



COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Monday, February 22, 2016

6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Farview Recreation Center

Meeting Notes

Committee members present: Jill Davis – Chair, Ali Warsame, Pam Owens, Jovita Morales, Al Jueneman, David Kaplan, Kathy Engen, Brian Nalezny, Bob Fine, Ahmed Ismail, Laura Johansson, Scott Neiman, Arlene Zamora, Camilla Jamal, Vanessa Haight, Ede Holmen, Larry McKenzie, John Lilly, Delano Lee

Committee members excused: Adelheid Koski, Beth Hart, David Jeffries

Guests: Lynne Crockett, Jake Virden, Clara Dux, Rosa Tock, Robert Acbe, Tom Evers

MPRB Commissioners present: none

Staff/consultants present: Jamie Neldner, Michelle Kellogg, Nick Williams, Andrew Pimental, Michael Schroeder, Sandra Meulners, Lydia Major, Spanish interpreter

[Please see [website](#) for additional project and Community Advisory Committee information]

Although portions of these notes may appear to be in the first person, they are not direct quotes of staff, consultants, CAC members, Commissioners, or the public. These notes are intended to paraphrase or summarize the key points of the discussion.

1. Welcome (*Jamie Neldner, MPRB*) (*Slides 1, 2, 3*)
 - Round of introductions of CAC members, MPRB staff, and consultants
2. MPRB Comprehensive Plan Overview (*Jamie*) (*Slides 4, 5, 6*)
 - MPRB mission statement and the relation to RecQuest.
 - In 2005, the MPRB embarked to a two-year commitment to complete this plan. Data was collected and a comprehensive outreach process was completed. The plan was implemented in 2007 and will be in effect through 2020. The plan encompasses four specific vision themes, with goals within each vision theme, and then strategies to reach each goal. The vision theme that brings us together to reach RecQuest goals is the second one in the comprehensive plan.
 - See slides 4, 5, and 6 for theme, goals, strategies
 - CAC member comment: the MPRB partnered with VRJ & Hope Communities – will this be a part of this?
 - o MPRB response: The slide is from the Comp Plan from 2007, and RecQuest was initiated because of this plan. The intent was to show how RecQuest is rooted in the comp plan,

RecQuest, led by the MPRB, is a comprehensive planning, design, community engagement, and recreation program evaluation and needs assessment for Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board recreation centers. The plan developed from the assessment will serve the next 25-30 years of capital improvements for recreation centers, and is an opportunity to tailor recreation center facilities and programs to meet the current and projected needs of communities across the city.

but VRJ and Hope Communities were only involved in RecQuest itself. VRJ did not work on the Comp Plan.

- CAC member comment: what is a community service hub?
 - o MPRB response: at the time the comp plan was created, we were working in a different service model, we now have service areas. There were originally 13 community service hubs. Now there are five service areas.
- CAC comment: Is the MPRB operating under this plan?
 - o MPRB response: yes, it is in effect until 2020.

3. RecQuest Trajectory (*Lydia Major, LHB*) (*Slide 7*)

- The presentation slide was the project phasing graphic from the Phase I report draft, but we have removed the dates after hearing CAC feedback from last meeting. We will be discussing the timeline and working with the CAC to revise the timeline for Phases 2 and 3.
- We have completed the “What is?” phase, and are moving in to “What can be?”, and after that moving on to “What will be?” over a timeline that we are still working out with the CAC feedback and support
- Focus on this portion of the meeting this evening will be the review and feedback and comments on the RecQuest phase I report—the “What is?” phase. (*Slide 8*)
- Please send grammatical/text edit suggestions to the report by email, not during this session. We will focus on ideas and themes that the entire group needs to hear and discuss.
- If something isn’t specifically listed on the slides we go over tonight, please bring it up if you feel it’s important to discuss as a group.
- We will record notes on the whiteboard during the meeting as well as take comprehensive notes by computer.
- Things to keep in mind:(*Slide 9*)
 - o Equity – keep the perspectives and ideas in mind that we discussed at the CAC orientation
 - o Where should we dive deeper, what issues do we need to explore in more detail? Are we missing key themes based on your knowledge of the community? We have a CAC to help us dig in and understand your communities better. If there are themes that we are uncomfortable with, let us know so we can get more comfortable with these themes.

