 - When contacting neighborhood organizations, NCR staff and NCEC commissioners will convey why input of neighborhood organizations is important for this process, and how feedback will be used.
 - NCR staff will set up a process to record input at all points in the process (including initial contact with neighborhood organizations, written communications, and feedback from meetings and focus groups).
 - Formal notification to neighborhood organizations will be provided via email and mail, starting early May, written comments due by Friday, June 11, 2010.
 - An engagement process will be implemented in accordance with the Stakeholder Engagement Plan, starting early May. NCR staff will contact each neighborhood organization to identify the best process for engaging the organization (at board meeting, focus group, or some other process).
 - NCR staff will “pilot” engagement meetings with a small number of neighborhoods, refine questions, and provide training for Commissioners prior to further meetings with neighborhoods.
 - NCR staff and NCEC Commissioners will be mindful to identify and seek out neighborhood organizations and their members that have been less engaged in this process.
 - NCR staff will organize five focus groups to be conducted in each quadrant of the City as well as downtown in late May and early June.
 - The NCEC Committee of the Whole will review input and provide recommendations to NCR staff as part of the refinement of the program purposes, guidelines and funding allocation formula.
 - NCR staff will develop draft allocation formula and draft guidelines based on input gathered through the communication and engagement process with neighborhood organizations and other stakeholders; input from subject matter experts and input from the NCEC CoW.
 - Draft Allocation formula and draft guidelines will be reviewed by CoW and NCEC in June prior to second engagement cycle.
2. Second engagement cycle: NCR staff and NCEC Commissioners will engage neighborhood organizations to gather feedback on draft allocation formula and guidelines. Feedback will be used to refine allocation the draft allocation formula and guidelines.
- Formal notification to neighborhood organizations will be provided via email and mail, starting in July, with a 45-day period for comment.
 - An engagement process will be implemented in accordance with the Stakeholder Engagement Plan. NCR staff will contact each neighborhood organization to identify the best process for engaging the organization for the second cycle (at board meeting, focus group, or some other process).
 - NCR staff will “pilot” engagement meetings with a small number of neighborhoods, refine process and provide training for Commissioners prior to further meeting with neighborhoods.
 - NCR staff and NCEC Commissioners will be mindful to identify and seek out neighborhood organizations and board members that have been less engaged in this process.
 - NCR staff will organize five focus groups to be conducted in each quadrant of the City as well as downtown in August.

- The NCEC Committee of the Whole will review feedback and provide recommendations to NCR staff.
- NCR staff will revise draft allocation formula and draft guidelines using in part feedback gathered through the communication and engagement process with neighborhood organizations.
- Draft allocation formula and draft guidelines will be reviewed by CoW and NCEC in September prior to sending to City Council.

Appendix C: Guiding Questions

- 8) What are the future goals and plans of the neighborhood organization?

- 9) How could city resources such as a new community participation funding program, city staff resources, partnerships with other organizations, etc. be used to meet these goals and plans?

- 10) How detailed should the allocation of funds be? (Consider a continuum from all neighborhoods getting the same amount annually to each neighborhood has its own formula that could change regularly based on different variables.)?

- 11) Are there ways that a new program could help neighborhood organizations be more effective at what they do?

- 12) Are there other things that we should consider when developing the new program?

Appendix D: Frustration with Current Community Engagement

- City says "We want to hear from you" and it goes into the circular file.
- Decisions from City that are top down. Administrative review is not working. Look at how these discussions are structured.
- Harrison is a forgotten neighborhood – we won't be forgotten.
- Neglected neighborhoods.
- Targeted for disinvestment.
- Neighborhoods are criticized for not being diverse when they are diverse.
- No one listened to neighborhoods about continuation of NRP.
- Issues of governance and control.
- City Council/State Legislature should respect work of neighborhoods.
- City doesn't often value volunteer time of neighborhoods - e.g. bikes.
- City is wasting volunteer talent because of lack of authority.
- Can city process help empower neighborhoods - open city process to empower neighborhoods.
- City should work better with neighborhoods.
- City support neighborhood organizations.
- City understand that neighborhoods provide value to the program and process.
- City work with neighborhoods in decision making.
- Continue working and having a voice with the city regarding developments.
- CPED froze neighborhood out of planning process.
- Culture shift if City departments/staff value neighborhoods as partners.
- Departments have \$s to include neighborhood priorities/initiatives.
- If the city does not provide enough time for the n'hood process leads to board "rubber stamping" City decision without proper input.
- Get out of the way - make it easy to work with City. (Bad example is the lot sale by CPEP for community garden).
- Neighborhood staff to be seen as "City Staff" – treated as peers.
- City should allow time for Neighborhood Organizations to respond or request (longer turnaround time).
- Neighborhoods as partners.
- Neighborhood organizations should have a close working relationship with City departments.
- Recognition at City level for volunteering.
- Realize neighborhood is part of the city.
- Should be a partnership between neighborhood and city.
- Supporting value of neighborhoods by city staff. Support neighborhood priorities through projects.
- Valuing neighborhood work within the city.
- What are the mutual expectations between city and neighborhood organizations?
- Would be better if both parties - (e.g. City/Neighborhoods) understand each other's timelines.

- Concern about lack of representation from East Phillips Neighborhood type (NRP-redirection). Also noted no NCEC representative from Ward 9. Noted District 7 Melanie Majors is NCEC Commissioner. Rep. Karen Clark asked about how that could have happened. Question about whether the State Legislature could take action to help the city correct the situation. [Clarification that the neighborhood organizations selected NCEC representation for 8 seats]. CM Schiff noted he and CM Colvin Roy were punished for being outspoken about concerns over NCEC appointment process.
- Haven't heard from NCEC Members.
- NCEC – not much trust / NCEC needs to build credibility.
- NCEC had failed to seat the Park Board alternative (Carol Pass).
- NCEC should have more neighborhood members than appointed members - not 50/50.
- NCEC/NCR build credibility – spend time in community.
- Perplexed by the NCEC.
- Some have been worried about NCEC as a puppet, but as long as there is transparency, NCEC seen as independent will help.
- We are not fairly represented by NCEC.
- Why isn't the representation on NCEC from the different kinds of neighborhoods?
- City needs to understand neighborhood organizations and what we do - better communication between city departments and neighborhoods.
- Sometimes notification is excellent (e.g. NCR). Others not so good (e.g. CLIC - use of acronyms - xx-give notices); Big question (e.g. great streets); Relevancy, detail, timelessness; Not user friendly.
- City and county see neighborhood involvement as a sign of their failure, threat to their plan.
- Neighborhood has track record of success - city doesn't listen and doesn't trust us.
- 311 not effective – not helpful depending upon the situation - 311 staff lack knowledge about neighborhood
- 311 statistics from community.
- Another level of 311 – better way of tracking.
- Better follow-up - call 311 and receive information back that you have been heard.
- Want to see 311 and 911 fully staffed.
- Daytime meetings difficult – eliminate meeting conflicts.
- Get Council Members out at meetings.
- Park Board / City Council members reaching out to community (resources).
- We have an ineffective City Council Rep.
- All departments not on the same page.
- Better relationships with police department.
- City departments should respond quicker.
- City lacks knowledge about expertise among neighborhood organizations (e.g. youth violence).
- City staff needs to return calls.
- City staff needs to work with neighborhoods on development.

