

neighborhoods 2020

City of Minneapolis

A guide for conversation



For reasonable accommodations or alternative formats please contact the Neighborhood and Community Relations Department at 612-673-3737. People who are deaf or hard of hearing can use a relay service to call 311 at 612-673-3000. TTY users call 612-673-2157.

Para asistencia 612-673-2700 - Rau kev pab 612-673-2800 - Hadii aad Caawimaad u baahantahay 612-673-3500.

May 14, 2018

Greetings –

Enclosed you will find a revised draft of the Neighborhoods 2020 Roadmap. This document is meant to help continue the dialogue with our stakeholders on the future of neighborhood programs, funding, oversight and support.

The Roadmap lays out the framework of why the City is undertaking this initiative, explains the project timeline, and proposes some recommendations for actions to be taken on polices, programs and oversight.

The next step of the project is to assemble three work groups to evaluate, expand, and modify the roadmap ideas and make a recommendation to the Minneapolis City Council by November 2018 on how to proceed with the goal of final City Council approval in February 2019.

The three work groups are: 1). Program Guidelines, Funding and Implementation, 2). Governance Advisory Structure for Neighborhood and Community Engagement, and 3) Citywide Community Engagement Policy.

There will be many ways to engage and give input into Neighborhoods 2020. You can sign up for regular updates on our web-site. <http://www.minneapolismn.gov/ncr/2020>

We are thankful for the great responses and input we have received thus far.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "David M. Rubedor".

David M. Rubedor
Director

Goal of Neighborhoods 2020

Neighborhoods 2020 is an opportunity to further develop and improve upon the City of Minneapolis' neighborhood-based engagement structure. Neighborhood organizations are by the people, for the people. When all of our residents are informed, connected to their community, and feel represented in City of Minneapolis government they are empowered to influence decisions that impact their lives.

This is also an opportunity to look at how the City of Minneapolis serves and supports neighborhood organizations both internally and externally via staffing, organizational / advisory board oversight, and grant-funded programs. Each piece is important for equitable and high quality services to our residents.

The lens that Neighborhoods 2020 uses encompasses four important parts:

- 1). Consistent funding and programming for neighborhoods and other community based programs such as One Minneapolis and the Community Innovation Fund
- 2). Proper sizing and oversight of these programs by an advisory body
- 3). A consistent citywide Community Engagement Policy for the City of Minneapolis that incorporates the Core Principles of Community Engagement
- 4). Evaluating the Neighborhood and Community Relations Department's service delivery model and making changes if necessary

Core City Services Provided by Neighborhood Organizations

- Empower residents to have a voice and work toward achieving common neighborhood goals; provide a unified vision of "who we are" as a neighborhood.
- Promote and celebrate diversity in the neighborhood.
- Continue to support strong relationships with thousands of volunteers with an annual value to the City of over \$1.9 million dollars.
- Encourage the discussion of ideas which affect the neighborhood and promote cooperative impactful action at a local level.
- Create open communication networks with government officials, businesses, and other groups. Make them partners in each neighborhood, all working towards a strong neighborhood.
- Partner with the City of Minneapolis to engage communities on citywide policy decisions and other initiatives.
- Fully utilize all the resources available to the neighborhood including NRP fund balances for projects, programs and initiatives.
- Provide leadership skills development for people participating in projects, and serving on boards and committees.
- Deepen the personal connection to neighborhoods and the City of Minneapolis
- Create a sense of place

Value Statements

The City of Minneapolis and many other stakeholders benefit from the robust community engagement network that our neighborhood organizations provide. The City is operating from these core value statements in framing up these policy options.

- The City of Minneapolis will fund programming based on scope of services, outcomes and performance measures.
- The City will provide oversight and structure for the use of public funds.
- It is fundamentally important to supporting grassroots organizing.
- The City will maintain a place-based neighborhood engagement system.
- Equity and inclusion of all residents is the goal.
- Partnership and collaboration with community-based organizations is paramount to achieving the City's goals.
- The engagement system we create should support the community for the next decade.

Core Principles of Community Engagement

1. Right to be involved: Public participation is based on the belief that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process.
2. Contribution will be thoughtfully considered: Public participation includes the promise that the public's contribution will be thoughtfully considered.
3. Recognize the needs of all: Public participation promotes sustainable decisions by recognizing and communicating the needs and interests of all participants, including decision-makers.
4. Seek out involvement: Public participation seeks out and facilitates the involvement of those potentially affected by or interested in a decision.
5. Participants design participation: Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate.
6. Adequate Information: Public participation provides participants with the information they need to participate in a meaningful way.
7. Known effect of participation: Public participation communicates to participants how their input affected the decision.

