Minneapolis Community Engagement
Report of the Work Group
April 2003

MINNEAPOLIS COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
REPORT OF THE WORK GROUP
APRIL, 2003

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
APRIL, 2003

On February 5, 2003 City Coordinator John Moir directed a work group be formed to determine what the current community engagement activities are in the City of Minneapolis and how these activities compare to other cities. The work group was formed with the following members:

Bob Cooper (MCDA)
David Fey (Mayor's office)
Pam Miner (Planning)
Lori Olson (City Coordinator's office)
Gail Plewacki (Communications office)
Jeff Schneider (CPED)
Erik Takeshita (Mayor's office).

As the process continued, the following persons were added to the work group:

Robert Baumann (CCP/SAFE)
Emily Ero-Phillips (MPRB)
Jeff Hayden (CM Schiff)
Joe Horan (NRP)
Jim Long (CCP/SAFE)
Gay Noble (CM Niziolek)
Gayle Prest (Public Works).

The Community Engagement work group used the adopted goal of the City Council of the City of Minneapolis, to "strengthen City government management and enhance community engagement," with the expectation that:

"the voices of individuals and the community are valued and will be heard and involved at appropriate points in the City's decision-making processes. The City will be more effective and efficient in how we communicate with and engage communities, and will work to include those who are typically under-represented in public dialogue. We will focus our engagement efforts in a manner that supports the long-term strength of a community."

The work group gathered information from entities involved in community engagement activities within the City of Minneapolis. A matrix was prepared to summarize these activities in terms of one-way (putting out information) and two-way (sharing ideas and feedback) engagement activities. This matrix is included in this report.

The work group also examined various engagement models from other communities and countries. The "Public Participation Spectrum" concept as defined by the International Association for Public Participation was used as a model for investigating activities. Numerous sources were consulted in regard to models of community engagement, which resulted in a matrix comparing the Minneapolis structure to other U.S. cities of Portland, Seattle, and St. Paul.

As a result of this inquiry, and building upon the most important common principles from all of these sources, the following principles are offered for future community engagement within the City of Minneapolis.

Minneapolis Community Engagement Should:

be a two-way process.

be a model of process, not a model of outcome.

serve as a catalyst for changing policies, programs and practices.

relate to empowerment - enabling communities to take action, influence, and make decisions on critical issues.

know, understand, and respect the targeted communities' culture.

be open and supportive of the participants' right to have a voice in the process.

make the benefit of participation by the community outweigh the cost of participation.

be long-term and sustainable.

be transparent - providing participants with a realistic understanding of the policy and decision making process and the range of possible outcomes. It should clarify the limits of the communities' influence in the process, particularly when the decision making power ultimately rests with government.

be coordinated and non-repetitive - work with other agencies operating in the area to avoid repetitive consultations with a community on the same or similar subject matter.

be measurable – monitor and evaluate as you go, modify your approach as necessary.

be timely.

▪ Strengthen City government management and enhance community engagement

Expectations:

Community Engagement:
The voices of individuals and the community are valued and will be heard and involved at appropriate points in the City's decision-making processes. The City will be more effective and efficient in how we communicate with and engage communities, and will work to include those who are typically under-represented in public dialogue. We will focus our engagement efforts in a manner that supports the long-term strength of a community.

Government Management:
The City will focus on enhancing productivity and creating a customer service-oriented culture. We will create a work environment where employees can excel, by building employee skills and improving employee diversity. Better information and analysis will be used to allow for more informed decision-making at both the elected and staff levels. We will develop and maintain a long-term, sustainable financial plan for the City. Special focus will be given to engaging our employees and the community in how we address and communicate these financial challenges. Elected officials and departments will hold themselves accountable to City goals, policies and plans.

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SPECTRUM/
CURRENT COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES
CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION SPECTRUM
(from International Association for Public Participation)

INFORM	CONSULT	INVOLVE	COLLABORATE	EMPOWER
Objective	**Objective**	**Objective**	**Objective**	**Objective**
To provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, alternatives, or solutions.	To obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives, or decisions.	To work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public and private concerns are consistently understood and considered.	To partner with the public in each aspect of the decision including the development of alternatives and the identification of the preferred solution.	To place final decision making in the hands of the public.
Promise to the Public	**Promise to the Public**	**Promise to the Public**	**Promise to the Public**	**Promise to the Public**
We will keep you informed.	We will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge your concerns, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and issues are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision.	We will look to you for direct advice and innovation in formulating solutions and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions to the maximum extent possible.	We will implement what you decide.

