



CITY OF BEND

BUILDING ON OUR PAST
SERVING THE PRESENT
SHAPING BEND'S FUTURE

Meeting Minutes

Neighborhood Leadership Alliance

March 11, 2020

Mt. Bachelor, Bend City Hall

710 NW Wall, Bend, Oregon

4:02 p.m. Neighborhood Leadership Alliance – Neighborhood Street Safety Program (NSSP) Debrief – Special Session

1. **Roll Call:** Hans Jorgensen (Chair), Lisa Mushel (Vice Chair), Karen Bergsvik, Cassie Giddings, Beth Hoover, Kathy Roche, Summer Sears, Sue Sullivan, Liz Weltin

Absent: Chris Friess, Dave Johnson, Jill Mehner, Courtney Underhill

Also Attended: Makayla Oliver, Janet Hruby, Robin Lewis

2. **NSSP Background (10 minutes)**

Staff Robin Lewis, Transportation Engineer, shared the general overview of the program in its first year.

3. **Current Work (10 minutes)**

Ms. Lewis explained the status of the final eight projects and their rollout schedule, as well as what each project may require for public support and design over the next few months.

4. **Reflections & Lessons Learned (60 minutes)**

Applications

- Workshop for the program before application opening could help eliminate the projects that don't meet criteria.
- Ask the public for a specific issue for a specific area rather than asking them to share a solution for the problem. Let staff come up with problem.
- Knowing where your suggestion went – provide some sort of feedback so that people are not discouraged and don't submit applications in the future.
- Confusion between Citizen Service Request (CSR) and application for NSSP.
- Better maps version that allows applicant to check on the status of their application and why they were not selected (if that's the case).
- Communication was an issue, how we communicated with our members caused confusion.

Screening

- Tight timeframe. Caused us to rush. 100 came off the 362 as not meeting criteria, but that wasn't communicated.
- Interactive map should be broken into neighborhoods.

- Staff Janet Hruby, Project Engineer, suggested support for communications. Maybe make form letters for each of the reasons someone was denied. Automated forms. NAs would still be the ones who send these out.
- Board members gained and board members lost from this process.
- City got a lot of insight into what is important to the residents.
- It was GOOD we didn't select the projects.

Project Development

- Field Meetings: maybe see if the people who submitted the application should have been invited.
- Time was also an issue. Need more time.
- Workshop came up again, or video.
- Auto update. Like the weekly road traffic support.

Voting

- Fillable form.
- Project names were difficult to follow. Couldn't remember where the neighborhood boundaries were. Assign a file name so the file name stays with it.
- How do we vote
- Tools received were difficult to read. Monkey survey? Member Ms. Weltin suggested.
- Field trip to see the projects for the NLA. We could fill up a small mini-van and go around.
- Ms. Lewis suggested a pitch off for all projects? "Ted Talks."
- New York study – Solicitation workshop, get a pool of projects, meter out the projects. Vetting right off the bat.
- Neighborhood equity: Divide sum between all thirteen Neighborhood Associations. This was not majority opinion.
- Price influenced decisions on traffic calming VS pedestrian safety.
- Facilitator to help guide the process.

Design & Construct

- No comments

Misc. Comments

- Every neighborhood should get something – how do we address this project.
- Staff Ms. Lewis discussed the opportunity with the projects that have been submitted and were not funded. There are bigger needs than we thought. What is the City's answer to this?

Member Ms. Roche exited the meeting at 4:43 p.m.

5. Public Comments (10 minutes)

David Gurule – MVNA Subcommittee Chair

- Put together a subcommittee for MVNA and Nssp projects.
- Worked great to use the NAs for communicating the program.
- When staff went through the applications and assigned to CIP or CSR, it was really helpful for them to provide feedback to the applicants

- Helped identify the needs. After identifying the needs: Was not successful asking the community to give solutions – should just ask community to identify the problems and the areas.
- Loves the idea of a facilitator. Wouldn't want to do it alone again.
- Decided children, schools, disabilities were priorities. Was easy to explain to the neighborhood.
- Don't we already have our lists for the most part? Why are we going to go back to the community and ask them again what is needed.
- Give opportunity to apply for new ideas, but keep older projects on maps.

Jeff Conrad – ABNA Guest

- There were growing pains. Confusions on when and where projects were shifted. We need to know what is happening with CIP CSR and how to communicate that with the applications.
- Is it too late to reach out now?
- Would like to know how committees were formed and how Awbrey Butte could do that. RWNA sent a mailer and held a transportation workshop.

Member Ms. Weltin exited the meeting at 5:03 p.m.

6. Looking Forward (10 Minutes)

Next steps

- Citizen collaboration. Ms. Lewis would like to meet with RWNA, MVNA, OBNA subcommittees. Makayla Oliver, Community Relations Manager, will reach out to NLAs and request subcommittee rosters for NSSP projects to provide input on the projects being implemented.
- Develop an education piece with the work
- Neighborhood slow-down signs. Purchase as the NSSP project is implemented.
- Janet will get us the info for the CSRs back to the NAs.

Adjourn at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Makayla Oliver
Community Relations Manager