4. Phase I Report Large Group Discussion (*Lydia*) (*Slide 10*)

- Review of the structure and organization of topics in chapter 1
 - o Lydia asks the group if anyone has any questions on how chapter 1 was organized, and there were no comments
- Facility tours: (*Slide 11*)
 - o CAC member question: Is this section about what is required for each facility, or what has already been done?
 - Lydia response: This section discusses how the recreation centers are today
 - o CAC member question: The smaller parks that don’t have a recreation center don’t seem to be in this report, how do they fit in? Example: Beltrami isn’t in this report.
 - Lydia response: We are only looking at recreation facilities with staff that operate programs, we are not considering maintenance or restroom facilities, etc.
 - CAC member response: Beltrami doesn’t have programming, but the community is trying to program it. It is important to include this in the project.
 - Lydia response: we are aware that Beltrami is requesting programming and we will consider that during phases 2 and 3. This report only reflects existing conditions.
 - o CAC member comment: If the referendum passes, we want to see more emphasis on green investments, solar panels, etc. It’s an investment that pays for itself in 10 years and this is a 30 year plan.

- CAC member comment: Regarding landscaping and curb appeal, it would be good to know which facilities are nicer, and which ones are more barren...this related to later the programs and programming funding...are we talking about have's and have-not's?
 - Lydia response: The complete notes on the facility tours are in the appendix. These help with the specifics on each facility, and during our tours we found that things like curb appeal and landscaping are more reflective of the interest of the staff in maintaining this element of the facility, rather than necessarily reflecting the resources of the specific center or neighborhood.
- CAC member question: In regard to the focus of this committee, should we be looking at replacement, removal, additions to facilities, etc? Knowing this would shape how we think about this report.
 - Lydia response: as we get into phases 2 and 3, part of that is looking at replacement, renovation, etc. of facilities at a system wide level, but not an individual building-by-building scale.
- CAC member comment: The one-pagers get into specifics, such as budgets, but how do we consider the referendum and other financial contributions into this graphic?
 - Lydia response: we will be talking about money, costs, and budgets in the coming phases, and we don't want to say that today's specific budget situation should frame the decisions we need to make. We will be looking at what should be happening in this community at a big-idea level.
 - CAC member response: I understand, but we have an obligation to be realistic about what comes out of these meetings.
- CAC member question: Regarding the Level of Services (LOS) analysis, should we also think about partnering with other organizations – are we looking at not relying on the rec center doing everything, but sending pieces of programming off to maybe the Y?
 - Lydia response: We will be talking about the LOS in a few slides, but we will be talking about different models of service, but right now we are looking at the existing conditions.
- CAC member comment: Safety should be more than just cameras, we should know who to consult with to know better design of buildings for safety/security.
 - Lydia response: Our designers did look at environmental security, including accessibility, at each facility. We can enhance how that is described in the report.
- CAC member comment: I assume we are going to replace roofs, etc. but when thinking about strategic shifts, these are very opaque designs. These buildings are from the 70s and are very closed off and segregated from the activity, so we should think about how do we get more eyes on the park.
- CAC member comment: 49% of users are women, another thing to think about with safety.
- CAC member question: Will we continue to look at facility data at an overarching view? The appendix is daunting.
 - Lydia response: We are not asking you to analyze each facility in depth, we are at an overarching view. We will use the one pagers to highlight the deep information for each center, but not dive deep right now into each center.
- CAC member question: Where do the outdoor facilities fit into this?
 - Lydia response: We are examining the outdoor fields from a programming level if the center staff is programming those amenities, but the outdoor facilities themselves are part of the service area master plans. We are working closely with those processes.
 - Other CAC member comment: So there will be interaction and overlap between this process and those processes?
 - Lydia response: Yes.