CURRENT MINNEAPOLIS PARTICIPATION SPECTRUM

INFORM	CONSULT	INVOLVE	COLLABORATE	EMPOWER
• Information letters • Informational flyers • Email alerts • Website information • News releases/articles • Brochures • Newsletters • Telephone calls • In-person contact • City calendar • Signage	• Public hearings • Website forms • Project meetings • Public meetings • Surveys • Citizen Advisory Committees	• Public meetings • Citizen Advisory Committees	• Citizen Advisory Committees • Neighborhood Action Plans	

INFORMATION (ONE-WAY COMMUNICATION)

	CITY CLERK	CCP/SAFE MPD	MCDA	MPRB	NRP	CITY BUDGET PROCESS Cons. Plan/CLIC	PLANNING	PUBLIC WORKS	REGULATORY SERVICES	STRATEGIC PLANNING/GOAL SETTING

INFORMATION LETTERS

| | | • Quarterly newsletter to volunteers (crime prevention block leaders, contacts and McGruff House volunteers)
 • National Night Out mailing (May)
 • Crime statistics (monthly/as requested) | • Information on 'big' issues
 • Development Newsletter | • Park planning meeting notices (postcard notices 3 blocks around any proposed improvement) | • NRP Link Newsletter
 • Annual Progress Report | • Consolidated plan | • Meeting notifications to neighborhood groups and residents related to ongoing planning activities
 • Public notice requirements associated with public hearing activities | • Sent to neighborhoods and residents related to area construction activities
 • Sent to affected residents when flushing hydrants | • License renewal notices
 • Special request enforcement initiative letters to neighborhoods
 • Letters to residents and rental property owners on the requirements of the Housing Maintenance Code. | • yes
 • 1-way |

INFORMATIONAL FLYERS

| | | • Crime prevention literature (ongoing)
 • Crime alerts (issued as patterns emerge)
 • Flyers developed for specific crime trends, details | | • Completed at all 49 recreation centers (used to inform and invite participation) | | • Yes | • Notification of meetings to neighborhood groups and residents related to ongoing planning activities | • Brochures (CSO, SW, Snow Emergency) SW is required by law to notify residents | • For education of citizens, and business owners about specific housing code requirements | • Yes |

EMAIL ALERTS

| | • agendas w/public hearing information to e-mail lists | • Issued as patterns emerge
 • Crime prevention messages (weekly to subscribers) | | • Meeting notices and summaries
 • Special activites | • Email alerts | • Consolidated plan | • CPC CoW agenda
 • CPC agenda
 • BOA agenda
 • HPC agenda | • Snow alerts
 • Traffic alerts | • Receive constituent complaints through use of MNIS and direct email | • yes |

CITY CALENDAR

| | • Yes
 • Prepare own city calendar | • Date of National Night Out listed | • Yes (pay a portion of cost) | • Supply written information and photographs for calendar each year | | • yes | • Listed in phone directory | • Snow, solid waste, water important numbers | • Clean Minneapolis Education Campaign for housing | |

	CITY CLERK	CCP/SAFE MPD	MCDA	MPRB	NRP	CITY BUDGET PROCESS Cons. Plan/CLIC	PLANNING	PUBLIC WORKS	REGULATORY SERVICES	STRATEGIC PLANNING/GOAL SETTING
WEBSITE INFORMATION										
	• Committee agendas/electronic packets • City Council agendas/official publications • Meeting schedules	• Description of services, general crime prevention and problem-solving information announcements • Information materials and crime alert pdf files (download and print) • Registration for National Night Out • Links to SAFE teams' email addresses	• www.mcda.org • Operating Committee and Board of Commissioners agendas and reports • MCDA-owned property information • Policies • Project summaries • Program information • Directories	• www.mprb.org	• www.nrp.org • PlanNet NRP database	• yes • Consolidated plan	• Copies of completed plans • HPC application forms • LRT information • CPC meeting schedule	• forms for streetlights out • reporting potholes	• Customer feedback section • CNAP website for business development and support • Environmental website – maps, permit information, educational information	• yes • 1-way and 2-way
TV/NEWS RELEASES/ARTICLES										
		• Teams send articles to neighborhood newspapers • Press releases and articles promoting National Night Out, Building Blocks awards, other topics • MPD Live! Live call-in TV show broadcast first and third Tuesdays.	• Press releases • Newsletter • Media calls and contacts	• Regular submissions to Strib, PP and neighborhood newspapers • Many neighborhood newspapers print MPRB program offerings as regular columns	• Provide support to the MTN Neighborhood News Program		• Community Calendar (STrib) notices of public meetings	• News releases/articles (traffic studies, capital projects, changes in work, upcoming meetings) • Some publications are mandated (Finance and Commerce)		• Yes • 1-way

