Community Summit

Summary Report and Discussion Paper

Acknowledgments

Disclaimer

The participants in the Community Summit achieved consensus on the summary themes and values submitted in this report. The recommendations for a new structure for citizen engagement were the product of the Summit Core Group, a subset of the broader group. These recommendations were based on the Community Summit work, but do not reflect a consensus of the whole group.

Executive Summary

Purpose

Minneapolis has a history of citizen participation, from Model Cities to the recent Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP). Although urban renewal and neighborhood revitalization efforts come and go, the citizen participation system creates the underlying foundation from which communities engage, discuss, and advise city officials on critical issues.

The Community Summit was created to review the current citizen participation system, explore its strengths and weaknesses, and suggest ways to improve upon what currently exists. Participants were invited to share insights on how the system responds to the diverse needs and interests of the city. Also important is the history of how the citizen participation system has evolved over time. The process reflected on the positive results gained through NRP as well as its criticisms.

The Community Summit was an independent process to stimulate a larger discussion on how the strengthen and improve the Minneapolis citizen participation system. Two critical issues that further framed the discussion were:

- The acknowledgement that there would be fewer resources, given current budget cuts and recent legislative changes to the use of Tax Increment Finance (TIF) districts, to support a citywide citizen participation system, and
- Criticisms waged against the current citizen participation system that it lacks accountability and representation of the range of community interests.

We hope it will spark discussion throughout the broader community.

Goals

The Community Summit was designed to generate respectful and reflective discussion that would lead to improvements in the citizen engagement processes of the City of Minneapolis. We wanted to learn from the successes and failures of the past and to create recommendations for the future. Building mutual understanding and common ground for community action guided the process.

Four community organizations—Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association, Metropolitan Interfaith Coalition for Affordable Housing, Seward Neighborhood Group, and the Center for Neighborhoods—came together to sponsor the Summit. More than 20 people, with a mix of racial, geographic, and community interests (including neighborhood organizations, faith-based coalitions, community development corporations, business associations, youth programs, and racial and cultural advocacy/support networks) were invited to participate. Those involved reflected a range of perspective, experience, and background with the current citizen participation system.

Participants in the Community Summit said that they found the process inclusive and stimulating—and a first step in developing a new citizen participation system. The participants also pledged to discuss the paper's recommendations within their own communities and networks as they consider and advise the City about ways to improve the city's citizen participation system.

The Community Summit recommendations are intended to:
- Require inclusion and embrace diversity.
- Provide greater alignment with and input into citywide goals.
- Reduce fragmentation and conflict.
- Provide continued and improved capacity building for citizen processes and citizen-based planning and development efforts.
- Build upon the existing system and what neighborhoods have already accomplished.
- Create greater accountability and consistency throughout the city.
- Develop efficiency and administrative economies of scale, given reduced financial resources in the future.
- Result in actions that help those most in need, those who have less access to participation, and those who have been discriminated against or excluded.

Themes and Core Values for Improving the Minneapolis Citizen Participation System
Conclusions achieved through the Community Summit

Community Summit participants reached consensus on the following themes and core values:

Different kinds of organizations and systems are needed to establish a sense of community. A single structure to foster, define, and establish a sense of community and place is not enough. We must accommodate the diversity of need for participation in social and "place" decisions.

Citizen engagement should happen at different levels. Different functions or roles are most effectively carried out on different levels (such as block, neighborhood, region, city, etc.). Citizen engagement should operate on multiple scales, depending on function. A single scale can lead to missed opportunities, inconsistency in citywide priorities, and exclusion of key elements of the community.

Diversity defines us. In embracing diversity of all kinds—cultures, values, and the uniqueness of individuals and communities—we can foster innovation and learning, and maximize our assets and strengths. We must find ways to give voice to and include the various interests and needs of our community, even for those who are not in the majority. This diversity requires flexibility in the system and may sometimes mean a disparity in the allocation and expectation of resources and action.

