



## Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting

June 14, 2018

### AGENDA

6:15p 1. Welcome and introductions

Jamie Neldner

6:15p 2. Board meeting timeline

Tyrize Cox

Presentation to Board will be June 22, 2018

Who will co-present with Dr. Stacey?

6:17p 3. Board presentation discussion

Tyrize Cox/Stacey Gray Akyea

Last 10 slides presented by CAC Member

Lynne: Concerns around Black and Bi-Racial

Brian: Somali and Ethiopian also labeled black?

Stacey: Yes.

Lynne: How do we serve the needs of the community after the large organizations?

Tyrize: less than desirable use of space time after organizations times are met?

Lynne: What about the buildings itself for meetings?

Tyrize: I am only aware of MPRB – not experience I have had, I am aware of conflict of field use.

Beth: They have been charging for use of rooms – so people have been going other places.

Tyrize: If it is a meeting open to the public, it is less like to be charged, but my private book club would be charged.

Beth: A lot of people may not understand that.

Manny: This CAC has the capacity to make more specific recommendations, add specific language?

Tyrize: We do

Manny: We have had a number of great ideas over the last year and creative solutions, and my goal is to put forth more concrete recommendations within the framework.

Tyrize: We can jump to that tonight

Lynne: Please define recreation programming.

Tyrize: It is all the leisure things, broad range, something defined as bike polo to something as less physical as card club – everything in between.

Lynne: Other CACs seemed to conflicting agendas to ours.

Tyrize: We are asking that they use our recommendations in guiding the Service Area Master Plan(s). Our intention is bring the work together and not on parallel tracks.

**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.

Lynne: That is not the feeling I have. I volunteered to have a voice. How does this translate to my community?

Tyrize: Whatever we do when finances are available, nothing in the SAMPS will be implemented in the next 5 years.

Beth: That is not an uncommon occurrence. This CAC has been more thought out. The SAMPS are making decisions with or without community meetings. Don't know our role at these meetings. Feel like we don't have a say. The SAMPS need to get the community involved.

Tyrize: I wish I had been hitting the SAMPS more closely through out this. I cannot say to you with confidence how many people were engaged outside that room and how many surveys, etc. were engaged. We can ask them to provide the data.

#### Recommendation edits.

Beth: More detail needed to collaborative solutions. If you put in active older adults – why are some activities in some parks and not others?

Tyrize: They need to be flexible enough to mold to community needs, you would like specific examples.

Beth: Some examples of what we discussed will help frame why we made the recommendations. Making Park Directors accountable for what community needs.

Lynne: What do you do when things are offered that other places do not know about?

Tyrize: Jamie sends out new offerings MPRB wide so all directors are aware. We also experience new activities when we are all together.

Brian: Area in South Minneapolis is a 'sweet spot' for the elderly around 36<sup>th</sup> and Bryant.

Tyrize: We picked up these senior events at Lyndale with that venue closing. How do we give examples without being descriptive?

Lynne: I have no idea about the programs at most parks around me.

Tyrize: Remember the audience is the Board, we are making recommendations to them.

Lynne: I would recommend the Board encourage the parks to engage the community.

Jamie: This is currently in the guiding principals – it is the foundation of what we do. We focus the 4 programmatic pillars into the guiding principals. That is how we blended.

Lynne: I don't know how to convince the board the voice of the community is the ultimate priority.

Manny: Youth Development Conversations – we were explicit about the programming that needed to be invigorated. We had an ongoing conversation about recommendations for that. It was expressed that Youth Development needs to be better funded. It is popular and growing at MPRB.

Tyrize: That is what we mean by #2 – do we need to be more specific?

Manny: That item in particular, I would not get that information out of those recommendations. I think being explicit, there is a will as to what specific programs are funded and how they are funded (and potentially provide more funding).

Tyrize: There is a will to do that very thing. I want to use a phrasing, because giving a mandate is not our role.

Lynne: I want to see something around encouraging the Board to put more funding into these for areas.

Tyrize: Remember you are making these recommendations.