	CITY CLERK	CCP/SAFE MPD	MCDA	MPRB	NRP	CITY BUDGET PROCESS Cons. Plan/CLIC	PLANNING	PUBLIC WORKS	REGULATORY SERVICES	STRATEGIC PLANNING/GOAL SETTING
BROCHURES										
		• Crime prevention literature (ongoing) • Crime alerts (issued as patterns emerge) • Flyers developed for specific crime trends, details	• Oodles, including brochures on programs, policies, general MCDA information, navigating the process, etc. • Annual Report of Accomplishments • Numerous reports (brownfields, historic preservation, riverfront development, etc.)	• Program and service specific (designed and distributed by the program) • Quarterly programs (each of the 49 recreation centers produces a seasonal brochure outlining programs available for residents) • Jump In! (program information produced 2/3 times each year listing programs/events, etc. Publication is mailed to every household in the city (over 180,000)			• TMP informational brochures • Neighbhorhood data summaries	• CSO • SW (required by law to notify residents) • Snow Emergency	• Neighborhood newsletters regarding seasonal housing inspection activities • Housing Maintenance Code Guide for tenants and rental property owners. • "How to Protect Your Business" • "How to Apply for a Business License" • Homeonwer Night brochures • Environmental brochures regarding noise, odor, phosphorus, food safety, lead poisoning prevention	• Yes • 1-way
SIGNAGE										
		• McGruff House signs on participating homes • Watch Force signs distributed to new block clubs (residents can also purchase their own) • No Trespassing signs (in several languages) distributed to businesses who give police permission to arrest trespassers • Building Blocks Awards signs posted on selected winning blocks	• On project signs	• Regulatory and informational signs (wading pools, beaches, gym rules, dog park regulations, park names, park usage/rules etc.)				• Project description, timeline, why and project manager name/phone number • Major downtown projects and some large residential projects	• yes	

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT (TWO-WAY COMMUNICATION)

	CITY CLERK	CCP/SAFE MPD	MCDA	MPRB	NRP	CITY BUDGET PROCESS Cons. Plan/CLIC	PLANNING	PUBLIC WORKS	REGULATORY SERVICES	STRATEGIC PLANNING/GOAL SETTING
PUBLIC HEARINGS										
Project based - requesting citizen input				• Minimum of 3 meetings • Project notification sent to residents 3 blocks surrounding project • Public notice in papers • Meeting notice to park councils and impacted neighborhood groups • Invitations to special interest groups and area businesses		• Yes			• Various town hall meetings on environmental topics	
Policy based - requesting citizen input <u>and</u> required by law	• Publish notices in Finance & Commerce • Notice on Cable Access • E-mail agendas w/public hearings listed to e-mail lists		• Land Sales (CPC) • Issuance of Bonds (CPC) • Plan Modifications (CPC) • New policies and amendments to existing policies		• Require 45-day neighborhood review process for adoption of new policies by NRP Policy Board • Require community involvement for specific changes to approved Neighborhood Action Plans through the Plan Modification Policy • Require broad-based community involvement in the development and approval of Neighborhood Action Plans through Participation Agreement contracts • Conduct annual neighborhood	• Yes	• Zoning amendments (CPC, Z&P) • Conditional Use Permits (CPC) • Site Plan Review (CPC) • Subdivision Plat and Registered Land Surveys (CPC) • Minor subdivisions (CPC) • Changes/Expansions of nonconforming uses (CPC) • Street/alley vacations (CPC) • Location & Design Review/Sale of Public Land (CoW) • 40 acre zoning	• Held when projects involve assessments • Held when projects involve ordinance changes	• Liquor licenses • Sidewalk café licenses • Ordinance changes • Rental licensing revocation and reinstatement approvals • When required by ordinance on environmental topics	

					representative election process for seats on the NRP Policy Board		studies (CPC, Z&P) • Moratoria and Waivers (Z&P) • Variances (CPC) • Board of Adjustment (BOA) • Appeals (Z&P) • Comp. Plan amendments (CPC) • Master plans (CPC, Z&P) • Development Objectives (CPC, Z&P) • Architectural design/urban design of public infrastructure (TPW) • (HPC)			

	CITY CLERK	CCP/SAFE MPD	MCDA	MPRB	NRP	CITY BUDGET PROCESS Cons. Plan/CLIC	PLANNING	PUBLIC WORKS	REGULATORY SERVICES	STRATEGIC PLANNING/GOAL SETTING
WEBSITE INFORMATION										
	• Meeting schedules	• Registration for National Night Out • Links to SAFE teams' email addresses	• Solicitation of input on plans and policy issues				• HPC application forms	• Forms for streetlights out • reporting potholes		
CITIZEN SURVEYS										
		• Block leader surveys	• Business survey (occasionally) • Annual monitoring survey of neighborhood groups						• Homeowner Night comments card	
TELEPHONE CALLS										
	• yes	• Multiple calls from residents daily concerning basic information, block club maintenance, problem addresses	• thousands	• ongoing		• Consolidated plan	• Zoning office: answering general questions • Planning Office: miscellaneous calls to planners (seeking information on current projects, future direction of city development, planning goals, etc.)	• Staff calling to get/give information • Others calling to get or give information	• Answering questions on general office lines • Inspectors answer direct lines	

