



Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission
August 25, 2009 Meeting Notes

MPD Fourth Precinct, 1925 Plymouth Ave N, 55411

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

NCEC members absent: David Crockett, Mark Hinds, Matt Massman

City staff: Jennifer Lastoka, Pa Vang

Guests: *Jeff Streder & Mark Winkelhake (City Development Finance staff)*

| Agenda Item | Content | Outcomes/Next Steps (Person Responsible) |
|--|--|--|
| 1. Welcome and introductions | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Special welcome to community members attending and watching • Introductions - Name, neighborhood you live in | |
| 2. Meeting notes and agenda (Action) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator asked commission members if any changes were needed to finalize the July meeting notes; there were no changes requested/made. • Facilitator asked if everyone was okay with today's agenda as it has been presented; there were no changes requested/made. | Outcome: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission finalized July meeting notes Next Step: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff remove "Draft" from July meeting notes |
| 3. Funding components of NRP Phases 2 & 3 (Informational) <i>(Jeff Streder & Mark Winkelhake)</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeff Streder provided an introduction to the Consolidated TIF Plan • Mark Winkelhake gave a brief history about the Consolidated TIF Plan and updated the commission on its current status (See associated memo for details) • Commission members were able to ask questions. • Staff clarified the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target Center debt and neighborhood revitalization funds have been split evenly in the Mayor's proposal at \$ 6.5 million each • The new department's administrative cost will be similar to what it has historically been in the neighborhoods of approximately \$1.5 million • Revenues from the Consolidated TIF Plan will fund only part of the NCR | Outcome: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Next Step: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(See outcome of agenda item #6)</i> |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>administrative costs, specifically the positions working on the neighborhood vitality component</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mayor’s proposed budget recommends to certify 50% of the parcels • If only 50% of the parcels are certified (at the latest by the middle of next year), the other 50% could later be certified by going through all the necessary steps in certifying districts. It does not need to be approved by the legislature. • Whether recertification occurs or not, the City will still lose \$9 million of Local Government Aid (LGA) in 2010. There is no penalty for certifying or not certifying. • Target Center debt is paid to bond holders and is expected to be paid off by 2024. • A commission member asked at what level the commission can have an impact on the decision based on where the Consolidated TIF Plan is now. Staff suggested a good starting point would be a formal letter from the commission. • A commission member commented that it’s up to the council members how they use the commission’s letter and input <p>B) Brookfield lease as part of NRP Phase 2 funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff explained the Brookfield lease is expected to be paid back by December 2009 and that the Brookfield repayment would be one of several revenue sources that go into a funding mechanism (the “waterfall”) that pays various expenses in a predefined order. This includes providing funds for the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP). NRP is capped at \$20M in 2009. The funds remaining after the capitalization of NRP are considered discretionary, and have been accounted for in the department of Community and Planning Economic Development’s 2010 budget. | |
| <p>4. Task forces (Informational)</p> <p>A) <i>Search and Screening member</i> B) <i>Matt Perry</i></p> | <p>A) Search and Screening Subcommittee update (est. 6/23/2009)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subcommittee will be meeting Thursday, August 27 to review applications in the “high” pile for the Assistant City Coordinator position • The total number of applicants in the “high” pile is in the upper twenties • Subcommittee members also have access to the “medium” and “low” piles • The subcommittee is looking at doing interviews with applicants in early September • The City Coordinator will conduct interviews in late September and target selecting the new director in early October | <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request granted for a two-month extension to the Bylaws Task Force • Commission agreed alternates would be on the September agenda for further discussion |