Manny: Increase priorities to these funding areas.

Lynne: Put the priorities in there – each recommendation should have their own slide to describe- restate 'active older adults'.

Manny: If we make a recommendation that there needs to be more open use fields – our recommendations to be they come up with more fields. Are you setting a perimeter as to what type of actives they are expanding for (a field recommendation does not cover swimming)?

Tyrize: In that scenario, staff would make a recommendation to the board based on rationale and need. The Board would then allocate the budget based on your recommendation. Still budgetary. It comes from a staff member. Rarely do they say 'I want an activity'. They typically do not get down to that level. At times, there are studies done based on specific needs.

Beth: We want to give the recommendations to the Board, and then give specifics to the Directors to explore.

Brian: Lyndale was revolutionary for senior adults, with something closing, you upped programming. It was an example.

Brian: This feels really good – don't know the quantity of the recommendations. One Rec Center? 100 Rec Centers? MPRB has more Rec Centers then other cities. And that is a great thing. Need for the Rec Centers. I would like to be explicit to not close any Rec Centers. Never been a recommendation for a closure.

Jamie: I want to caution because I have never asked that question. I am concerned giving that recommendation without community testing. Could be our opinion.

Manny: It is not rooted in community engagement. What you are saying.

Stacey: Whoever presents that section could mention that we thought about all 47 center continuously.

Manny: We recommended youth programs being extremely low cost or free – nothing to recommend that.

Jamie: My understanding, from our meetings, we charge the climate of the market. You didn't have an opinion to offer programs in Kenwood for free.

Manny: Then programming should be equitable (to the community it is in).

Jamie: We can use the equity matrix.

Tyrize: What that means to this CAC, we hear you and are making additional resources to meet the needs and honor the work of the CAC.

Brian: Any difference to recommendation and what is adopted?

Tyrize: The way I wrote the agenda item, I have to say what I am asking them to do. I am asking them to adopt the recommendations. You don't get as granular in a powerpoint, you do in executive summary. The only thing they are saying yes to is what we recommend. Have our priorities a part of the SAMPs. Consider your priorities as they develop the 2019 budget.

Tyrize: We are asking these guidelines in the facilities for 25 years. We can't ask budget for longer then the year at hand. Economic picture will change annually.

Manny: Two layers to the ask – youth development to take greater priority then it does in its current state and continue in years going forward (invest on

where it is beyond today, as budget increases can not be promised).

Tyrize: I am presenting on Wednesday, I don't feel like I have the words you want.

Manny: I can write something up based on our recommendations – you are using our 4 areas. I am willing to do one with athletic fields, youth development.

Tyrize: I am worried the powerpoint does not reflect what you want said.

Manny: I like the idea of adding narrative to the presentation so that it has more depth.

Tyrize: What if we do this: if you are not comfortable, we can push this to the July Board and talk electronically. How does that feel?

Stacey: Remember – as an CAC, you have to hand it off and trust that they will do the right thing.

Manny: It is our responsibility to be as to the point and directed we can be. The openness is where I have the problem. It is our responsibility to be as clear as possible on the specifics are carried out as much as possible. 3 to 5 recommendations is not enough for our work.

Stacey: It sounds like you want a program master plan.

Manny: This is almost half of what the park does. It covers more then programming. I want to be as thorough and provide as much context and basis as possible. I recognize it is a recommendation and not a directive.

Stacey: I like it – large scale, like a program master plan.

Beth: My take is the board is going resist specific recommendations and could miss our window. Adding the framework with substance, we can meet both sides of that. This is our presentation and the meat of what we have done. We can't put our whole speech on a slide.

Tyrize: Am I pulling this for Wednesday?

Manny: It is a lot to pull together that fast.

Tyrize: We are holding to July – we have to.

Discussion of collaborative work before the presentation to the Board among CAC members in the next two weeks. Potentially meeting at Manny's office.

Memorandum

Date:

~~7:45p 5. Public comment~~ ~~Arlene Zamora~~

8:22p 6. Closing remarks and adjourn Tyrize Cox

..