Collaboration is essential. Collaboration—the genuine sharing of risk, power, resources, and decision-making must be embraced. Collaboration is not input; it requires a demonstrable commitment to meaningful partnership, with shared power and resources.

Investment must be a balance between process and product. There must be a balance between investing in organizations' ability to carry out work projects as well as in the products of the work. It is also essential to invest in and support citizen engagement—in addition to the products the engagement and planning process ultimately produce.

Roles must be clearly defined, and there must be accountability. Acting on behalf of the public good and ensuring that dialogue and action is beyond personal/individual self-interests are essential to genuine engagement and sustainable community development. This requires skills and knowledge, not just good intentions.

Change must occur. There must be a new message and renewed trust between the city and its residents and between local organizations and their neighbors.

A Proposal for Discussion—Modeling a New Citizen Participation System

Recommendations submitted by the Summit Core Group

Based on the principles and values stated above, the Summit Core Group took the ideas one step further to offer a model for how a revised citizen participation system would look. The model creates a tiered system by which different layers perform distinct roles and responsibilities. The City, providing resources for citizen participation activities, may contract with independent organizations to provide services and support to public decision-making processes. Those agreements also define the roles and responsibilities that hold the contractual partners accountable to one another.

The proposed model is offered as a stimulus for discussion by policy makers and the broader public.

PROPOSED MODEL—A MULTI-TIER SYSTEM

We propose a new structure for citizen engagement that maintains citywide access and embraces and manages a broad range of needs and differences of perspective. This will require significant changes in structure, funding, accountability, and process:

I. Assign roles and functions to a multi-tiered citizen participation system.

> **City level**—The City will host public hearings for issues of city policy, and will appoint various commissions to advise the City on policy and resource allocations.

> **Regional level**—Regional level organizations will contract with the City to administer citizen participation services (the City will streamline its contractual requirements into one agreement). The regional organizations will be independent nonprofit organizations, not government entities. This level will provide administrative support, community planning, development and zoning recommendations, and evaluation. (Specific boundaries for the regional level are not proposed in these recommendations.)
>
> **Primary role is Administration and Planning**

> **Neighborhood / community level**—Neighborhood and community-based organizations will continue in their role of implementing programs, outreach and community-building activities. They are maintained as private nonprofit organizations, defined by their own missions and goals. These organizations may subcontract from the districts for city funds to implement programs and community development projects. As independent organizations, they may also generate additional revenues from other private or public sources.
>
> **Primary role is Program Implementation, Community Building and Outreach**

> **Block level**—Block organizations are the fine grain building blocks of the system. They will be allowed to evolve organically around critical issues and opportunities.

II. Require the region's governance group to be a genuine collaboration of neighbors, business, broad policy/interest groups, and race and cultural groups. Use census data to establish baseline expectations for participation by racial groups, new Americans, tenants/owners, low-income people, etc.

III. Strengthen local organizing where it is done best—at the local level—by block clubs, neighborhood associations, and other citizen engagement and organizing entities. Invest in both skill development and accountability for these activities.

IV. Align Minneapolis CPED, Public Works, and other critical city departments to provide support and collaboration with the regional/district scale and to create more effective public/private partnerships.

Additional details regarding this model are included at the back of this report.

The Community Summit

Purpose and Goals

Minneapolis has strongly supported community-based planning for the past decade with the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP). Although this was highly successful in a number of areas, it did not meet expectations in others. As Phase I (the first 11 years) of NRP comes to an end, there has been a considerable amount of discussion about Phase II—specifically about how much funding will be committed to the program. We wanted to broaden the discussion and to identify goals and outcomes for the future of community-based planning.

The Community Summit was designed to broaden the focus of citizen engagement to include not only neighborhood organizations, but also other community-based groups. Supporters and critics of the current system were included in the Summit.

Sponsors of the Community Summit were: The Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association (PPNA), Seward Neighborhood Group (SNG), Metropolitan Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing (MICAH) and the Center for Neighborhoods (C4N).