- CAC member comment: If we want more soccer fields, for example, is that part of this?
 - Lydia response: We will note that and pass it on to who needs to know that for their master planning efforts.
- CAC member comment: I am uncomfortable with the disconnect between indoor and outdoor amenities.
- CAC member comment: Who is looking at analyzing the outdoor facilities?
 - Lydia response: The service area master planning efforts are going through the same process: they have CACs (or, in the Downtown Service Area's case, a steering committee) with full community engagement processes.
 - Michael Schroeder comment: By 2018 the plan is to have all master plans complete.
 - CAC member response: Is there an overlap of people? Is there someone on the boards making sure the overlap is happening?
 - MPRB staff response: For staff, yes, but for committees no – this is a huge commitment for volunteers to make to be a part of just one committee, and there simply is not time to participate on multiple committees.
- CAC member comment: Think of how to design the buildings to support the functions that happen inside of the buildings.
- CAC member comment: Some of the parks have holes in the turf fields. (MPRB staff connected with this member after the meeting to ensure that there is a near-term solution to this issue.)
- CAC member question: I also have a hard time with the disconnect between indoor and outdoor space – what's the history of the decision to break this apart?
 - MPRB response: This city is huge and that would be a huge workload. We are looking at absolutely everything on every property, so to throw the facilities and outdoor amenities together into one project is too much. The regional plans are at a regional scale, the service area master plans are by service area, but the RecQuest plan is a city-wide model.
- CAC member comment: The Nokomis/Hiawatha master plan has been done, SSAMP is going on, and now we have this going on – there is confusion on all of the master plans going on – there will be confusion on why there are only parts happening with each plan.
 - MPRB response: The processes are quite different, and happening at different scales – we are implementing the service area master plans and RecQuest at the neighborhood scales, and the Nokomis/Hiawatha plan is at regional park scale, so that will help people understand the focus more.
- CAC member comment: Regarding DSAMP, that project gets to work with CPED and has a cool name.
 - Lydia response: Pathways to Places is a joint effort between the City of Minneapolis and the MPRB but the two projects (the City's Downtown Public Realm Framework Plan (DPRFP) and the Downtown Service Area Master Plan (DSAMP)) had separate and confusing names. They were given the shared name "Pathways to Places" to communicate their shared processes and outcomes.
 - CAC member response: Will we work with CPED?
 - Lydia response: We can have conversations with the City if needed.
- CAC member comment: Other planning processes have not looked at the buildings, so you're saying that this is our opportunity to look at facilities.
 - Lydia response: Yes, and we are looking at the services and programs that are provided from the facilities as well as the facilities themselves.
- CAC member comment: My family plays soccer at Corcoran Park, I know that Peavey Park and Stewart Park is disconnected between the park and the playground – if we call it a community park, there needs to be more safety. There are holes in the fields. Businesses

