



COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Thursday, March 30, 2017

6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Headquarters

Meeting Notes

Committee members present: Arlene Zamora – Chair, Bob Fine, Al Jueneman, Brian Nalezny, John Lilly, Beth Hart, Emmanuel Ortiz, Katrina Nygaard, Delano Lee, Ede Holmen

Committee members excused: Ali Warsame, Jovita Morales, David Kaplan, Kathy Engen, Ahmed Ismail, Larry McKenzie, Adelheid Koski, Lynne Crockett

Guests: none

MPRB Commissioners present: none

Staff/consultants present: Jamie Neldner, Tyrize Cox, Christy Tuuri, Adam Lares

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*) 6:05
 - Round of introductions of CAC members, resignations, MPRB staff, new CAC Chair
2. CAC Rules of Order (*Tyrize Cox, MPRB*) 6:09
 - o Address the previous meeting and changes occurring, reaching out to groups with missing voices
 - Looking into meeting protocols for high level contribution, respect and people being heard – how do we facilitate that?
 - Lilly: additional meetings if needed. Three new people present tonight and there will be more new people, and we have lost some ground. Keep faces at the table, and that is huge for me, engagement and working through tough things.
 - General Question – 18 total members, only 6 of the original are here, why do you keep losing members?
 - Cox - life happens, volunteerism is dependent on free time in the evenings; not uncommon to have ebbs and flows. We would like to keep the group at the table as consistent as possible.
 - Jamie: majority of people have had major life changes – travel for work or moving. The reality is that there has been a great deal of change in the last year.

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.

- Cox: Plan is to meet separately with the new members individually to not have a constant ‘restart’ with a new member. We have to build into what we do to ensure forward movement.
- Cox: To address if we need a quorum? We are not a decision making body. CAC may drive how they function in that sense, whether majority vote or consensus. Imposing Roberts Rules would challenge how welcoming we are to new members. Does anyone have a strong feeling?
 - Al: We just got done with Master Plans, how did past practice work?
 - Brian: Opinion - recording votes gives the commissioners an accurate picture. Minority report may be good information as well.
 - Katrina: Use Fist of Five – technique to vote how much you agree on things.
 - Cox: is consensus what you want? Ie - “I want this, but for the good of the group I can support the decision to do this”. Sounds like the group really wants to make sure that the voices in the room are heard and captured.
 - Emmanuel - public opinion is equally important as others and those should be taken into record and shared.
 - Arlene: I agree with Emmanuel – we all should be heard moving forward. I have done Roberts Rules, and I would like to avoid that.
 - Cox: I hope we allow flexibility to adjust as things arise.
 - Brian: Is there anything that we wouldn’t report?
 - Cox: we would not include disparaging comments, but will absolutely include feelings to capture and explore. We want to be true to exactly what you say as long as it’s not disparaging.

3. MPRB Recreation Programming (*Jamie Neldner & Adam Lares, MPRB*) 6:15

- Intent is to share what programming means to us and how we navigate recreation programming throughout the city.
- Slide One – Recreation Center Funding: in depth conversation will occur next month
 - Nuances need to be presented tonight as a foundation, but we urge you to save your budget questions for next month with a presentation from Larry Umphrey, Director of Recreation Centers and Programs
 - Center Budgets are Formula Based – on three tiered hour system (based on building hours open to the public). Busier/more complex centers are open longer.
 - Majority of our funding is rooted in staffing
 - Budget is based on how many hours during the week the facility is open to the public.
 - This decision was made many years ago - three tiered hour model to reduce expenses
 - Based on usage, programming, and square footage
 - Beth Question: are we relooking at that?
 - Not tonight, but could be looked into by the CAC and have these discussions.
 - Beth: example of Peavey in the 1990’s. Poor funding, now it is very active and limited services and limited space.
 - Limited program funding
 - Funding was distributed using the Equity Matrix from the historic NPP20 funding agreement with Minneapolis Council –

this funding goes directly to neighborhood parks- NO MONEY GOES TO PROGRAMMING. All for capital improvement (roof, fields, etc.)