Process and Participants

The Community Summit was a series of four facilitated two-hour discussions with focused questions. A core group designed and hosted the process, contracted with the facilitator, and developed the list of participants. This group also met between discussions to reflect on the meeting, produce notes, and prepare the next agenda. The core group's meetings were open and all participants were invited to join as they wished (and several did).

An outline for each meeting was developed and distributed in advance. Informational materials gave an overview of the current citizen-participation system and background about its purpose and intent. These materials included:

- Minneapolis City Goals and Expectations, 2003
- Strengthening Community and Economic Development in Minneapolis (an analysis by McKinsey & Company)
- Neighborhood Revitalization Program—Goals for Phase I and II
- "New citizen participation group can learn from Phillips history" (*The Alley*, May 1998)
- *A Statement of Values, Accomplishments, and Intentions of the Twin Cities Neighborhood Movement* (Center for Neighborhoods (discussion paper by Steven Mayer, Ph.D., October 2002)

- Core Values for the Practice of Public Participation International Association for Public Participation
- "Citizen Participation in Community Development," L-700 (article published by the Ohio State University Extension Service)

A process overview with proposed guidelines for the discussion was included in the invitation. The overview and guidelines, along with a recap of the previous meeting, were used to start each meeting and maintain a rolling dialogue. It was agreed that, while each participant was invited because of multiple relationships within the community or with specific cultural or interest areas as informed leaders, each represented his or her own experience and opinions, and not that of any organization.

Meeting I: Focus on the Current System included an overview of the history of citizen engagement in Minneapolis in general terms and an overview of the goals of the Community Summit. Its primary discussion topic was a reflection on what worked and what was lacking in the City of Minneapolis citizen-engagement process, primarily the Neighborhood Revitalization Program.

In general, Summit participants believed that the NRP process started with great enthusiasm and effort but waned in effectiveness in involving citizen participation and accountability over time. The engagement and participation of early years faded to a more exclusive and divisive decision-making process that focused on use of money rather than overall value/desired impact on the neighborhood. Opinions and experiences, capacity among neighborhood groups, and opinion about overall net impact of the program's Phase I vary widely.

The staunchest supporters of NRP acknowledged its weaknesses, and the staunchest critics became aware of and trusted the experience of others about its strengths and successes. All agreed that improvements must be made for the future—and that the Summit's dialogue process was helpful in building common ground and energy for doing so.

Meeting II: Building a Better System for Citizen Participation included an overview of the first discussion meeting and continuing dialogue on what functions or elements need to be in a successful citizen-engagement process.

Questions of scale, elements of a successful citizen-engagement process, and the various roles that need to be played were posed and discussed. These were used

to develop the models/scenarios used for discussion in Meetings III and IV.

Meetings III and IV: Building Recommendations for Implementation was a two-part discussion of and reaction to alternative scenarios for process and structure of citizen engagement—models that could build on the strengths of NRP, include the essential elements of an effective citizen-engagement process, and surface key issues (tensions) for examination. Meeting IV was a continuation of the scenario discussion and a group identification of themes and suggested elements of a report of the process.

Four models were used in Meeting III and IV. They were developed based on the issues identified in the strengths and weaknesses of the NRP process during Meeting I and the roles/essential elements of an effective citizen process developed in Meeting II. Key elements that were discussed included:

- Neighborhood vs. larger scale.
- Open competition vs. designation of entity for planning/engagement efforts.
- Integration vs. parallel processes for racial, cultural, and non-geographic based issues.
- Establishment of standards as prerequisites vs. incentives or rewards for self-organizing processes.

The ratio of costs for capacity/process vs. programmatic/direct application was also discussed, but not necessarily used to evaluate the options.

The group—with the exception of those from Meeting IV—approved notes, but no effort was made to use the notes to reach conclusions. The dialogue process itself was the designed vehicle for building consensus. The discussion allowed each person to comment or share his or her opinion without judgment or rebuttal. Therefore, the notes are historical records, not conclusions of the discussion, and should be used accordingly.

This report includes a summary of the process, topics discussed, and recommendations. Although not everyone who participated will agree on everything in the report, a solid, detailed set of recommendations has been developed.

