



**Work Group 2: Governance Advisory Structure for Neighborhood and Community Engagement
Notes for Meeting 6: October 25, 2018
Crown Roller Building**

Check In:

Introductions

- All work group members and staff shared something about themselves like family or job.
- The work group proposed looking at agenda and deciding on times per agenda item.
 - Note: Original agenda item #4 – NCR discussion – was eliminated
- The work group took more ownership of the meeting while facilitator and NCR staff took a step into the background.

Grounding Review:

NCR staff took previously handwritten charts and generated a computerized graphical image of the two models for “Planet 11” that had been discussed during the previous two meetings. The work group members reviewed the models individually and then came back together as a full group to discuss. (Later designated as models “A” and “B”, for clarification below.)

Noteworthy comments/explanations

- Council member Reich explained a proposal to tap into TIF funding for \$1.5 million in needed funding for the start of a navigation center aimed at helping the homeless encampment members.
- Proposal: There was a suggestion that received majority anecdotal support to move to a 6-month check in as opposed to just one, annually
- Question for NCR to report back on: Why does Planet 11 have to be elected officials? Planet 11 does not need elected officials, but the NRP Policy Board is required by State Statute to include elected officials.
- Proposal - NCR is represented as a dotted line all the way around the circle – this should be represented on whichever model chosen (or hybrid) from above.

Discussion on place for NCR

- Clarification: Model “B” - Dotted line means NCR has a dual governing direction similar to the Bicycle Advisory Commission. That group communicated formally once a year and have access to the transportation/ public works committee (before that is taken to city council)
- Majority support for Model “B” relationship
- Note from Councilperson Reich: Favors anything that follows requirements. If NRP is doing what it does now and we have a little more participation to avoid quorum issues then we can start plotting and planning beyond. Govt works for people – who can help figure that out? People. My ambition is, NRP goes from just nurturing to figuring out

what we can do next. But that notion of neighborhood project-based commitment shouldn't end with NRP.

Discussion on size and structure of Planet 11 board

- A suggestion from a member during the discussion that large boards – beyond the current proposal - can be twice as effective so a round table sharing of opinions followed. A majority of opinions favored larger boards for reasons of inclusivity, equity and workload. (One minority opinion centered around the idea of ensuring a quorum. Additional comment reminded group to consider “alternates” as part of the discussion.)
- Group separated into to two smaller groups to discuss further
 - *Group 1*
 - Started with weighted % of three green circles with a call for equal membership in each
 - 11-11-11 ← though this total # was somewhat arbitrary.
 - Really focused on having it large enough, equal and an odd number in total (33)
 - Standard application across the three circles
 - At least the 8 districts should have a rep
 - Representation of neighborhood associations beyond the boards
 - Geographic diversity of districts
 - Independent member?
 - *Group 2*
 - Total representation = 31
 - Topical (6)
 - Place-based Neighborhoods (13 by ward) + 6 open appts that would have to be nominated by neighborhoods but appointed by elected officials
 - They could tweak to make sure they are fitting the criteria (a missing demographic) – that doesn't mean they are there representing those that appointed them
 - In the application you would state your reason
 - Culture (6)
 - Elections are annual @ Community Connections with option of absentee voting beforehand (they could do breakout sessions @CC)
- Reconvened for large group discussion where each member had a chance to share
 - Summary -
 - Consensus on standard application and having an odd number
 - Though there is a concern for bias amongst those choosing if City Council can choose from applications
 - There are still some differences in opinion of what those seats should look like. Opinions offered consisted of:
 - Would like to see more cultural representation
 - Would like to know answer to city employees being on board question
 - Some like place-based neighborhood have the core/most membership of P11
 - Some like equal distribution across
 - Regardless, need to ensure bringing in more voices and accountability
 - Multiple reminders to remain transformative and bring in voices

- Ultimately no votes or final decisions were made.

Check Out:

- Next meeting is Wednesday, November 7 - A request was made at the end of the meeting to come prepared to next meeting to make those final decisions so that it is the last meeting (which will be #7, one extra than originally schedule).
- *Homework*
 - Think about equity deeply. It is important to have representation, but it is more substantive than that. Think about what voices and perspectives. Remember also this group is overseeing engagement, not just P11.
 - Please see handouts:
 - At the request of a group member, please bring any edits to workgroup notes so that they can be shared with the notetaker to update.
- Full Neighborhoods 2020 Meeting – all work groups will be meeting on Monday, November 19 at a location to be determined.