

Created: November, 2019

Updated: April, 2020

Updated: July, 2020

Updated: March, 2021

Staff Lead: Emma Pachuta**Department or Division:** Strategic Planning**Project Name:** Cedar Lake-Lake of the Isles Master Plan**Engagement Level:** Consult, Involve, or Partner (See Engagement Assessment attached)

This plan serves as a guide for the community engagement process for the *Cedar Lake-Lake of the Isles Master Plan (Cedar-Isles)*, located within the Chain of Lakes Regional Park. 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 *Involve* 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.

Outline of CE Plan:	Page 1
Milestone #1 Reflection:	Page 12
Milestone #2 Reflection:	Page 16
Milestone #3 Reflection	N/A

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: Both local and regional partners were invited to share feedback on the plan, including:

- Cedar Isles Dean Neighborhood Association
- Kenwood Neighborhood Organization
- Bryn Mawr Neighborhood Association
- Lowry Hill Neighborhood Association
- East Isles Residents Association
- Cedar Lake Park Association
- The Loppet Foundation

- Met Council
- Parks and Power
- City of Saint Louis Park

1. Project Description

1a. Project Overview:

Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles are part of Minneapolis Chain of Lakes Regional Park, connecting to Bde Maka Ska on the southern border and Brownie Lake and Theodore Wirth Regional Park to the north. Visitors enjoy a multitude of year-round activities that include walking, biking, swimming, fishing, canoe/kayaking, cross-country skiing, and ice skating. The other three lakes in the Chain have been previously master planned: Bde Maka Ska and Harriet in 2017 and Brownie in 2012.

The Regional Park as a whole sees more than 7 million annual visits. It is the most visited park site in the state.

Master Plans play a critical role in the park board's mission. Characteristics of a park master plan include the following:

- Set a vision to guide long-term development and improvements to a park or group of parks,
- Guide stewardship and help ensure that park features and amenities reflect the needs of the communities they serve,
- Help ensure long-term financial and ecological sustainability,
- Involve extensive engagement with individual and group stakeholders, other community partners and governmental entities, and
- Subject to review and comment by the public, as well as public hearings and approval by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board of Commissioners.

The Cedar Lake-Lake of the Isles Master Plan includes Cedar Lake and the surrounding park land, Lake of the Isles and surrounding park land, the Kenilworth Channel, and a portion of the Cedar Lake Regional Trail to the west of Cedar Lake. The completed master plan will direct policy and design implementation for the park land around both lakes for the next 20+ years.

1b. MPRB Outcomes *(What goals, strategies, or values in the MPRB Comprehensive Plan does this project, program, or initiative relate to? What goal in the Racial Equity Action Plan does this relate to?):*

Comprehensive Plan (update after adoption of 2021 Comp Plan)

- Vision Theme #1:** Urban forests, natural areas, and waters that endure and captivate
- Vision Theme #2:** Recreation that inspires personal growth, healthy lifestyles, and a sense of community
- Vision Theme #3:** Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs
- Vision Theme #4:** A safe place to play, celebrate, contemplate, and recreate

Racial Equity Action Plan Goals

- Goal #2:** Minneapolis residents view the MPRB as an effective and inclusive governmental organization that engages all communities.
- Goal #5:** MPRB provides programs and services that are responsive and reflective of community needs

1c. Project Timeline (has been updated to reflect impacts from Covid-19):

Winter 2019/Spring 2020: Master Plan start-up: Establish CAC, preliminary communications & engagement, identify consultants for project, complete boundary and topographic survey.

Fall 2020-Summer 2021: Discovery and Assessment: work closely with the project team, advisory committees, and community groups to research, assess, map, and begin to understand physical conditions and park and recreation needs for the Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles. Engage community about the vision for Cedar/Isles.

Summer 2021–Spring 2022: Park Master Planning: Initiate master planning for the regional park as a whole. This phase will feature community events and will significantly engage the appointed Community Advisory Committee (CAC). Staff will rely heavily on input from the general public, as well as engage significantly with established neighborhood organizations and service and outreach providers that work with diverse populations.

Master Plan Approval: Spring 2022-Summer 2022: MPRB staff will work with all advisory groups, consultants, and plan partners to finalize the master plan. This will include a public comment period and final approval by the board of directors.

1d. Project Funding:

<u>Capital Sources</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Expiration</u>

Parks and Trails Legacy	\$470,000	none

2. Project Data:

2a. What are the boundaries of the community engagement area? *(For regional facilities include neighborhoods adjacent to the park and city/regional boundaries)*

The adjacent neighborhoods to Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles park boundaries include the: Bryn Mawr, East Isles, Lowry Hill, Cedar Isles Dean, and Kenwood neighborhoods.

