

Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Policy Board

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF

June 23, 2008

Present and Voting: Debbie Evans, Beverly Conerton, Kari Anderson, Jeffrey Strand, Mark Stenglein, Peter McLaughlin, Cara Letofsky (Alternate, Mayor's Office), Robert Lilligren (Alternate, City Council), Rep. Joe Mullery, Scott Vreeland (Alternate, Park Board), David Ellis (Alternate United Way), Ken Kelash (Alternate Central Labor) and Gail Dorfman, chair, presiding.

Alternates Attending: Brock Hanson, Mark Hinds, Carol Pass, Nicholas Kakos

Absent: Mayor R.T. Rybak, Barbara Johnson, Peggy Flanagan, Sandra Vargas, Lauren Segal, Bill McCarthy, Todd Klingel

Staff: Bob Miller, Willie Willis

Others Present: Jennifer Lastoka, Gary Arntsen, Kerri Pearce Ruch, Shirley Yeoman

I. CALL TO ORDER

Gail Dorfman, chair of the NRP Policy Board, called the meeting to order at 4:40 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Upon a motion by Mark Stenglein and seconded by Ken Kelash the agenda was adopted.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Upon a motion by Mark Stenglein and seconded by Ken Kelash the minutes of the May 19, 2008 meeting were adopted.

IV. PRESENTATIONS & REPORTS

Prior to the presentation, Bob Miller gave a brief update on responses from Community Interest Members that he has so far. Central Labor and the United Way want to continue and the Chamber of Commerce does not.

He also responded to a question on the status of the Affordable Housing Reserve Fund projects. He will present a report at the July meeting.

1. Framework for the Future

Robert Lilligren made the presentation to the Policy Board that had been given to the City Council on June 19th. The City Council did not take any action on the presentation as it was intended to be informational only. He also pointed out that there are still areas of finance and administration to be worked out. The plan is to bring the completed proposal to the City Council on July 24th.

The first part of the presentation was a brief review of the history of NRP and the innovations that happened because of NRP. He then presented a timeline for adopting the revised Framework.

Beverly Conerton added a question / comment at this point of the presentation:
“If someone was listening to this presentation “cold” they would hear you say that NRP was this huge success. It leveraged dollars, it is an innovative program that other cities have adopted, NRP staff is incredibly helpful for facilitating relationships with the city, that it created and fostered independent organizations that build capacity to a high level of community involvement. Listening to that somebody would say, “Why do you want to change that?”

Robert Lilligren responded that the program was structured for 20 years and that the time period ends after 2009. The program structure needs to change and the funding sources will be different.

He then reviewed with the Policy Board the elements of the working document and organizational chart. The new organization will be a part of the City Coordinator’s office and called the Neighborhood & Community Relations Department. A list of functions for this department and the structure for an advisory board was presented as well as the selection process for determining a director for the department.

From this point forward in the meeting a discussion was held on the proposal presented. The topics covered included:

- 1) Discussion of how putting this department into the City Coordinator’s office would make more formal connections to staff within City departments in the implementation of neighborhood action plans.
- 2) Discussion of the governance of the new department in comparison to the current Policy Board.
- 3) Discussion of service delivery through neighborhood action plans and City Council members versus a delivery system through the City Coordinator’s office. Centralized verses decentralized power sharing was part of this discussion.

- 4) Discussion of evaluation of the new structure and how it could be changed if it doesn't work. What will be the performance measures for accountability?
- 5) Discussion of the administrative and discretionary funding. What will be diverted to the Target Center and what will be for neighborhood discretionary funds. Concerns were expressed that the new department will be developed in pieces especially as funding is addressed.
- 6) Comments about dismantling the current NRP and what will be accomplished by this. What are the strategies and structures that will make the neighborhoods better.

Bob Miller then made comments to clarify some positions presented in the discussions. He pointed out that from his observation from contacts throughout the country, that Minneapolis is unique in that all the neighborhoods are independent entities and function as such. Secondly, he pointed out that there is a misconception that NRP has not worked collaboratively and then listed major projects that were excellent examples of collaboration. Finally, he disagreed with the concept that the NRP program has not changed over the past 20 years. He pointed out the significant areas that have been changed in response to the needs of the neighborhoods and requests of jurisdictional officials.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 6:30 pm.

Willie Willis, Secretary Pro Tem

ATTEST: Gail Dorfman, Chair