Top Five Themes from written comments submitted by residents:

1. The City needs to communicate better with residents (two-way and consistent). Not everybody goes to neighborhood organization's meetings. They do not know about them or even what neighborhood they live in. (Campaign to educate residents about it)

2. Lack of accountability of NRP to control neighborhood organizations' expenditures. The City should conduct Independent audits of neighborhood organizations to learn how much money has been well spent, poorly spent, inefficiently squandered or just plain disappeared. Also, neighborhood boards are often obstacles to open engagement. They should have term limits to ensure impartiality and rotation.

3. The community engagement report does not address the NRP model in any way and all of the successes achieved in the community through the NRP program. We need to begin a debate about ways to better employ the grassroots model of NRP, about how well and ill NRP functioned, and what needs to be changed to improve the NRP model of community involvement.

4. The CE report is the beginning of a much more extended discussion concerning what is the place and importance of citizen participation in the community and governmental affairs of the City.

5. It was time for the City of Minneapolis to consider restructuring CE activities and revaluating some elements of the previous system that have not worked. However, the City should not reinvent to achieve better community engagement. The gift that the NRP gave to Minneapolis was the opportunity to exploit the resources of its neighborhoods and citizen participants for the betterment of communities and the City as a whole.

Top Five Themes from written comments submitted by Neighborhood Organizations:

12 Neighborhood organizations who signed the Resolution:

1. Community engagement should not be around pending City decisions; rather it should be based on a grassroots effort to involve people in their communities on an ongoing basis through outreach and recruitment, volunteerism, community building, public education, leadership development and community action.

2. Neighborhood organizations have been an integral part of Minneapolis process of community engagement and have successfully undertaken the important work necessary to involve people in the communities where they live.

3. Neighborhood organizations welcome the opportunity to work with the City to build upon the strong foundation of CE in Minneapolis, to strengthen their practices and to be accountable for their results.

4. To improve the system there needs to be a broad-based discussion (or the establishment of a commission) on the importance of CE for Minneapolis' future. It needs to include residents, neighborhood associations, the City Council, the Mayor, City staff, community organizations and the business community.
5. Neighborhood organizations, City departments and elected officials need to be held accountable for their ability to engaging constituents in decision-making processes.

Other 9 neighborhoods:

1. Neighborhoods need to be involved early in the decision-making process. They need to be informed equal partners in the process, up to and including being initiators, not just responders.
2. Neighborhood organizations should be funded at a level that allows them to effect change and accomplish tangible goals identified by their residents. We urge policy makers to find a way to provide equitable funding, consultation and oversight for neighborhood organizations.
3. City departments are not engaged with Neighborhood organizations. Usually they come to us when decisions have been made then CE becomes telling us what will be done rather than asking us what should be done, or jointly addressing problems and issues.
4. The City should ask the community how to restore the trust between community members and City government.
5. There are two types of CE. The first one occurs at the City department levels (internal process model in page 5). The second one is characterized by the ability of citizens to initiate discussions, identify problems, find solutions and implement them. This one requires that people have the information, resources and mechanisms they need to make informed decisions.

Top Five Themes from written comments from <u>online forums:</u>

1. Need an assessment of the performance of neighborhoods in fulfilling their Citizen Participation Contracts to show that they have well-used the grants and stay in the engagement loop.
2. Keep the good work done by neighborhoods, do not start all over.
3. Centralized vs. decentralized NRP program
4. Residents, neighborhood organizations need to be involved early in the process of deciding/designing the community engagement system.
5. Improve communication 2-way.

Top Themes from written comments from <u>City Boards and departments:</u>

1. Need to include non-geographic communities/ underrepresented populations to keep citizens from being marginalized and encourage participation in City government.
2. Define roles and responsibilities fro Boards and Commissions. Be clear about it when explaining it to the public.
3. The City's website needs to be clear and easier to access. Needs information on upcoming public meetings and engagement opportunities.