The regional parks are funded in large part by the State of Minnesota and the Metropolitan Council. They are considered the state parks of the metropolitan region, and as such are meant to be enjoyed by everyone: people that live in the adjacent neighborhoods, people who live in Minneapolis and adjacent cities, and people visiting from outside of the region. For the purposes of community engagement, the project will focus on engaging residents who live in Minneapolis as well as some additional engagement with residents in the adjacent cities to the park: Golden Valley and Saint Louis Park.

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

Regional race and ethnicity (Met Council 2016):

- White 81.3%
- Pacific Islander or Asian 4.4%
- Black or African American 7.7%
- American Indian .1%
- Hispanic or Latino 4.1%

Regionally, almost 25% of the population is under 18 years old. Additionally, 13% of the population is over 65.

Projections tell us that communities of color, youth, and seniors will double in current demographic percentages by 2040 (Thrive MSP 2040), confirming how integral it is for MPRB to include diverse voices within the master planning process.

According to the Met Councils' 2016 Regional Parks Visitor Census Data, seniors and people of color are underrepresented among those who currently visit the regional park system.

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:

Past concept plans were created in the 1990s to master plan portions of the Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles. They include:

- the Concept Master Plan for Cedar Lake Park, completed by the Cedar Lake Park Association in partnership with MPRB in 1997,
- Chain of Lakes Comprehensive Plan: With the Future of Water Quality in Mind, completed by Michael Van Valkenburgh Associations, Inc. for MPRB in 1997.

Many elements of the plans have been implemented by MPRB and partners over the years. Local groups, such as the neighboring neighborhood associations and the Cedar Lake Park Association, have been involved with past MPRB decision-making and project implementation.

A few project examples where MPRB have partnered and/or engaged with local stakeholders and residents in the area include Cedar Lake South Beach Improvements, the Dean and Cedar Lake Parkway Trail Improvements, and most recently, neighborhood park planning for the Southwest Service Area Master Plan. We will reference the history of the area, past projects, and past engagement as it relates to conversations over the course of this project.

We will also reference citywide MPRB plans and documents as applicable, such as the MPRB Comprehensive Plan, MPRB's Racial Equity Plan, and the Minneapolis Tree Advisory Commission 2019 Annual Report.

We will refer to other city and national trends and data as is relevant.

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

Historically, the Chain of Lakes were important to the Dakota people, the original inhabitants of Minnesota. The history of the site for the Dakota people was brought into the development of the Bde Maka Ska/Harriet Master Plan and it will be important to incorporate the Dakota people's voice into this plan, as well.

Though we know how many people visit the overall regional park annually, we don't know the demographics of the people that visit Cedar-Isles. There is also a gap in understanding what people in the region (beyond Minneapolis) envision for Cedar-Isles.

There will be projects underway in the area during the master planning process for Cedar-Isles, most notably the construction of the southwest light rail line along the western board of the Cedar Lake park land. We will stay informed about internal and external project timelines and whether they will impact our master planning process.

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.

Project Stakeholder <i>(students, ethnic communities, neighborhood groups, community leaders)</i>	Outreach: How will you reach out to the stakeholder? <i>(i.e. go to parks, neighborhood listserv, engage with cultural media)</i>	Engagement: How will they participate? <i>(i. e. online survey, focus group, community open house, intercept survey)</i>	Reflecting Back: How will stakeholder groups be reflected back to about the project progress or outcomes? <i>(Posted on project website, ribbon cutting, e-blast, site visit, celebration)</i>
Local organizations in the adjacent areas, that could include but are not limited to: -Adjacent neighborhood organizations, committees, and residents of: CIDNA, KNO, East Isles, Lowry Hill, Bryn Mawr -Jones-Harrison Residence -All Stewardship Agreements Holders operating in the Project Area - St. Stephen's Services - Kenwood Elementary School - Cedar Lake Park Association	Attend community events, present to neighborhood associations, recommend CAC appointees, neighborhood listservs	Online survey, possible community open house, neighborhood organizations will be asked to help select the recommended CAC slate and to engage their community in all public meetings.	Website, direct email, GovDeliveries, news articles, flyers at community nodes