Copyright IAP2. All rights reserved.

Adopted by Minneapolis City Council, December 2007

Critical Issues

Minneapolis is growing at a rapid pace and becoming more diverse. Our communities of color are growing faster than the population as a whole. The City is facing important policy decisions about how to best protect our diversity both economically and racially. The City is now a majority renter population, and racial disparities exist in almost every factor of life such as housing, jobs, health care, education and more. All of these factors can and should be part of the dialogue around Neighborhoods 2020.

- Growing and diversifying population
- Majority renter population
- Affordable housing will be an ongoing policy priority - production not keeping up with loss
- Increased focus on equity and inclusion in city policy and programs
- Ongoing focus on eliminating racial disparities

Funding

Revenues from the Consolidated TIF District will fund the CPP program through December 31, 2020 subject to annual City Council budget approval. New funding is proposed to start January 1, 2021.

Timeline



2018

- March – Present Roadmap to the NCEC
- March and April – Public review and comment on Roadmap
- May – Present to City Council for adoption of framework and establishing funding commitment in City’s financial plan
- June – Establish work team for “Neighborhood Funding, Guidelines and Implementation”
- June - Establish work team for “NCEC and NRP Policy Board Reform”
- June – Establish work team for “Citywide Community Engagement Policy”
- November – Finalize program guidelines and funding strategy after robust public review and comment period
- November – Finalize recommendations for NCEC and NRP Policy Board reform (after public review and comment)
- November – Finalize recommendations for Citywide Community Engagement Policy (after public review and comment)

2019

- February – City Council adopts program guidelines and advisory board redesign
- August – Transition Year - Neighborhood Funding Program opens for applications

2020

- January – Adopt Citywide Engagement Policy
- 2020 – Transition Year (between current CPP and any new program created through this process)

2021

- March – Revised City Neighborhood and Community Engagement Advisory Board created

Background



The City of Minneapolis has historically recognized that neighborhood organizations are an important link to the civic and community life of the City of Minneapolis. Neighborhood organizations are also in a unique position to identify local issues and opportunities in their communities and mobilize local resources.

For more than five decades, neighborhood organizations have led resident-based planning efforts resulting in more than 130 Neighborhood Action Plans adopted by the City, directing the use of more than \$300 million of City funds.

One of the main goals of the [Blueprint for Equitable Engagement \(2015-2020\)](#) is to support Inclusive, vibrant and effective neighborhood organizations. In addition to the project-based work carried out over the past three decades through the [Neighborhood Revitalization Program \(NRP\)](#), neighborhood organizations are an increasingly integral part of the City's engagement efforts.

Neighborhood organizations also serve communities that are demographically unique and face very different challenges. The [Framework for the Future](#) established goals for administrative and program funding for Minneapolis neighborhood organizations, and led to the design and implementation of the [Community Participation Program \(CPP\)](#) in 2011 following extensive engagement with neighborhood organizations across the City.

The Community Participation Program was designed around the anticipated revenues from the [Consolidated Redevelopment Tax Increment Financing District](#). This district will be decertified after 2020, and the change in funding source provides an opportunity to reexamine the roles of Minneapolis neighborhood organizations and to establish a new partnership between neighborhood organizations and the City.

Summary of Outreach, Engagement and Research

Throughout 2017 NCR staff collaborated with the NCEC and other stakeholders to have robust conversations on [Neighborhoods 2020](#). Outreach and Engagement were varied and diverse depending on the audience and in keeping with the [Core Principles of Community Engagement](#) that was passed by the Minneapolis City Council in 2007. One of the Core Principles is that "Public participation seeks input from participants in designing how they participate." Therefore, there were many ways to give the City feedback and ideas for the future role of Neighborhood organizations. These outreach and engagement activities are:

- Five geographically-located community conversations using the Art of Hosting and World Café engagement methodology with over 500 people signing in at the meetings
- Culturally specific focus groups for Lao, Hmong, Latino and American Indian communities based on underrepresentation at larger geographic meetings
- On-line survey
- Monthly meetings with the NCEC Neighborhoods 2020 Committee
- In-person feedback at the Community Connections Conference
- Presentations from the City of Seattle, City of St. Paul, and Minneapolis neighborhood organizations at the monthly Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission (NCEC) meetings