The final report was sent to all participants for review prior to release. The final and edited report has been presented to the Mayor, City Council and NRP Policy Board.

Themes and Core Values

I. Sense of Place and Inclusion

▶ Community engagement and the sense of "place" are essential elements in building and sustaining quality neighborhoods.

▶ Community engagement often occurs through involvement in an issue, through faith, racial and cultural experience, or through geographic location.

▶ A physical sense of place also occurs on a macro level, based on metropolitan assets or physical or environmental resources. Place can be defined by natural and human-made boundaries, such as traffic barriers, lakes and parks, business and entertainment centers, or issues that span (or differ from) neighborhood and sub-regional boundaries.

▶ It is essential to care about and include people who do not maintain a sense of physical, emotional, or psychological place, and who may not be affiliated with organized groups.

▶ A single structure to foster, define, and establish a sense of place is not enough. Future engagement efforts must accommodate the diversity of needs to participate in social and place decisions.

Some issues and functions seem to need action through a neighborhood, block, or even building-level process. Current citizen-engagement structures don't meet everyone's needs and may even create boundaries that are arbitrary and not reflective of how people identify with community. Some issues—small physical developments, home ownership, local traffic, safety, children, and general livability—require a scale that is small so that relationships can be built and sustained. At this small scale, participation can be maximized and diversity accommodated.

However, many people identify themselves with groups that transcend existing neighborhood boundaries, groups that have a more psychological, personal, life style or spiritual sense of personal place in the community and/or world. These communities are as real and vital as the physical place of planning and must be included and respected in community development, planning, and implementation processes.

Many people also identify with the citywide place of Minneapolis in addition to or instead of their own block, neighborhood, or region.

In addition, more and more people are living in isolation, are overburdened with daily living, or are excluded due to discrimination or economic, physical, or mental capacities. they can be invisible in our communities, but they are part of us and must be welcomed and included if we are to be successful.

One of the weaknesses of the NRP and other city planning efforts based on the local place of neighborhoods has been the under-representation of all of the—equally important—definers of community and inclusion.

2. Scale and Function

▶ Human beings operate on various levels of scale in their lives, in the establishment of community, and in interest areas in which they wish to participate and influence.

▶ Scale should relate directly to the decision being made or the primary goal/desired outcome of the activity.

▶ Different functions are most effectively carried out on different levels of scale, and citizen engagement should operate on multiple scales—depending on function.

▶ To use only a single scale in citizen engagement leads to missed opportunities, inconsistency in city-wide priorities, and exclusion of key elements of the community.

The neighborhood level is critical when developing a local sense of place and citizen organizing and education. Cross-neighborhood or community scale is important for sub-regional efforts, including shared boundaries and issues that transcend somewhat arbitrary lines. Planning districts, police precincts, and ward boundaries have been developed for various and valuable reasons. Larger issues that need system-wide response, such as affordable housing, employment, mass transit, environment and natural resources, schools, and health care, require citywide planning and engagement efforts. Other topics should be addressed through multiple coalitions within the county, metro area and state.

When the citizen-engagement process has only one level of scale, and when other structures try to participate, citizens can be confused, frustrated, and pitted against one another. If issues of importance on a larger scale cannot be addressed through a neighborhood-based process, the net impact can be negative—the whole is not greater than the sum of its parts.

3. Diversity/Uniqueness

▶ The reality of our communities, interests, capacities, and needs is that we are not the same—and a single formula or structure will not achieve universal desired results.

▶ While common values and outcomes must be held across the system, diversity of action and priorities must be allowed—indeed encouraged—if the richness of our city and its peoples is to thrive.

▶ This diversity requires flexibility in the system and often disparity of allocation and expectation regarding resources and action.

▶ Our engagement processes and structures must find ways to hold common values and outcomes, accountability, and clarity, and at the same time to foster innovation and uniqueness in activities and solutions.

▶ In embracing diversity of all kinds—cultures, values, and uniqueness of individual and communities—we can foster innovation and learning and maximize our assets and strengths. We must find ways to give voice to and include the various interests and needs of our community, even those that are not a majority of people.