Citywide neighborhood organizations and community groups	Attend community events, recommend CAC appointees, neighborhood listservs	Online survey, possible community open house, neighborhood organizations will be asked to help select the recommended CAC slate and to engage their community in all public meetings.	Website, direct email, GovDeliveries, news articles
MPRB staff who engage audiences at Cedar Lake, Lake of Isles	Connect with Service Area Manager to identify best process	Focus group	Direct email
Park Users	Go to parks/park events, MPRB listservs, social media	Online survey, in person survey at park events	Website, Gov deliveries, news articles
Non-park users	Connect with neighborhood groups to share through their networks	Focus group, online survey,	Website, Gov deliveries, news articles
Cultural communities	Community partners with focused constituents	Experiential event/conversation(s) at Cedar-Isles, online survey	Direct communication with partners
Seniors/elders and disability community	Community partners with focused constituents	Experiential event/conversation(s) at Cedar-Isles, online survey	Direct communication with partners
Renters	Community partners with focused constituents	Experiential event/conversation(s) at Cedar-Isles, online survey	Direct communication with partners
Youth	Park-based youth programming	Experiential event/conversation(s) at Cedar-Isles, online survey	Share out with youth programming staff to share with groups

If needed, describe the outreach, engagement, or reflection methods you will use that are referenced above:

3a. Advisory Committees:

Technical Advisory Committee: This roster is a list of agencies and groups that are on the TAC
City of Minneapolis
Hennepin County
MN Department of Natural Resources
MN Historical Society
Minnehaha Creek Watershed District
City of Saint Louis Park
Cedar Lake Park Association
Audubon Chapter of Minneapolis

Additional to inviting entities to formally sit on the Technical Advisory Committee, we to present and obtain guidance from other existing TACs. A few that have already been identified include but are not limited to:

- Minneapolis Tree Advisory Committee
- Minneapolis Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Minneapolis Bicycle Advisory Committee

Project Advisory Committee: This roster is a list of MPRB departments and divisions that are on the PAC
Community Outreach
Strategic Planning
Design and Project Management
Forestry
Environmental Management
Recreation
Asset Management
Customer Service
Communications
Public Safety

3b. Will a Community Advisory Committee be required for this project, program, or initiative?
 Y/N YES

If yes, complete the following section.

CAC Charge The Cedar-Isles Community Advisory Committee shall:

- become knowledgeable about the MPRB master planning process,

- understand the history of the park land areas,
- understand and balance programming and recreation needs with natural space and preservation needs,
- understand the values and needs for the Minneapolis regional park system and regional community and the values and needs of the local community,
- to inform and listen to community about the project,
- help identify communities, organizations, user groups, populations and others that should be consulted in the engagement process,
- report back to appointers or appointing bodies, as requested, on the plan process, information presented, and possible recommendations,
- engage in working groups and subcommittees as needed,
- provide feedback on a draft plan,
- make recommendations about the project to the MPRB Board of Commissioners, and
- to abide by the CE Policy.

CAC Composition Goals:	Appointers and the CAC Selection Committee should appoint individuals that represent one or more of the identities/perspectives listed below to ensure diversity on the CAC. This is not an exhaustive or conclusive list, and categories should be based on self-identification, and not assumption.
Racial/Ethnic Diversity	White, African America, Hmong, Lao, East African, SE Asian, Native American
Generational Diversity	Youth and seniors
Socioeconomic Diversity	Renters, below the poverty line, people experiencing homelessness, or individuals/organizations that assist people experiencing homelessness
Linguistic Diversity	ASL, people that speak a language other than English at home
Diversity of interests	Recreation, youth programming, climate resilience, safety and security, active transportation, food systems, geographical diversity
People with Disabilities	People with mental, emotion, physical disabilities or individuals/organizations that assist people with disabilities
Gender diversity	Diversity of gender identities
Geographic diversity	Under the Community Engagement Policy, regional park CACs must be composed such that 50% of people live outside of neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the regional park area being planned. Seek people from across the city and outside Minneapolis
Political Experience Diversity	A balance of new voices and participants that have experience serving on boards, commissions, CACs, and committees.

CAC Selection Committee Roster: <i>This roster of groups and individuals that are participating in the CAC appointment process for the project, program, or initiative</i>	
Open call to neighborhood organizations to select and send one representative for the organization.	
Select up to five MPRB Project Advisory Team Subcommittee members	
Open call to cultural/community organizations within the region	

MPRB staff will aim to have members on the committee that represent both the local community and the greater regional area. The selection committee will meet after the deadline for commissioners to appoint to the CAC.

