

MINUTES  
City Neighborhood Council  
Monday, November 19, 2001  
Special Meeting Time: 5:30 p.m.

Voting Members: Stephen Lundgren (Ballard); Adrienne Bailey (Central); Russ Brubaker (Delridge); Kate Joncas (Downtown); Janis Maloney (East); Charlie Cunniff (Greater Duwamish); Chris Leman (Lake Union); Doug Lorentzen (Magnolia/Queen Anne); Irene Wall (Northwest); Joan Jevnikar (Southeast); Ann Owchar (Southwest);

Absent: Mike Thompson (North); Jeannie Hale (Northeast)

Other District Council Members: Paul Stoms (Madison Park Community Council/East); Deborah Witmer (CNC Secretary/Southeast); Ron Burke (Southwest)

Community Members: Skip Knox

City Staff: Brent Crook (Department of Neighborhoods); Bernie Matsuo (Neighborhood Matching Fund Staff, DON)

*A complete tape recording of this meeting is available to listen to — call Sandy Brooks at 684-0719.*

Charlie called the meeting to order at 5:47 pm.

**1. Introductions/announcements/agenda/minutes**

**Doug Lorentzen moved to approve the October Minutes, as submitted; Joan Jevnikar seconded; approved unanimously.**

**2. Neighborhood Matching Fund Committee Report: Doug Lorentzen**

Doug announced there were 25 applications, for approximately double the amount of money available. The Citywide Review Team (CRT) decided they would perhaps not fully fund each project in order to increase the number of projects funded. Doug fully expects to see some of them back for another round. Each applicant was asked what they would do if not fully funded — most had contingency plans in place. The CRT members were particularly impressed with the Fremont group's fundraising plans.

Doug reminded the CNC members of the rating and funding process. The CRT decided to stop the funding process before all of the money was spent, in order to preserve some amount for next funding round. There is some question as to what the cuts for the Neighborhood Matching Fund will be in the proposed revised budget.

Question: It seems Fremont was penalized simply because they had a good fundraising plan. Doug answered that they were amenable to the cut and also reminded us that they can come back again.

Ron expressed some disappointments about this year's process and the decision to stop before expending all the money — possibly sending a signal that we don't need that much. He would also like to see a larger emphasis on social component instead of such a large emphasis on budgets, paperwork, etc. He asked for a motion to restore funding to the Duwamish Longhouse project. Charlie noted that the District Council (DC) score was also very low. **Ron Burke moved that we pass the recommendations, with the additional funds for the Duwamish Longhouse project at least \$114,000. Russ Brubaker seconded.** Charlie opened discussion. Doug read from the letter sent to the project leaders turning the project down and suggesting they re-apply, asking for funding that is NOT “after the fact”. The land acquisition is already under way. There are other parts of the project that could be funded in the future; the letter also added that there were several CRT members willing to assist in a future application. Doug explained that there is precedent for turning down a project for funding that had already been expended. It is a fundamental policy that projects cannot start incurring costs until the project contract has been signed, with the exception of some special design costs.

As a member of the CRT, Stephen explained about his rating, which was low, and was based in part on the interview, and the application as well. He did not believe it was a fundable project under the rules, although he hopes it will come back in another form that would be “legally” fundable.

Ron disagrees with Stephen's comments about the illegality of funding the project.

Adrienne echoed the question of why the DC rated it so low. She indicated that at her DC she had to rate a project she liked, because it needed some work, although she hopes it comes back for funding.

Janis talked about a project that came through the East DC (Migilvrer strip) which was not being maintained properly by the City - it got a high DC rating, but it wasn't funded. Russ was not at the DC meeting where this was funded and can't answer why the low funding rating; he hopes they will come back. He also agrees with Ron that the money should all be expended and asked Doug what the next project to be funded would be. **Charlie called for the vote: For: 1; Opposed: 8 Abstention: 1, Motion Failed.**

Charlie raised Janis' question — why the discrepancy between the DC and CRT on the Migilvrer Divide? Doug read from the letter declining funding, which raised the issues of a lack of neighborhood support and wide benefit. He reminded the CNC that the more complete the application, the better the CRT rating. Janis still wonders about the discrepancy — and is frustrated by what she sees as a disregard for the DC rating.

Doug raised a process point — the CNC's role is to make sure the process was followed and, if so, they should vote to approve their recommendations. He can't see any procedural errors in this year's process. Charlie reminded the group that many groups go back a second time for funding. Adrienne echoed this and explained their DC critiques their Districts' proposals to help them. Both Charlie and Adrienne offered to assist other DC's to develop this kind of process.