	CITY CLERK	CCP/SAFE MPD	MCDA	MPRB	NRP	CITY BUDGET PROCESS Cons. Plan/CLIC	PLANNING	PUBLIC WORKS	REGULATORY SERVICES	STRATEGIC PLANNING/GOAL SETTING
MEETINGS										
		• Each team has at least one in district - from Crime Prevention Committees, organizing committees, specific issue-related committees	• Neighborhood group meetings • Project review committees • Interest-based meetings (riverfront)	• Park planning projects CACs			• Related to area plans and projects	• Project meetings (open houses, part of agenda, entire agenda) • PW staff initiative, neighborhood requests, partners' initiatives, and/or Council Member initiative	• Special event planning • Nuisance Business Committees • On special request from neighborhoods when City Council to concentrate on certain housing inspection activities within a neighborhood	• Yes • 2-way
OUTREACH										
					• Conduct citywide training sessions and conferences		• Presentations/panel discussions with local business groups and organizations, chapters of local professional organizations, local educational groups and classes, touring officials (from U.S. and other countries) • Walking/van/bus tours with local, national, or international groups, professional organizations, classes, and touring officials			

	CITY CLERK	CCP/SAFE **MPD**	MCDA	**MPRB**	NRP	**CITY BUDGET PROCESS** **Cons. Plan/CLIC**	**PLANNING**	**PUBLIC WORKS**	**REGULATORY SERVICES**	**STRATEGIC PLANNING/GOAL SETTING**
ONGOING MEETINGS/ADVISORY GROUPS										
	• City Council meetings • Committee meetings • Charter commission meetings	• New block club - neighborhood watch meetings (several per year) • Crime Prevention Block Leader meetings (at least 2x per district per year) • Block Leader trainings (25 per year) • Business Association meetings (some monthly/varies by district) • Home and Business Security Checks (residents schedule) • Property owner/landlord meetings (as problems arise, scheduled by staff) • Neighborhood Association meetings (monthly to quarterly) • Precinct Advisory Councils (monthly) • Sex offender notification meetings (ongoing as Level 3 offenders are released) • Various crime prevention related workshops - personal safety, home security, rental owners workshops (several per year)	• Neighborhood group meetings • Project review committees • Interest-based meetings (riverfront)	• Park Activity Councils • Special committees (to examine improvements or to study appropriate usage of a given area)			• 35W access project • Upper River Implementation Advisory Group • MET Council TAC and TAB • Mills District TAC • Skyway Advisory committee • 46th St. Project Review committee • Marshall St. TAC • SEED Implementation committee • Bicycle Advisory committee • Riverfront Interjurisdictional Coordination committee • River Forum committee • American Heritage Rivers Initiative	• Project meetings (TACs, open houses, part of agenda, entire agenda) • PW staff initiative, neighborhood requests, partners' initiatives, and/or Council Member initiative	Licensing: • Downtown Security Council • Alcohol Compliance Task Force • Mayor's Committee on Disabilities Housing Inspection: • Neighborhood meetings • Housing Board of Appeals • Rental Licensing Board of Appeals • Assessment Hearings Environmental Services: • Citizens Environmental Advisory Committee • Food Safety Advisory Council • Lead Network	

COMPARISON OF ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES
MINNEAPOLIS, PORTLAND, SEATTLE, ST. PAUL

	MINNEAPOLIS	PORTLAND, OR	SEATTLE	SAINT PAUL
Census 2000 population	382,452	529,121	563,374	287,151
Number of neighborhood organizations.	67 organizations defined by NRP/MCDA. MCDA has contracts with 41 business groups. There are 81 neighborhoods for data purposes.	95 (officially recognized); also 40 business organizations	100 (approximate, Seattle does not officially recognize)	17 districts. Typically there is a district resident council and one or more business groups and community development corporations. In one district, three neighborhoods participate separately.
Average population	5,708	5,570	5,634	16,891
Is city divided into districts?	Yes - 11 communities for data purposes only.	Yes - 7 districts each of which has a formal District Coalition of neighborhoods.	Yes - 13 districts for neighborhood/citizen engagement; each has a service center for pay utility bill, passport, etc. In addition, there is an overlay of 6 sectors within which are neighborhood planning areas.	Yes - 17 Community Planning Districts each of which has a Community Councils
Is the topic of neighborhoods "translucent" on city's Web site?	MCDA and NRP sites explain their roles.	Yes - all aspects including (with a bit of searching) dept's budget.	Yes - all aspects including (with a bit of searching) dept's budget.	Yes - linked directly from home page.
Is there a distinct (centralized) city department of neighborhoods?	No. MCDA, NRP, Planning and other depts each has a relationship.	Yes - Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI) created in 1974.	Yes - Department of Neighborhoods	No. CPD structure funded by Department of Planning and Economic Development.