- Presentation from City Coordinator staff at the NCEC on summary research data compiled from many large communities with neighborhood systems in the United States
- City luncheon conversations with staff from Minneapolis City departments
- City luncheon conversations with staff of Minneapolis elected officials

Appendices

- A. [Framework for the Future 2009](#)
- B. [Community Participation Program Guidelines 2017-2019](#)
 - b1. [CPP Allocations 2017-2019](#)
- C. [One Minneapolis Fund Guidelines \(2017\)](#)
- D. [Community Innovation Fund Guidelines \(2015\)](#)
- E. [NRP Policy Board](#)
- F. [Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission](#)
- G. [BIKO Report – Evaluation of Neighborhood Programming and Support](#)
- H. [Draft summary of findings– and other engagement](#)
- I. Recommendations
- J. Neighborhood Program Options for Consideration
- K. Executive Summary of Feedback
- L. 2020 Workgroups Overview and Application
- M. [Blueprint for Equitable Engagement](#)

Acknowledgements

NCR would like to thank the many volunteers and staff who offered countless hours in gathering feedback and information from the community on this project - especially our neighborhood leaders, Art of Hosting volunteers and contractors, and the thousands of people who gave us feedback. A particular thanks to the following individuals.

Gary Arntsen - Volunteer
 David Boyd – NCEC
 Peter Eichten – NCEC
 Dave Ellis, Ellis Consulting

Loretta Ellis, Ellis Consulting
 Denis Houle – NCEC
 Marcea Mariani - NCEC
 Marcus Mills – NCEC

Jeff Strand – NCEC
 Pat Vogel – NCEC
 Kenya Weathers – NCEC

Recommendations

Throughout the Neighborhoods 2020 outreach and engagement process, some themes emerged as high priorities. Our analysis of the [Draft Summary of Findings](#) report identified the following themes in response to the questions asked throughout this process. These themes had the most comments and ideas and were weighted the highest. Specific action items have been included below.

QUESTION #1 – WHAT SERVICES, OPPORTUNITIES AND INFORMATION SHOULD NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS PROVIDE?

- Improve the Social and Physical Environment of the Neighborhood – Neighborhood programs for safety, youth development, and housing Issues: beautification, immigrant services; respond to local issues.
- It's important to note that many neighborhoods still have [Neighborhood Revitalization Program funds](#) and these funds serve as the primary source for neighborhood projects based on the specific Neighborhood Action Plan.
- Neighborhood projects are often a key way to get diverse residents to participate in civic programs and projects.

PROPOSED ACTION ITEM #1: NCR recommends the continued use of NRP funds in perpetuity.

Neighborhoods are making good use of these funds and undertaking regular updates to their plans.

- NRP Neighborhood Action Plans have hundreds of strategies regarding: community building, community safety, housing, economic development, environment, transportation and infrastructure, livability, and much more.
- If the City makes changes to the funding or programmatic structure of engagement grants to neighborhood organizations, those organizations may need to rely more heavily on remaining NRP funds.
- On average, City of Minneapolis neighborhood organizations have made modifications to their NRP Plans 20 times per group over the last 20 years.
- In November 2015, the City Council adopted the [Policy for Expenditure of NRP Funds](#). Every residential neighborhood in the City has an approved Neighborhood Action Plan. In a review of the implementation of these plans, we have found that:
 - 97.03% of Phase I dollars have been contracted and 95.2% have been spent
 - 90.92% of Phase II dollars have been contracted and 76.02% have been spent
 - Since the policy noted above was enacted, the City Council has returned \$9.141 million dollars of previously frozen NRP funds. During this same period, neighborhoods have received over \$3.8 million of NRP Program Income. This has greatly impacted the applicability of the seven-year period for contracting/expending that is included within the policy.

PROPOSED ACTION ITEM #2: NCR recommends updating the Policy for Expenditure of NRP Funds to focus on an annual check-in and review of NRP fund expenditures. NCR also recommends sun-setting the seven-year threshold in this policy.

QUESTION #2 – WHAT ARE THE CHARACTERISTICS OF AN EFFECTIVE NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATION?

- Clear Mission, Vision and Leadership – Effective goal setting, leadership development, honesty, transparency, trustworthiness.