Joan reminded us that we had this same discussion the last time the CNC looked at this process. The NMF committee will be reviewing the funding/rating process in the near future.

Russ said his DC tightened up the DC rating process and he thinks this has strengthened proposals coming from his district.

Stephen reiterated that the DC scores are NOT discounted and he, for one, did look at the DC scores and comments.

***Kate Joncas moved that the proposals be approved as submitted; Ron Burke seconded.*** Charlie said that although he feels the next project on the list should have been funded, he recognizes it has flaws and won't ask for it to be funded. ***Vote Taken: - 8 approved; 2 abstentions; Motion passed.***

In closing, Doug said the committee meeting in December will be addressing some of these things and that City Council will be reviewing a statement of legislative intent to review the scope of the NMF.

### ***3. Large-Group Discussion; Guest: Richard Conlin, City Council Member***

Richard Conlin joined us. Charlie introduced him, congratulating him on his recent re-election, and thanking him for responding to CNC concerns in the past. Charlie then opened up a continuation of the discussion begun last month of the future of the CNC and referred members to the list of issues compiled at that meeting. Councilmember Conlin set the context with some remarks. He started by announcing that the Council has arrived at a balanced budget. The Neighborhood Street Fund lost \$500,000; lost all Neighborhood Plan Implementation Funds, although he hopes to restore these; (statement of legislative intent that Doug referred to.) Also the SW precinct has been delayed. Saved: Delridge Library; all sector managers; \$500,000 for sidewalks.

Charlie reminded the group of our purpose from the CNC Bylaws. At minimum, Reps should be reporting back to their DC and see to it that items are coming up from the DC to the CNC. Communication with DC is important. **The suggestion was raised again that DC's meet on 1 of 4 or 5 days of the month to open up more meeting days. Also group the DC meetings closer so that turn-around time is lessened. Perhaps more than one CNC meeting should be held?** Charlie noted that several of these items in the CNC mission group are related. It was noted that issues that the CNC spend time on are often very different than more local issues that are addressed at their DC. **He recommends having a few CNC-sponsored "big-picture" events instead of dealing with these issues at regular CNC meetings. They would need to be timed early to be of influence.**

We should try to identify what is "on the radar screen" so we are dealing with important issues in a timely manner.

It was noted that the DCs are places to actually work on local and common issues — very different than what the CNC deals with. There isn't enough time to deal with EVERYTHING.

The CNC should be a place to work on common problems that all Districts have — like with City departments. CNC should be an advocate in dealing with common, larger issues.

Another DC doesn't have time or much interest in the CNC — too busy dealing with their own issues which are different than a lot of the rest of the city. It would be nice to hear more about what is going on in other DC's/neighborhoods. **Can we bring some positive things from the Districts to the CNC?** We can be of assistance to each other on issues that others have dealt with successfully. It is a time management issues as well — we have a limited amount of time — it might affect ability to have guest speakers. It was commented that one DC, in the past, always had guest speakers go first, with the feeling that they were most important — later they decided that THEY were the most important and now they put neighborhood groups on agenda first.

Another member commented that not all the DC's "need assistance" from the CNC or other DCs. Can we go towards supporting info going to out districts? Better lines of communication would be great.

One member feels the CNC is at its peak — better attendance than in past years. But we have failed to get the message out about what we have done. They would like to see a quick turn around of at least a meeting summary. Perhaps could use the new CNC web site pages to get more info out. There are some communications issues.

Richard Conlin was asked what the City Council (CC) might want to see from us. Richard asked how many of the DCs see Council members at their meetings? Most members responding said they sometimes see them, and most will respond if asked for information or send council staff. You have to ask — they are not proactive about it.

Richard also said he doesn't really have a good sense of what the CC expects from CNC - he is not sure there is much thought given to CNC. Question: What SHOULD Council expect? He answered that what he finds most useful both from CNC and DC's is feedback on what the City is doing and what yet needs to happen — and what is working well. Identifying issues that need addressed.

When one DC had a meeting that Richard attended, there were a lot of complaints about DCLU - soon he helped get contact from DCLU that helped. Could CNC help shepherd that kind of stuff?

**Is it possible to once or twice a year to bring the CNC and CC in a meeting together? Richard expressed that might be a good idea.**

Another member also liked having each CC member here separately. Those two ideas don't have to be mutually exclusive. **What if there was a Budget Priorities Conference and the CNC worked on these issues for a few months and then sat down with a joint meeting with the CC for a frank discussion on budget priorities. This could really invigorate the process.**

A question — what has happened to at-large CNC members? It looks like no one has applied in the recent past. A reminder that CNC has a large role to play in appointing CIRP members — who have had the role of helping oversee a large pool of money. A similar role is played by the CRT.