		MINNEAPOLIS	PORTLAND, OR	SEATTLE	SAINT PAUL
Department of neighborhoods subdivisions		Not applicable.	5 "centers" - civic involvement, crime prevention, neighborhood mediation, metro human rights, info & referral	Administration (which includes communications) and 5 divisions - community building, customer service, preservation and development, education, research and prevention.	Not applicable.
Department of neighborhoods budget, FTEs. Etc both central and spent at a district level.		Not applicable.	$5.3 million general fund, $1.3 million other sources, 46 FTEs (2002-03)	$8.3 million, 92 FTEs (2003 adopted); $3.7 million to Neighborhood Matching Fund (NMF)	City provides $729,516 for citizen participation, and $323,600 for crime prevention
		MINNEAPOLIS	**PORTLAND, OR**	**SEATTLE**	**SAINT PAUL**
Are neighborhood associations formally recognized by the city?		Yes - NRP recognizes 67 neighborhoods; MCDA contracts with 60 groups; Communications informs "registered groups" -- these are overlapping sets.	Yes - by the Office of Neighborhood Involvement - note extensive guidelines on roles and expectations.	At the neighborhood level, no. However, beginning at the district level, there is a formal association-based advisory process.	Mayor and City Council formally recognize each group. Subdistrict neighborhood, business and CDC orgs recognized at district level.
Does city fund neighborhood group staff costs? operating costs?		Yes - MCDA provides staff and operating funds to 60 groups - $345,510 CDBG, $100,000 general fund. NRP not researched.	No - ONI pays some minor operating costs, staffing largely voluntary, some have staff paid with non-city funds,	No. However Neighborhood District Coordinators provide some support services to community groups with which they work.	Groups may use city funds for staffing costs. A formal agreement which details budget is required (Staff is not civil service.)
Are neighborhoods funded for projects?		NRP funded projects.	Not through ONI although a program has been considered; other depts (eg forestry) have small-scale programs.	Neighborhood Matching Fund funded 203 projects in 2002 with 30 of those being Large Projects over $10,000. The community matches these projects dollar for dollar.	Neighborhoods may compete w/city an all funding programs. STAR Program provides Large and small project categories.
How are neighborhoods					

involved in:	MINNEAPOLIS	PORTLAND, OR	SEATTLE	SAINT PAUL
Determining city goals and strategies.	Citizens and organizations invited but not required to comment. Area meetings have been held. Also through Web site.	"Bureau (ie ONI) Advisory Committee" charged with task.	Through City Neighborhood Council made up of reps from the 13 District Councils.	District Councils asked to participate through city planning processes.
The city's budget process.	Citizens and organizations informed of Truth in Taxation and public hearings during annual budget process.	Bureau Advisory Committee task; also ONI organizes open houses on capital improvement program.	Through City Neighborhood Council made up of reps from the 13 District Councils.	District Councils participate heavily in the city's capital budget process.
Development issues in the neighborhood.	Asked but not required to comment; particular attention to MCDA-funded projects.	District Coalition staff work with neighborhoods to ensure opportunity to comment.	Department staff, including Neighborhood Development Managers and District Coordinators work with community to implement plans and on other development issues.	District Councils heavily involved.
Zoning and planning issues in the neighborhood.	Notified by Planning of opportunity to comment.	District Coalition staff work with neighborhoods to ensure opportunity to comment.	Neighborhood Development staff advise and assist neighborhoods; also with development and implementation of neighborhood plans.	District Councils heavily involved.
Creation/implementation of neighborhood plans.	NRP Action Plans.	Major responsibility of District Coalition staff who provide technical assistance.	Neighborhood Development staff advise and assist neighborhoods; also with development and implementation of neighborhood plans.	PED creates Small Area Plans with citizen input.

Crime prevention.	Police department organizes at block - not neighborhood - level.	Block level crime prevention a subdivision of ONI.	Neighborhood Action Team assists residents and works with police to deal with nuisance issues. Police department organizes at block - not neighborhood - level.	City provides District Councils with funding for crime prevention (see above)
Other department of neighborhoods activities of note.	Not researched.	Immigrant/refugee program, graffiti abatement, liquor license notification, downspout disconnection, "elders in action", siting of community-based facilities	Race Relations and Social Justice efforts, Neighborhood Service Center for bill payments, Families and Education Levy administration, Communities that Care, Involving All Neighbors (promotes neighborhood involvement of people with disabilities), historic preservation, community gardens.	Not researched.
Does the city conduct random-sample citizen surveys? (Exclude other feedback mechanisms.)	Minneapolis released multiple topic Citizen Survey in Feb 2001.	Yes - on selected subjects, note current survey of crime prevention program. No "all city" survey found.	Yes, the City of Seattle conducts a random citizen survey every other year.	No such surveys.
	Contact made by Bill Carter, March 2003.	Amanda Shepard, Support Specialist, ONI, 503-823-3413, ashepard@ci.portland.or.us	Natasha Jones, Senior Public Relations Specialist, Department of Neighborhoods, 206-615-0950 natasha.jones@seattle.gov	Bob Hammer, Director of Administrative Services Dept of Planning & Economic Development 651-266-6693 bob.hammer@ci.stpaul.mn.us