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>B) Bylaws Task Force update (est. 7/28/2009)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Met on Friday, August 7, 2009. The task force looked over the charge of the Bylaws Task Force, reviewed the purpose of the NCEC, created goals for the task force (not goals of the bylaws), and discussed approaches to creating the bylaws. • From the first meeting the task force brainstormed and created a first draft of NCEC bylaw categories. Staff has been asked to fill in information already set by City Council. • The next meeting is September 16, 2009 at Shingle Creek Commons, 4600 Humboldt Avenue North, 55412. • Presenter requested further direction from the commission on the alternates piece. (Ami Thompson facilitated during this portion of the meeting) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commission member suggested alternates be included on next month's agenda for further discussion • Other suggestions from commission members that did not get addressed or were forwarded to future discussions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Seeking other legal opinions on alternates ○ Soliciting input from the neighborhoods ○ Conducting a non-binding straw poll to get a sense of how the commission feels about the topic • A commission member asked for clarification on the process of NCEC appointments | <p>Next Step:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task forces will continue work • Staff will research more on alternates |
| <p>5. Commission members and community members relations (Discussion)</p> | <p>A. Any member may share what they are hearing from the community related to the work of the commission.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commission member shared experience being contacted by a neighborhood wanting to know what the commission was working on. The commission member responded that the commission is still working on structuring itself • Several commission members have heard from neighborhoods about funding concerns • A commission member requested more clarity around who neighborhoods are to communicate with in 2010. Is it NRP? City? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Response: NRP is still responsible for Phase I and II and the City for Phase III until any formal agreement changes that. • A commission member shared that two top concerns of neighborhoods are funding and stability • A commission member shared that a consensus-seeking model may not be | <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff will check with Communications about having video available online • Staff will work with |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| | <p>sufficient for the work the commission has to do around funding questions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission members requested to get information on which neighborhoods may be running low on funding for 2010 • Commission member asked about getting an audience and doing a presentation to provide commission input instead of sending a letter • Staff clarified about the council process and how community input is typically delivered. A letter and in person input at a public hearing gets treated the same and has the same weight • A commission member suggested having a constructive engagement with NRP about transitions and perhaps inviting commissioner Dorfman to a future NCEC meeting • A commission member suggested the commission have well defined communications with the NRP Policy Board emphasizing the importance of working closely with the board • A commission member commented that the priority of the commission is to get the commission to a point where they can get resources for neighborhoods • Commission members expressed interest in finding new innovative ways to communicate with the City and other boards and commissions, acknowledging that a letter carries power • A commission member shared an experience of being contacted by the media and commented that the person seemed to be looking for tension among the commission members. How do commission members handle media? • A commission member shared experience also being contacted by the media and choosing not to respond; members cannot determine what is on other members' mind • A commission member shared that one approach when being contacted by the media is to give the disclaimer that you are speaking as an individual and not on behalf of the commission • Staff shared that there are board/commissions that address how to handle the media in their bylaws: the bylaws do not allow individual members to write a letter or speak on behalf of the whole board/commission • A commission member requested staff give neighborhoods an introduction to the NCEC Google groups • Staff clarified a question from a commission member regarding how neighborhoods get information about commission meetings: Staff recently sent out an email to Community Engagement subscribers & to neighborhood organizations and their contact staff notifying them that they can visit the | <p>finance to get summary information about financial status of neighborhood organizations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task force established to draft letter as a starting place (see agenda item #6) |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>City's web site to sign up to subscribe for information about NCEC meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commission member commented that this is neighborhood and community engagement work but is only hearing about the neighborhoods: wants commission to remember other stakeholders such as businesses and more • A commission member commented that it was surprising to find that other communities besides neighborhoods were not already included in the dialogue • A commission member suggested the commission come up with name to replace "NRP Phase III". Suggested "NCEC". • A commission member suggested having the NCEC videos available on-demand somewhere online • Staff clarified the videos would not live online forever and have a cost associated with archiving but can look for options of making the videos available more broadly. • A commission member shared that NRP has been nominated for a state award. NRP is 1 of 2 finalists with the City of Willmar- encourages everyone to vote at a specific URL that member can later provide. • A commission member suggested having NCR staffing/budget as a future agenda topic. | |
| <p>6. Other business (Informational)</p> | <p>A. Related announcements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commission member suggested establishing a new task force to draft a letter from the commission about the Consolidate TIF Plan and to make the letter available on Google group to gather input from other commission members. The commission member also inquired about getting an audience in addition to a letter. • A commission member suggested the letter be more philosophical and not specific due to the budget's complexity • A commission member commented can't imagine the commission taking a stance for certifying any less than what the mayor has proposed. • A commission member suggested using Google groups to gather neighborhood input for the letter; Staff clarified that neighborhoods could follow the commission member conversation on Google group | <p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task Force – NCEC Letter: Consolidated TIF Plan--- Tony Anastasia, Melanie Majors, Mark Hinds, Marcea Mariani <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task Force draft a letter related to the Consolidated TIF Plan for commission members to consider. |