The idea of a single model or process to achieve common desired results is tempting, but language, processes, understanding, stages of development, resources, values, expectations, needs, historical relationships, perspectives, age, gender, and experience are only a few of the variables that must be understood and accommodated to achieve genuine engagement and sustainable community development.

Our commitment is to equity, fairness, and a quality of life where there are no disparities based on race, culture, gender, and economic class issues. But we'd like to go beyond the minimum commitment of non-discrimination to a place of enrichment of everyone's diversity. This equity can't be achieved through equality of treatment. Being treated the same is not being treated with respect for unique differences. There must be flexibility in the engagement process, in the formula or allocation of resources, and in the targeting of particular issues or geographic areas that need unique support and investment to bring them to parity.

4. Collaboration and Balance

▶ Collaboration—the genuine sharing of risk, power, resources and decision-making must be embraced. Collaboration is not simply input!

▶ The complexity of human systems requires a complexity and diversity of people at the table to develop shared visions and then act in cooperation with each other to achieve them.

▶ We are better now at collaboration than we were several years ago, with more experience and appreciation for the time, understanding, learning, and change required to be in true partnership with others in mutually accountable relationships.

▶ There must be a balance between supporting/investing in the local capacity to carry out work projects, as well as investment in the products of the work.

▶ It is essential to invest and support the capacity for an engagement process—in addition to the products the engagement and planning process ultimately produce.

Participants in the Summit differed in whether they preferred a local or regional scale; integrated or parallel processes for race, cultural and non-geographic issues; designation or open competition for planning

and funding entities; and over other elements of the scenarios. But in the values and themes of the discussion there were two areas of agreement.

We believe that changes in the human condition or quality of life are accomplished only when multiple perspectives and resources come together for common action. Collaboration is power sharing and a commitment that essential representation is present—not merely sought or invited—but truly included. We are convinced that this is the only way to establish genuine and sustainable communities and engagement processes.

We believe that the relationship between ends and means, process and product is inseparable. Much of the criticism of the first phase of NRP and other citizen engagement processes has been of the process—its inconsistency, lack of sufficient outreach, lack of sustainability over time, or failure to engage the energies and capacities of the community.

The capital investment or programmatic funds for services, while always limited, also always adds value to the community. Limited funds mean disappointments and missed opportunities. But limitations in process produce cynicism, anger, distrust, and harm to the spirit and health of people and their relationship with each other and with their government.

5. Roles, Authority, and Accountability

▶ Not even the best of intentions can be fulfilled without role clarity, organization and citizens' capacity, and follow through with accountability and evaluation.

▶ Government alone need not assume all roles, but government does have a role to play in defining goals, resource allocation for products and to sustain capacity, and engaging citizens in critical policy and development decisions.

▶ Communities, neighborhoods, interest groups, and individual citizens have responsibilities for community building, information exchange, and participation in engagement and advisory processes.

▶ Direct program administration should be carried out where it can be most effective, and this may vary based on the goals, scope, and content of the program.

▶ The relationships between leaders and their constituents, between city government and its communities, and between community organizations and their residents must be one of mutual value, regard, and accountability.

▶ Acting on behalf of the public good and ensuring that dialogue and action is beyond personal/individual self-interests are essential elements of genuine engagement and sustainable community development; it requires skills and knowledge to accomplish.

The structures and processes that support citizen-based planning and development must be clear about roles and expectations, establish authority for deci-

sion-making and action, and build in non-political and fair methods of accountability for both process and results. New ways for people to self-monitor and to hold their own community structures and processes—as well as city government—accountable are needed.

Not all individual leaders and organizations have equal capacities and strengths. When weaknesses emerge, we need to build and sustain capacity and to engage with and support each other. Effective engagement processes build trust and produce improved quality of life for everyone.

6. Degree of Change

▶ It is often essential to change significantly in order to develop trust that something really has changed.

▶ All participants believe that change needs to occur and that the existing system is performing unsatisfactorily on many levels.