WRITTEN POLICIES FOR CURRENT ENGAGEMENT ACTIVITIES IN THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS

Photocopies of Policies Contained
In Original Hard Copy (pp. 21-39)

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
CLIC
CCP/SAFE
Budget
Consolidated Plan
MCDA

As a result of the Community Engagement meeting held 2/5/03, the following summary is presented for attention by the work group. According to my notes, the work group members are: Erik Takeshita, David Fey, Lori Olson, Gail Plewacki, Bob Cooper and Pam Miner.

- Identify what the City is currently spending on 'public outreach.' Need to find out from Planning, MCDA, Police, Fire, Communications, NRP and any others what the department costs are for meetings with the public.

- Identify how the City has provided technical assistance and funding to help neighborhoods build capacity to reach their constituents. If *none*, as suggested at the 2/5/03 meeting, what SHOULD the City be doing (if anything)?
    - Does the City have any expectations about what a successful neighborhood should look like? Expectations for particular outcomes from the neighborhood organizations?
    - What about the NRP process? Has it provided technical expertise to the neighborhood groups on consistent practices for forming neighborhood groups?
    - Are there other cities with a neighborhood model for Community Engagement that do not rely on City funds for implementation? Identify, and determine what the expectations of neighborhoods are in those places.

- How do we ensure a two-way flow of communication – from residents to City Hall and from City Hall to residents?
    - For discussion: proposed model from Planning for delivery and communication by City sector – Community Planner assigned to one of five geographic areas to act as a first point of contact and conduit for the flow of information in both ways.
    - Gather information on other City departments' service delivery areas.

- What about the 57(?) boards/commissions that are available for citizen participation? How do these fit into this issue?

Community Engagement Work Group
2/20/03
Planning Library

In attendance: David Fey, Pam Miner, Lori Olson Gail Plewacki, Jeff Schneider
Absent: Bob Cooper, Erik Takeshita

Discussion focused on the mission of this group, to define the ultimate product and timeline for delivery of that product.

It was concluded that the work of this group is to lead toward a recommendation on community engagement as part of the overall CPED realignment decision-making process, and that this recommendation needs to be presented by mid-March. This recommendation is to include three areas:
1. a 'map' of the current community engagement activities taking place in all parts of the city;
2. identifying principles of what good community engagement is/looks like; and
3. models of what other communities do for community engagement.

To accomplish these three objectives, the following actions will be taken:
1. Gather data from all entities involved in community engagement in the City on what is currently being done to engage citizens (such as regular meetings, flyers, newsletters, web sites, etc.). Data will be collected from public works, police/CCP/SAFE, planning, MCDA, NRP, library and parks. The following persons will collect information as listed:
    ■   Police - Lori Olson
    ■   Library - Gail Plewacki
    ■   Parks - Jeff Schneider
    ■   Public Works - Gail Prest (will be invited to participate in the work group)
    ■   MCDA - Bob Cooper
    ■   Planning - Pam Miner
    ■   NRP - Bob Miller? (invite to work group?)

2. Gail Plewacki's staff will investigate other cities' models for community engagement to determine common themes and best practices.

3. At the next meeting of the work group, the group will develop a 'map' of all of the current engagement practices.

4. After developing this 'map' the work group will work to develop core principles for good community engagement against which we can measure the City's level of achievement and to develop goals.

5. After developing these principles, and based on other cities' models of community engagement, the work group will develop a model for how the City of Minneapolis should formulate its engagement for the future

Community Engagement Work Group
2/27/03 - 1:30pm
Planning Library

In attendance: Gayle Prest, Lori Olson, Jeff Schneider, Bob Cooper, Pam Miner
Absent: Erik Takeshita, David Fey ,Gail Plewacki

Discussion began by answering the two questions that were a result of the last meeting:
- After discussion and information from the group, it was agreed that NRP needs to be invited as a participant in this work group; Bob Cooper will contact NRP for a representative and inform this person about the next meeting.
- After discussion from the group, it was agreed that a representatives of the City Council will also be added to the group; Bob Cooper will contact Allan Bernard (CM Zerby) and Gayle Prest will contact Gay Noble (CM Niziolek).
- At the suggestion of the Mayor, Jeff Schneider will also discuss this group with Lucy Gerold of the police department for input.

Discussion progressed to the focus, outcomes, and timeline for this work group. At the previous meeting the group had outlined the three objectives to be accomplished by mid-March for a report back to John Moir. The three objectives are:
1. A 'map' of the current community engagement activities taking place in the City.
2. Identification of principles of good community engagement.
3. Investigation of other cities' models of community engagement to use in determining the best practices for Minneapolis.

