

Minutes

Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiative Steering Committee Meeting

English Foundation Building, Conference Rooms 6 & 7

May 31, 2006

7:30-9:00 AM

Attendees: Bill Brooks, Colts; Steve Campbell, City of Indianapolis; Mary Clark, National City; Bruce Curry, Indianapolis Neighborhood Housing Partnership; Thomas Darling, Ivy Tech; Brienne Delaney, MIBOR; Jan Diggins, Citizens Gas; Greg Fennig, IPL; David Forsell, Keep Indianapolis Beautiful; Andy Fraizer, City of Indianapolis; John Hall, U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development; Jim Hopkins, Chase; Lamont Hulse, Bridges to Success; Diane Jackson, MLK Center; Mark Jakubovie, resident Pike Township; Joanne Joyce, IPIC; Mike Knight, Indianapolis Arts Council; Kim Lawrence-Curry, Wishard; Greg Lindsey, IUPUI; Tony Macklin, Central Indiana Community Foundation; Jim Muholland, resident; Amy Murphy-Nugen, Indianapolis Coalition for Neighborhood Development; Jackie Nytes, City County Council; Maury Plambeck, City of Indianapolis; Ryan Poor, Ice Miller; Anne-Marie Predovich, INRC; Dixie Ray, resident east side; Cheryl Reed, Synergy Marketing Group; Lyman Rhodes, IPS; Tara Seeley, Central Indiana Community Foundation; Yvonne Shaheen, volunteer; Bill Taft, LISC; Pitt Thompson, Clarian; Scott Truex, Ball State; Sara VanSlambrook, LISC; Kevin Warren, resident north side

I. Call to Order

Steering Committee co-chairs Yvonne Shaheen and John Hall opened the meeting and welcomed the Committee members.

II. Old Business

Yvonne Shaheen discussed the Working Groups and Declaration of Interest forms.

- Working Groups
 - All Steering Committee members are encouraged to actively participate in a working group to build additional partnerships and advise staff on programmatic issues related to the initiatives.
 - These meetings will take place every other month through the end of the year and then as needed in 2007. The first meetings are scheduled for June. Please see the dates and locations at the bottom of your agenda: June 14 7:30-9:00 LOI work group meeting at INRC, June 14 7:30-9:00 Imp/Dem work group meeting at INRC, June 21 7:30-9:00 Engagement work group meeting at INRC, and June 28 7:30-9:00 Communications work group meeting at INRC.
 - Sign-up sheets are being passed around or you can contact Sara VanSlambrook.
- Declaration of Interest
 - To avoid even the perception of a conflict of interest, we are asking all Steering Committee members to complete and sign a declaration of interests form.
 - If you have a potential conflict – you are an employee, provide contractual work, and/or sit on the board of directors of a GINI applicant

- convening organization – then you will attend the presentations on July 18 & 20 but not participate in the discussion and final vote.
- Extra forms are available at the front table. Please complete the form and return it to Sara.

III. Selecting Neighborhood Finalists

Tara Seeley described the review selection process.

- The letter of intent working group members introduced themselves: Tara Seeley, Kevin Warren, Tom Darling, John Hall, Ed Perez (not present), and Beverly Mukes-Gaither (not present).
- We are following a process outlined in the Request for Letters of Intent dated January 27, 2006.
 - Seventeen letters of intent were submitted to the Great Indy Neighborhoods Steering Committee on April 3, 2006.
 - By the end of April, staff made an initial review of applications using basic eligibility requirements.
 - During the first few weeks of May, a working group of the Steering Committee reviewed the letters using a point system based on selection criteria.
 - The top scoring applicants will be given feedback from the working group, asked to submit additional information, and prepare a presentation for the steering committee at meetings scheduled for July 18 & 20.
 - At the end of those meetings, the Steering Committee will select between six and ten neighborhoods to participate in the Great Indy Neighborhoods Initiatives for three years.
- The letter of intent working group reviewed the letters of intent based on the selection criteria described in the Request for Letters: community attributes & challenges, organizational capacity & experience, and community involvement.
- The group reviewed each letter and scored it independently, and then the group met for two two-hour sessions to discuss the letters and come to consensus on the list of finalists to recommend to the Steering Committee.

The Chair of the working group, Beverly Mukes-Gaither was ill and could not join the meeting. In her place, John Hall described the recommendations.