- City staff should meet at a time convenient for residents.
- City staff to attend neighborhood meetings - i.e. City Inspectors.
- CPED needs to be better integrated into neighborhood work.
- Inspections support.
- Learn how we can utilize city program staff to assist us - city marketing program.
- Redirect city staff (CCP-Safe) back into the neighborhood.
- Used to have area planners coming out. Now planners don't "know" the neighborhood.
- We don't get the opportunity to meet with inspectors.
- We need middle or lower staff - not top city staff.
- Whittier considered an "impacted" neighborhood by some departments and others consider not.
- Time and communication are barriers.
- Whole system needs better PR – "Building Better Communities".
- Sit down meeting with residents and city departments about local issues – direct to various departments 1 or 2 per year.
- Better cooperation with city and neighborhoods.
- City should set up a systematic program to call each resident to find out what their problem is.
- Difficult to get things done and spend dollars...staff should work with neighborhood organizations as well as developers. Current support not helpful.
- Need the city to listen to us.
- Better city data base – to determine housing crime area.
- Don't like "administration"-call it community support – not just different needs – different levels of leaders/volunteers – developing capacity.
- NCR broker information transfers within city - not getting same answer from various departments and Council Members.
- Not working (?) strict def. with admin and programs.
- % of departments budget be neighborhood initiative projects.
- Administrative review does not allow for public debate/by passes the community process.
- City liaison for neighborhoods.
- Alignment and support by City Departments for neighborhood work/plans.
- PPU needs conduit from neighbors + reg. senior department.
- What is being done by the city? E.g. other neighborhoods settling, but not here.
- Harrison as new part of Minneapolis.
- City could fix its website.
- City could put notice of neighborhood website
- City website to connect neighborhoods and neighborhood programs.
- Neighborhoods more prominent on the city website.

Appendix E: Loss of Resources

- If dollars (\$) are available for organizing to build capacity \$3,000,000 is not enough.
- If money is not enough then more should be allocated.
- \$3,000,000 is not adequate for now- need to advocate for additional dollars (\$).
- Be creative. Consider alternative funding sources (dime a drink e.g.)
- City Council is now responsible for implementation - can still tap into city resources.
- City is being generous with \$3M for neighborhood organizations.
- Dollars should go to neighborhoods; Health care dollars.; CDBG dollars.; Federal stimulus dollars.
- Funding is inadequate. Setting ourselves up for not having neighborhood capacity + resources (e.g. crime prevention stats, sex offender notices, neighborhood gardens) to implement city council priorities and department initiatives.
- Give neighborhood organizations the most amount of money to do what they do.
- Give neighborhoods real funding - we are being strangled - e.g. dedicated funding source.
- High cost if benefits are added. Need to add larger funding sources.
- Institutions priorities being met... should support implementation.
- Loss of funding is a concern
- More funding - revenue sharing.
- Neighborhood organizations should collect a portion for neighborhood residents that call us and use our services.
- Neighborhoods need more resources.
- NIF & CIF should be rolled to CPP.
- NRP housing dollars (\$) should be doubled and invested.
- Program needs more money.
- Put all funds to CPP (none to CIF and NIF).
- Spending more money on neighborhoods - allocation variables considered.
- State funding – “green jobs” available.
- City Wi-Fi system – consider how neighborhoods can tie into system.
- Watching the destruction of neighborhood programs.
- Without city funding we will struggle to do anything.
- Why not all money in to administration and not discretionary - create a more robust administrative program.
- Doesn't trust that city will provide funding to neighborhood.
- Can't get funding for positive activities for youth.
- Concern about State of Minnesota actions on TIF funding.
- Decision on overall funding for neighborhoods was political - neighborhoods will die on the vine.
- Leverage existing City services (use City resources).

Appendix F: Overburdened Volunteers

- Volunteer organizations mostly writing grants is challenging - will lead to burn out.
- Volunteers have taken on a lot
- A lot of work to bring everyone to the same table.
- All volunteer organizations have trouble with continuity with paperwork.
- Efficiencies - staff already does twice as much as they get paid for.
- Impossible to think about contacting neighborhood organizations without any staff or office.
- Overwhelming with all the work that needs to be done.
- Difficult recruiting volunteers for crime watch / can't afford beat patrol.
- Funding to have a set person to coordinate events and activities. It is All volunteer driven now
- General worry about NCR/NCEC effect on staff - volunteers can't do staff work. Shrinking base of stable homeowners-renters. Need support with office staff.
- More funding for staff - without our staff we would have a hard time doing anything
- Need staff at neighborhood level to help with administration and organizing - currently SNG does this with a mix of a part time community coordinator and neighborhood volunteers . Running the organization with no paid staff would be impossible or would burn out volunteers very quickly.
- Office staff is important - point of contact allows neighborhood to adapt in a way volunteers can't.
- May not survive on just volunteer basis.
- Sustain current operation – e.g. staff to support volunteers /fewer hurdles for covering administrative costs the better.
- City doesn't often value volunteer time of neighborhoods - e.g. bikes.
- City is wasting volunteer talent because of lack of authority.
- Recognition at City level for volunteering.
- Different now than 20 years ago – [neighborhoods taken seriously now – City needs people who volunteer. City will fail without volunteers

Appendix G: Comments regarding Organizational Capacity and Autonomy:

- Support neighborhood capacity - funding/stewardship.
- We can do more with a full time staff.
- Could be a better organization if CNO had a full time staff person.
- CNO could accomplish a lot more – Staff & Admin. \$30,000.
- Maintain staff - part time.
- Need paid staff person to focus on activities – need consistency to address neighborhood needs.
- Long term funding for neighborhood coordinator. Have stretched out funding for coordinator by cutting from half-time to quarter-time.
- Having good staff is critical
- Maintain staff support / maintain capacity.
- Staff is very important.
- Central office/shared space for printing, faxing, shared newsletter with other neighborhood organizations.
- Consistent work done by paid staff versus sole reliance on volunteers. Staff stability benefits the organization.
- We need consistent staff and funding to do our work.
- Value in having a professional paid staff with health benefits: Consistent long term staff; Grant writing fund raising; Create initiatives that are self-sustaining.
- Key staff is critical for neighborhood organizations.
- Key staff makes the program successful.
- Staff is essential.
- Keeping staff is key.
- Dollars (\$) to support staff.
- We need money for staff.
- More jobs right at neighborhood organization.
- Support for staff.
- Money to have a full time paid staff to lead our communication efforts, organizing, report about what is happening, do marketing. 2.5 positions.
- Can't administer any of our programs without paid staff - administration and program dollars (\$).
- Need administration of program dollars (\$).
- Hire staff person.
- Staff.
- Don't have staff now – might be helpful in the future
- We did have staff for housing program
- Ability to temporarily hire someone to accomplish specific tasks to assist volunteers
- Staffing to help neighborhoods with grant writing
- *Support neighborhood continuity and significance – retain neighborhood expertise and staff.
- Provide staff support.
- Funding for staff/communications.

- Staff/shared services.
- Continuity of staffing.
- More staff hours (20 hours/month).
- Continue support for organization staff.
- Allow neighborhood organizations to use the funding to hire staff or consultants or whatever they need.
- Office staff is important - point of contact allows neighborhood to adapt in a way volunteers can't.
- Office support - maintain offices.
- Paying for staff gives people more incentive to work to get more people to come out.
- Neighborhood organizations need assistance with staff responsibility and support - Neighborhood organization will not survive without paid staff support.
- Need staff to represent neighborhoods interests and needs.
- Staff is the life blood of neighborhood organizations.
- Dollars (\$) should help neighborhood organizations pay for office space.
- General worry about NCR/NCEC effect on staff - volunteers can't do staff work. Shrinking base of stable homeowners-renters. Need support with office staff.
- Need staff at neighborhood level to help with administration and organizing - currently SNG does this with a mix of a part time community coordinator and neighborhood volunteers . Running the organization with no paid staff would be impossible or would burn out volunteers very quickly.
- Don't want to suffer because no staff @ SNO.
- Don't look at current staff model to determine funding.
- More funding for staff - without our staff we would have a hard time doing anything
- Need to continue to have staff – centralized support-e.g. benefits. Back office items – printing, templates for web pages.
- Funding for office and neighborhood.
- 2.5 staff and would like to maintain.
- Paid staff person (10/15 hours/week).
- Staff person.
- Funds for Org. capacity/staff flexible.
- It is Important for us to hire a full time staff person to do more outreach to community
- We would have a better organization if we had a full time staff paid for by new program.
- Staffing component and core volunteers comprise brain of organization. both proactive (to maintain organization) and reactive (to respond to problems)
- City capacity support to neighborhoods.
- Increase our capacity to do what we do.
- Fund staff time at neighborhood organizations to assist other neighborhood organizations that don't have the staff to reach out to other neighborhoods.
- Effective neighborhood organizations can train and assist others, but need to be compensated.