▶ We need a revised system of citizen engagement that can both build on what exists and make visible and significant change to address systemic weaknesses

▶ A revised citizen engagement process must emerge with a new message as a vehicle for revitalization and renewed trust between the city and its residents and between local organizations and their neighbors.

Some Summit participants have had negative experiences with the NRP process. Some found ways to work around it, some were never invited or included, and some are new and unaware of it, and therefore not included. Some participants were strong supporters of NRP.

NRP invested in structures, processes, and leadership that are now—in most cases—stronger and more practiced in the messy business of citizen engagement and consensus building. Many things were done well in the early stages of NRP and many are still being accomplished and attempted with good intentions and quality leadership.

Modifying and improving an existing system can be defended based on a long-term commitment and perspective, ultimate return on investment ratios, and practical considerations of time, resources, and "not throwing out the baby with the bath water," but significant change brings its own benefits.

Being visibly different, changing the rules, and introducing a fresh start are valuable messages and practices that bring hope, trust, and an opening to return for people who have been disenfranchised, to engage for those who have been excluded, and to be welcomed in for those who are on the outside.

Summit Core Group

Recommendations

A Proposal for Discussion—Modeling a New Citizen Participation System

The sponsoring organizations of the Community Summit established the process because they agreed that there was room for improvement in the way current citizen participation worked—and that the primary reason for revamping citizen participation was the current model's lack of representative participation.

The Core Group felt that the Community Summit dialogue had surfaced important ideas for a new model that needed to be put forward for consideration and discussion. These ideas were not presented and discussed by the Community Summit as a whole, and the participants of that process have not endorsed the model. Nevertheless, we believe that the model reflects aspects of the rich discussion provided by the Summit members.

We ask that everyone who reads this discussion paper—delivered specifically to our city leaders, but shared with our own organizations, neighbors, partners and allies:

A. Receive the report in the spirit of understanding, support, and constructive dialogue.

1. Read and discuss it with others—engage in consensus building around its themes and recommendations.

2. Make change and act in ways consistent with its principles when possible and appropriate.

B. Strengthen the citywide structure for citizen engagement to accommodate the polarities we discuss in this paper by implementing the following changes.

1. Establish regional Citizen Engagement Regions that create geographic coverage for the city. The structure should not: break up existing neighborhoods, disregard natural and human made boundaries such as interstates, rivers, and lakes; or become synonymous with political boundaries. The Citizen Engagement Regions should be independent nonprofit entities that govern their own affairs, not units of government or for profit businesses.

2. Assign roles and functions to a multi-tiered citizen participation system that includes:

Citywide level—The City will host public hearings for comment on issues pertaining to city policy and will appoint various commissions to advise the City on policy and resource allocations.

Regional level *(Primary role is Administration and Planning)*—

Regional organizations will contract with the City to administer citizen participation services (the City will streamline its contractual requirements into one agreement). The regional organizations will be independent nonprofit organizations, not government entities. This level will provide administrative support, community planning, development and zoning recommendations, and evaluation. (Specific boundaries for the regional level are not proposed in these recommendations.)

Neighborhood/community level *(Primary role is Program Implementation, Community Building and Outreach)*—Neighborhood and community-based organizations will continue in their role of program implementation, outreach and community-building activities. They are maintained as private nonprofit organizations, defined by their own missions and goals. These organizations may subcontract from the districts for city funds to implement programs and community development projects. As independent organizations, they may also generate additional revenues from other private or public sources.

Block level—Block organizations are the fine-grain building blocks of the system. They will be allowed to evolve organically around critical issues and opportunities.

3. Align city government process to these Citizen Engagement Regions and require that departments (such as CPED, Public Works, etc.) work closely with them for citizen engagement, iterative planning processes and goal setting, and for advisory and evaluation feedback for improvement.

4. Use a citizen engagement process to develop criteria and values for citizen engagement within the city, methods for resolution of conflict and disagreements, and an evaluation process for ongoing feedback and improvements in the system.