- Amenities and activities also dictate the funding – gymnasiums, warming rooms, etc
- Questions:
- Katrina: If funding is tied to what your park offers, how do you help your park get to a different funding tier?
- Jamie: the budget stays the same; amenities/funding not used at one park are moved to another. This decision making is rooted in data.
- Brian: how do we add more facilities?
- Jamie: conversation starts early to build into the budget early in the year.
- Manny: are they reflective of how much revenue a facility may bring in?
- Jamie: Not a factor. We will have a presenter at our meeting next month on how we permit our properties. Tim Grate will be here to talk about this specifically. He will be able to address those questions, but no, it is not a factor in a budget.
- Arlene: I am skimming Recreation Standards – are we going to talk about how a director is reaching out to a community when budget is given? Is there a standard throughout MPRB? Certain things they have to do?
- Jamie: There is not a specific rule or regulation. There is a checklist.
- City Wide Programs – we distribute from a central location (Slide 2)
 - Three groups – MPRB Programs, Contracted, Programming Partners
 - MPRB Programs: Youthline, Teen Teamworks, Athletics, Recreation Plus, Nite Owlz
 - Contracted: Computer Labs, Revolutionary Sports, Specialty Camps
 - Programming Partners: Minneapolis Institute of Arts, Inner City Tennis, Minneapolis Public Schools
 - Programming Standards – shared a bit of history and chart of hours for programming for each age group
- Moved into Measurements (Slide 3)
 - Flexibility
 - Efficiencies
 - Tailoring for community needs
 - Facility limitations
 - Promotes innovation
 - Standards – developed in 2012, revised in 2013. Existence is important.
- Service Area Manager Role (Slide 4)
 - 5 recreation service areas
 - South service area has a large number of rec centers, so that particular service area is split into 2 recreation services areas from a management perspective - upper and lower.
 - 5 MPRB service areas across the city – north, northeast/southeast, south, southwest, downtown
 - 5 Recreation Service Areas (from a managerial standpoint) – north (includes Loring), northeast/southeast, upper south (includes Elliot), lower south, southwest

- Seasonal activity brochures are developed 3 times per year - winter/spring, summer and fall
- Service Area Manger Role
 - Manage pricing
 - Keep geographical balance
 - Resource sharing
 - Monitor cancellations
 - Decrease duplication of services
- Adam speaks about role of Recreation Facility Specialist (Slide 5)
 - Responsibilities:
 - Facility Management
 - Budget Management
 - Permits
 - Staff/Volunteer Supervision
 - Overreach/Engagement
 - Programming
- Programming for Dynamic Communities (Slide 6)
 - Understanding Complexities
 - Demographics
 - Outreach and engagement
 - Community Input
 - Differences and challenges
 - Wants and needs
 - Outside influences
 - Beth – it seems that the parks need more community involvement, and there are great programming differences in parks based on the discretion of the director and what the community needs are
 - Cox - it is our expectation that there is community involvement and interaction (like facebook pages - one way to hear from users).
 - Arlene- there should be regulation on the Director for reporting that community involvement was used.
 - Jamie – no current reporting on this particular detail
 - Beth- activity guidelines need to be readdressed, concern of lack of programs at parks near my home. Programming offered at the park is concerning. If a program does not exist, kids will not play.
 - John – rec specialist assigned to a park is not necessarily from that neighborhood.
 - Katrina – what do we do with language barriers?
- Programming for Dynamic Communities (Slide 7)
 - Implementation
 - Tailoring programming
 - Staffing (identifiable)
 - Community driven programming
 - Collaborative programming (ex. Churches in the area)

- Program Resources (Slide 8)
 - Limited Resources
 - Doing more with less
 - Multiple site responsibilities
 - Satellite sites
 - Seeking alternative funds
 - Community driven programming
 - Collaboration (resources sharing)
 - Access and affordability
 - Seasonably changing programs
- 4. Public Comment Period (*facilitated by Arlene Zamora, CAC chair*) 7:52
 - Public comment: no comments.
- ~~5. Childcare at CAC Meetings (*Tyrize Cox, MPRB*)~~
- 6. Closing Remarks (*Jamie Neldner, MPRB*) 8:03
 - Homework handed out, instructions and feedback will be emailed.
 - Arlene - Best meeting so far, she learned a lot!
- 7. Adjourn (approximately 8:04pm)

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.