Community Advisory Committee:	
Committee Recommended Slate	Board Approved Slate
Adam Braun	Adam Braun
Michaela A. West	Michaela A. West
Laura Kinhead	Laura Kinhead
Nan Dreher	Nan Dreher
Aaron Shaffer	Aaron Shaffer
Lilia Theisen	Lilia Theisen
Eric Gangl	Eric Gangl
Jim Romlin	Jim Romlin
Will Stensrud **local alternate #1	Will Stensrud **local alternate #1
James Reid **local alternate #2	James Reid **local alternate #2
Constance Pepin **regional alternate #1	Constance Pepin **regional alternate #1
Board Individually Appointed CAC Members	
Commissioner	Appointee
Forney (at large)	Linda Mack
Cowgill (district 4)	Win Rockwell
Musich (district 5)	Anna Eleria
Meyer (district 1)	Agleska Cohen-Rencountre
Bourn (district 6)	Ben Surma
Vetaw (at large)	Alice Lehman
Severson (district 2)	
Hassan (district 3)	
French (at large)	Drew McGovern

Board Commissioners were requested to appoint their selected CAC member by Friday, February 14th, 2020.

4. Analysis:

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

What is your vision for the Cedar Lake and Lake of the Isles and the surrounding park land?

What is your vision for:

- Recreation?
- Programming?
- The trail system?
- Environmental sustainability/invasive species management?
- Watershed management/water quality?

What are the current strengths of Cedar Lake/Lake of the Isles?

What are the opportunities for improvement at Cedar Lake/Lake of the Isles?

How do we ensure that these parks are accessible and available to all user groups?

What concerns do you have regarding the master plan area?

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

Ensuring that we are being inclusive with the voices that are represented throughout the process will help the Park Board develop a master plan that takes everyone's needs and interests into consideration.

5. Evaluation Summary:

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)

Milestone #1: Establish Community Advisory Committee (Spring 2020)

Milestone #2: Conclusion of Discovery & Assessment (Fall 2020)

Milestone #3: Community Engagement before Final CAC Recommendation (Summer 2021)

The rest be completed at one or more project milestones, and at the completion of the project, program, or initiative.

Project Milestone 1 – Establishment of Community Advisory Committee (Spring 2020)

5a. 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.*)

There were numerous strategies that we implemented to get the word out about CAC applications, including:

- Sending several emails out to local and citywide Gov Delivery listservs
- Emails to neighborhood organizations to share with their networks
- Personal emails to local organizations and community groups
- Presentations to city and neighborhood groups
- Flyers in all rec centers around the city
- Flyers at local community nodes
- Creation of a video to market it on social media
- Shared on social media
- Presentations to city staff, city standing committees, and MPRB committees

Outcome

- 52 applications were submitted to sit on the CAC, 35 applications were from local applicants, and 17 were from regional applications outside of the project site's five adjacent neighborhoods (Bryn Mawr, Lowry Hill, Lowry Hill East, CIDNA, Kenwood).

Selecting Community Advisory Committee (CAC) members

Outreach for Selection Committee: to help identify community members to sit on the Selection Committee, the group who selected 9 of the 17 CAC members, MPRB staff sent:

- Email to neighborhood organizations
- Personal emails to both local and citywide organizations
- Presentations to community organizations about the opportunity

Outcome

- The selection committee process is a new addition to our Community Engagement Policy that was updated in March 2019. This is the third Selection Committee that was convened, the other two were for the Comprehensive Plan and Upper Harbor Terminal's CAC process. Both of those processes had one or two community representatives. Our Selection Committee had attendance from nine community organizations, a much larger cohort.

Selection Committee Process

The goal of the meeting was to select eight candidates from the applicant pool who best met the equity goals outlined in the community engagement plan. The Selection Committee had to weigh a diversity of demographics to find a pool of candidates that would best represent a broad swath of voices from the community. The committee also was required to balance local and regional representation amongst applicants as this was a regional park and the Community Engagement Policy outlines that no more than 50% of CAC members were to be from the five adjacent neighborhoods. The Selection Committee came to consensus on four regional committee members with two alternates, and four local committee members with two alternatives. One of the regional alternates has since been appointed by a commissioner.

Outcome

The current CAC Slate adopted by the Board of Commissioners:

https://www.minneapolisparks.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/climp_cac_slate_march_30_2020.pdf

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

Engagement helped to broaden demographics of folks who applied to be on the CAC. This CAC has the broadest representation in the age category, skills/interest representation, and local/regional representation than any past CAC. The Selection Committee also had both local and citywide representation.

