**Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission**
**Committee of the Whole**
**Wednesday, April 13, 2011**
**North Commons Park**

**DRAFT NOTES**

**Commissioners Present:** Doron Clark; John Finlayson; Bill Helgeson; Crystal Johnson; Ed Newman; Matt Perry; Karen Lee Rosar; Breanne Rothstein; Jeff Strand; Ami Thompson.

**Commissioners Not Present:** Tony Anastasia; David Crockett; Mark Hinds; Melanie Majors; Marcea Mariani; Matt Massman.

**Introductions and Announcements**
Agenda accepted.
Revisions to notes: Doron, Breanne and Ami were present. On NRRC, "false choices" reference was about using CPP funds in this way, "or org fails." Notes accepted.

**CPP submissions**
Just four submissions coming in for April NCEC meeting.

- Columbia Park Neighborhood Association: No questions.
- Elliot Park Neighborhood Inc.: Question on membership requirement. Specifies under-engaged groups, no strategies for engaging them. Request for staff to request additional information on connecting. Staff direction: Hiring fund development specialist? More clarification on fund development. Could city grant department help with this?
- Loring Park: Submission should be better set up to answer within template, re-write so they follow the template... too much information, not cohesive answer. Have people writing in same format so we can compare. Was this a requirement to follow the template? Did provide some wiggle room, does provide a lot of information of what they are doing. Don't need to reject, but direct staff to talk to neighborhood, could fit better in template. This one seems further out of bounds than others. Training neighborhoods what community engagement is. This is long and windy. If we ask them to do it again, may get something long and windy in a different way. Next year we want application submitted in a different way. If we say template is required, then we can be more critical on template. Template was designed as add on, not as part of Guidelines. At pilot group, participants said they don't like top down approach. Also, this doesn't fill in budget. There is an advance with CLPC? Should be paid back out of next three years of funding. Their budget is much larger, may not have capacity. Not interested in format, but trying to figure out how they engage under-represented groups. This program is about engagement, why this is different from NRP. Submission could be clearer on their strategies for addressing under-represented, but this is different from NRP. Downtown neighborhoods are unique in nature of population, transitory nature of downtown. The only people who attend board meetings are board. Land Use and Livability often get 20 to 40 people, consider themselves independent of board. Staff Direction: greater clarity on

engaging under-represented, fix $2,000.

- Sheridan: In budget, memberships under professional services. What is this for... enumerate. Also, development of small area plan startup costs. Can imagine, but want it explained. What are startup costs?

**Equity Directive Work Plan**

Discussion on pilot focus group, feedback on questions.

- Suggested revision: “give us an example from the last year of engagement with a City department that you had or wished you had.”
- Need to build on success of 311, how do we run with that and expand on that.
- Concern about language, we had CPP program all ready to go.
- Should be consistent with numbers. $12.68. Need stop using acronyms. As we are funding $10 million
- Hope we get bigger turnout, focus groups conflict with other meetings.
- Ridiculous to ask about inequity, only one way to do it.
- This conversation is unfair to people.
- If we get an idea that we can run with, should run with it.
- Suggestions for questions: give clear options to respond to.
- This was handed to us, not a great question to ask, but is reality of situation. No one at table was thrilled, but it is what it is.
- Make sure messages we are giving are consistent.
- Question 3 needs to be really narrowed down. Prologue needs to set up discussion about future rather than past.
- We only have so much money, give parameters, summarize options that we will be discussing. Move ahead with CPP? change formula?
- We have a good set of draft points in David's document, should use them. Assessment probe, multiple choice, why that answer? What is your understanding of budget?

**Change to update agenda, swap items four and five.**

- Recommended $2.85 mil going back to NRP, change Policy Board, Reincorporate into CoW framework, establish a policy direction for City Department's engagement with neighborhoods.
- Need to update CoW charge, need to ask about Department connections. Melds with what we are doing. Doesn't this also address concerns about going back and asking same questions over and over? Recommend some changes Asked about list of where City Depts are engaging with neighborhoods?
- Look at Portland model on how to have more impact on city enterprise.

**Neighborhood without Organizational Representation**

- This is beginning of conversation. There are a few geographic areas of city that have residents, but not neighborhood group representing them. Mid City industrial, Humboldt Industrial, University District, MCI has asked Council member Reich for recognition. AT:

not all neighborhood groups engaging all residents. DC: we have missed residents within CPP.