It was determined in today's discussion that the timeline would need to be lengthened, at least until the end of March, for this group to accomplish what is necessary.

For addressing the first objective, Gayle Prest presented a list of ways in which Public Works does community engagement. Group discussion led to the decision that a template will be developed for other departments/organizations to provide the same type of information for the next meeting. Participants will be asked to complete and bring this information with them to the next meeting.

The second objective was discussed by the group in a brainstorming session to identify the principles of community engagement. Lori Olson will investigate the availability of an ICMA reference book on community engagement; other resources will be investigated from MIL. In preparation for developing a definition of good community engagement for the City of Minneapolis, the following items were listed:
- Does it include community building?
- Community capacity building
- Timeliness
- Accuracy
- Easy to understand - simple/multiple languages
- Clarity
- Honest - no spin on it; candid
- Meaningful
- Clear expectations
- Clear on community's role
- Clear on the process involved - how many meetings? How long will the process last? What issues /decisions are actually up for discussion?
- Staff prepared for community engagement process
- Relevancy to audience
- Adequate notice - timeliness, multi-media
- Staff role - facilitator vs. advocate
- Heartfelt - staff/elected officials honoring the process and not just going through the motions
- Community honoring the process
- There has to be an end point
- Come back with results - show how the engagement was taken in and responded to

- Open and fair
- Reach broad/diverse range of individuals representing Minneapolis' diversity
- Medium/mechanisms for presentation appropriate to the audience

These ideas along with information gathered on community engagement principles will be used at the next meeting to prepare a framework for the recommendation for Minneapolis' engagement. All work group members need to think about this issue in preparation for this discussion at the next meeting.

The third objective is being investigated by a staff member of Gail Plewacki. Lori Olson will contact Gail to ascertain the status of this work.

Community Engagement Work Group
3/7/03 - 9:30am
Planning Library

In attendance: John Baumann, Bob Cooper, David Fey, Joe Horan, Jim Long, Pam Miner, Gay Noble, Lisa Olson, Gayle Prest, Jeff Schneider, Erik Takeshita

Jeff Schneider reported that Bill Carter (in Gail Plewacki's office) has been looking at the community engagement activities of three other cities - Seattle, Denver, Kansas City. Mr. Schneider will follow up with Mr. Carter to have information prepared for presentation at the next work group meeting.

After reviewing information received by various departments regarding their ongoing engagement activities, it was decided by the group that a new matrix would be developed for the next meeting. The new matrix will show one activity per page with information from all departments by activity to will allow an easier comparison of which departments are doing similar activities. Pam Miner will put together the new matrix for the 3/10/03 meeting. Additional information is needed from other departments/areas - a group was formed to meet with NRP and the Center for Neighborhoods regarding each of these processes. This group includes: David Fey, Gay Noble, Lori Olson, and Jeff Schneider. Pam Miner will solicit information for the matrix from the City Clerk and Regulatory Services.

Discussion once again centered on the definition of community engagement. Participants will need to prepare their definition of "good community engagement" for the next work group meeting to allow for a group discussion to formulate the basis for Minneapolis' effort. Included herein is a list of ideas from the 2/27/03 meeting:
- Does it include community building?
- Community capacity building
- Timeliness
- Accuracy
- Easy to understand - simple/multiple languages
- Clarity
- Honest - no spin on it; candid
- Meaningful
- Clear expectations
- Clear on community's role
- Clear on the process involved - how many meetings? How long will the process last? What issues /decisions are actually up for discussion?
- Staff prepared for community engagement process
- Relevancy to audience
- Adequate notice - timeliness, multi-media
- Staff role - facilitator vs. advocate
- Heartfelt - staff/elected officials honoring the process and not just going through the motions
- Community honoring the process
- There has to be an end point
- Come back with results - show how the engagement was taken in and responded to
- Open and fair
- Reach broad/diverse range of individuals representing Minneapolis' diversity
- Medium/mechanisms for presentation appropriate to the audience

The meeting ended at 11:00am. The next work group meeting will be Friday, March 14, 2003 9:30-11:00 am, Planning Library, City Hall Room 210.

Community Engagement Work Group
3/14/03 - 9:30am
Planning Library

In attendance: Bob Cooper, Joe Horan, Jim Long, Pam Miner, Gay Noble, Jeff Schneider

Pam Miner reported that she had been contacted by Erik Takeshita who stated that he would no longer be a participant with this work group.

Pam Miner presented the summary matrix of community engagement activities, organized by separate activity. It was noted that information is still needed from NRP, Regulatory Services, and Communications. Ms. Miner will send a follow-up email to Regulatory Services and will contact Communications to complete the initial template for information. Joe Horan will complete the NRP information prior to Thursday, March 20. Jeff Schneider presented information that he had obtained from the budget and strategic planning areas - Ms. Miner will incorporate this into the information matrix. During his investigation with these additional areas, Mr. Schneider was presented with information regarding specific policies that exist for community engagement. It was decided that one of the products of this work group would include an appendix of all existing policies that exist regarding this issue. Ms. Miner will contact all participating entities for this information.

