

**Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission
Committee of the Whole
Wednesday, June 8, 2011
East Phillips Park**

DRAFT NOTES

Commissioners Present: Tony Anastasia; Doron Clark; Bill Helgeson; Mark Hinds; Ed Newman; Matt Perry; Jeff Strand; Ami Thompson.

Commissioners Not Present: David Crockett; John Finlayson; Crystal Johnson; Melanie Majors; Marcea Mariani; Matt Massman; Karen Lee Rosar; Breanne Rothstein.

Guests Present: Gary Arntsen Michele Braly, Chao Hong,

Introductions and Announcements

Announcement: The Park Board is accepting public comment on the proposed revisions to their Community Engagement Policy. (Thompson)

Notes from May meeting

- Concern regarding characterization of focus group comments on CPP. Seems that people didn't comment on proposed changes CPP – not that they didn't want changes. Suggested language revision: "*Staff conclusion was ...*" (Clark, Hinds dissenting).
- Need for sensitivity regarding terms used. "Cow-paths" and "silos" are potentially derogatory. (Strand)
- Approved with revisions.

Comments about NCEC CoW meetings

- CoW has led to questionable behavior. Lack of attendance. Committees meet forever, then work gets voted down by NCEC. (Anastasia)
- Consensus model is the problem. Robert's Rules are more efficient. Time is needed to go through the materials, so conflicted about need for extra meetings. (Newman)
- Strongly disagree with possibility of eliminating the CoW. When NRP eliminated the Management Review Team, the lead was taken by the program's central administration. (Strand)
- The CoW is a good model – there's a lot to cover. Issues can be dealt with here, versus. at NCEC. Robert's Rules would let decisions happen quickly. (Helgeson)
- We didn't know what we signing up for at first – now people do. (Thompson)
- Odd connection between consensus and attendance. Group needs to think how decision-making process happens. (Perry)

Equity Directive Work Plan

Reminder provided of this plan for a process, which includes many “may”s, and fewer “should”s. Mitigating the equity issue is a must. NCEC asked City Council, “What *is* equity” – which lead to asking neighborhoods for input during the Spring 2011 Focus Groups. NCEC should also provide policy direction for improving connections to City Departments. Work must be completed for the June NCEC meeting.

Discussion about conditions that need to be met and why:

Must satisfy 2011 focus group and 2010 feedback data.

- Might also be worthwhile to “take the temperature” of the group on the items beyond the bullets (Strand)
- Deliverables call for a set of recommendations - not necessarily implementation details.
- What will be most helpful to the City Council? It might be more than bullet points. (Hinds)
- Council didn’t know what they were requesting (Thompson)
- Replace “must satisfy” in memo with “thoughtfully consider”.
- Switch order of 2011 focus groups and 2010 feedback data since more people were involved in 2010 process.

Must satisfy “what is outcome of community participation?” question from neighborhoods.

- Must be outcome-based. If it’s in the focus group data, it doesn’t need to be a bullet.
- Unclear which pieces are the staff analysis. Mixing apples and oranges. (Newman)
- Delete bullet.

Must fit NRP legal requirements / NRP Legal Sandbox

- It would be useful to see a chart showing where there are conflicts -- what’s NRP legal, what’s NRP policy, what’s CPP policy, etc. (Hinds)
- NRP policy should be left out of this. (Perry)
- The community participation bullet covers 95% of State law. Equity Directive should be kept separate. (Newman)
- Joint Powers agreement is ending and the NRP Policy Board will need to be reconstituted. (Strand)
- NRP funds are going to fund this new program; we have mud whether we want it or not. (Perry)
- Staff clarifications: Funds cannot be spent without a Policy Board. Tier 1 issues will need to be addressed before we can get to Tier 2 and Tier 3. Changes to the program must be compliant with NRP statutes during 2012 and 2013 only.

Maintains continuity of CPP program and minimizes “whiplash.”

- Revise wording to read “with minimal disruption” (Anastasia)
- Keep language consistent with decisions of October 26, 2009.
- This and remaining bullets could be deleted. (Newman)

Addresses equity issues.

- This is could be deleted.

Meets City’s earlier “assurance” of 70% NRP funds

- Important for City live up to its 70% guarantee – but maybe not beyond 70%. (Newman)
- NCR Department has no obligation to do this. This doesn’t address equity and NCR does a much better job than NRP of distributing funds. This isn’t something we were directed to do. (Perry)
- It does start to address equity – but should neighborhoods settle for just 70%? (Hinds)
- *Staff clarification:* This is a possibility of extending current CPP contracts by 6 months and 50%. (RThompson) Funding base for CPP would increase, and NIF would be folded into CPP. (Cooper)
- There’s really nothing that this group can do to address equity. The only equitable solution is to return the funds to the neighborhoods, and we don’t have \$10 million. It should be made clear to the City Council that the NRP Policy Board should continue assisting neighborhoods in implementing plans. (Newman)
- Can’t support this item. (Anastasia)
- This item perpetuates NRP – which is ending. NCEC shouldn’t do this. (Perry)
- This is an important milestone – and should be supported. (Strand)
- *Staff clarification:* NRP isn’t ending anytime soon. (Cooper)
- It’s important to reduce overhead and not run two programs. (Newman)
- It’s worth keeping the CPP pool. Getting to 70% is a good step. (Clark)
- *Staff clarification:* CPP in and of itself isn’t an eligible use of NRP funds; there must be an implementation component. CIP is an eligible use, but NIF is not. (Cooper)
- City should find a way to replenish the \$10 million out of TIF. Everyone knew that there would be two programs for a while. (Strand)
- Can the numbers be run to see what it would take for each neighborhood to get to 70%?
- Funds should be distributed based on need. The focus groups said this. (Thompson)
- Needs for CPP are different from needs for NRP. The least affluent neighborhoods lost the most NRP funds. Kenwood lost \$1,000 in NRP funds, but received lots of CPP funding. (Clark)
- CPP does a better job of distributing funding.
- It might – but not when taken in the context of NRP funds that were lost.

- There's an added layer of complexity. It's not just how much a neighborhood lost, but from where the funding was lost. A bullet should be added stating that funding goes back to neighborhoods that lost the most. (Hinds)
- *Staff clarification:* TIF interest that's earned after 2009 can't be used for NRP activities. (Cooper)
- Advocate for the 70% or look at the CPP formula and distribute based on that. (Strand, room divided on suggestion).
- This calls for a "separation of church and state". NCEC should be respectful of the NRP plans developed by neighborhoods, but should look to combining the administration of the neighborhood programs. (Newman)
- This bullet should be narrowed and then offered to the NCEC since it seems that consensus won't be reached tonight. (Thompson)
- It is assumed that CPP will be changing to include programs? (Perry, Hinds affirming)
- Group hasn't even talked about CPP guidelines. (Newman)
- Can staff look at the two approaches (making \$860,000 available as part of CPP versus giving \$860,000 back to neighborhoods? (Hinds)
- Are we close to the 52.5% for housing? (Clark)
- *Staff clarification:* It appears that the 52.5% can be met without mandates.

Encourages community engagement partnerships with City departments.

- Provides policy direction; this should be kept.

Paves the cow-paths.

Helps break down silos.

- Like the ideas, but the terminology needs to be changed.
- Formal processes don't always work, which is why cow-paths exist. (Hinds)
- Possible language revision: "informal pathways".