- around the park look like they are just for certain people, not the community. Fees are too much. Facilities are too old.
- CAC member question: Did you get this facility condition information during the community engagement process?
 - Lydia response: We did tours ourselves and took feedback from community members during the entirety of Phase 1.
 - CAC member question: Why isn't there any information here on Northeast Park? There should be past information on the new Northeast Park.
 - Lydia response: This is an existing conditions report, but we can include information about the plans for that park.
- Demographic Projections: (*Slide 12*)
- We are looking at a high level findings for the demographic studies
 - CAC member comment: There is a confusion in the service area breakdowns – the service areas in the report differ from the service areas that are listed in the program registry books.
 - Lydia response: We are aware that the MPRB explains service areas in different ways depending on what lens we are looking through, and we can explain the service area model discrepancies better.
 - CAC member comment: the mayor has a goal of 500K people in the city by a certain year, and city policy can help or hurt that – if the city has a greater goal than what the projections are showing, these projection numbers could be different.
 - Lydia response: we can add that information to this section.
 - CAC member comment: Confusion on information available on languages spoken...that part could be more robust.
 - CAC response: that information is provided in the table.
 - Lydia response: we can examine that and clarify where possible.
 - CAC member comment: Some families have more kids than the average family, those families in those areas need more attention, and do we have the information on family sizes in different communities?
 - Lydia response: We didn't speak to that as directly as we could, and will look into that during the editing process, but the projections do reflect project growth in specific communities.
- Program Assessment (*Slides 13, 14, 15*)
- This section reflects more of what we heard during our Phase 1 community engagement process, as well as the raw numbers of programming that is happening right now.
 - CAC member comment: Two-part comment – regarding sustainability, how do we increase programming so we don't duplicate or compete with other resources (thumbs up to more partnerships) and how much do particular staff members influence the character of the building and the programs? There needs to be a system of checks and balances and responsiveness including evaluations, ways to incentivize coordination with the communities, and accountability. There is no accountability or responsiveness, this should be a systemic change.
 - CAC member comment: Regarding revenue generation, I found that part of this section upsetting. Does the MPRB re-invest the money back into the rec center where it is generated? It creates have and have-nots to rely on individual centers to raise their own funds. A more global system would be more equitable.
 - CAC member comment: Community members feel like they should have a say in how the parks are run – there should there be a committee in each neighborhood that decides which programs are run in each park.
 - CAC member comment: Outsourcing vs. staffing – we should vet the economics of this. The one pager shows that only 15% or so of the available programming hours are being

used, is this a reflection of the staff, or that people just aren't showing up when the place is in fact available? What is the story behind this data?

- CAC member comment: The equity lens should be highlighted here regarding fees. There should be more accountability for who you are engaging in your community. There should be a balance between the central organization as well as the site specific programming.
- CAC member comment: In our experience with fundraising at the Loring Park Community Arts Center, the individual centers don't get the money, it goes to the general parks fund. Our experience is different from the other comment where each center has to fund raise for itself.
 - Other CAC member response: Facilities are being pitted against each other for funds.
- CAC member comment: There's a lot of pressure on recreation center staff, they program and reach out to community. Is there MPRB policy written as to what staff has to do to reach out to community members? Is there a stakeholder list that rec center managers have to use when they reach out with people, and can we see that list?
 - Lydia response: We will talk about that list at the end of the meeting and during the next meeting.
 - MPRB response: There isn't a written policy on how center staff does neighborhood outreach.
- CAC member comment: The physical layout of the rec center makes it so you can't have a face-to-face interaction with the staff. There aren't bilingual people at the facilities. It is hard to engage the community when there is that disconnect. Also, there is a safety concern: I smelled illegal substances in the bathroom at a facility – who is managing this? I don't want my kids hanging out there. Also, why isn't the money being spent to rent out facilities at the park being used to maintain that park?
- CAC member comment: Some parks allow snacks, but some parks don't allow people to bring their own snacks. Sometimes one person is allowed to bring snacks and another isn't even at the same facility. The facility supervisors should be trained and understand the culture of the communities they serve. There is no inclusion in some parks, and there is a deaf ear to comments made by people of color.
- CAC member comment: In the Cedar-Riverside & Phillips areas, most of the gyms are owned by the schools. They reserve the gyms for smaller private groups when there are local groups in greater numbers that have the need to use these facilities as well, and these groups have less resources to find other places to occupy.
- CAC member comment: The only verbiage in the report about inclusion is about people with disabilities – this is disappointing and outdated. I'd like to see how many people have requested the data about the ethnicity of parks users.
 - Lydia response: This is an instance of the gaps in the data, we don't have good data about race/ethnicity of users. We will research the budget information about financial assistance programs to see if that adds insight into this issue.
- CAC member comment: There is confusion in the part of this section that explains that higher income neighborhoods have the resources to pay for the programs they use.
 - Lydia/CAC group response: It's a statement of fact, not opinion. Currently, if a neighborhood is willing to pay for enhanced programming, those programs can be added.
- CAC member comment: There is a disparity on food permitting and bringing food in.
 - Jamie response: If someone registers for a food program, we don't need a permit for that, but if we serve food to the public, or if anyone serves food to the public on our property, we must obtain a permit. This is city policy, not MPRB.