5. Develop an annual or biannual process using citizen participation to advise the City on citywide priorities and goals.

6. Establish funding for the Citizen Engagement Regions that supports: citizen engagement, individual and organization capacity building, planning on policy and development issues/projects, and project implementation. The governance group should *not* be the implementers of these functions, but rather the contractor, overseer, and guarantor that these functions are successfully fulfilled within the region by neighborhoods and other community-based groups.

7. A funding formula should be developed for each funding pool based on its goals, available resources, and statutory limitations. For example, we might require that 60-70% of available project funds be used

in ways that demonstrate direct alignment with city-wide goals. This would mean that the funds would not necessarily be distributed equally across all Citizen Engagement Regions. A set-aside, such as 20% of the funding, would be used to directly address the unique and diverse needs of a particular region/neighborhood, and 10% of the funds should be allocated for multi-region or collaborative efforts for addressing citywide issues of scale.

8. Require the region's governance group to be a genuine collaboration of neighbors, business, broad policy/interest groups, and race and cultural groups. Census data should be used to establish baseline expectations for participation by racial groups, new Americans, tenants/owners, low income etc.

9. These governance groups should have the responsibility/authority to re-grant or allocate funding to smaller scale efforts but require:
- All proposals to demonstrate genuine collaboration and representation in the decision-making body that will carry out the project,
- All proposals to have capacity to carry out the project and a plan for genuine citizen engagement and participation,
- All proposals to include an identification of who is to be impacted by the project and an evaluation component that directly asks these people about the success of the project,
- All proposals, regardless of the group/issue targeted to be addressed, to conduct a race and economic justice impact assessment to address systemic and institutionalized issues of discrimination at every opportunity.

10. The governance group should also be required to regularly:
- Conduct an assessment of the region, using a citizen engagement process, to identify areas where there is disparity of access or outcome based on class, race, culture, or life style; with groups that are historically under-represented; or for specific needs outside of the citywide goals.
- Ensure that the engagement process stays relevant to the community by modifying it regularly, evaluating its effectiveness, ensuring multiple approaches, and offering outreach in innovative and diverse ways other than meetings.
- Demonstrate progress in addressing these issues. It should be held accountable or, if unable to perform, the city should periodically reopen the process for contracting for the governance function.
- Demonstrate success in building and sustaining the capacity of citizen engagement efforts within neighborhoods, blocks and other genuine organizing entities in the Citizen Engagement Region—

and an accountability structure for those who assume responsibility for doing so.
- Provide technical assistance resources as needed to ensure successful process and project implementation.

11. A transition period will be necessary to create the new system, recognizing that neighborhood organizations are at various levels of completion in their NRP Phase I implementation and planning. Development of the new system should be phased in within a year and supported with sufficient technical support and resources. Public and private sources of funding should be sought for this purpose. Governance of this transition and the development and implementation of the new model will require the participation of a range of representational organizations (both geographic and non-geographic) and governmental partners. If legally permitted, the NRP Phase II should be coordinated through the new citizen participation structure. All Phase II plans that have been completed already will be submitted through the Citizen Engagement Regions, rather than repeating the process under the new system.

C. Build on the strengths and trust that went into the exercise that led to this report, and engage its participants in follow-up planning and continued dialogue.

Critical Assumptions
- Neighborhood organizations will continue to operate as independent, private nonprofit organizations, maintaining their boards of directors, missions, and objectives.
- Neighborhood organizations will derive funding as other community-based organizations do, through competition for private and public sources, membership, and fees for service.
- Neighborhood/community-based organizations may be able to contract with the Citizen Engagement Regions for administrative services and support.
- The City will provide funds to support citizen participation processes and community development planning and development, as well as technical support and expertise.
- To streamline the contractual process, the City will coordinate its requirements into one contract with each Citizen Engagement Region.
- The City will establish communication policies to identify how community groups are notified about zoning, policy, and other pending issues and opportunities that require public action.

Attachments available upon request
· Initial letter of invitation
· Notes from each of the Community Summit Meetings