

Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting Two

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board North Service Area Master Plan (NSAMP)

06/15/2017 6:00 – 8:00pm
Harrison Recreation Center

CAC members present: Jonathan Palmer (Chair), Angelina McDowell, Erica Dani, Kesha Walker, Mike Brennan, Olivia St. Martin, Philip Kelly, Kimberly Caprini, Georgianna Yantos, Jodi Gustafson, Kevin Thompson, Tim Davis, Brett Buckner

Approximately thirteen members of the general public attended the meeting:

Staff, consultants, and speakers present:

Adam Arvidson (MPRB), Colleen O'Dell (MPRB), Siciid Ali (MPRB), Brad Aldrich (Consultant), Emily Neuenschwander (Consultant), Terry Minarik (Consultant),

1. Introductions

The second community Advisory Committee (referred to in this document as CAC #2) was called to order at 6:15pm by Jonathan Palmer, the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Chair. The CAC members were all asked to introduce themselves and share which neighborhood or association they were from and representing. Following the CAC introductions were introductions from the guest attendees, Minneapolis Park Board Staff, and Consultant Team.

2. Welcome/Agenda

Adam Arvidson, Director of Strategic Planning and project manager, gave an overview of the agenda, and iterated that this CAC meeting would be largely decision making about how they would want to see the process continue.

[NOTE: The CAC was notified in CAC#1 that they would be tasked with selecting Community Connectors for the North Service Area Master Plan (NSAMP). Community Connectors are members, organizations, or businesses from the community who would like to engage the community about parks and assist in the NSAMP community input process as a separate or supported process and were able to negotiate a contract and fee for doing so. Community Connectors Request for Proposals were advertised to local organizations and community groups and were open to the public. Community Connectors were able to submit an application that would be reviewed and selected by CAC members.]

3. Community Connector Selections

Adam reiterated to the CAC important criteria to consider when selecting Community Connector (CC) proposals – Does the proposal add value? Does it engage directly with north side residents? Does it reach underserved groups? He asked CAC members to announce if they had any conflicts of interest regarding the received CC proposals. CAC Chair Jonathan specified that there was nothing that would prohibit the selection, but that transparency is important in the selection process. CAC members and proposers stated what may be a conflict of interest and the process continued. *[NOTE: a document with all disclosed conflicts is on file at MPRB]*

Adam referred to a previously assigned individual CAC voting poll (Yes/No/Maybe) that was compiled into one total vote spreadsheet. He mentioned that this spreadsheet was just a starting point for discussion and that the CAC had discretion to choose CCs as they saw fit.

Adam mentioned that the CCs with a large number of CAC “Yes” votes totaled \$68,000-\$69,000 which was higher than MPRB intended on spending (\$50-55k target). He asked logistically if it was okay to start discussion and voting with the proposals in the “Yes” category. He handed off the discussion to CAC Chair Jonathan.

The CAC discussed the “Yes” proposals and recategorized them as still “Yes” or “Maybe.” Then CAC members were asked to advocate for any proposals that were in the “Maybe” or “No” categories and suggest why they were intrigued by the proposals. A continued discussion process eventually produced a slate of 11 CC proposals, with recommended modifications in funding for two of them:

- Asian Media Access, with funding reduced from \$20,000 to \$10,000
- Assata Brown
- Cathy Spann
- Cleveland Neighborhood Association
- C.E.O. Basketball League
- ENRG Freestyle Dance
- Juxtaposition Arts
- NoMi Roots, with funding increased from \$1000 to \$2000
- Northside Residents Redevelopment Council (NRRC)
- Redeemer Center for Life
- Slow Roll Bike Tours

DISCUSSION – Motion to Approve Community Connectors

- The Asian Media Access (AMA) Funds are still very high
- Still don’t know how many people are reached
- Talk about experience in getting users
- The level of professionalism makes the funds requested more understandable
- What is the \$10,000 funds (\$10,000 below ask) is not enough and they deny the contract? Can we choose others?
 - Adam (Project Manager): Yes, the CAC would come back and fill the \$10,000 gap
- (AMA) does quality work and engagement

At 7:34 the CAC voted in favor of the Community Connector slate.

4. Public Comment

- Noir Fitness Representative wanted to know why they weren’t chosen
 - It was unclear how input would be gathered
 - Adam said he would take down names, emails/contact information and can talk more with CCs that were not chosen outside of meeting time



- Can we rally for proposals?
 - No the CAC has already approved.
- Thanks for giving the public engagement opportunities to the community
- Transit modes and connections are important to the plan and would like to see NSAMP including information from other projects
 - Adam (Project Manager): MPRB has a planned CE event at a Transit Meeting Open House: Penn Avenue Community Works

5. Subcommittee/ Work Time

Adam (Project Manager) asked the CAC if there were any subcommittees that would like to be formed to focus attention on specific topics that might otherwise consume the CACs time. He mentioned that in previous MPRB CAC processes including RecQuest and the Calhoun/Bde Maka Ska-Harriet Master Plan, Racial Equity subcommittees were formed. He asked the CAC – Are there any subcommittees that this masterplan should support?

Subcommittees get help and support from MPRB for meeting spaces and resources, but they set their own agenda. Their ideas/proposals get integrated into the CAC process later in the project.

CAC Chair Jonathan, asked if subcommittees needed to get established now or if they can be established at any point in the NSAMP process. Adam answered: Yes they can be established at any time. Jonathan asked if the CAC needed to support subcommittee recommendations. Adam answered No. Jonathan asked if Subcommittees had to include a CAC member and Adam answered that Yes, at least one CAC member had to be involved.

- Seven subcommittee were suggested by the CAC:North Commons Park
- Bassett Creek Valley
- Farview Park
- Satellite Parks (Parks without Recreation Centers)
- Public Art
- Native American / Indigenous engagement
- Activities

6. Choose your own Adventure

At 7:56pm Adam briefly went over a rough NSAMP schedule. He then brought up that there were some exercises that MPRB and Consultants would like the CAC to do at a future meeting. He also mentioned that the CAC had previously requested some group tours, and a data/information review. Adam presented several content and format options for the next few CAC meetings and asked the CAC to discuss which “Adventure” they would like to take with the next 2 CAC meetings.

The CAC majority selected option B – which included a meeting dedicated to a planning exercise with data presentation, (no dedicated time for subcommittees) and a Parks Tour.

Announcements and Next Steps

- The CAC should look out for future scheduling emails (The Park tour, CAC #3)
- Subcommittees should meet and work on their respective topics

Adjourn (8:08pm)

Handouts: Agenda, PowerPoint presentation, Community Connector Submittal Summary