A discussion followed regarding additional information needed from all departments. Ms. Miner will contact all asking for information regarding any surveys that are conducted, and add that information to the existing matrix. It was also discussed that the matrix information would be useful presented in a format that separates the one-way communication (informational notice only) from the two-way communication (true community engagement). Ms. Miner will separate the information into this format for the meeting on March 21.

During Mr. Schneider's investigations, he gathered information regarding some existing policies on community engagement. It was agreed that the product of this work group would include an appendix of all existing policies from different departments. Ms. Miner will email all participating entities and obtain this information.

Jeff Schneider reported that Bill Carter (in Gail Plewacki's office) has been looking at the community engagement activities of three other cities, and has expanded his investigation to include several more. Mr. Schneider will contact Mr. Carter to have his information ready for discussion at the meeting on 3/21/03.

Moving on to the second item on the agenda, participants were provided with a summary of the core values of public participation as defined by the International Association for Public Participation (http://www.iap2.org/corvalues/coreofvalues.html) along with an example of these values put into action by a unit of government (www.iplan.nsw.gov.au/engagement). Participants were asked to review this information for the March 21 meeting to prepare a definition of community engagement for the City of Minneapolis.

Community Engagement Work Group
3/21/03 - 9:30am
Planning Library

In attendance: Bob Cooper, Jim Long, Pam Miner, Jeff Schneider, Gayle Prest, Jeff Hayden, Bill Carter

Pam Miner reported that she was still waiting for information from NRP to complete the matrix of current community engagement activities. When this information is received the document will be prepared for presentation to the group. Ms. Miner also reported that she had received additional information from participants regarding any surveys that are conducted – this will also be included in the final matrix. Copies of written policies/standards for engagement activities were also received and will be included as part of the final report from this work group.

Bill Carter of the Communications office presented preliminary material regarding community engagement activities in other communities. Mr. Carter was asked to continue his investigations and have a matrix prepared for the next meeting of the group to show comparisons between Portland, Seattle, and St. Paul.

It was agreed by the group that information to be presented at the next meeting will include:
1. Detail of current community engagement activities in the City of Minneapolis.
2. Comparison matrix of other cities' engagement structures
3. Principles of Minneapolis community engagement using the public participation spectrum model from the International Association for Public Participation.

The next meeting will be Friday, March 28, 9:30-11:00 am in the Planning Library.

Community Engagement Work Group
3/28/03 - 9:30am
Planning Library

In attendance: Lori Olson (City Coordinator), Gayle Prest (Public Works), Bob Cooper (MCDA), Joe Horan (NRP), Pam Miner (Planning), Jeff Schneider (CPED), Bill Carter (Communications), David Fey (Mayor), Gay Noble (CM Niziolek)

Bill Carter presented an overview of community engagement activities Minneapolis, Portland, Seattle, and St. Paul. Several items were discusses for clarification. Further comments are to be submitted to Mr. Carter by noon, Monday 3/31 for use in his final version of the matrix.

Pam Miner presented the completed matrix of current Minneapolis community engagement activities. Revisions and edits were made by the group – any further comments or changes are to be submitted to Ms. Miner by noon, Monday 3/31 for use in the final version.

After discussion, the work group concluded that the following material will be presented as the final product:
1. Current Minneapolis community engagement spectrum using the public participation spectrum model from the International Association for Public Participation.
2. Principles of Minneapolis community engagement.
3. Matrix of existing Minneapolis community engagement activities.
4. Comparison of Minneapolis engagement activities with other cities.
5. Existing written policies for Minneapolis community engagement.
6. Background material on community engagement.
7. Community engagement work group meeting notes.

This material will be compiled by Pam Miner and presented back to the City Coordinator and all work group participants.

There will be no further meetings of this work group scheduled at this time.

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT
INFORMATION AND
BACKGROUND MATERIAL

International Association for Public Participation
- http://www.iap2.org
- http://www.iap2.org/corevalues/coreofvalues.html
- http://www.iap2.org/boardlink/aboutiap2.html

Community Engagement in the New South Wales Planning System
- http://www.iplan.nsw.gov.au/engagement/

Queensland Government Department of the Premier and Cabinet – Community Engagement
- http://www.premiers.qld.gov.au/about/community/index.htm
- http://www.premiers.qld.gov.au/about/community/pdf/ced_directions.pdf

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: Principles of Community Engagement
- http://www.cdc.gov/phppo/pce
- http://www.cdc.gov/phppo/pce/part1.htm

Hashargen, Stuart. Models of Community Engagement. Scottish Community Development Centre, May 2002.

Walsh, Mary L. Building Citizen Involvement: Strategies for Local Government. International City/County Management Association, 1997.