



Date of Board P+C: 05/05/2021

Please fill out this form if your project, program, or initiative includes community engagement. All Community Engagement Plans should be filed as Petitions and Communications with the MPRB Board of Commissioners and submitted to the MPRB Engagement Portal on SharePoint

Staff Lead: Siciid Ali

Department or Division: Planning Division

Project Name: Sibley Park Improvements and Possible Name Change

Engagement Level: Consult

This plan serves as a guide for the community engagement process for Sibley Park Playground and Wading Pool Improvements and Possible Name Change. The plan may be modified as circumstance warrants during project duration. Substantial modifications are to be communicated to stakeholders and the MPRB Board of Commissioners.

As required by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Community Engagement Policy, this project requires a Community Engagement Plan because the project falls under the consult category of community engagement for which MPRB is required to obtain stakeholder feedback on project, initiative, or program analysis, alternatives, or decisions. This CE Plan was used with a GARE Racial Equity Tool Kit framework.

Key Stakeholders should be engaged in the creation of this plan. This is to be filled out before the CE Plan is submitted to the Board as a P+C. Please explain how they were engaged:

MPRB Sibley Recreation Center staff and the local neighborhood organizations, Standish-Ericsson Neighborhood Association and Bancroft Neighborhood Association were provided the opportunity to comment on the Draft CE Plan prior to and concurrent with the plan's submittal to the Board of Commissioners, and prior to initiation of community engagement activities.

1. **Project Description**

1a. Project Overview:

The Sibley Park Improvements and possible name change will be an implementation of the South Service Area Master Plan. This project will design and construct a new playground and wading pool in Sibley Park, and will include the decommissioning of the existing tennis court, per the adopted master plan for the park. The old equipment is showing its age and funding is provided for new playground equipment and wading pool. Additional site features may be included such as benches, shade, and picnic tables.

In addition, we will be exploring a possible name change for the park. Sanford Middle School students have voiced their interest in exploring a name change for Sibley Park based on the history of violence perpetuated against the Dakota people by Henry Hastings Sibley. Students said they were uncomfortable with Henry Sibley’s name on their jersey’s after learning what he did in their history class. Students reached out to the Park Board to see if the name of the park can be changed. We also heard from the community at large and the commissioners.

1b. MPRB Outcomes *(What goals, strategies, or values in the MPRB Comprehensive Plan does this project, program, or initiative relate to? What goal in the Racial Equity Action Plan does this relate to?):*

Vision Theme 3: Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs.

Vision Theme 4: A safe place to play, celebrate, contemplate, and recreate

1c. Project Timeline:

Community Engagement and Design: Spring/Summer 2021

Initial discussion of name change: Spring/Summer 2021

Construction: Summer 2022

1d. Project Funding:

<u>Capital Sources</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
2019 CIP: NPP20	\$98,779	These funds do not expire, however, it is recommended to use these funds by 2021.
2021 CIP: NPP20	\$922,000	These funds to not expire, however, it is recommended to use these funds by 2022.

<u>Supplemental Sources</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Expiration</u>

2021 CIP: Park Dedication Funds	\$100,713	N/A
TOTAL	1,121,492	

2. Project Data:

2a. What are the boundaries of the community engagement area? *(For regional facilities include neighborhoods adjacent to the park and city/regional boundaries)*

For this project the Standish, Bancroft, and Ericsson neighborhood boundaries will be used as the community engagement area, specifically related to neighborhood organization engagement. Bancroft is included because the western boundary for the Standish neighborhood is Cedar Avenue, which does not account for park users who may travel east across Cedar Avenue to get to Sibley Park. The Bancroft Neighborhood does have “Bancroft Meadows” with sidewalks, picnic areas, and an open lawn for recreation; however, this is owned by the City of Minneapolis Public Works and its primary function when built in 1989 was to act as a flood basin for storm-water detention. Additional engagement activities will focus on Sanford Middle School in the Longfellow neighborhood. Though distant from the park, students attending the school utilize the park and have voiced concerns with the Park’s current name.

