

Lake Harriet CAC: Agenda and Draft Meeting Notes, 1 June 2009

Agenda Item	Lead	Results
1. Welcome and introductions (5 min.)	Matt Perry	Attendees included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CAC members Matt Perry (chair), Sarah Harris, Joel Chechik, Joseph Schmidt, Elizabeth Larsen, Lisa McDonald, Janet Hallaway, John Finlayson, Roann Cramer and Bruce Manning • MPRB staff members Don Siggelkow, Shane Stenzel, and Heather Ocel • Public engagement consultant/facilitator Anne Carroll • Guests: Randy Johnson, Arlene Fried, Cristof Traudes, Harvey Ettinger, Peter Sussman, Dolores Pospese Diane Leider.
2. Review and agree on agenda (5 min)	Matt Perry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For item 6, it is Sarah Harris (vs. Elizabeth Larsen) presenting with Joseph Schmidt on the previous process • Discussion of whether it is possible to extend this meeting a bit longer (staff will check) • Discussion of what content needs to be covered under financials, how long it will take, when we should get into the detail, and so on. Some feel strongly that substantial detail is needed before proceeding much farther. To be finalized later in the agenda. • Agenda agreed
3. Review, finalize and approve items from May 19th Meeting (15 min) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group Norms • Operating assumptions/Project objectives • Review and approve May 19 notes 	Matt Perry introduces; Anne Carroll facilitates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See attached final Group Norms • See attached final Operating Assumptions/Project Objectives • See attached final 5/19/09 Meeting Notes
4. Stakeholder Identification, Analysis; Stakeholder Engagement Plan (30 min) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Process Summary—Roann Cramer • Draft Stakeholder Engagement Plan Summary—Joel Chechik/Bruce Manning • Review, modify and approve Stakeholder Engagement Plan—Anne Carroll 	Matt Perry introduces; Anne Carroll facilitates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See attached draft Stakeholder Engagement Plan • Discussion: • Two Task Forces were created at the previous meeting, one to identify and analyze stakeholders relevant to this particular effort, and other to take those results and draft a plan to engage identified stakeholders • Task Force members reported on the process used to identify and analyze stakeholders, and then formulate an initial engagement plan • Stakeholder identification discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What about property owners directly on the lake?

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The neighborhood organizations intend to reach out to property owners as well as other community members • Stakeholder engagement discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Included stakeholders beyond those who are already “at the table” • These are stakeholders to whom the CAC will explicitly reach out • There may be others whose perspectives we must also seek in order to avoid challenges in the future • Three levels of engagement: inform, consult, and involve (see IAP2 Spectrum of Public Participation) • Seven forms of engagement: see details in draft Stakeholder Engagement Plan • This is a lot of input to gather in a short period of time, and we must explain how we are going to use people’s input, then do it • We must be clear on how we are going to use the information we gather to inform our decision making • Timing: discussion of when the decision has to be made <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff: If something new, must be done in July; if not, could be later; if no change, it’s a 10-year decision; if expansion, it’s a 40-50 year decision • Need to take the time to make the “right” decision by getting input from the critical stakeholders • If we are going to change the CAC’s timeline, we must discuss with the Board • Not enough time in the next 6 weeks to both gather the information we want <i>and</i> process it to inform our decision making • Note that enterprise profits or regional park funding (vs. bonds) would be used for major rehab and any expansion • It may be possible to do this within approximately the current schedule but with additional meetings within that framework • Extending the time would give us more time to collect and process the data we need to make decisions; takes time for local organizations to pull together neighborhood forums • Suggestion: Chair to work with Board to add meetings and perhaps extend into early August. Discussion: not yet sure how many meetings needed; recommend creating a Task Force to further |
|--|--|--|

		<p>elaborate the SH Engagement Plan and implementation schedule, run that by the CAC, and then bring it to the Board. Also need to lay out our work plan that includes information beyond stakeholder input, which will shape our meeting schedule and specific agendas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discussion of how much detailed information do we want to get <i>before</i> we gather stakeholder input; suggestion that the two sets of activities can run concurrently; staff noted that the potential additional income from the possible expansion should not be seen as the key driver – it’s about possibly expanding services for users at that location; staff has seen and appreciated similar expansions elsewhere, so more stakeholder input is of value prior to making this long-term decision
<p>5. Websites (15 min)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update on Lake Harriet CAC Ning Site—Matt Perry • Update on Lake Harriet CAC MPRB Web Site—Don Siggelkow 	Matt Perry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website, hosted by MPRB. See handout; also add link to Ning site • Ning site: public space for people to view interactions among CAC members, review draft documents, etc. www.lakeharrietcac.ning.com • When documents are finalized, they are posted to Board’s Web site: http://www.minneapolisparcs.org/default.asp?PageID=1145
<p>6. Resident members recap of prior proposal process and outcome (10 min)</p>	Joseph Schmidt Sarah Harris	Postponed until next CAC meeting
<p>7. Remaining CAC meetings (25 min)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of Stakeholder Engagement Plan • Decide Purpose/ Dates/ Times/ Structure/ Content of Remaining Meetings 	Matt Perry introduces; Anne Carroll facilitates	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Schedule/timeline Task Force created: Lisa, Janet, John, Roann, Matt. • Charge is to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • identify topics that need to be addressed in the next several meetings to make a recommendation to the Park Board • identify tasks and schedule to gather and process stakeholder input • create timeline for gathering data and gathering stakeholder input • identify milestones and interdependencies of all tasks, along a timeline • provide suggestions on resources required to do this • look at stakeholder group schedules (such as those hosting community forums) and reconcile with proposed CAC schedule • provide draft to CAC via the Ning site • CAC members provide input to this charge via the Ning site <p>• SH Engagement Plan <i>detailed design</i>:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • this really needs input from all CAC members • lots of people have strong opinions about this • starting from scratch as a large group is very difficult; can have a more fruitful discussion starting from a draft • CAC members all need to have a legitimate part in this work • a smaller group could come up with a draft that includes various alternatives, then have the group finalize • could do some of the initial work online • could use some of the questions from the 2001 survey • need to remember there are many methods beyond the possible intercept survey • Decision: Chair will use the Ning site to begin discussions on the various SH engagement design issues, inviting other CAC members to contribute and continue the discussion
8. Financial overview (15 min)	Don Siggelkow	Postponed until later CAC meeting
Closing Discussion		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chair note: It may be frustrating to people that this isn't all going to be done in four meetings, but given the timeline provided by staff, the import of this recommendation to the Board, and the long-term implications of the decisions, it is better to spend the time doing the high-quality and necessarily more time-consuming up-front decisions in order to have a better outcome • Schedule Task Force will find a time to meet using an online scheduling tool • Next CAC meeting: will try to stick with 7-9 but Chair explore other options in light of the amount of work to be completed

