

Neighborhood Conservation Program Review (NCPR)  
Working Group – Meeting #11  
November 9, 2020  
5pm – 7pm

**Meeting Summary**

**Meeting Location:** Virtual via MS Teams

**Community members in attendance:** Hans Bauman (Co-Chair), Rob Swennes, Stephanie Derrig, Claire O’Dea, Shruti Kuppa, Margarita Brose, Kathleen Reeder, Howard Solodky, Daniel Weir, Girair Simon

**County staff members in attendance:** Anthony Fusarelli (Co-Chair), Tim McIntosh (CPHD), Bernadette Grullon (DPR), Laura Simpson (CPHD), Adil Chauhan (DES), Jennifer Skow (CPHD), Michelle Stafford (DES)

---

**1. Opening and Introductions**

- a. Welcome, introductions, and opening remarks were provided by Co-Chairs A. Fusarelli and H. Bauman.
- b. Staff distributed an approximately sixty-page report to the working group on November 6. The report included four sections, an executive summary, and an appendix.
- c. This meeting was set up to discuss reactions and high-level comments about the Executive Summary and Recommendations Section. Editorial comments (as well as any additional comments) were requested during an open comment period after the meeting.

**2. Draft Report Discussion**

- a. *Discussion Introduction:* A. Fusarelli presented four framing questions for the discussion:
  - i. Does the executive summary strike the right balance of program strengths and areas for improvement?
  - ii. The recommendations were streamlined into four key strategy areas to reduce redundancy within the report and organize the proposed improvements in a digestible way. Does the group agree with how the recommended strategies and actions were organized?
  - iii. Are the recommendations appropriately contextualized and document why they are important to the functioning of the program? Do any need additional substance or further clarification?
  - iv. Do the revised revisions adequately capture the comments shared at the last meeting?
- b. *Tone of the Report*
  - i. The tone of the report was of concern to a few working group members. Specifically, the tone of the report does not match past conversations, is much

more critical of the program, and left out program strengths. Others felt the tone was appropriate, reminded the group that the program review was set up to critically evaluate the program, and voiced concern of staff watering down the language.

- Staff could look at word choices, generalizations, and the use of “should,” and should be mindful not to overstate criticisms. However, when appropriate, criticisms (and their context) should be noted.

*c. Strategies and Recommendations*

- i.* Staff did not organize the four strategies in any priority. The prioritization of the strategies and recommendations within was intended to occur by staff administratively through future annual work plans.
  - Leading up to these recommendations, consider noting that the strategies presented are not organized with any prioritization.
- ii.* Although the group should not prioritize the strategies in any particular order, the order of presentation is important. The group recommended ordering the strategies from biggest picture to finer details (County vision/funding → streamlining/reduce burden).
- iii.* The group generally liked the way in which the strategies were organized, and could identify themes: Process, people, policy, and money.
- iv.* Strategy 1 could be renamed to be more reflective of the actions within.
- v.* While one action within the recommendations calls for a name change, the report is not explicit with why the name change should occur – it creates confusion, and this should be explicitly mentioned.
- vi.* The report is not clear about who should lead implementing the recommendations. Many recommendations are directed to the NCAC to oversee. The NCAC may be able to handle leading the implementation of some recommendations, but the working group should be careful not to overburden the NCAC.
  - Staff has been discussing an implementation framework that would detail who would oversee the program.
  - A. Fusarelli noted that when the working group finalizes the report, the recommendations will not be adopted policy. Rather, the report will be shared with the County Manager to determine necessary steps to advance the recommendations.
- vii.* Elevating projects that meet County priorities should be re-evaluated. The bottom-up approach to the program gives residents an opportunity to pursue projects that are not necessarily County priorities.
  - Discussions from the P3 subcommittee were about streamlining and better coordinating NC projects with County projects so that civic associations don’t spend time duplicating efforts or using their preference points on something that the County will pursue anyway.

*d. Executive Summary*

- i.* The purpose of the review is missing from the Executive Summary, and should be noted up front (not just in Section 1). This will help those who haven't been part of the working group process to better understand why the group evaluated the program and why the recommendations emerged.
- ii.* The bottom-up nature of the program (and the program's benefits) should be noted up front (and highlighted throughout the document).
- iii.* The data findings (HPI index) may not reflect the analysis completed in Fall 2019.

**3. Next Steps/Schedule Ahead**

- a. Open comment period for two weeks, until November 20, 2020.
- b. Staff will distribute a Word version of the report to better facilitate the transfer of comments.
- c. December meeting is the tentatively scheduled last working group meeting.

**4. Meeting adjourned approximately 6:20PM**