2b. What are the demographics of the community engagement area? *(Please refer to percentages of the population when possible and note the sources of the data.)*

Data comes from MNCompass Neighborhood Profiles (2015-2019)

Total Population

Standish Neighborhood	6,483
Ericsson Neighborhood	3,523
Bancroft Neighborhood	3,512
City of Minneapolis	429,605

Age by Percentage of the Population

Age	Standish Neighborhood	Ericsson Neighborhood	Bancroft Neighborhood
Under 5 years	7.3%	8.5%	9.3%
5-9 years	5.5%	7.6%	4.8%
10-14 years	5.1%	2.7%	4.9%

15-17 years	2.7%	1.4%	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>
18-24 years	4.1%	3.6%	5.8%
25-34 years	18.8%	17.0%	22.2%
35-44 years	18.6%	18.9%	14.5%
45-54 years	12.1%	14.3%	12.9%
55-64 years	13.7%	12.4%	13.1%
65-74 years	6.6%	9.9%	6.1%
75-84 years	3.5%	3.0%	2.6%
85 years and older	1.9%	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>

Median Age in City of Minneapolis is 32.1

Race by Percentage of the Population

Race & Ethnicity	Standish Neighborhood	Ericsson Neighborhood	Bancroft Neighborhood	City of Minneapolis
White	78.0%	85.8%	72.8%	63.6%
Black or African American	7.6%	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>	9.7%	19.2%
American Indian and Alaskan Native	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>	1.9%
Asian or Pacific Islander	1.8%	3.1%	1.8%	5.9%
Prefer to answer another way	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>	4.9%
Two or more races	4.2%	2.6%	6.2%	4.8%
Hispanic or Latinx	10.3%	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>	9.6%

Median Household Income

Standish Neighborhood	\$74,000
Ericsson Neighborhood	\$91,549
Bancroft Neighborhood	\$71,974
City of Minneapolis	\$62,583

Percentage of the Population that Speaks a Language Other than English at Home

	English Only	Language other than English	Speaks English less than "very well"
Standish Neighborhood	87.5%	12.5%	4.5%
Ericsson Neighborhood	89.8%	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>	<i>NOT ENOUGH DATA</i>

Bancroft Neighborhood	87.6%	NOT ENOUGH DATA	NOT ENOUGH DATA
City of Minneapolis		22.3%	

Percentage of the Population with a disability

Standish Neighborhood	13.5%
Ericsson Neighborhood	7.6%
Bancroft Neighborhood	10.3%
City of Minneapolis	11.2%

Renter v. Home Ownership

	Owner-occupied housing	Renter-occupied housing
Standish Neighborhood	79.9%	18.6%
Ericsson Neighborhood	79.8%	18.6%
Bancroft Neighborhood	72.4%	26.2%
City of Minneapolis	47.2%	

Analysis:

The Standish, Ericsson and Bancroft Neighborhoods tend to generally be older, whiter, and wealthier compared to the City of Minneapolis as a whole. It should be noted that the Standish Neighborhood has a higher percentage of people who identify as Hispanic or Latinx when compared to the entirety of the city. People in these three neighborhoods are more likely to be homeowners, while renters account for the majority of households in Minneapolis according to data from the *American Community Survey*. These neighborhoods also have smaller percentages of people who speak languages other than English in their homes. The Ericsson and Bancroft Neighborhood Populations are less likely to have disabilities when compared to the City of Minneapolis as a whole, while the Standish Neighborhood’s population has a HIGHER percentage of people who have a disability.

2c. List any key findings or excerpts from relevant plans or policies that are informing this project, program or initiative, especially if community was engaged in the policy or plan:

The project will be guided by the adopted South Service Area Master Plan, completed in 2017 after a two-year community engagement process. The following lenses were used while developing the master plan for Sibley Park; Community Focus Lens, Racial Equity Lens, Gender Equity Lens, Lifelong Equity Lens, Design Lens, and an Environment Lens.

2d. What are the data gaps? What additional research needs to be done to understand the project stakeholders and project scope?

Some of the data gaps include not knowing who actually uses the park compared to the neighborhood demographics. But we have an initial engagement with Sanford Middle School students which will be key to the rehabilitation of the park. Engagement with park staff, adjust residents, park users and neighborhood organizations will be sufficient in rehabbing the playground, wading pool, and possible name change.

3. Community Engagement:

The MPRB supports the use of a variety of techniques to interact with and obtain information from stakeholders. Outreach and research tools and methods can be applied for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to the following:

- a. Evaluate success and measure community impact of existing programs, services, or facilities.
- b. Gain stakeholder insight and perspective regarding development of a new program, service or facility.
- c. Proactively identify or explore park and recreation trends or ideas.
- d. Determine essential services to be provided for a community or park area.
- e. Query stakeholders when proposing or revising policy.
- f. Resolve persistent conflicts or problems.
- g. Educate or inform the public on proposed changes, initiatives and projects.
- h. Reflect on projects, programs and initiatives after adoption by the Board or report on how community input has been integrated.
- i. Learn the history of local context and community.

