

## MEMORANDUM

---

**Date:** Tuesday, September 27, 2010  
**From:** Robert Thompson (NCR staff)  
**To:** NCEC Commissioners  
**CC:** David Rubedor (Director, NCR)  
**Re:** Staff Recommendations for Revisions to CPP Guidelines

---

This document provides staff recommendations for revisions to the Community Participation Program Guidelines for the 2012-2013 program. Please note also that additional minor technical revisions will be made to the Guidelines in response to neighborhood organization suggestions and lessons learned.

### **Staff Recommendations for revisions to CPP Guidelines:**

1. Neighborhood Investment Fund (NIF) and Community Innovation Fund (CIF) options:
  - NIF will be functionally incorporated into CPP.
  - Defer further development of CIF programs until 2013 (for possible 2014 implementation)
  - Focus of program would still be on three core program purposes (identify and act on neighborhood priorities, influencing City decisions and priorities, increasing involvement). However, use of NRP funds means first program purpose (identify and act on neighborhood priorities) has greater emphasis.

Summary: CIF is not eligible use under NRP statutory requirements. Commissioners offered mixed responses on CIF. NIF is eligible, but feedback from neighborhoods in 2010 and 2011, as well as feedback from Commissioner was to make program as simple as possible. CoW indicated a preference that CIF or NIF should be revisited when further funds are available.

2. Project Funding options (currently prohibited by CPP):
  - Allow project funding through the CPP Guidelines.
  - CPP submissions would continue to focus on community engagement for development of neighborhood priorities.
  - Neighborhood organizations must identify priorities in "neighborhood priority plans."
  - Projects will be guided by existing NRP policy.

Summary: Community engagement and planning without implementation is not allowable under NRP statute. Engagement and planning must connect to real outcomes. Neighborhood feedback in 2010 and 2011 was to provide for funding of projects. CoW indicated preference that project funding should be allowed under CPP Guidelines

3. Relation to existing NRP Plans:

Requested Action:

Identify NCEC preference for relation of NRP Phase II Plans to Neighborhood Priority Plans.

- Neighborhoods may use CPP funds to continue implementation of their Phase II NRP plans, as identified through neighborhood priority plans.

Summary: Neighborhood organizations may have already identified priorities through development of Phase II NRP plans. Optionally, neighborhood organizations can restate NRP strategies in neighborhood priority plan. CoW expressed no preference.

- Option 1: Allow neighborhood organizations to fund NRP plans directly with CPP funds (i.e. as directed in a Phase II plan).
- Option 2: Allow neighborhood organizations to fund NRP plans through CPP but not through NRP plans (i.e. as directed in a Neighborhood Priority Plan).
- Option 3: Prohibit any use of CPP funds for projects appearing in NRP plans.

(Some Commissioners have raised concerns about the administrative burdens of allowing the combined use of CPP and NRP funds in support of the same project. Staff have reviewed this issue, and are not concerned about this as a problem.)

4. Three-year funding cycle options: (contract cycle would remain annual)

- 2012 and 2013 allocation cycle would be for 18 months.
- Continue three year allocation cycles starting in 2014 to provide stability for neighborhoods. Allocations would be adjusted every three years based on updated data.
- Allow neighborhoods to do submissions for 1, 2 or 3 years.

Summary: 2012 cycle will start in July, 2012 and run through 2013. Neighborhood organizations have varying levels of capacity, and may be at different stages of planning, organizing and implement. Allowing neighborhoods to adopt a one, two or three year cycle will provide them with flexibility.

**Staff Conclusions:**

- CoW preference was that next submission and allocation cycle will be for 18 months. Following allocation cycles will be for three year period. CPP submissions can be for 1, 2, or 3 years.

**Other issues:**

5. Neighborhood Priority Plans:

- Guidelines must provide for development of neighborhood priority plans. Language regarding plans will appear in both "Program Purposes" section under "identify and act on neighborhood priorities" and in submissions section.

Summary: Necessary revision to meet NRP requirements.

**Staff Conclusions:**

- Provided by staff as informational that "program purposes" section would be changed to more clearly meet NRP legal requirements.

6. NCEC Role in approval of CPP submissions:

- Guidelines will reflect change in approval process, determined in separate policy document.

Summary: For 2012 and 2013, NRP Policy Board has legal authority of use of program funds. NCEC role in approval would result in unclear governance structure.

Staff Conclusions:

- Staff recommendation to prevent unclear governance. NRP Policy Board will have legal authority over use of NRP funds (and over CPP funds in 2012 and 2013).

7. Organization Newsletters:

- Newsletters and publications that accept advertising will not be eligible for funding.

Summary: Not currently allowed under NRP Policy. Could be revisited by NRP Policy Board.

Staff Conclusions:

- NCEC may make recommendation to NRP Policy Board at future date.

8. Fundraising:

- Fundraising expenses should be allowed as long as outcomes are eligible under the CPP Guidelines (i.e. for community engagement or projects identified in neighborhood priority plans).
- Revenue need not be treated as program income.

Summary: provide neighborhood organizations an opportunity to leverage funding. However, treating all fundraising revenue as program income would be bureaucratic and administratively challenging.

Staff Conclusions:

- CoW preference was to allow fundraising expenses to be allowed as stated above.