Community Engagement Plan

Date of Board P+C: November 6, 2019
Date of Board Approval (for CAC’s only): N/A
Date of Most Recent Update: N/A

Please fill out this form if your project, program, or initiative includes community engagement beyond the “Inform” level. All Community Engagement Plans should be filed as Petitions and Communications with the MPRB Board of Commissioners and submitted to the MPRB Engagement Portal on SharePoint (A link to the Community Engagement Portal can be found at https://minneapolisparks.sharepoint.com/planning/SitePages/Home.aspx.)

Staff Lead: Christine Downey

Department or Division: Strategic Planning Dept.

Project Name: Review and Development of MPRB Land Policies and Procedures

Engagement Level: CONSULT

This plan serves as a guide for the community engagement process for the Review and Development of MPRB Land Policies and Procedures project. The plan may be modified as circumstance warrants during project duration. Substantial modifications are to be communicated to stakeholders and the MPRB Board of Commissioners.

As required by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Community Engagement Policy, this project requires a Community Engagement Plan because the project falls under the CONSULT category of community engagement for which MPRB is required to obtain stakeholder feedback on project, initiative, or program analysis, alternatives, or decisions. This CE Plan was used with a GARE Racial Equity Tool Kit framework.

Key Stakeholders should be engaged in the creation of this plan. This is to be filled out before the CE Plan is submitted to the Board as a P+C. Please explain how they were engaged:

A draft copy of the Community Engagement Plan was emailed to the Project Review Team. The Team’s feedback was elicited prior to submission to the Board.

1. Project Description

   1a. Project Overview:

   Complete scheduled review of MPRB Land and MPRB Land Acquisition Policies and consider further development policy and procedural changes to associated aspects of the Policies. This project does not include discussion or review of the MPRB Naming Policy.
1b. MPRB Outcomes

This Policy review and development relates to the following vision and goal statements in the MPRB 2007-2020 Comprehensive Plan:

Vision Theme 3: Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs.

Goal: Focused land management supports current and future generations.

This Policy review and development relates to the following goal in the Racial Equity Plan:

Goal: #2 - Minneapolis residents view the MPRB as an effective and inclusive governmental organization that engages all communities.

1c. Project Timeline:

The MPRB Land Policy MPRB land Acquisition Policy are due for revision March 26, 2020.

1d. Project Funding:

MPRB General Fund, through departmental budget.

2. Project Data:

2a. What are the boundaries of the community engagement area?

All Park properties, with focus on park adjacent residents/landowners in the city of Minneapolis.

2b. What are the demographics of the community engagement area?

Data limitations make it nearly impossible to obtain reliable demographic statistics for just park adjacent residents/landowners in the city of Minneapolis.

Much of these Policy reviews apply to the city of Minneapolis as a whole; therefore, demographics for Minneapolis only from 2017 data are displayed.

81.1% of the residents were over the age of 18.

Males represented 50.6% and Females represented 49.4% of the residents.

The median income was $55,720

The average household size was 2.29.
43% of housing was owner-occupied and 57% was renter-occupied.

Residents that had a high school or higher education was 89.3%.

The percentage of working age adults who are employed was 77.4%.

40.1% of residents were of color and 59.9% were white.

21.7% of residents speak a language other than English; 10.2% of residents speak English less than "very well."

** Source: Minnesota Compass

2c. List any key findings or excerpts from relevant plans or policies that are informing this project, program or initiative, especially if community was engaged in the policy or plan:

The previous MPRB Land Policies.

A White Page completed in 2017 detailing other jurisdiction’s encroachment policies.

2016 ALTA Survey of Bde Maka Ska and Lake Harriet.

2d. What are the data gaps? What additional research needs to be done to understand the project stakeholders and project scope?

Topics/issues that were not answered by previous MPRB Land Policies.

Lack of complete list of all Properties that may potentially encroach on park land.

Lack of ALTA Surveys for all parks identifying potential encroachments.

Demographics of park adjacent residents/landowners.

3. Community Engagement:

The MPRB supports the use of a variety of techniques to interact with and obtain information from stakeholders. Outreach and research tools and methods can be applied for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to the following:

a. Evaluate success and measure community impact of existing programs, services or facilities.

b. Gain stakeholder insight and perspective regarding development of a new program, service or facility.
c. Proactively identify or explore park and recreation trends or ideas.
d. Determine essential services to be provided for a community or park area.
e. Query stakeholders when proposing or revising policy.
f. Resolve persistent conflicts or problems.
g. Educate or inform the public on proposed changes, initiatives and projects.
h. Reflect on projects, programs and initiatives after adoption by the Board or report on how community input has been integrated.
i. Learn the history of local context and community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Stakeholder (students, ethnic communities, neighborhood groups, community leaders)</th>
<th>Outreach: How will you reach out to the stakeholder? (i.e. go to parks, neighborhood listserv, engage with cultural media)</th>
<th>Engagement: How will they participate? (i.e. online survey, focus group, community open house, intercept survey)</th>
<th>Reflecting Back: How will stakeholder groups be reflected back to about the project progress or outcomes? (Posted on project website, ribbon cutting, e-blast, site visit, celebration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Park Adjacent Landowners</td>
<td>*Mailing</td>
<td>Online survey Public hearing</td>
<td>Posted on project website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General City Population</td>
<td>Project website/ Gov Delivery</td>
<td>Online survey Public hearing</td>
<td>Posted on project website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities/ Agencies</td>
<td>Targeted email</td>
<td>Direct email Public Hearing</td>
<td>Posted on project website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developers</td>
<td>Targeted email</td>
<td>Direct email Public Hearing</td>
<td>Posted on project website</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If needed, describe the outreach, engagement, or reflection methods you will use that are referenced above:
3a. Advisory Committees:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Review Team</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This roster is a list of MPRB departments and divisions that are on the PAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning- Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Outside) Legal Counsel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Police</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Advisory Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>partner agencies, utilities and RE developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minneapolis Public Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most active real estate Developers in City of Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Analysis:**

**4a. What questions will you be asking community to respond to in your outreach and engagement?**

This is a chance to inform community of the Policy Review process. We will allow community to ask questions and gain clarification on changes being considered, improving transparency. Additionally, we will request feedback on the draft policies.

**4b. How will your community engagement outreach, engagement, and methods make MPRB a more equitable system?**

Creating more comprehensive Land Policies that are more broadly known. Also providing a transparent process and increasing the Policies’ accessibility and the community’s trust of the review process.
5. **Evaluation Summary**: To be completed at one or more project milestones, and at the completion of the project, program, or initiative.

**ONCE ADOPTED, WE WILL EVALUATE.**

5a. Identify one or more key project milestones when project evaluation will be performed (i.e. Draft design review, draft policy review, project mid-point)

Just before the executive team review.

5b. **Who was engaged during the process?** (i.e. demographic info from online survey participants, the CAC, and community engagement whenever possible. Refer back to Section 2 in the CE Plan and how your engagement reflects the diversity of the community in the engagement area.)

5c. **How did the engagement inform the project outcome?** (i.e. public tabulation and amendments following a public comment period)

5d. How did the project and engagement fulfill a goal or strategy in the MPRB Comprehensive Plan?

5e. Please describe any new or innovative engagement methods used during the process:

5f. What recommendations do you have for future engagement around this topic, park, or area?

5g. What, if any, were the unintended outcomes of your CE Plan?

5h. Were there any barriers to successful implementation of your CE Plan?

5i. Were you adequately resourced, including staff support, expertise, and funding?

5j. If applicable, how can this project, program, or initiative, or MPRB continue to partner and deepen relationships with underrepresented communities?