- Best to be hands on, when needed. (Example: Larry Hiscock @ Harrison Neighborhood Association).
- Need to come up with a chunk of capitol for initial investments. Get neighborhood organizations to become self sustaining.
- Fund people to train other people in neighborhood organizations that need help with management, ongoing programs, and activities.
- Pay neighborhood organizations to share best practices - hands on.
- Portion of money used to assist other neighborhoods – not be penalized
- SENA considering 3 key areas - location, staffing, programs.
- Provide opportunities for growth
- Neighborhoods want to get things done - need to be able to implement.
- Administration funds to help lower functioning Neighborhood Organizations
- Keep organization going at all costs.
- Need dollars to sustain our self – keep doing what we do.
- Need staff to keep us going and meet our budget.
- If you take away NRP base of funding 20-25%, all of our work will go away.
- We have a minimum fund level (70,000 annually).
- Money for admin.
- Continuity of organizations.
- To be able to continue.
- Stay intact.
- Stay funded - need funding / without funding we are going to go back 10 years.
- *Maintain current level of service -need more support.
- Neighborhood organizations & City Council initiative program will die without adequate funding to the neighborhood organizations.
- Neighborhood organizations need funding to maintain what we are doing.
- Support for core administration of organizations.
- Continue operations in some semblance of what we've had in the past – with similar budget and to continue to do what we do.
- Structure of place-based neighborhood organizations in the city is incredibly valuable – to try to get into who makes up the associations is not the right role for this pocket of money. There should be restriction on how money is used – giving to different associations the freedom to manage the money. Allow neighborhood organizations to determine within guidelines how to spend their operations funding.
- Fully fund SENA.
- Maintain neighborhood organization.
- Funding for administration.
- Don't let existing organizations fall apart or scale back.
- Annual \$170,000 administratively - want to continue providing health benefits.
- Don't have a guarantee to keep up on administrative costs.
- Want to continue what we are already doing - organization works well.
- Help with costs and expenses so that Neighborhood offices stay localized.
- Promote and encourage the “self determination” of neighborhood organizations.

Appendix H: Comments regarding Accountability:

- Cost involved in evaluating - be careful about how you do it.
- End of year report.
- Outcome based accountability.
- Neighborhood organizations should be more accountable to community.
- More oversight of neighborhood organization.
- Should be a timeline process and annual review.
- Need tight controls on program spending by neighborhoods.
- Need to be a good steward of dollars (\$).
- Needs to be some accountability... greater scrutiny for greater amount of money.
- Support neighborhood capacity - funding/stewardship.
- More even stewardship.
- The neighborhood organizations have to meet needs, transform neighborhoods and build community.
- Build in incentives - support efficiencies/outcomes.
- Clear expectations.
- We are not a proponent of the city writing a blank check – things there should be some tension between the expectations of the city and the groups they fund
- Fewer strings with guidelines that match city goals. Citizens are not as interested or involved as they could be – top down, restrictive process
- Make funds very prescriptive
- Accessibility guidelines
- Don't create bench marks, but what can be reasonably accomplished
- Money is such a small pot being spread. How to ensure not completely spending ineffectively? Not just “sort of” keep lights on for all organizations. Can't solve problem with this amount of money.
- Transparency in how neighborhoods use their funds (e.g. through NCR website).
- Accountability - needs to be measured in different ways.
- Some kind of review of how organization is using dollars.
- Grant format for dollars to say what you will do, how you will work with projected outcomes.
- Guidelines - neighborhood wide benefit = articulate benefits.
- City develops parameters about what funds can and can't be used for.
- Focus on something that can be successful.

Appendix I: Comments regarding Flexibility and Simplification:

- Frustrated with housing rule of 70% Neighborhoods should have more say on allocations, should have more freedom to move funds around. Don't want to do boilerplate projects.
- Develop a series of categories based on what's important to neighborhoods. Provide a list of menu items and let neighborhoods choose. Give neighborhoods their own sense of identity and purpose.
- Don't leave totally wide open ended, provide some basic categories.
- No Funding limitations to housing like NRP?
- No longer need to dedicate 70% of NRP for housing any longer.
- *Maintain neighborhood priority setting and allocation/flexible dollars (\$).
- Large “buckets” of dollars (\$).
- Broad range of dollars (\$).
- Not too specific broad flexibility.
- Allow flexibility to neighborhoods for projects as well as administration.
- What has worked is that the City has been hands off: We know what we are doing and we are successful; We can do what we do more efficiently.
- Provide as much money as possible for neighborhood discretion. Example: Council of Non-Profits approach.
- Neighborhoods have been creative in adapting to program requirements - "Leave it as open as possible".
- Money used the way neighborhood wants (be more flexible).
- Flexibility and transparency.
- Not prescriptive other than basics - staff, space and communication)
- Neighborhood organizations should not be punished for finishing early or late.
- No more prescriptive than staff, office and communication.
- Make dollars (\$) flexible.
- Provide flexibility between administration and programs.
- Not just “admin.” but neighborhood programming.
- Have financial resources to respond flexibly to community needs.
- Don't program everything - leave room for "magic" to happen.
- Flexible dollars (\$).
- More flexibility with funding.
- Not tied to specific program areas (e.g. grants).
- Let neighborhood organizations figure out what they need
- Additional funding for creativity without a lot of details which might hinder other neighborhood organizations.
- Prevailing attitude if not expressly allowed = prohibited which doesn't allow for creativity - not squashed at outset. Ideas entertained even if not currently “allowed”. (Ex. re-opening Nicollet seems to be limited -wanted for only the city to do something.
- City not put conditions on money (no mandates).
- Process similar to NRP - but more flexible.

- Do not present neighborhoods with unfunded mandates.
- If Neighborhood Organizations are not able to commit dollars to what it needs to do/Can't survive – program will fail
- Flexibility.
- Funds should be general to allow each neighborhood to have their own approach.
- Flexibility
- Flexibility to adapt to changing conditions (e.g. foreclosures).
- Not too prescriptive.
- More flexibility.
- Need for clarity - flexibility.
- Allow flexibility – e.g. arising issue.
- Allow neighborhoods to stay current.
- Flexible over a period of time.
- Broad - not very detailed. Ability to move dollars around when necessary.
- Less red tape and less bureaucratic.
- Allocation not a lot of paperwork - have a short & flexible timeline to get money.
- Flexible.
- Neighborhood organizations have flexibility with funds.
- New funding to neighborhood organizations should be flexible for neighborhood organizations to decide what they want.
- Funds should be flexible.
- Flexibility is key.
- Groups should ask forgiveness rather than permission.
- If you do everything by the book, you will never learn.
- Allow room for failure.
- Keep process simple – do not add layers.
- Need to consider administrative impact.
- If NCR is administering RFPs/grants - be specific and simple.
- Looser guidelines (e.g. no plan mods).
- Streamline allocation and reallocation process.
- Streamlining process – less rigid structure.
- Simplify paperwork.
- Simplification – administration consolidation.
- Don't want a lot of red tape.
- Shorten paperwork trail
- Standardize some paperwork
- Provide a more efficient process to move contracts through the city process for approval. Mandate a review time of one week that would automatically approve a contract if not acted upon in that time frame.
- Simplify paperwork and contracting.
- Simplify process and provide dollars (\$).
- Simplify, simplify, simplify.
- Not cumbersome or expensive to administer.

- Reimbursement process is disaster waiting to happen (U gives 80%, McKnight gives 100% up front, City only does reimbursement of expenses-forcing n'hood groups to take out loans to cover expenses.).
- Don't make grants too burdensome.
- Simplicity of application - scaled to size of grant. (e.g. bridge funding application was simple).
- Keeping it simple!
- Would be nice to have less hoops and less bureaucracy – more citizens friendly.
- Need to have basic system to access funds.
- Streamlining process for contracts.
- Too much time has been spent on getting money.