PROPOSED ACTION ITEM #3: NCR will work with neighborhood organizations and others to improve the recruitment and retention of board members and will ask neighborhoods via grant reporting how diverse participants are allowed to determine expenditures of neighborhood funds (NRP or other).

PROPOSED ACTION ITEM #4: NCR recommends streamlining additional neighborhood and community grant funds to support this effort.

QUESTION #3 – HOW CAN NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS EMPOWER ENGAGEMENT?

- Increase Opportunities to Volunteer to Make a Better Place – More diversity across ages (youth, childcare, incentives, cultural awareness).

PROPOSED ACTION ITEM #5: NCR will assist neighborhood organizations in expanding outreach to diverse participants and encourage ways to support more inclusive engagement – such as child care, stipends, streaming meetings, etc.

PROPOSED ACTION ITEM #6: NCR recommends streamlining additional neighborhood and community grant funds to support this effort.

GENERAL ANSWERS THAT CROSSED ALL QUESTIONS – VARIOUS EFFECTIVE WAYS TO COMMUNICATE INFORMATION

Many ways to communicate beyond just meetings: two-way communications: partnerships with other agencies (public and non-profit).

PROPOSED ACTION ITEM #7: NCR will support neighborhood organizations in expanding their outreach and engagement strategies via technology, partnerships and other creative means.

City of Minneapolis Engagement Policy

PROPOSED ACTION ITEM #8: In June 2018, a workgroup will be convened to revise and expand a City-wide Community Engagement Policy to be adopted by the City Council.

In 2009 the City Council passed recommendations on creating a City of Minneapolis Community Engagement Policy via the [Framework for the Future](#). The City has followed the Framework in the creation of the Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission (NCEC), creating the Neighborhood and Community Relations Department (NCR), and in the implementation of the Community Participation Program (CPP).

Attachment D to the Framework is the section that outlined how neighborhood organizations and the City each have unique roles in identifying and acting on City and neighborhood priorities and how they could partner to accomplish better two-way communications. Attachment D outlines the responsibilities of each party and the CPP Program contractual relationship.

- Include a city-wide Community Engagement Policy that outlines expectations for City department community engagement. This includes appropriate notification on policies, programs and projects that respects the community and is based on the Core Principles of Community Engagement.
- Identify staff within each department to oversee adherence to the policy and work with NCR on engagement planning and outreach.
- Collaborate with neighborhood and community organizations to establish city-wide goals and budget priorities.
- Provide feedback to those who submit input on how their input was or was not used.

Advisory Board for Neighborhood and Community Engagement

PROPOSED ACTION ITEM #9: NCR recommends reforming the existing advisory governance structure for neighborhood programs. Currently there are two governing bodies overseeing the neighborhood and community engagement programming at the City. In June 2018 a work group will be convened to develop recommendations to the City Council.

The NRP Policy Board oversees the City's NRP funds and Neighborhood Action Plans. The Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission oversees the City's Community Participation Program, Community Innovation Fund and One Minneapolis Fund.

The City Council acted in 2017 to have both bodies explore merging or reforming: the final result was that no changes were made. The evaluation of neighborhood programming and support commissioned by the City Council also recommended reform and; again no changes have been made.

The NRP Policy Board does not always meet quorum. All of the City's neighborhood organizations have completed their NRP Phase I and Phase II plans. The board is currently meeting a legislative requirement to meet four times a year. There are few items to bring to before the board.

The NCEC has grown in scope and currently has eleven task forces and subcommittees. In order to staff every committee or task force and meet the commission's expectations, a majority of NCR's work plan would need to be dedicated to staffing the Commission.

Residents mainly run uncontested for elected seats on the Commission because the election process is complicated and requires neighborhood delegates from every district to attend a mid-week, evening election.

PROPOSED ACTION ITEM #10: As long as there are NRP funds, there is a requirement to have the NRP Policy Board in place. NCR recommends keeping the seven elected officials represented on the NRP Policy Board - Mayor, City Council, Hennepin County, School Board, Park and Recreation Board, State Senate and House representatives as required by State Statute and adding eight community seats that serve at-large. The eight at large seats would be elected by the community at a neighborhood congress or at NCR's annual Community Connections Conference.

The benefits to this reform is having contested races for community seats, alleviating a complicated NCEC election cycle with neighborhood electors needed, and having an engaged and active NRP Policy Board who oversees the NCR funded programs along with community representatives.

