

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Park Naming Roundtable October 1, 2024

Goals (as directed by Native Parks Council):

- To provide input on the MPRB Naming Policy to inform the new policy that guides all naming and renaming processes at MPRB.
- To bring together all stakeholders who have been involved, or should be involved, in the Sibley Park Renaming process
- For Parks to provide a detailed background of the Sibley Park Renaming process
- For Parks to provide stakeholders with a background on the landscape
- For the Stakeholder group to provide feedback on the process for Parks to guide them in future renaming and community engagement work
- For the Stakeholder group to consider the new name suggestions in a way that feels safe, supportive and appropriate
- Reaching group consensus - *if possible*

Intended Outcomes:

- For all stakeholders involved to have the opportunity to hear and understand one another
- For Parks to gain feedback about their engagement processes with American Indian communities and Tribes
- Consensus building for a new name for Sibley Park to share with the MPRB Board
- To provide input to MPRB on Naming Policy and how to integrate Indigenous naming processes into the policy

Agenda:

1. Opening words/prayer
2. Go through goals for the day and group agreement
3. Introductions
4. Naming Policy Foundation
5. Provide a presentation and background of the Sibley Park Renaming efforts to date
 - a. Including how the name change idea came about
 - b. What process Parks used/is using
 - c. How Parks engaged consultants and implemented community engagement
 - d. How Parks engaged tribes
 - e. Various name suggestions and how each suggestion came into the conversation
6. Share information about the history of the landscape/park at and around Sibley Park
7. Facilitated discussion about the process itself and critiques
8. Facilitated consideration of Naming Policy and the names that are being considered - potentially opportunity to come up with new name options and consensus building activity. What is next for the naming policy and naming process?
9. Closing and coming together

Small Group Breakout Notes on Naming Policy:

Group 1: Policy & Bureaucratic Consideration

Guiding questions:

- How can Dakota, the broader Native community, and Parks and Rec collectively contribute to a policy that respects cultural heritage and the continuing presence of Dakota and all native people and relevant city requirements?
- What timelines and milestones should be established to keep the process moving forward efficiently?
- What new steps could be developed with city governments to formalize the renaming of Dakota ancestral lands under park management through action?

Group reflection:

- 1: Understanding that we are in Dakota Land
- 2: Put Dakota Names in all parks
- 3: Why relevant City requirements
How do we better educate the community on city requirements?
- 4: Waul'aj fees on American Indian People
- 5: Standard signs to educated people on Dakota lands?

B: Annual reports

C: Again, to name parks in Dakota

- 1: Include tribal org.
- 2: Work with American Indian Council

Group 2: Cultural Significance & History

Guiding question:

How can the renaming and policy change honor the history and ongoing significance of Dakota land under American management for the Dakota people and the broader Native community?

Group reflection:

- Know the full history
- Understand the differences of the different worldviews
- Understand regional context or connection of the space – Bde Maka Ska was a good model
- Part of Bdote
- Tribal consultation should have happened beginning in 2016
- Need to go to the tribe v. send a letter and a box
- Cultural significance didn't end when removed
 - Continues to grow, evolve- still has meaning
- 'wise practices' How name came to be
- Public needs to be beyond neighborhood
 - Need to go out to the tribes beyond city
- Dakota co. has an example of 2 similar names. Variations of name
- Understanding the removal & include those impacted
 - 7 council fires meeting would be a starting point

Group 3: ED. + Public Awareness

Guiding Questions:

- How will the city and Dakota and Native community work together to communicate the significance of the name change to the public?
- What educational programs or public outreach efforts can be implemented to build broader understanding of the name change?
- How can renaming of the park serve as a platform for broader conversation around Indigenous history, land, and cultural revitalization?

Group Reflection:

- Community recognition of Native culture
- Name not on current list- Dig Deeper
- MPRB & people here today & youth & Native parks council together
- Celebration/ community festival
- Accessible to all
- History, stories, public art (interactive)
- Working technology
- Opportunity to educate people
- Use the original name (Known?) (check books, maps)
- Reason we want to change name
- Middle school
 - Youth power
 - Sibley history
 - +damage done
 - EX: work of Kate & Carly in schools
 - EX: Renaming States across U.S.
- Involve news media
- Embed in public schools
- ED. Resources (QR codes, web pages)
- Sibley History from Native Perspective
 - Personal family histories + stories
- Create space(s) for this discussion
- Inline learning companion or PDF download
- Personal Experiences
 - Record stories, harm done
 - Embed in art or map
- “Dakota” name, not “Native” name
- Land back-> to Dakota
- Speakers at school, flags in park weekly language table in the park
- *EGO V. ECO*

Group 3: Community Perspectives + Inclusion

Guiding Questions:

- What specific understandings and agreements might community members have about the name change or the policy change, and how can they be efficiently recognized and affirmed?
- In what way can we collaboratively educate and engage the broader public on the cultural significance of the name change and a policy endorsement to build support?

Group Reflection:

- Community Engagement/ Support seeking/multi timelines/sites
- Name Lake of Loons/ English settlers
 - False narratives... where do they come from
 - How many do we have (MPRB)
- How did we remove Sibley
 - No clear process
 - Inclusive?
 - Look at communications
- From east -> west
 - Indigenous naming to English Names
- Stories to romanticize us?
- How do we protect our names
- Traditional way of naming thinking new traditions
- Public education giving voice to our women
- Park over process
- We create a process + are part of it (Tribal Consultation, THPO's, Comm)
- Wise Practices
- 7 council fire/ decisions
- Use Dakota not Native
- With stories, public art
 - History
 - Celebrations
 - Functional technology
 - Native perspective

Group 4: Conflict Resolution & Consensus Building

Guiding Questions:

- In what way could mutually crafted agreements and understandings between the Dakota and Native community and MPRB provide guidance and help resolve future disagreements?
- Could a consensus building approach be employed to ensure all parties feel heard and respected in the decision making process?
- In the event areas remain where compromise is needed, how can we navigate those discussions constructively?

Group Reflection:

- Parks invite Dakota to Meetings -> What about tribes that were pushed out?
 - Invite elders
- Parks relinquish naming of parks to Dakota
- Having two names will divide people per park-> Anger/ Confusion
- Time/Place of meetings-> Get more people to participate
- What is the Timeframe? When will this be done?
 - Filter through council before going to public with plans projects
 - Decisions
 - Names
 - Etc.
- Would have been good to know how long people were involved→ Who's already given names?