Appendix J: Comments regarding Engagement and Empowerment:

- Need for more and better communications - how to get more people involved.
- People aren't as involved as they used to be.
- Need the city to listen to us.
- City should set up a systematic program to call each resident to find out what their problem is.
- City departments should respond quicker.
- Community based approach.
- Empowerment vs. Engagement – need more money than the \$40K “pittance”.
- People that don’t have voice should get voice.
- Reward organizations that have a structure and have been effective/accomplishments.
- Empowerment not just engagement.
- Empower us to do what we do.
- Empowerment is more important than engagement.
- Money doesn't solve the problem, but engagement is important.
- Need to reach each and every person.
- Don’t consider getting dollars if you don’t engage people.
- Dollars (\$) community outreach.
- The key is organizing neighborhoods.
- How do you make sure everyone is at table? - "Make sure there isn't a table". (e.g. walking tours, food, cameras, going to where they are - don't assume standard way of doing this is going to work).
- Include NRP engagement outreach/strategies.
- Funding transportation to meetings - within neighborhood - a barrier to attendance. (e.g. high rise - 18th & Central to park is expensive and hard to arrange).
- Funding for daycare for meetings.
- We will never have enough time to get appropriate input - respect “good faith efforts”.
- Need to hear community first – meet with neighbors.
- Important to get more people involved – not just a few people making decisions.
- Neighborhood organization more inclusive of community.
- High rental - need to engage all of community.
- Not enough money for maintenance of housing stock - need to incentivize upkeep.
- NCR can't be seen as place where all citizen participation happens.
- Difficult to get things done and spend dollars...staff should work with neighborhood organizations as well as developers. Current support not helpful.
- Provides a conduit for entering into relation with other planning activities. (e.g. street improvements, twins stadiums, etc, redevelopment around Wirth lake).
- Getting people to participate - come to meetings.
- Live in CARAG - how to be involved.
- Knowing who lives here - understand/learn about residents.
- Involvement is most important.

- NRP provided empowerment with the promise or expectation of dollars (\$) – engagement vs empowerment. Money empowers people.
- Empowerment that was key in NRP program.
- We have not seen a commitment to empowerment.
- Empowerment - "has not been seen it in deed, only in words."
- Want to be present during administration of new program.

Appendix K: Comments regarding Collaboration and Partnerships:

- Lack of collaboration between neighborhoods.
- Special grants should encourage collaboration.
- Funding to support collaborative efforts between the neighborhood organizations.
- Start at what is the need to determine collaboration - addressing a problem, common interest.
- Ideas for collaboration - program staffing, location (shared space) and technical assistance.
- Remain independent, but collaborate.
- Collaboration rather than efficiency
- Supporting cross neighborhood facilitation - next two balance with funds.
- Develop collaborations with other Neighborhood organizations in our area – (Como, Cedar Riverside, Prospect Park, City and U of M.)
- Partnerships and collaboration between neighborhood organizations really need to have staff support.
- Encourage collaboration, but don't mandate.
- City should encourage and incentivize collaborations and sharing of resources between neighborhood organizations.
- Inter-neighborhood cooperation and communication.
- Networking with other neighborhood organizations, Churches, businesses.
- We are establishing partnerships with Churches, Boys and Girls Clubs and WE WIN
- Creating better communication links between neighborhoods.
- Support joint programming to increase impact and utilize resources.
- Concern about relationship of department with County. Have had difficulty in partnerships (e.g. streets) Better coordination between city and county. Someone on staff to interface between departments.
- Need to provide support to other organizations (e.g. Hmong).
- Incentivize partnering between organizations
- Incentives for partnering is good, but would like to not have the limitations of too much detail
- Develop good relationship with parks and schools.
- Develop regional partnership with other Neighborhood organizations
- Partnership with other Neighborhood Organizations.
- Focus on relationships between city and county, etc.
- Using utility bills to help build outreach.

Appendix L: Comments regarding Networking, Training and Information Sharing

- At minimum-Mentoring/training of CPNA Board Members - coordination with other neighborhoods.
- Mentoring program
- Incentives for networking with neighborhood.
- NRP – training was kind of one level – need growth.
- Some common administrative process for hiring. Separate umbrella nonprofit or through city working so neighborhoods don't have to spend time and energy on managing staff. Human resource support. Shared staff, training, evaluation etc.
- Help neighborhoods organize in different ways for different purposes.
- Resources and tools for engaging to be more effective/strengthen voice and meaningful.
- Trained, supported staff provides city opportunity to have uniformity
- Training
- Assistance with promotional materials or sharing what the neighborhood is doing.
- Board training
- Board training – e.g. fundraising, generating volunteers, how to submit grant applications.
- Bring neighborhoods together to leverage resources
- Bring neighborhoods together to share ideas.
- Build collaborations with city – coming out with preset ideas (not to do).
- City could help train neighborhood staff – project management training.
- Education - sharing ideas (ex. other neighborhood successes...don't reinvent.
- Education role: Scholarships to MCN events, etc; How to work with immigrant communities; Training/flyer on fiduciary duties.; Working with renters (non-owners).
- Education/training on filing 990.
- Help build bridges and relationships with other organizations (i.e. neighborhood senate)
- Help create a website, clearinghouse of share information between neighborhood organizations about best practices.
- Help facilitate cross-neighborhood projects & provide structure/assistance. (Ex. transit programs).
- Help neighborhood group's work together to be effective.
- Help neighborhoods figure out how to work together, share resources, and collaborate on issues.
- Help provide structure for neighborhoods to work together on common/similar issues.
- Hold engagement meetings or regional meetings with other neighborhood organizations.
- Idea of shared staff between neighborhood organizations and contact with the City
- Increase the current level of citizen participation with staff training, community participation requires staff on site.
- Information sharing between neighborhoods - successes & failures.
- Informed “President's Club” (e.g. meeting of neighborhood leaders).

- Insurance training.
- Leadership training (e.g. St. Thomas)
- Leadership training/ outreach.
- Maybe all neighborhood organizations in a ward could share space
- Mentoring of volunteers.
- More collaboration between neighborhoods
- More communication between neighborhoods.
- Neighborhood mixers networking – share special programs through presentations/workshops
- Neighborhood organizations don't have a chance to share practices, b/c and increased turnover in staff. (?)
- Neighborhoods utilize city base to connect with each other.
- NRP offered lots of training sessions for contract and financial management. If the system changes dramatically, the city will need to train people on the new system
- Offer Training Programs for “Best Practices” in minority involvement, budgeting, tax & 501c3 law and community organizing etc.
- Programs to help build connections between neighborhoods.
- Record and information sharing across neighborhoods (all in the same loop on information). What has/has not worked (not re-invent the wheel).
- Regional neighborhood center based in neighborhood organizations.
- Resources may be there – people don’t have access or knowledge. Make sure we can communicate and disperse resources.
- Responsive person on NCR staff as pointer to other neighborhood program
- Share best practices - reference to McKnight Foundation Hosted Training.
- Shared staff between neighborhood organizations
- Sharing best practices with other neighborhoods.
- Sift through information and share what is relevant for a neighborhood.
- Social networking where neighborhoods can share projects and ideas - each neighborhood has some access.
- Sponsor monthly or quarterly get-togethers - have fun!
- Staff able to develop relationships with other neighborhood organizations to develop programs.
- Staff and leadership training; use NRP training (board training).
- Staff: Training; Two way communication; Mentoring program for neighborhood staff.
- Suggestion: Have one of these meetings with Neighborhood Staff/Coordinators to hear from people actually working on the paperwork.
- Support annual neighborhood conference/festival so that neighborhood organizations can share best practices.
- Support to bring neighborhoods together as a collaborative – regionally.
- Template for organizing for regular events.
- Training – Board/staff on how to understand new program/system and know how to leverage continuing training resources and networking. – Growth built into training – intermediate and advanced. Neighborhood training to build core competencies.
- Training for board (Board training & organizing training).