- Based on the scores and working group discussion, eleven neighborhoods are recommended as “finalists” to participate in the presentations before the Steering Committee in July. These finalists include the top eleven scores.
- Of the eleven finalists, only one specifically requested to be in the Implementation Initiative. Based on group discussion and the progress already underway in the neighborhoods, the working group has designated two others potential Implementation neighborhoods. The remaining eight seem most appropriate for the Demonstration Initiative.
- The memo handout describes the recommendations of this working group. The first page contains a summary chart, which lists the neighborhood convener, the score and the recommendation. The remaining pages include brief comments for

each letter of intent explaining common themes that arose during working group discussions.

Questions

- *Are all the recommended neighborhoods are in Center Township?* No, there are also some neighborhoods with boundaries that include Pike, Lawrence, Washington, Wayne, and Warren townships.
- *How are scores weighted?* It was reiterated that the scores were based on predetermined criteria that were included in the request for letters that the neighborhoods received back in January. These criteria included a very specific point breakdown.
- *Will the staff clarify the difference between the Implementation and Demonstration Initiatives?* Implementation is for neighborhoods that have more capacity, more residents engaged, and some planning already completed. The funding levels and program expectations for the Implementation neighborhoods are less than Demonstration. The Demonstration Initiative is more intensive in resources and expectations and is targeted at neighborhoods that have some capacity, but need greater assistance to accomplish resident engagement and quality of life planning.
- *What if the two neighborhoods that requested Demonstration, but the working group recommended for Implementation, do not want to participate at this level?* Neighborhoods were told at the required applicant workshops in February that all letters were for Implementation. There is a place on the cover sheet to check if the neighborhood is interested in Demonstration. All neighborhoods were informed that the final decision about which neighborhoods will be Demonstration will be up to the Steering Committee.
- *It looks like all of the selected organizations are “strong.” Are you concerned about the perception of selecting only the top performers?* While we have always said selected neighborhoods would have a demonstrated recent track record of success, we have also said that the size of that “success” is not as important as the completion of the project and the collaborative partnerships developed. If you look over the recommended neighborhoods, the conveners have varying levels of capacity.
- *Do we have any way of knowing about the convening organization’s board support of their participation in the Initiatives?* There was not a requirement to show board support as part of the letter of intent process. This would be a good addition to the next phase of information collection and presentations.
- *It is difficult to understand the rationale for the scores. Is there a breakdown of points that we can see?* There is a specific breakdown of points that were used (same breakdown that the neighborhoods received in January). We have a spreadsheet with the average score for each neighborhood on each of these specific criteria, though not on hand at this meeting. We can distribute this spreadsheet to the Steering Committee after the meeting.
- It’s important for the Steering Committee to respect the time, dedication and tough decisions put forth by the working group.

John Hall reviewed the themes that arose from the working group review.

- **Community Alliance of the Far Eastside** has a strong history, but lacks recent examples of collaboration and resident engagement. The target area is confusing (primary and secondary areas listed) and requires clarification.
- It's exciting to see **Community Hospital East** interested and investing in its neighborhood. There is some concern over the lack of resident engagement. The organizational leadership is confusing – seems to overlap with the BRAG/Community Hospital Foundation proposal. The committee was concerned that a neighborhood organization within the boundary area had submitted a letter, expressing concern about the application, but agreed to recommend the application for further discussion.
- **BRAG/Community Hospital Foundation** has excellent examples of resident engagement and collaboration. The organizational leadership is unclear and requires clarification. Apparent use of a “fiscal agent” type of arrangement is of concern.
- **Crooked Creek Northwest Community Development Corporation** has strong examples of community partnerships and a good understanding of community attributes and needs.
- **Hawthorne Community Center** has a strong list of community partners and a good description of the challenges facing the neighborhood. The working group noted that they would like more detail around examples of Latino outreach.
- **Irvington Development Organization** has strong partner collaboration and resident engagement. There is some concern about the organizational capacity. This neighborhood may be appropriate for the Implementation Initiative since the neighborhood just completed a plan.
- **John H. Boner Center** has strong organizational capacity and good examples of partner collaboration and resident engagement. More information is needed about how NESCO and Boner will coordinate leadership of this effort.
- **Southeast Neighborhood Development** has strong capacity and a realistic assessment of neighborhood challenges. The letter was missing some partners – neighborhood associations and merchant association. This neighborhood is appropriate for the Implementation Initiative since they just completed a plan.
- **Children's Museum** is a strong organization with a good understanding of attributes and challenges facing the neighborhood. There was some concern about the level of collaboration and resident engagement involved in the neighborhood.
- **West Indianapolis Development Corporation** has strong business partnerships and organizational capacity. They clearly understand the challenges facing the neighborhood. The letter was lacking examples of resident engagement. This neighborhood may be appropriate for the Implementation Initiative since the neighborhood already has a plan.
- **Meridian Kessler** did not submit the required IRS 501(c)3 determination letter. The Steering Committee voted on a motion to exclude this neighborhood based on its lack of 501(c)3 documentation. The motion was seconded and passed on a vote of 14 yes, 11 no, 5 abstain.