Planning — how could CNC be involved in changing role of planning in future of comprehensive plan? Richard: **it would be ideal if there was a closer and better relationship between CNC and Planning Commission. One suggestion might be to develop a closer relationship; perhaps even sponsoring some workshops together.**

Neighborhood Planning Implementation Advisory Committee (NPIAC)/Neighborhood Planning Committee (NPC) — what are the roles of these two in the future? How do we work better together? What are their respective roles? Are they both needed? These are all questions raised by both Richard and CNC. (Funding lost was money for NPIF - opportunity fund). NPIAC should continue. **He recommends the CNC look at its role in neighborhood planning and then meet with the NPIAC and work out roles.**

In conclusion, Richard commented that there should be some interesting changes with the new Mayor coming. He seems to have a lot of interest in growth and neighborhoods. But there will be a lot of competition for his attention over the next several months. Implications for neighborhoods and NPs will need to be brought to his attention as initial decisions are made in the new administration. The CNC will need to get back on the agenda soon so as not to be left behind in the process and decisions — especially budget issues.

**We should invite the new mayor to the CNC in January if possible.** In 1998, the CNC had a meeting with the new Mayor in the City Council chamber that was on TV28 - each member got to ask a question.

***Ron Burke moved we invite the Mayor to meet with the CNC in the Council Chamber ASAP and have it televised; Stephen Lundgren seconded; passed unanimously.***

#### **4. Budget Committee Report: Stephen Lundgren**

Stephen passed out a report on the Citizen Implementation Review Panel (CIRP). The Budget Committee will be interviewing Dennis Ross for CIRP membership at the December 10 Budget Committee meeting. They are always recruiting for CIRP; some CNC reps' terms will be ending soon. Spring Budget Priorities conference is being planned. ***Stephen Lundgren moved that we endorse CIRP's motion regarding the Delridge Library; Russ Brubaker seconded; passed unanimously.*** Stephen passed the

typed resolution around for Reps' signatures — this is VERY time sensitive as the vote is tomorrow at 2pm.

Joseph Pasqudrella is here from CIRP to answer questions. Issues like the Delridge Library is a perfect example of the importance of bodies like CNC and CIRP. There was a question as to why CC is even involved in the Delridge Library? Their role is regarding staffing, maintenance, etc. Joseph encouraged people to come to their meetings — the schedule is in the flyer that was passed out.

### ***5. Election of Officers***

Tom Veith was nominated as Co-Chair of the Neighborhood Planning Committee with Cindy Barker.

***Slate as offered:***

***Chair: Kate Joncas***

***Vice Chair: Irene Wall***

***Secretary:/Parliamentarian: Ann Donovan***

***Neighborhood Matching Fund Chair: Doug Lorentzen***

***Neighborhood Planning Committee Co-Chairs: Cindy Barker and Tom Veith***

***Budget Committee Chair: Stephen Lundgren***

***The slate was approved as nominated – 9 affirmative votes with 3 Representatives not in attendance and 1 abstention.***

### ***6. Announcements/New Business***

Charlie summarized the earlier discussion on the future of the CNC by noting that several good suggestions came out and although not every issue was directly addressed, many of them were touched on as related.

**It was suggested that the Neighborhood Development Manager (NDM) structure and role be looked at. Rebecca Herzfeld is open to feedback. There is some question as to whether all City departments really “bought into” NDM’s and their role. This should be a future agenda item.**

It was observed that the CNC future conversation is premature — it hasn’t been discussed as to the actual mission — suggest a real review of this body and its work and mission. There are voices — especially of the past — that are missing at the table. **Suggestion that a committee be convened to take a better look at these issues.**

Irene announced there will be a December 3 hearing to review the draft agreement between Zoo and Parks regarding the agreement to manage the zoo. Comments are encouraged. One of the issues has to do with parking at the zoo. She has some concern about the timeline, since the long-range plan and EIS won’t be done until after the first of the year. These decisions may affect plans at other large parks in the city.

Reminder there is no CNC meeting is in December; although the new Executive Committee may meet.

There will be a meeting on the superfund cleanup on Nov. 28, 7:30 am, at Union Hall (Aerospace).

**Kate would like to come to all the DC meetings during the first several months.**

***Stephen Lundgren moved a vote of appreciation to Charlie, Adrienne and Deborah for their work this past year; Kate Joncas seconded; all clapped and passed unanimously.***

Charlie adjourned the meeting at 8:35 pm after a group picture.

Respectfully Submitted,

Deborah Witmer, Secretary