



Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission

September 22, 2009 Meeting Notes

Central Library-Doty Room, 300 Nicollet Ave, 55401

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

NCEC members absent: Crystal Johnson

City staff: Jennifer Lastoka, Pa Vang

Guests: *David Rubedor (NCR staff), Bob Cooper (City Development Finance staff)*

Agenda Item	Content	Outcomes/Next Steps (Person Responsible)
1. Welcome and introductions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Welcome • Introductions - Name, neighborhood you live in • Overview by facilitator of how the meeting will run: members will be called on in the order they raise their hand; remember the commission's decision-making process of choice is consensus or consensus-seeking; hold questions to the end; follow group norms • A commission member commented that when guest presenters are invited to commission meetings it's the opportunity to ask questions • Facilitator clarified any earlier comments about asking questions was to simply hold questions until the end • Primarily facilitator commented he chooses not to vote should there be a need • A commission member suggested the Bylaws Task Force address the topic of the primary facilitator and voting 	
2. Meeting notes and agenda (Action)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitator asked commission members if any changes were needed to finalize the August meeting notes. One suggestion made (see next step) • Facilitator asked if everyone was okay with today's agenda as it has been presented <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commission member commented a previous request for designating time at the meetings to hear from community members was not properly recorded in the meeting notes and doesn't see it on agenda; it's important to get input on the work of the commission 	<p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commission finalized July meeting notes <p>Next Step:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff edit Aug. notes: NRP was nominated for state "award" not "video" • Staff remove "Draft"

		from August meeting notes
<p>3. Task Force (update from task force)</p> <p>(Informational)</p> <p>A. Search and Screening Subcommittee (est. 6/23/09)</p> <p>B. Bylaws Task Force (est. 7/28/09)</p> <p>C. NCEC Letter on Consolidated TIF Plan (est. 8/25/09)</p> <p>(Informational)</p> <p><i>(Ed Newman, Matt Perry, Tony Anastasia, Mark Hinds)</i></p>	<p>A) Search and Screening Subcommittee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subcommittee has completed its work; an unranked slate of names have been forwarded to City Coordinator Steven Bosacker Subcommittee thanks City staff for making it a smooth process for subcommittee The pool of 88 applicants was narrowed down by City staff and subcommittee Commission members shared concerns: thought the commission would be able to weigh in at some point before names were forwarded to City Coordinator Subcommittee member clarified it's subject to the private personnel data under the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act and that names are not to be revealed A commission member commented when establishing task forces the task forces should be more explicit in their authority to avoid discussion on whether the task force's work needs to come back for approval or not. Commission member did not expect the work of the Search and Screening Subcommittee to come back. <p>B) Bylaws Task Force</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Met on August 16th will be meeting again on October 6th at North Regional Library, 6-8 p.m. Community members are welcome to attend but meetings are not public hearings. Please follow the Bylaws Task Force on the NCEC Google groups <p>C) NCEC Letter on Consolidated TIF Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Task Force member provided information on the rationale of suggesting the letter: 1) felt the commission needed to work on something tangible aside from infrastructure 2) felt there was bubbling tension around this topic and wanted to have constructive conversations 3) build basis or starting point for how the commission could communicate with and advise council members. Task force member explained the position the NCEC takes on the letter: supports 50-50 split, recommends funding 100% parcels. Letter does not define where the dollars should go. Task force member explained the rationale. Some include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supporting Target Center payment since it helps make it easier for City to meet budget needs in the long run Task force member didn't think a hard cap should be placed on NRP but 	<p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <p>Next Step:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The task force working on the Consolidated TIF Letter will incorporate the input heard, make minor changes, post the letter on Google groups for review and further comments and bring to the October meeting what would be the final letter