Grant funds beyond the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) and Community Participation Program (CPP)

PROPOSED ACTION ITEM #11: NCR recommends reforming the additional grant funding available to neighborhood organizations and non-profit community groups that currently have a broad scope of services to more directly support the outcome of equity and inclusion in neighborhood organizations.

PROPOSED ACTION ITEM #12: NCR recommends any additional grant funds be available for partnerships between neighborhood and community organizations to increase diversity in leadership and decision-making. Funds should be available on a similar cycle to the larger engagement grant program with similar reporting requirements and programmatic procedures.

There are currently two discretionary funding programs. The Community Innovation Fund (CIF) and One Minneapolis Fund (OMF).

CIF was originally recommended in the Framework for the Future as a way to allow neighborhoods to propose innovative and locally-relevant approaches to City identified goals or problems. As implemented, the CIF guidelines placed a priority on collaborations and proposals were reviewed by the NCEC for approval by the City Council. Projects varied widely and the only requirement was that the initiative supported a City Goal. (CIF was funded once in 2015; \$300,000 was awarded for a two-year project scope and budget).

OMF was originally created in 2013 to support community-based non-profit organizations (neighborhood organizations are not eligible for funding) whose work advances the City Goal, One Minneapolis—Disparities are eliminated so all Minneapolis residents can participate and prosper. The proposals are reviewed by the NCEC for approval by the City Council. (\$182,000 each year is awarded for a two-year project scope and budget).

OMF funds are available to support two types of projects. Group A funds are available for projects that develop and prepare leaders to serve on City boards and commissions and on neighborhood organization boards. Group B funds are available for projects that connect diverse residents to the City and engage communities, beyond neighborhood borders, in specific targeted audiences.

While the City of Minneapolis has made progress on [diversifying the City's Appointed Boards and Commissions](#), the neighborhood organizations have not made as much progress on [diversifying their boards](#). Grant programs should support our mission of helping neighborhood organizations increase equity and inclusion goals and should assist with creating more diverse leadership in the neighborhood organizations.

Funding, Program Guidelines and NCR

PROPOSED ACTION ITEM #13: In June 2018, a Neighborhood Funding, Guidelines and Implementation work group will develop funding options for neighborhood organizations. This work group will include policy makers who have the ultimate decision making authority on programs and funds.

Current funding (CPP) will support the neighborhood organization support and programs through 2020, ending December 31, 2020. The existing funding resource (the Consolidated TIF District) will be decertified December 31, 2019. The total funds needed for NCR staff and programming (including CPP

and OMF) is approximately \$8 million per year; this is the amount needed to maintain the current level of service to the community and to continue to forge a strong system of support for neighborhood organizations.

The work group will also look at NCR programs and neighborhood support for improvements that will support positive neighborhood outcomes and impact.



Neighborhood Program Options for Consideration

To Address Critical Issues

Neighborhoods 2020 is a unique opportunity to analyze our existing neighborhood and community engagement programming, structure, funding and oversight. NCR has taken care to make options available for City policy makers to consider, taking into account the historical success of the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP) and Community Participation Program (CPP).

The City has long recognized the importance of neighborhood organizations and that they are an important link to the civic and community life of the City of Minneapolis. Neighborhood organizations are also in a unique position to identify local issues and opportunities in their communities and mobilize local resources.

The [Neighborhood and Community Relations department](#) (NCR) worked in collaboration with the [Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission \(NCEC\)](#), community partners, neighborhood organizations, City leaders, and other stakeholders to determine policy recommendations for the future programming and funding of neighborhood organizations.

We must look for constant ways of improving the services we provide to our residents through our granted agencies. Businesses and agencies that do not change and adapt to the changes in society and the world have a difficult time surviving and remaining relevant and competitive.

The options that include reform in Neighborhoods 2020 include ways we can plan for a more equitable, impactful and sustainable neighborhood funding system. The idea is not just to help neighborhood organizations survive past 2020, it is to help them thrive. It is also looking at a new model for an engagement policy at the City of Minneapolis and making sure that we have a two-way relationship with our contracted agencies and that the City, and each of its departments, is committed to creating consistency and transparency in our engagement efforts.