- The remaining six letters of intent received lower scores and had greater areas of concern. A total score and summary of concerns were given to the Steering Committee in written form.
- The Steering Committee agreed to accept ten neighborhoods as finalists for the final round of review on July 18 & 20, based on the recommendation of the working group: Community Alliance of the Far Eastside, Community Hospital East, BRAG/Community Hospital Foundation, Crooked Creek Northwest Community Development Corporation, Hawthorne Community Center, Irvington Development Organization, John H. Boner Center, Southeast Neighborhood Development, The Children's Museum, and West Indianapolis Development Corporation.

IV. Great Indy Neighborhoods Budget

Anne-Marie Predovich reviewed the budget elements that are part of the Engagement Initiative.

- Enhanced Toolkit & Documentation: A staff member to document baseline data in neighborhoods, track changes, document success at the neighborhood level, and work with neighborhoods to do the same. This will also include development of resources and tools for all neighborhoods some which will be part of the Resource Guide, to be discussed later in the meeting.
- Neighborhood Communications: It is anticipated that there will be a communications strategy to promote GINI and its successes.
- Mini Grant Pool: INRC is proposing a Neighborhood Matching Fund of \$50,000, as a small grants pool for all neighborhoods to access/apply for.
- Program Measurement: As part of the overall GINI program measurement, progress on the Engagement Initiative will also be measured.

Bill Taft reviewed the budget items as part of the Implementation and Demonstration Initiatives.

- The budget is based on six neighborhoods participating in the implementation/demonstration initiatives, with three in each initiative. Any addition of total neighborhoods or increase in the percentage of neighborhoods participating in the demonstration initiative will increase this budget.
- At the 6 neighborhood budgeted level we have almost all of the funds in hand necessary for the first year of the program.
- The Implementation and Demonstration Initiative budgets are essentially identical with the exception that Demonstration has more funding budgeted per line per neighborhood to reflect its greater intensity of work.
- While not all funding sources are identified for years 2-3, the partner organizations have already decided not to pursue CDBG funds for the Implementation and Demonstration initiatives.
- This budget does not include funds necessary to carry out the goals that will be included in each neighborhood's quality of life plan. While GINI partners will seek to be helpful in identifying such funds, they are likely to come from many different sources and flow directly to various neighborhood-level organizations.

Yvonne Shaheen described next steps in terms of fundraising.

- We need your help. Co-Chairs and Staff will be contacting Steering Committee members over the summer to learn more about corporate and foundation giving guidelines for potential donor groups to which you have an affiliation. At the September meeting, we will have informational packets available for funding opportunities.
- For Steering Committee members that represent nonprofit organizations, we understand that you may not be able to directly help us fundraise (though some already are and we are grateful to them). We encourage you to think about how your nonprofit might be able to partner with Great Indy Neighborhoods in other ways, maybe programming opportunities in the selected neighborhoods or incorporating the principles of healthy neighborhoods into your organizational talking points.

V. Neighborhood Resource Guide

Tony Macklin introduced the Guide and asked for feedback.

- A team from LISC, INRC and the City of Indianapolis have been working on the development of a Resource Guide for neighborhood organizations. The team worked to keep the Guide user-friendly, containing all appropriate information, while not overwhelming the reader.
- The Guide is arranged according to the GINI principles, and arranged in a Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) format. The Guide's goal is to point people towards broad resources and tools, versus specific information that could frequently change.
- The Indianapolis Foundation has committed up to \$5,000 for the development, layout and printing of the guide.
- Please review and submit any comments to Anne-Marie Predovich by Friday, June 9.
- The Engagement Committee will finalize the document, with the goal of releasing the document when the Implementation and Demonstrative Initiatives neighborhoods are announced, in mid-July.

The next Steering Committee meetings are scheduled for July 18 & 20 7:30-10:30 at MIBOR.

Meeting adjourned.