- Training for Board members.
- Training for how the system works and how the City works.
- Would be helpful to know how other neighborhoods operate.
- City wide neighborhood meeting
- Community Board
- D&O insurance
- Facilitate collaborations between neighborhoods
- MTN promotions
- NYC model
- Staff support working with neighborhoods: Tech support; Mapping support
- What resources are available from city staff?
- “Highlight reel” of successful organization work - distributed/circulated to neighborhoods.
- 990s/audits/D&O insurance.
- A way to report what NCR is doing
- Access to legal advice.
- Accounting services for Neighborhood organization.
- Administrative support from city staff.
- Advocacy + Communication --- program.
- Annual audits.
- Annual conference.
- Annual recognition of cool things done by neighborhoods - way to share ideas - e.g. TED Awards.
- Approve the look of the neighborhood through City support/work.
- Assistance with administering Federal grants.
- Auditing and 990 preparation.
- Avoid duplication of resources and encourage Neighbor-hood Organizations to work together.
- Basic contact list for city staff.
- Basic resources on other grants, etc. to find grants, etc.
- Basic things everyone gets... i.e. consolidate/support same activities - meetings reminder #2.
- Be connected with National Night Out (neighborhood organizations).
- Beefing up support at city for writing grants.
- Better communicate what resources are available.
- Better contact information for neighborhood information.
- Better partnership between local NRP person to better connect with downtown staff.
- Blogging to inform neighborhoods - NCR staff to blog
- Board insurance.
- Board support ---administration.
- Bookkeeping.
- Build connections/support and advocacy
- Bulk purchasing as an idea.
- Catalog good ideas.
- CDBG.

- Central location in the city for neighborhoods to ask questions and make recommendations.
- Central purchasing –good and bad.
- Centralized services.
- Circulate CLIC proposals, etc.
- City could have a “system navigator”.
- City department staff play consultant role.
- City helps facilitate relationship building - help neighborhoods communicate between themselves.
- City keep a directory of grants requested by neighborhoods to help see successes and patterns.
- City leverage neighborhood organization with dollar (\$) support and other support.
- City needs to share internally what they do right / what they don't do so well - overcome silos.
- City owned neighborhood distribution list.
- City provide person to help Neighborhood organization through difficult situations
- City resource - template for some core practices (e.g. budget).
- City resources help neighborhoods stay stable, safe, and livable. Help neighborhoods stay xxxx.
- City resources used to keep neighborhoods from failing/sliding.
- City to create DB offering experts in field to consult who could help in programs. DB of best ideas, people resources, additional funding sources to leverage.
- City to provide "Clearinghouse" for grants - assist with writing grants
- Clarify expectations and procedures – ex. save for 10 years.
- Clearinghouse of ideas/best practices.
- Combined purchasing power.
- Common infrastructure system.
- Common infrastructure to set up communications like website.
- Common needs that could be more efficiently handled at larger scale.
- Common shared services.
- Common vendors for cross neighborhood support!
- Common visioning for the city (all) by neighborhoods.
- Communication
- Computers for each neighborhood (accountability needed) and IT support.
- Concern about deductible for D & O Insurance (e.g. now \$10,000?).
- Concern with safety – help address safety concerns
- Connect neighborhood with city staff/
- Connection to make things happen.
- Connections with other departments are important - all along line - resident, city, businesses, etc.
- Consider a “Democracy In Action – Civics Model”.
- Contact person from neighborhood organization: Use city staff on city payroll to service neighborhood organization - neighborhood organization not use their dollars (\$) for city services.
- Continue D & O insurance.
- Continuing support of NRP.

- County/State/Federal aid availability - staff at NCR who know who to talk to and where to go.
- CPP specialist = perfect model.
- Create a Central Clearinghouse on what works and what hasn't worked.
- Create website of "good ideas" to collect and share videos and pictures for each neighborhood - web page of best ideas.
- Crime prevention resources - street staff.
- Cross border / neighborhood to neighborhood communication.
- Current deductible of insurance.
- D & O insurance.
- D & O insurance.
- D&O insurance/general liability.
- Databank of resources.
- Date base of what has been tried by other neighborhoods.
- Define "best practices" here in Minneapolis or at least collection of best practices - encourage process to share and collaborate.
- Departments have parallel information.
- Develop a process for Neighborhood interaction with other jurisdictions; i.e.: Park Board, Minneapolis Public Schools , police and Hennepin County. A considerable amount of non-housing NRP dollars went to Park Board activities. It is important to maintain these activities; i.e.: River Gorge trails and activities, Savanna Forest, invasive species removal and maintenance of park facilities. Hennepin County has jurisdiction over many thoroughfares and cooperation with them is essential to efficient upgrade of business corridors.
- Develop neighborhood based measures of performance. Make the data utilized available to neighborhoods and provide technical assistance to utilize and maintain the measures over time
- Direct inquiries to neighborhood websites, etc.
- Director and officers.
- Disputed philosophy of gaining efficiencies.
- Do reacting things and get together with other organizations, not as often for garden-variety planning.
- Doing better job of evaluation: Figuring out outcome is harder; Help with figuring out what should be evaluated - help with evaluation.
- Dollars (\$) in federal health care (2014) pooling groups for consumer-based health care
- Downtown needs to come here.
- Each neighborhood does a lot of great things, but there is a lack of shared centralized data (e.g. what occurred, what cost.
- Easier if documents are sent to "city" and should be archived and maintained by the city. If the city wants the neighborhood organization to keep supporting documents for a certain time...tell the organization.
- Education - help neighborhood organizations understand what is out there.
- Email discussion list for Mpls neighborhood organizations that could include a variety of topics-- nonprofit organization management, working with renters, working with immigrant communities, working with CPED, fundraising ideas.

- Employee to help with grant writing.
- Encourage/support collaboration between neighborhoods.
- Establish a visioning process around commercial corridors between neighborhoods.
- Every six months have "breakfast meeting" or some type of in person meeting of N'hood board chairs. Maybe another meeting for n'hood board treasurers. - e.g. CUNA immigrant funding program.
- Ex. - "System Navigator" for Economic development... for large businesses. Ex. - In regular services.
- Expand services to neighborhoods similar to CCP-Safe, inspection.
- Facilitate communication between departments.
- Facilitate communication on environmental issues.
- Facilitate creating relationship (see input prepared).
- Facilitate district meetings
- Flag items for neighborhoods – send out to responsible people in neighborhood,(e.g. HPC should have been flagged, make sure Council members are flagged and City has responsibility for engaging).
- Focus less on capitol needs, more on community needs.
- Funding.
- Fundraising/grant writing assistance;; Workshops?; Assistance?; Direction?
- General liability.
- Get information about program and opportunities in the neighborhood.
- Getting information out to neighborhoods and individuals more effectively.
- Grant writing, other creative funding
- Greater collaboration between neighborhoods - share resources / skill sets.
- Guidance on forms, procedures, policies – how to organize a neighborhood organization.
- Have a contract at NCR to be conduit to other city resources.
- Have CARE like meetings in all parts of city - more neighborhood involvement.
- Have city-wide meetings.
- Have option for discounted rate for accounting.
- Have person at City that can pull together City departments and neighborhoods (NCR is good inside the City).
- Have staff out with neighborhoods.
- Having staff work directly with the Board.
- Health care and insurance
- Health insurance consideration for staff (neighborhoods pool together...facilitated by City).
- Help address connecting with diverse population – immigrant community.
- Help address Issues identified through organizing.
- Help and sharing website
- Help build closer relationship with city departments.
- Help coordinate neighborhood plans with other city plans.
- Help neighborhood organizations be more diverse (youth, culture, income, etc).
- Help neighborhoods get maximum use of staff time.
- Help open direct lines to state/federal agencies for other sources of funding.
- Help reaching out.