This is also an opportunity to evaluate how NCR can provide better services to residents, contracted agencies and City departments. The current staffing levels and structure make it difficult to meet the expectations of neighborhood organizations, City departments and other important partners. The most recent evaluation of [neighborhood programming](#) indicated that several more neighborhood support specialist staff at NCR should be hired and that the Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission (NCEC) is in need of reform. None of this has occurred.

At this time, these options are presented for discussion purposes only. The NCR Department and the NCEC are not making recommendations to the City Council. Recommendations to the City Council will be developed after further community dialogue and work groups have taken place - anticipated date for this work to be completed is February 2019.



Option #1 – Partnership Model / Impact Assessment Model

The impact assessment model allows for neighborhood organizations to be classified and funded based on the capacity of the organization. Neighborhood classifications could be determined by a third party source with extensive knowledge of the Minneapolis neighborhood system or through self-assessment. The final determination would be vetted by NCR staff and the NCEC before going to the Minneapolis City Council for approval. An example of an impact assessment model is:

Level I organization –Has developed web site and newsletter, is creating partnerships and collaborations.

Level II organization – Is in the process of fiduciary certification, and has emerging community partnerships and renter leadership.

Level III organization – Has sufficient staffing for intended impact, and has outside funders, fiduciary certification, solid community partnerships, sustainable programming and leadership for renters and underrepresented groups.

Pros –

- Ability to increase partnerships across neighborhood organizations and increase mentorship between higher capacity groups and smaller capacity groups
- Not based solely on a complex funding formula, but based on what the neighborhood organization feels they can effectively accomplish with their grant funds through the City's application process
- Level II and III Organizations could provide administrative oversight for smaller Neighborhood organizations so they can focus more on community organizing
- Manages expectations from other stakeholders on what the capacity to provide outreach and engagement is for each funded organization

- Increases opportunities for more partnerships with cultural organizations and larger non-profit community-based organizations
- Increases fiduciary consistency throughout the neighborhood system
- Allows for complete autonomy of neighborhood organizations as separate from the City
- Increases capacity of NCR staff to focus on equity and inclusion efforts and the training and support that neighborhood, City departments and cultural organizations expect
- Increases consistency across the City for robust engagement opportunities in all areas of the City

Cons –

- Could result in lower funding for neighborhood organizations that do not wish to partner with a higher capacity organization
- Could result in additional staff and volunteer time in doing assessment and handling disputes
- May result in organizations growing too fast
- May result in additional staffing costs

Option #2 – Pooled Services Model

The pooled services model allows for neighborhood organizations to be funded at a capacity base level and for what they feel is possible to accomplish with their grant funds through an application process.

It differs from the impact assessment model in that some funds will go to pooled administrative and support services to a geographic area loosely based on the Minneapolis community boundaries. The pooled services model would provide administrative and inclusiveness support for neighborhood organizations and engagement support for the City departments.

Pros –

- Ability to provide more administrative support for neighborhood organizations such as financial management, payroll, HR, legal, risk management and policy and procedure development
- Allows for neighborhood organizations to focus more on community organizing and less on administration
- Allows for NCR to be more embedded in the community
- A more de-centralized approach to engagement support for City departments and leaders with more support and feedback on local projects, programs and policies
- NCR could create a pool of supportive services, including bi-lingual outreach support, translation, childcare, etc. – to support increased equitable engagement at the neighborhood level
- Increases fiduciary consistency throughout the neighborhood system

Cons –

- May result in an increased need for additional funding
- Potentially creates another layer of bureaucracy
- Could be seen as blurring the lines of independence of neighborhood organizations and the City

Option #3 – Community Participation Program (CPP) Model

The [Community Participation Program](#) model is the current model of engagement funding for neighborhood organizations on a three-year cycle based on a complex funding formula. The formula takes into consideration many factors of each neighborhood such as size, underrepresented groups, income and livability. The minimum allocation is \$25,000 per year. Neighborhood organizations receive an additional \$900 for Directors and Officers insurance.

Pros –

- Ability to maintain the existing robust system of 70 neighborhood organizations
- Minimizes disruption to the current neighborhood system
- Allows for complete autonomy of neighborhood organizations as separate from the City

Cons –

- Lack of fiduciary consistency across the system
- Capacity of neighborhood organizations varies widely
- Expectations of neighborhood organizations do not always match capacity
- Expectations of NCR do not always match capacity
- Outreach support for City programs, projects and policies varies by organization
- Limited capacity for systemic equity

Option # 4– To be determined – We want your ideas!