	<p>rather a set percent</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Letter suggests a flexible approach for the City • Staff clarified the certification deadline date is June 30, 2010 in order to be done to collect revenue for 2011. • A commission member asked if staff had a sense of when council would vote for certification. Staff replied it would likely be similar to last year in that through the City's budget process staff would likely get direction from the Council on certifying the districts. • Staff clarified the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • December 7th is when the budget will be adopted; however, no actions on the Consolidated TIF Plan are expected to be taken until after the budget is adopted • There is a public hearing on the levy and budget on November 19, 2009. • A commission member commented the elections are coming up and could change things. The benefit to being on the commission is the ability to make recommendations. It's critical to have the letter completed. • A commission member commented the NCR Department's budget hearing was postponed to Nov. 20 which is one day after the public hearing on Nov. 19. • Staff clarified that the NCR Department's 2010 budget does not speak to the Consolidated TIF Plan because it is not expected to generate revenue until 2011. • A commission member suggested the letter include an acknowledgement of the work and challenges of the City's Budget • A commission member commented there would essentially be two sets of staff running at the same time • A commission member stated that taxes are increasing due to pensions. The struggle is not just the City's but also taxpayers'. • A commission member commented the letter was to start the process and explore more about how to communicate with City Council and Mayor. Suggested tabling the discussion and using Google groups to collect ideas and do work on the letter. • A commission member commented what's important is to collect revenue in 2011 and not the certification date. • A commission member commented about being careful about being prescriptive. Suggested adding principles. • A commission member commented the role of the commission is to be prescriptive since it helps to influence the impact and demonstrates that the 	
--	--	--

	<p>commission understands the issue</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commission member commented the commission picked a non-classic model that could lead to a less formal commission • A commission member commented the discussion is starting to seem unproductive and that issues seem to be around “wordsmithing” the letter • Members went around the room and expressed their thoughts on the Consolidated TIF Plan letter. All supported the general intent of the letter and added comments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consolidated TIF Plan Letter is critical to making decisions. Urgency to get this done. • Minimize descriptive nature • Minor tweaks are needed to be made by the task force • Consider taking the 50% paragraph out and only leaving the 100% statement • Would like to see the final letter after modifications before it goes to Council and Mayor • Leave target center related content. Letter needs minor wordsmith changes • Commission members asked if the commission has a process for how the letter goes to council. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff shared that Council Member Ostrow, chair of the Ways & Means/Budget, welcomes a few people to deliver in person the letter and to talk with him about it more • A commission member suggested the Bylaws address communications between the commission and city council and mayor 	
<p>4. Integrating NRP Phase 1, 2 and 3</p> <p>(Discussion)</p> <p>A. Planning for Phase 3 (~15 mins)</p> <p>B. Transition funds 2010 (~25 mins)</p>	<p>A) Planning for Phase 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff quickly presented information laid out in the corresponding memo 4a • Questions/answer period: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commission member commented presenting factual information is favorable but there are issues around semantics. NRP Phase III is not an accurate name. • Staff commented they are aware of commission members’ interest in not using the name “NRP Phase 3” hence, it was stated up front in the memo that it’s a temporary name and will change once the commission decides to recommend new name to Council and NCR. <p>B) Transition funds 2010</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff summarized and presented information laid out in the corresponding 	<p>Outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Task force established to work on 2010 Transition fund guidelines. Members include: Mark Hinds, Matt Perry, Melanie Majors and Jeff Strand <p>Next Step:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transition Fund

	<p>memo 4b</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A commission member commented there's a policy issue. Hearing about the \$200,000 is suspicious. There seems to be money at the City it's just not available until they want it to be. When do neighborhoods hear about it? There's an awful late communication. The worst thing to do is to make neighborhoods compete for money. Competing for money would be bad start. • Staff clarified that this money has been part of the Mayor's five-year budget for the last two years. • Staff proposed a task force to work on parameters for the allocation of \$200,000 in 2010. • A commission member commented the principles wanted for the disbursement should flow into the allocations • Two commission members provided an update on the NRP Policy Board from 9/21/09: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal opinion received by NRP that NRP is responsible for administrating the first two phases of NRP. • Was told about a dozen of organizations would be in need for transition funds in 2010 • A commission member commented when putting together guidelines one item to keep in mind is the idea of rewarding organizations that burn money faster than others • A commission member commented that conducting an RFP process can be unfair. Some organizations don't have capacity to do RFP, some don't have administrative support, etc...suggested looking at creating a formula 	<p>Guidelines Task Force and City staff will meet, begin work, and report back to commission at next months meeting</p>
<p>5. Representations (Discussion)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not enough time. Topic was not addressed and is expected to appear on the next agenda. 	<p>Outcomes: Next Steps:</p>
<p>6. Other business</p>	<p>A. Related announcements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Park board is willing to host an NCEC member gathering. Commission members should expect to hear more from Ami Thompson via email regarding the event. 	<p>Outcomes: Next Steps:</p>