- Help with a transition plan when no people are involved.
- Help with funding financial resources - city person knowledgeable at other grant resources / assist neighborhoods with accessing other dollars (\$).
- Help with organizing.
- Help with reaching out to diverse populations – Hmong, Laos, Hispanic, and East African.
- Help with websites.
- Help with writing grants - Where is the money (\$). How to get the money (\$).
- Help work with developers.
- Helping with start up of new organization.
- Helps apply for grants...”gets dollars (\$) back”.
- How can NCR/NCEC organize neighborhoods to put pressure on current system that is not responding/performing rather than create shadow system to work around a non-responsive system. (NCR not enough resources to create shadow). Facilitate place for neighborhood organizations to come together.
- Human Resources services.
- Human resources.
- Identify departmental contacts for Neighborhood Organizations and then let the Neighborhood Organizations know who they are. Publish City Department responsibilities; see Framework For The Future Phase I.
- If shared resources – know what each Neighborhood Organization’s needs are and how to address it.
- Information - e.g. get to neighborhood organization/group.
- Informative data base.
- Insurance - desire to compare rates and opt in (D&), general liability).
- Insurance (general liability).
- Insurance for events and organization.
- Insurance is important.
- Internship program (i.e. Vista for neighborhoods)
- Interpreting and language.
- It’s not all about money – e.g. health insurance for staff, access to Federal dollars.
- Key is in coordination (among the neighborhoods).
- Legal, insurance and administration costs.
- Leverages programs.
- Leveraging city resources.
- Liaison to navigate bureaucracy:
- List of programs that didn't work.
- Meet and greet for all Board members city-wide once a year.
- NCR - analyze how dollars are being spent by other neighborhoods.
- NCR can assist neighborhoods in this area.
- NCR Department to work with other departments so that Neighborhood organizations have support at city level.
- NCR should support “Community Benefits Agreements” developed by the Neighborhood Organizations.
- NCR to use city resources to better help Neighborhood Organizations do their work
- Need help bringing in other people.

- Need someone to report problems.
- Need to build relationships first – more than translations.
- Need to consider matching up organizations with other resources.
- Need to re-frame the problems and trying to solve. Needs to be a “leveraging” mechanism or re-cast objectives.
- Need to tap other city staff/agency work - CPED marketing.
- Neighborhood information fairs (annually).
- Neighborhood organization boards need to be trained in management when new directors and staff start.
- Neighborhood organizations need staff to represent them at City meetings to report back.
- Neighborhood staff needs to understand how to run small business (e.g. finances).
- Neighborhoods can provide outreach services and may require special needs outreach through NCR Department - e.g. ESL interpreting).
- Neighborhoods may have to do more grants/fundraising - may need funding for grant writing
- Network with city departments and incorporate with the city's plan.
- Offer resources and actual help from City Departments (i.e. Planning Department) active role - not directive department.
- Offer translation of materials and information in various ways.
- Office Max - office supplies.
- Office space shared across districts.
- Office support, staffing, etc., costs we could reduce through City services.
- One centralized data base for Neighborhood Organization’s to communicate, support and exchange ideas. Help develop ideas can be a tool to support each other.
- Opportunity to share ideas/best practices with other neighborhoods (website, e-mail).
- Orientation for paid staff and Board members.
- Partner with NEHBA.
- Partnerships with city agencies.
- Person proactive and coming to neighborhood organizations /listening to the work of neighborhoods.
- Point person.
- Pool of available resources of loans to get out to neighborhoods.
- Pool of benefits for staff.
- Pool resources between neighborhoods across district lines.
- Portal to neighborhood resources
- Professional services needed also: Accounting - same software for ex.; Need access to legal services - employment, contracts, etc.; Not helpful to have people contact with various lawyers ... share needed professional services.; D&O insurance - Umbrella policy.; Pool of consultants to access.
- Provide “Director and Officers Insurance”, Workman Comp. Insurance and Liability coverage similar to current NRP coverage for all Neighborhood Organizations.
- Provide a simplified format for basic bookkeeping and contract management
- Provide audit support and continued audit reviews by the Office of the State Auditor.

- Provide audits and bookkeeping services for Neighborhood Organizations.
- Provide expertise in Marketing plans and establishing history of communities
- Provide mailing lists to targeted audiences for Neighborhood fundraising and community meetings.
- Provide Neighborhood organization staff a route to a 401K: no matching required.
- Provide Neighborhood organization staff access to a Health Insurance pool.
- Provide Neighborhood organizations access to an e-mail client that does not rely on Google or Yahoo. Residents are already leery about giving out e-mail. Google and Yahoo are not very secure and have lots of advertisements.
- Provide technology support for Neighborhood organization – help with details and functions.
- Provide updates/articles for neighborhoods - not filled with acronyms.
- Provides access to existing city resources (e.g. Tech, HR, Attorneys). Examples - CCP-SAFE, CPED, Inspections.
- Public realm plan – sf: Partner with neighborhoods; City and city-wide initiatives.
- Pulling people and resources.
- Put ideas in one place.
- Put together an effective housing program to help neighborhoods - give neighborhoods the resources or access to resources.
- Reference to NCRC foreclosure recovery.
- Resource directory.
- Resource Guide of Services/Organizations.
- Resources sharing.
- Routine notices to neighborhoods / public hearings.
- Seek other sources of funding.
- Seminars to diverse population to understand what is happening.
- Seminars to teach coming groups to put together a business procedure/work plan.
- Share what works - lots of success stories.
- Shared accounting, legal, insurance and payroll.
- Shared administrative backroom at NCR.
- Shared communication resources: Direct mail.; E-mail communications, etc.
- Sharing of ideas
- Sharing of knowledge of day to day function (best practices).

Appendix M: Comments regarding Eligibility:

- I would just add (and maybe this has already been stated and acted upon in some hopefully concrete fashion) that the NCEC and NCR should acknowledge and act upon the difference between some of these other "stakeholders" -- for instance, CDCs -- as compared to neighborhood organizations. Neighborhood organizations are, at their core mission, community engagement vehicles. From that, they may take a stand or action or produce an outcome/project. However, many other "stakeholders" that certain NCEC commissioners seem to focus on are at their core and via their mission aimed at supporting, in various ways, a for-profit endeavor or a development entity or a private enterprise. By definition, their missions are not more community engagement focused than the gas station down the street is. The core missions and *raison d'être* of these types of organizations -- Minneapolis neighborhood organizations as compared to other so-called stakeholders like CDCs, chambers or business associations -- should not be overlooked or confused. They are distinctly different. Thus, the role of CDCs, chambers and business associations can not and should not be equated with Minneapolis neighborhood organizations when it comes to discussion of funding or access to funding. The NCEC and NCR needs to make this distinction; it does not appear that they fully have yet. In addition, different laws govern different types of nonprofits like chambers of commerce, and thus they are allowed to (and do) perform certain activities such as lobbying and political functions that Minneapolis neighborhood organizations are prohibited from being involved in. The NCEC and NCR needs to deal with this distinction.
- Funding other groups would not be wise-Less money available - Neighborhood organization not necessarily in position to get outside funds
- Existing neighborhood organization should be funded.

Appendix N: Continued and Expanded Services and Group Purchasing

- All neighborhoods need some help with basic records management (esp. for all volunteer orgs).
- Document processing services.
- Help with administrative cost.
- Lack of group purchasing, job descriptions, (e.g. insurance - D & O, Liability).
- Shared administration costs (e.g. single office).
- Increase buying power / econ. of scale
- 990s/audits/D&O insurance.
- Access to legal advice.
- Accounting services for Neighborhood organization.
- Administrative support from city staff.
- Annual audits.
- Assistance with administering Federal grants.
- Auditing and 990 preparation.
- Board support ---administration.
- Bookkeeping.
- Combined purchasing power.
- Common infrastructure system.
- Common infrastructure to set up communications like website.
- Common needs that could be more efficiently handled at larger scale.
- Common shared services.
- Common vendors for cross neighborhood support!
- Computers for each neighborhood (accountability needed) and IT support.
- Concern about deductible for D & O Insurance (e.g. now \$10,000?).
- Continue D & O insurance.
- Current deductible of insurance.
- D & O insurance.
- D & O insurance.
- D&O insurance/general liability.
- Director and officers.
- Disputed philosophy of gaining efficiencies.
- Employee to help with grant writing.
- Getting information out to neighborhoods and individuals more effectively.
- Grant writing, other creative funding
- Have option for discounted rate for accounting.
- Health care and insurance
- Health insurance consideration for staff (neighborhoods pool together...facilitated by City).
- Help neighborhoods get maximum use of staff time.
- Help with funding financial resources - city person knowledgeable at other grant resources / assist neighborhoods with accessing other dollars (\$).
- Help with writing grants - Where is the money (\$). How to get the money (\$).

