

Meeting Minutes

NRP Policy Board
March 23, 2017
Crown Roller Mill, 105 5th Avenue South

Members Present: Park Commissioner Liz Wielinski; City Councilmember Kevin Reich; Jenny Arneson, Minneapolis School Board; NCEC representatives David Boyd, Marcea Mariani, Nasser Musse.

Also Present: Gary Simpson (Citizens for a Loring Park Community), Jana Metge (Citizens for a Loring Park Community), Lynn Regnier (Elliot Park Neighborhood, Inc.), Maggie Moran (Midtown Phillips Neighborhood Association), Donald Joseph (NCR), Robert Thompson (NCR).

The meeting was called to order at 5:04 PM.

1. Public Comment

No one appeared to give public comment.

2. Agenda

Agenda approved

3. Approved October 2016 Minutes

Motion to approve minutes of December 2016.

Discussion: substitute West Calhoun for Nicollet Island.

Minutes approved as corrected.

4. Officer Elections

Board Chair Election

Nominations: David Boyd. No other nominations. David Boyd elected Chair by acclimation.

Vice Chair election

Nominations: Marcea Mariani. No other nominations. Marcea Mariani elected Vice-chair by acclimation.

Secretary

Liz Wielinski nominated. No other nominations. Liz Wielinski Elected Secretary by acclimation.

5. Resolution of Mpls Neighborhood Organizations in Facilitating Engagement

Don Joseph provided update on NCEC action.

Presentation by neighborhood representatives Jana Metge, Gary Simpson and Lynn Regnier. JM provided copy of draft of summary of comprehensive plan community engagement. Originally draft copy of comprehensive plan, Passed out revised resolution. Background of organizing among neighborhoods regarding "Abolish recognition of neighborhood organizations" comment. Do not want to censor, want planning document to be accurate representation.

Discussion:

- Gary Simpson discussed summary document and use of Invevo. Description of use of data. Use of stylized language ("abolish recognition of neighborhood organizations") suggests someone is making sure this is staying in. Not suggesting take out of raw data, but single comment should not make it into summary point. At NCEC meeting, spent a lot of staff time to defend statement. Statement is still in document. Suggests document is not valid.
- Neighborhood has worked many times with planners, always do excellent work, recent example of Loring Park Master Plan. DT neighborhoods concerned that this raised to theme in document.
- This is important to volunteers in neighborhoods to remove bullet point from summary.
- Concern about one comment leading to a bullet point vs one bullet point representing many data points. Will make motion to remove bullet point.
- When using software like this should just summarize, but something like this seems to take active intervention. Concerned about how it might appear three years from now.
- Chair of committee doesn't seem inclined to change. But this bullet point is out of context, not equivalent to other bullet points.
- Most of report is good, raises important issues, however this raises questions about validity. This bullet is a statistical outlier. Concerned about statement about making no judgments. Good sociology does involve making judgments. Summary report didn't include bullet point about police even though many comments about police.
- Question: so not suggesting scrubbing comment, but just removing from report?
Answer: comment belongs in raw data, not in summary. This makes it hard to trust the City staff, trust validity.
- This could have been resolved simply. A lot of neighborhoods expressed concerns, neighborhood organizations not involved in process, raises concerns about community engagement.
- These are front line people doing work. But between policy work and decision makers, there is usually managers/directors. But in this case, that is missing. Will have to get changed in City Council chambers.
- David will provide transmittal letter. This is not about censorship, but about validity. Need to include neighborhood organizations.
- Question: If taking action tonight, adopting revised resolution? Answer: Yes. Modification to resolution is clarification, not to remove raw data.
- **Motion to adopt resolution.** MM moved and David Boyd seconded to approve resolution presented and forward to City Council. Approved.

6. Update on Return of NRP funds

Robert Thompson presented on return of NRP funds. On Friday, February 10, the City Council approved repayment of \$9,141,951 to Phase II NRP plans over the next four years. This amount represents the \$10 million frozen by the City Council in 2010 less the \$858,049 returned to neighborhoods as Equity Funds through the 2012-2013 Community Participation Program cycle. Pressures on NRP revenues and property taxes started in 2001 with property tax reform, 2003 recession. Discussion:

- Question: why was this taken from community money, not other sources? Increasing pressure on residential property taxes following 2001 tax changes and 2003 recession. Led to pressure to reduce property taxes.
- Stated intent was to use NRP funds to fund CPP for two years, then return funds at some point. 2010 action was a surprise to everyone, even some council members.
- Shouldn't question any neighborhood's lack of trust with city after this.

7. NRP Policy Board NCEC merger discussion

Discussion on merger proposal: CM Gordon had asked how things could be shaken up, boards brought together. Discussion in January where there were three options at the table.

- Any particular recommendation from NCEC? No.
- Reasoning behind merger? Response to neighborhood program evaluation. Some confusion around role of both bodies. CM Gordon thought there were opportunities to change and improve.
- NRP Policy Board stated previously that were not interested in merging because of uncertainty at state.
- When earlier discussions, what is benefit to community? At this point, not a clear cut purpose, what is need? What are pros, cons, what are benefits?
- Concern about timing—told that had to have it be done by January, just didn't have time to respond to it.
- Need to hear from school board and county, they are partners in NRP too.
- From school, not wise to do anything this year. We are only here by statute. Not really looking to increase our time obligation. Connection is remote.
- County: haven't been clear on consequence, benefit. No definitive opportunity to vote, discussion. Should table for a year so can get on with work.
- Big question is what happens to NRP dollars? Will they be dissolved?
- Where are state legislature representatives? They should be here.
- Is this the right time to shake the bush when politics at state are shaky.

Motion: Recommendation to appropriate bodies table discussion on merger of NCEC and NRP Policy Board indefinitely. Moved by DB, seconded by MM. Approved.

The meeting adjourned

Submitted by Robert Thompson