



## Approved Minutes Met Council Task Force

Thursday, February 4, 2:30 p.m. – 6:00 p.m. (special extended meeting)  
Mount Zion Temple, 1300 Summit Ave, St Paul, MN 55105  
Meeting Room: Margolis Hall

**Members present:** Susan Arntz (**Co-chair**), John Knapp (**Co-chair**), Elizabeth Kautz, Jim Erkel, Michele Foster, Scott Neal, Chris Gerlach, Bill Hargis, Shannon Watson, Ravi Norman, John Adams, Jim Solem, and Acooa Ellis.

**Members not present:** Steve Dornfeld, Sharon Sayles-Belton, Peter Bell, Adeel Lari, Carol Flynn, and Dan McElroy,

**Staff & staff support present:** Pahoua Yang Hoffman and Sean Kershaw

**Citizens League members and special guests present:** Gabriel Flaa, Kate Weyenberg, Bright Dornblaser, Ray Schoch, and Implications Wheel facilitator Jim Schreier.

### Proposed outcomes for this meeting

- Approve minutes from previous meeting.
- Debrief last meeting.
- Review project status.
- Participate in Implications Wheel exercise.
- Agree on next steps.
- Evaluate meeting.

### Minutes

Co-Chair Susan Arntz called the meeting to order at 2:33 p.m.

#### 1. **Welcome, Introductions, Approval of Minutes, Debrief of Previous Meeting, Review Project Status**

##### *Introductions*

Co-chair Susan Arntz started the meeting by introducing special guest Jim Schreier, the facilitator of the Implications Wheel tool. Arntz went over the proposed meeting outcomes.

##### *Approval of Minutes*

Co-chair Arntz asked if there were any questions or feedback on the minutes from the January 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. Shannon Watson moved to approve the minutes. Jim Erkel seconded the motion. A unanimous verbal vote passed the motion to approve the minutes.

##### *Debrief of Previous Meeting*

Co-Chair Arntz provided a brief re-cap of the previous meeting on January 21. The Task Force reviewed and began to refine the list of findings and conclusions in order to prepare for final recommendations. A lot of work was completed at this meeting, but since the Task Force did not finish going through the entire list, a small sub-group convened to refine the remaining findings and conclusions. Arntz indicated that the full Task Force would have another opportunity to review the

final list of findings and conclusions, offer language changes, and prioritize them via Survey Monkey.

#### *Review project status & share plans for upcoming meetings*

The group agreed to review the findings and conclusions again to prioritize them. Arntz asked Pahoua Hoffman to walk through the draft table of contents. Hoffman explained that she and Sean came up with the outline for the final report to get members feedback. A member suggested the addition the *1976 Metropolitan Land Planning Act* under Major Changes to the Metropolitan Council in the draft table of contents. Hoffman responded that this was the kind of feedback she would like from members. Hoffman responded to a question about audience for the final report. She explained that while the Governor, the Met Council, and the Legislature were all key audiences for the final report, the Citizens League also sees its members and the general public as an important audience. Because of this, the report should be comprehensive: covering the history of the Met Council, major milestones, and the conclusion of this Task Force. She thought it would be a disservice if someone who wanted the full picture had to go to three different Citizens League reports to get it.

Co-Chair John Knapp mentioned that he and a few Task Force members including Pahoua Hoffman attended the Legislative Commission on Metropolitan Government hearing chaired by Rep. Tony Albright on Wednesday, January 27. Senator Scott Dibble, a member of the Commission, called attention to the Citizens League's Task Force and how the work would be shared with the Commission once completed. Due to legislative committee deadlines and the compressed session, it was suggested that the Task Force come out with its findings and recommendations in two phases: a preliminary release in time for session start and final report later in March.

## **2. Implications Wheel Exercise**

Co-chair Arntz turned the meeting over to Implications Wheel facilitator, Jim Schreier.

#### Background and context

As Task Force Members confirm findings/ conclusions and begin to consider recommendations, a decision was made to introduce the [Implications Wheel Exercise](#) into the Citizens League process on Thursday, February 4 in an extended meeting. During the facilitated exercise, Task Force members would be exploring consequences/implications--both positive (opportunities) and negative (risks)--of a few possible recommendations in order to inform the group's decision-making process for final recommendations.

#### The Pre-work and Exercise.

The Implications Wheel exercise begins by phrasing possible outcomes/recommendations in the form of a question. These questions are referred to as "center" questions. After these center questions have been developed, participants build out from this center by identifying several "first-order" implications. One does this by considering "what might happen next if this were to happen?"

In order to identify two questions for the facilitated exercise, four center questions were developed and loaded onto an online platform. They included:

1. What are the possible implications of Met Council members having staggered terms and no longer serving at the pleasure of the Governor? (Example of a positive implication: *"The Met Council is strengthened by more institutional stability and memory."* Example of a negative implication: *"Met Council is fragmented due to disagreements among members and the Governor."*)
2. What are the possible implications of the Met Council having a member selection process similar to the Minnesota Commission on Judicial Selection (which solicits candidates, evaluates applicants, and recommends nominees to the Governor for appointment)?
3. What are the implications of maximizing transit options for low income people as a top priority for transit planning and infrastructure decisions?
4. What are the possible implications of the Met Council considering adopting

measures that hold it accountable for closing economic disparities?

Note: The center questions above were crafted for the exercise only and should not be considered final recommendations by the Task Force.

In the pre-work, Task Force members were asked to identify six "first-order" implications for each of the four center questions. For every positive implication, they were instructed to also list a negative implication and vice versa. The results from this pre-work were shared with the facilitator, who then selected the final two questions for the in-person exercise. The facilitator based his decision on the specificity of member responses and the likelihood to generate second and third implications. The two questions used in the facilitated exercise on February 4 included:

1. What are the possible implications of Met Council members having staggered terms and no longer serving at the pleasure of the Governor?
2. What are the possible implications of the Met Council having a member selection process similar to the Minnesota Commission on Judicial Selection (which solicits candidates, evaluates applicants, and recommends nominees to the Governor for appointment)?

After the facilitator provided an introduction and instructions, the Task Force broke into five small teams to complete the Implications Wheel exercise.

#### Results from the Implications Wheel

All of the results, including interactive displays and multiple reports, are available here: <http://www.the-learning-depot.com/citizens-league/> Password: **future2016**. (See handout on the reading and scoring of an Implications Wheel.)

### **3. Next Steps & Evaluation**

Co-chair Arntz closed the meeting by informing the Task Force that members will receive another online assignment to confirm the revised findings and conclusions so that the Task Force can begin finalizing recommendations from these at the meeting on February 18 and March 3. She also reminded members that while the Task Force's last meeting will take place on March 3, work on the final report will continue after this date. To that end, members were informed they would be self-selecting themselves into one of two teams: writing team or editing team to help staff complete the final report. It was also mentioned that while the final report may not be completed until later in March, it was suggested earlier that a preliminary summary with findings and recommendations be released in time for the start of the legislative session with a final report to follow. Lastly, Arntz reminded Task Force members to provide staff feedback on the draft table of contents for the final report, which was distributed earlier.

The members evaluated the meeting as follows: 5, 5, 5, 4, 4, 5, 4, 4, 4, 4 and 4 for an average 4.36.

### **4. Adjourn**

Co-Chair Susan Arntz adjourned the meeting at 6:05 p.m.