- Helping with start up of new organization.
- Helps apply for grants... "gets dollars (\$) back".
- Human Resources services.
- Human resources.
- If shared resources – know what each Neighborhood Organization's needs are and how to address it.
- Insurance - desire to compare rates and opt in (D&), general liability).
- Insurance (general liability).
- Insurance for events and organization.
- Insurance is important.
- Internship program (i.e. Vista for neighborhoods)
- It's not all about money – e.g. health insurance for staff, access to Federal dollars.
- Key is in coordination (among the neighborhoods.
- Legal, insurance and administration costs.
- Professional services needed also: Accounting - same software for ex.; Need access to legal services - employment, contracts, etc.; Not helpful to have people contact with various lawyers ... share needed professional services.; D&O insurance - Umbrella policy.; Pool of consultants to access.
- Provide "Director and Officers Insurance", Workman Comp. Insurance and Liability coverage similar to current NRP coverage for all Neighborhood Organizations.
- Provide a simplified format for basic bookkeeping and contract management
- Provide audit support and continued audit reviews by the Office of the State Auditor.
- Provide audits and bookkeeping services for Neighborhood Organizations.
- Provide mailing lists to targeted audiences for Neighborhood fundraising and community meetings.
- Provide Neighborhood organization staff a route to a 401K: no matching required.
- Provide Neighborhood organization staff access to a Health Insurance pool.
- Provide Neighborhood organizations access to an e-mail client that does not rely on Google or Yahoo. Residents are already leery about giving out e-mail. Google and Yahoo are not very secure and have lots of advertisements.
- Provide technology support for Neighborhood organization – help with details and functions.
- Shared accounting, legal, insurance and payroll.
- Shared administrative backroom at NCR.
- Shared communication resources: Direct mail.; E-mail communications, etc.
- Sustain insurance.
- Take away city support / econ of scale: Accounting; Taxes; Insurance; Health care
- Tax returns
- Tech Services - need services 1-2 times per year (e.g. Geek Squad).
- Technical assistance for grants
- Technical support for neighborhoods to respond to grants.

Appendix O: Comments regarding dividing funds equally among neighborhoods:

- Divide by number of neighborhoods - smooth
- Dollars (\$) equally divided amongst the neighborhood organizations.
- New program starts in 2011 – everyone gets same allocation.
- Equal share.
- Equally across neighborhood organizations with option to give back
- Equal dollar (\$) amount to each neighborhood (x84) – not organizations/not look at size.
- \$30-40K annually not a lot of money, but just divide up and move on...don't spend too much time on this money.
- Allocate by neighborhood, not by population.
- I understand that you will be making a decision on how to divide up the annual GENEROUS three Million (\$3,000,000.00) into the 72 neighborhood organizations. I hope that the decision is to divide it up equally between the seventy-two neighborhoods. It is my understanding that many of the neighborhood with permanent huge staff have been asking that it be divided into programs so that they making the most noise can have the lion's share of the amount. I do not believe that this is fair and I see no reason that the City of Minneapolis should pay for large staff positions at the neighborhood level. The City of Minneapolis has elected individuals and very competent city departments to do the desired work of the city of which the neighborhoods are a part of. SO PLEASE, DIVIDE UP THE ANNUAL GENEROUS THREE MILLION DOLLARS EQUALLY BETWEEN THE 72 NEIGHBORHOODS.
- Allocation of funding should be based on neighborhood need and work accomplished. Equal allocation doesn't make sense to us.
- It should not be the same across board. Needs to be level of equity.
- Don't know how you could give each neighborhood the same amount.

Appendix P: Comments regarding needs based allocation:

- Different neighborhoods have different needs. Some could put to better use.
- Different Neighborhood Organizations have different needs- the City should provide funds to address needs.
- Formula needs to be needs-based. NRP formula identified logical needs, plus capacity to leverage the dollar base on past experience.
- Need based allocation.
- Need based allocation.
- Based on needs
- Combination of needs based (e.g. housing, crime, etc.).
- Based on level of needs – same as previous
- Based on today's factors
- Point system - to get at needs: Vacant homes, properties to be maintained.
- Based on need.
- Increase access to dollars (\$) for those who really need it.
- Base on need.
- Funds allocated based on neighborhood organizations needs – some need more than others.
- Equity based allocation of dollars (\$).
- Some neighborhoods have more problems/issues.
- Programming has shifted as needs shift - e.g. foreclosures.
- Some places don't need money - should share with neighborhoods.
- Demographics are different from S/W - not affluent professionals / consider as part of allocation formula issues with gangs as factor in allocation.
- Allocation of funds should be very different from neighborhood to neighborhood.
- Neighborhoods that need more help should get more help.
- Have an opportunity to reach out – (e.g. PPL Project). No two neighborhoods [alike]. Shouldn't fund and judge neighborhoods the same. Same shoes do not fit everyone.
- Not all neighborhoods need money. Some neighborhoods are screaming for help.
- Makes sense that livability criteria neighborhoods with higher needs get more \$s.
- By need - similar to NRP, some neighborhoods need more help.
- Some neighborhood organizations have all the resources they need. Others have more challenges. Formula shouldn't be guaranteed indefinitely. Money should go back to the same pool.
- Some neighborhoods have more complicated issues and don't have the capacity required to access some city program funds. It is important for the city to provide capacity-building assistance for those who need it.
- Not same amount goes to each Neighborhood.
- Different parts of City will have different needs for resources.
- Some sections of City with a stronger tax base –different needs – every group is different/ every financial need is different.
- Based on need.
- Wealthy neighborhoods don't need as much - some neighborhoods need more.

- Neighborhoods that have greater needs have greater access to other resources.
- Neighborhoods no longer have access to those funds.
- Neighborhood capacity - level of education, crime, income, etc.
- Funding formula needs to reflect conditions.

Appendix Q: Comments regarding Competitive Grants:

- Treat like a RFP (# of points)
- Put out RFP and neighborhood could respond.
- Don't balkanize neighborhoods - competition grants will lead to division of neighborhoods and inhibit collaboration.
- Don't pit neighborhoods against each other.
- Competitive grants may pit neighborhoods against each other.
- Less funding - competitive grants pit neighborhoods against each other.
- Competitive grants make it harder to collaborate/plan.
- Allocation formula should not pit neighborhoods against each other.
- Harder for small neighborhoods to reply to RFP or develop RFPs.
- Volunteer organizations mostly writing grants is challenging - will lead to burn out.
- Don't pit neighborhoods against each other with competitive grants.
- Non competitive \$s.
- Competition is the wrong way to approach the process. Cooperation not competition.
- Concern about neighborhood organizations cannibalizing (fighting over money).
- Should not be a competition with other groups that serves the neighborhood.
- Competitive funds are a terrible idea.

Appendix R: Comments regarding "Baseline Plus":

- Fixed allocation by population - ("x" amount per neighborhood) + need formula/variables; Density; Population; Income; Diversity; Housing.
- Part of funding is set and part is flexible.
- Need a flexible pool for competitive pool / base level funding?
- Need \$6,000-\$8,000 minimum – increase depending upon the situation.
- Give neighborhood organizations enough dollars (\$) for neighborhood organizations to function well.
- Consider a baseline.
- The LCC board is in unanimous agreement that funding based solely on populations is unfair and unacceptable.
- Some portion allocated evenly - another portion based on need. \$2,000 base in citizen participation is inadequate.
- Set base amount for some portion, remainder by allocation.
- More than \$2K Admin. CDBG.
- Core set of administrative support provided -remaining dollars (\$) being divided by need.
- Dollars (\$) based on population – not housing units using current census data.
- Funding needs to reflect 9,000 residents & 8,000 renters.
- Everyone get base rate - could start with base and add variability based on population. Dependent on population - perhaps economic needs of neighborhood.
- Base rate + competitive funding open to neighborhoods collaborating on a project (ex. Visiting Nurse Program).
- Established minimum (e.g. base of \$20,000, some competitive).
- Population based - (e.g. \$5.00/head baseline would leave additional funds for needs based)
- Population based baseline with competitive (?)
- Bulk divided by household - hold back some (e.g. \$300,000) for special needs (e.g. language).
- Minimum baseline (e.g. \$15/household).
- Base amount divided equally and something based on number of homes per capita. Example: number of newsletters being mailed out vary by the number of households to mail.
- We need a minimum of \$15,000 - advocacy, functionality, outreach, keep the doors open, and administration - Without the doors open, this community will be a lot worse off.
- \$40,000 would not pay rent.
- Blended program.