Project Stakeholder <i>(students, ethnic communities, neighborhood groups, community leaders)</i>	Outreach: How will you reach out to the stakeholder? <i>(i.e. go to parks, neighborhood listserv, engage with cultural media)</i>	Engagement: How will they participate? <i>(i. e. online survey, focus group, community open house, intercept survey)</i>	Reflecting Back: How will stakeholder groups be reflected back to about the project progress or outcomes? <i>(Posted on project website, ribbon cutting, e-blast, site visit, celebration)</i>
Standish-Ericsson Neighborhood Association Bancroft Neighborhood Association	Attend virtual meeting(s), project website, email	Provide feedback via focus group, design virtual open house, intercept survey, or online survey.	E-blast, MPRB project website, and opening park celebration.
Nearby Residents	Attend virtual meeting(s) and/or in person pop-up events, project website, email	Provide feedback via focus group, design virtual open house, intercept survey, or online survey.	E-blast, MPRB project website, and opening park celebration.
Sanford Middle School students	Attend virtual meeting(s) and/or in	Provide feedback via focus group, design virtual open house,	E-blast, MPRB project website, and opening park celebration.

	person conversations, project website, email	intercept survey, or online survey.	
General Park Users	Email, project website	Email, project website.	Email, project website

Due to COVID 19 Social Distancing requirements, we may hold some in-person engagements for this project in early/late 2021.

Mendota Heights High School—Staff are engaging with the district to learn more about their Community Engagement process and policy around changing their name from “Henry Sibley High School”.

3a. Advisory Committees:

Project Advisory Committee: This roster is a list of MPRB departments and divisions that are on the PAC
Planning Division
Asset Management Department
Community Connections and Violence Prevention Department
Youth and Recreation Centers Department
Communications Department
Park Police Department
Forestry Department

3b. Will a Community Advisory Committee be required for this project, program, or initiative?

NO

4. Analysis:

4a. What questions will you be asking community to respond to in your outreach and engagement?

- Any additional ideas for how or who to engage with about this project?
- What types of play structures and pool features are the most desired?
- How can the new playground and pool enhance users’ experience in the park?
- What else is needed around the playground area
- How do you feel about the name Sibley Park? Is there interest in changing the name? What ideas do you have for a new name?

4b. How will your community engagement, outreach, and methods make MPRB a more equitable system?

Sibley Park is home to three different neighborhood associations (Standish Neighborhood, Ericsson Neighborhood, and Bancroft Neighborhood). The age group that frequent the playground and the wading pool in all three Neighborhoods range from 14 and younger. This age group makes about 18.8%

of the population for each neighborhood. Therefore, the community engagement outreach will specifically work to engage youth that use the playground and wading pool.

Staff will also discuss a possible name change of the park with the school and park users. We as the Park Board were approached by some of the users that frequent the park that the name makes them uncomfortable. Some people believe the Park Board should consider changing the name of the park. This is due to the history of Henry Sibley and pain, trauma, and dislocation he caused the Dakota people.

Engaging this neighborhood organizations along with youth is an important aspect of creating an equitable system.

The design will work to be inclusive and universal where possible with a focus on providing a broad range of structures for a wide range of ages and abilities.

5. Evaluation Summary: *To be completed at one or more project milestones, and at the completion of the project, program, or initiative.*

5a. Identify one or more key project milestones when project evaluation will be performed (i.e. Draft design review, draft policy review, project mid-point)

At the conclusion of concept design, prior to board approval of concept designs

5a. Who was engaged during the process? (i.e. demographic info from online survey participants, the CAC, and community engagement whenever possible. Refer back to Section 2 in the CE Plan and how your engagement reflects the diversity of the community in the engagement area.)

5b. How did the engagement inform the project outcome? (i.e. public tabulation and amendments following a public comment period)

5c. How did the project and engagement fulfill a goal or strategy in the MPRB Comprehensive Plan?

5d. Please describe any new or innovative engagement methods used during the process:

5e. What recommendations do you have for future engagement around this topic, park, or area?

5f. What, if any, were the unintended outcomes of your CE Plan?

5g. Were there any barriers to successful implementation of your CE Plan?

5h. Were you adequately resourced, including staff support, expertise, and funding?

5i. If applicable, how can this project, program, or initiative, or MPRB continue to partner and deepen relationships with underrepresented communities?