- CAC member comment: the community education system does do a lot of adult programming at the facilities.
 - Lydia response: We do recognize that just because the MPRB doesn't offer this programming doesn't mean that other organizations don't.
- *Skip to the Next Steps part of the meeting due to time constraint; the group will finish the discussion on the Phase I Report at the next CAC meeting*
- 5. Public Comment Period (*facilitated by Jill Davis, CAC chair*)
 - Public comment: As a representative of those aging in the community, I disagree with the "passive use" comment for adults. We have a very large and diverse immigrant community that tends to be more family-oriented. When we don't have family oriented activities, especially those geared toward elders, we aren't supporting healthy families. All of the activities shouldn't be focused solely on youth – elders should be able to age in place and not have to rely on retirement centers and one center in the system that caters to them.
 - Public comment: With respect to the CAC, this CAC committee doesn't wholly represent the communities regarding ethnicity and age in the city – this group is older and whiter than Minneapolis in general. The CAC should be talking about equity, not keeping property values high.
 - Public comment: The MPRB should do a better job connecting with those who use the facilities. Actually go to the facilities and talk to the people there using the facilities to connect with them. Sometimes people in the community don't know how to make their voices heard or how to reach out and connect with the MPRB. There should be a better job done on renovating facilities that are important to the communities. In general, think about how the parks can keep people at all income levels engaged in the process.
 - Public comment: The "fundamentals" for kids brings kids and families together – it's been a successful endeavor in north Minneapolis when groups there started focusing on making the fundamentals stronger. Larger organizations came along and wanted to invest in the community (Twins, Timberwolves, Vikings, etc.) because it was a community. "When we play together we stay together!" Main focus should be on thinking about families and growing together as a city and we will draw better conclusions. Work on solutions and strategies on how to get these big picture things done together.
 - Public comment: I was offended by Closing the Gap meetings and how people that don't use the parks were making decisions on the future of parks and how they will be used. Seniors sit around bored and want something to do, they may be willing to volunteer to be involved with their community and they have valuable skills and experience. I don't see people here tonight that I see in the parks.
 - Public comment: A local senior group did research on how much it would cost to install a hot tub, MPRB came back with a much higher number. Too many things have been priced or paperworked out of possibility.
 - Public comment: Brian Coyle center should be Currie Park. I don't agree that Pillsbury United Communities runs all of the programming there. We need to be sincere about how the programs are run and invite more organizations to partner with us to provide programs.
 - CAC member comment: We need to reach out to the people struggling, not the organizations or the leaders, but the people.
- 6. Preview of CAC Meeting #2 (*Lydia*)
 - We are looking for help and insight on how we can best reach out to the people in the community.
 - We will be discussing the community engagement processes for Phases 2 and 3.
 - Homework assignment for the CAC is to think about groups, stakeholders, partners, etc. who you would like to see brought to the table. You telling us first tells us a lot more about what is important to you and where our priorities should lie going forward.
 - We will also get to what we didn't get to today.
 - CAC member question: Will we continue with intercepts going forward?

- Lydia response: we can use intercepts if those are the most effective tools we have to reach our goals.
- CAC member comment: In the next meeting we should make sure we spend time further discussing things we didn't get to tonight.
 - Lydia response: we will certainly do that. Also feel free to provide feedback to us via email or phone in the interim.
- CAC member comment: Will the CAC be meeting through Phase 2?
 - Lydia response: We will discuss the timeline moving forward internally, then discuss it with the CAC at the next meeting.

10. Adjourn (approximately 8:35pm)

This constitutes the author's understanding of items discussed and decisions reached. If there are any omissions or discrepancies, please notify Jamie Neldner in writing.