Appendix S: Comments regarding Timing:

- Avoid "use or lose" mentality.
- 2-3 year allocation (Refresh).
- Yearly allocation will not work well.
- Neighborhood organizations need to have dollars (\$) to continue after NRP is gone. Increase dollar after 5 years.
- Allow neighborhoods to use a portion left over from un-restricted fund.
- Neighborhoods have a yearly request process.
- Have a two/three year allocation plan.
- Neighborhood organization should be allowed to use dollars they don't spend the previous year: Don't take away dollars (\$) not used in year.
- Neighborhood organizations who spent NRP should get dollars (\$) first.
- For planning - 1 year is too short, 10 years is too long.
- If money isn't used in a set time period it should be reallocated to be used by other groups
- Neighborhoods considered all equally needy - don't penalize for having money in the bank or having been careful in spending the money.
- Allocation formula should be for ten years - should rollover, not annual grant.
- Need to have a multi year allocation of funding to neighborhood organizations.
- There needs to be a long term strategy to funding.
- Funding needs to be a longer term.
- Allocation for a period of time (e.g. 3 years with review after 2 years).
- Pool of stable funding so neighborhoods can plan – NRP made it possible.
- Predictability/reliance on funding - best of all possible worlds would know what we are getting in 2011.
- If Neighborhood Organizations don't know what they will receive – it will be difficult.
- Board needs lead time to react to funding changes.
- Neighborhood organizations need to be able to plan in advance and be able to make long term decisions.
- Budget(able) amount to plan on annually.
- Timing of funding
- Develop a 5 years budget cycle for Neighborhood Organizations.
- *Allocation formula should provide continuity - multiple year, 10 years is too long.
- Predictability from year to year.
- If neighborhoods don't spend dollars within a certain timeframe, they would lose the dollars and are put back in to pool. If yearly allocation...have 6 months after year to spend dollars.
- Yearly makes sense if for administration.
- Longer time frame for allocations to help with budgeting.
- Neighborhoods should be allowed to carryover funds.
- Plans should have shorter time frames – it's hard to go back to someone else's plan. It would increase effectiveness of community engagement.

- Time Frame: 10 years is too much; 1 year is too little; Adjust every 2 years; 5 year review
- Process for revising things mid stream is “tortured” - 10 years is a long time. 3-5 year commitment for programming plans - flexibility to respond.
- Want multi-year commitment of 3-5 years (not year after year).
- Lack of stable dollars over longer term is setting up neighborhoods to fail.
- Need stable funds for neighborhoods 3-5 years.
- NRP process very long to plan.

Appendix T: Comments regarding Independence from NRP Status:

- Will neighborhood organizations be penalized for not using NRP funds?
- Shouldn't be penalized for being good stewards - should be blind to NRP coffers.
- CDBG from NRP should continue to flow to neighborhoods.
- NRP status (Phase I/Phase II) shouldn't impact CPP status.
- Use NRP money to run programs and the new program dollars (\$) to support neighborhood organizations.
- Don't punish neighborhoods for finishing early or finishing late.
- Neighborhoods should not be penalized for random selection used in NRP.
- Fund neighborhoods each year regardless of status of NRP funding status. Use NRP for programs and NCR-NCEC for administration.
- All neighborhoods need to be funded well. Whatever the equation is you should not be punished for timing of entry. Avoid phasing out and phasing in.

Appendix U: Comments regarding Leveraging of Resources:

- City-wide Study on NRP showed leverage of NRP funds.
- Funds can help leverage more dollars (\$).
- Allow organizations to grow funding sources.
- Use funds to leverage resources such as other organizations, help with volunteers and educating other groups – Have incentive \$\$.
- Help neighborhood organizations leverage more dollars (\$).
- Leveraging resources - NCR can help facilitate leveraging of resources.
- Concern about loss or lack of leverage that was so successful with NRP.

Appendix V: Comments regarding Communication and Feedback:

- Area meetings versus 8 for the 8 Districts
- Review what was discussed. No consensus as collaboration.
- School Board inclusion.
- Park Board inclusion.
- Assure neighborhood input - city use the input from neighborhoods.
- Make sure neighborhoods are empowered by allowing input to be used in new plan.
- Neighborhoods need to hear back in the same way information was gathered.
- We want to know how information given/input given is going to be used.
- The city should use the same process gathering information and input from neighborhoods as it does presenting program ideas generated from that input back to the neighborhoods.
- City says "We want to hear from you" and it goes into the circular file.
- Every person has a right to be informed.
- Loss of a 45 day review period is a concern.
- Neighborhood input is not same as public hearing.
- More communication with community
- Executive Director to communicate regularly.
- Neighborhood organizations should be warned/notified of any funding changes – in a timely fashion.
- Have the same positive relationship with new department as we did with NRP – better.
- Time and communication are barriers.
- Keep in touch with us.
- Let us know more in advance what is coming up so neighborhood can contribute
- Clearer communication from city
- Please keep us informed as the process moves forward and thanks again for coming to MHNA.
- Good idea to engage neighborhoods - but come to neighborhoods with an open mind.
- Better communication – more is better than less. Will take what we can get

Appendix W: Comments regarding Implementation and Transition:

- Concerned about implementation.
- Have an implementation strategy of the city's future that everyone can buy into.
- Look at goals first.
- Don't overlay plan - promote the idea of "Failing Fast"
- Neighborhood organizations need time to transition.
- Assure that neighborhood organizations are funded well. Equitable way to phase in and out of money programs.
- Want easy transition - allows small neighborhood to continue working.
- Seamless transition.
- Approval timeline response - Nov-Dec. 2010.
- Would have been easier to have a Phase 3 of NRP. This transition has been a difficult process – would have been better if we could have avoided it.
-

Appendix X: Comments regarding Other Resources:

- Institutions priorities being met... should support implementation.
- Put all funds to CPP (none to CIF and NIF).
- Why not all money in to administration and not discretionary - create a more robust administrative program.
- Spending more money on neighborhoods - allocation variables considered.
- Talk to foundation, assemble pool of funds, NCR administrators. Current resources aren't enough. Resources to work on other issues.
- Give neighborhood organizations the most amount of money to do what they do.
- High cost if benefits are added. Need to add larger funding sources.
- Be creative. Consider alternative funding sources (dime a drink e.g.)
- State funding – “green jobs” available.
- Funding is inadequate. Setting ourselves up for not having neighborhood capacity + resources (e.g. crime prevention stats, sex offender notices, neighborhood gardens) to implement city council priorities and department initiatives.
- More funding - revenue sharing.
- NIF & CIF should be rolled to CPP.
- Neighborhoods need more resources.
- \$3,000,000 is not adequate for now- need to advocate for additional dollars (\$).
- Dollars should go to neighborhoods;; Health care dollars.; CDBG dollars.; Federal stimulus dollars.
- City Council is now responsible for implementation - can still tap into city resources.
- Give neighborhoods real funding - we are being strangled - e.g. dedicated funding source.
- NRP housing dollars (\$) should be doubled and invested.
- Neighborhood organizations should collect a portion for neighborhood residents that call us and use our services.
- Program needs more money.
- Why limit to just \$3,000,000 - pool all funds together.
- Concern about State of Minnesota actions on TIF funding.
- Can't get funding for positive activities for youth.
- Decision on overall funding for neighborhoods was political - neighborhoods will die on the vine.
- Leverage existing City services (use City resources).
- City Wi-Fi system – consider how neighborhoods can tie into system.
- City is being generous with \$3M for neighborhood organizations.
- Support interactive forums (elect).
- Sharing of information among neighborhoods.
- City could jump start process of regional meetings.
- Community boards /messaging.
- Host or facilitate conferences of neighborhood level leaders and specialty practitioners, building on networks developed via conferences such as the Neighborhood Sustainability Conference organized by Alliance For Sustainability.

- Regional or district meetings rather than city-wide.
- Helping to cross-reference neighborhood programs to be able to connect with other neighborhoods on subjects/programs. Build partnerships and find common ground.