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

VISION THEME 3 Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs. Goal to bring in broad perspectives and voices to shape decision-making

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

None were new, but we did use a broad spectrum of methods with the hopes of bringing new voices in.

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

Overall, staff heard reservations from community leaders about recruiting members from their communities to apply based on how tense CAC meetings can become. There was concern that MPRB staff would not create safe spaces for everyone to participate. Though we ultimately selected a strong pool of candidates to sit on the CAC, staff believes this perception (both real and/or perceived) hindered the racial diversity of candidates that chose to apply.

Recommendations for future processes:

Recommendation that:

- MPRB staff continue to break down barriers to support broader participation on the CAC and attend the CAC meetings: work on creating safe spaces and mediation during CAC meetings to ensure all people feel comfortable in the meeting space.
- Commissioners and staff from different departments support outreach within different communities to broaden who hears about the CAC process
- MPRB staff continue to work at creating policies and procedures that are inclusive to all voices. Currently, participating on the CAC is a two-year and 40-50 hour commitment; not everyone is able to commit to this.

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

I don't believe there were any unintended outcomes from the CE Plan during Milestone 1.

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

It felt challenging to encourage folks who did not live near the area and folks from different cultural communities to apply. For folks who don't currently visit a regional park, it was challenging to make the case for volunteering time to sit on a CAC for a regional park project. Therefore, the voice of those who don't already visit Cedar Lake or Lake of the Isles is underrepresented. This gives us a lot of information about what people currently value, and how the regional park is currently used, but will require us to have more conversations about what would draw folks to the regional park in the future.

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

Yes.

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

From my observations, MPRB planning staff have begun working to build relationships within underrepresented communities and should continue to prioritize and focus energy on these relationships to strengthen them in the future.

Project Milestone 2 – Conclusion of Discovery and Assessment (Fall 2020)

5a. 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.)*

The Vision and Discovery phase was originally planned to begin in March 2020, and due to Covid-19 state shutdowns, didn't get fully underway until late summer 2020 and continued through January 2021. Unlike other master planning projects, CAC meetings and engagement during this phase were implemented online to ensure safety during the pandemic. Staff implemented a number of strategies over the course of these eight months. Hundreds of community members weighed in; the majority of residents who MPRB has heard from have been local residents and regular, everyday users of the park system within the Cedar-Isles master plan area.

Strategies implemented in 2020 and Q1 2021 included:

1.) Hosting Virtual Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meetings

MPRB staff hosted the first round of virtual [CAC meetings](#), the "Informational" phase of the CAC process, between September 2020 – January 2021. The meetings were well attended, with anywhere from 25-45 community members alongside staff, consultants and CAC members.

Observationally, the residents who attended meetings have been folks who are following the project, have shared their input through at least one avenue, and have opted-in to receive email updates about the project.

2.) General engagement to reach a local and regional audience

Several strategies were implemented to try and obtain input from a local and regional audience.

Online feedback tools: The most popular engagement tools have been the [online survey](#) and the [online mapping tool](#). As of March 1, 2021, the online survey had gathered 635 individual survey responses and the mapping tool had gathered hundreds of data points on the project map. The links to these input tools were shared through Gov Delivery email listservs, social media, lawn signs placed within the project area and around the city, and direct emails to local and regional community leaders and organizations.

Social media photo campaign: Staff implemented a social media photo campaign from September – December 2020 to capture visual feedback and using the hashtag [#cedarisles](#). Staff promoted these campaigns on Instagram and Twitter in an attempt to reach a younger and more regional audience. Although hundreds of images have been shared by more than 80 people on the hashtag

since its implementation, staff found that the hashtag was not a successful feedback collector, but that the hashtag brought general awareness to the master plan process. Staff will continue to use the hashtag throughout the process as an awareness tool rather than a feedback tool.

Virtual Walking Tours: Staff worked with interested CAC members to create a series of [virtual walking tours](#) that are available to the CAC and the public. The goal of these tours is to help community members be able to experience the master plan project area through taking the tours in-person individually or viewing them online. The tours have been available since January 2021, shared through emails and social media blasts, and viewed almost 1,000 times. MPRB staff plan to use these tours in virtual engagement opportunities in 2021. Just recently, staff a virtual boat tour in partnership with the Lowry Hill East Neighborhood Association in March 2021.

Online events in partnership with community groups: Early on in the planning process, staff hosted an [online listening session](#) in partnership with several local organizations. Communications were shared city-wide and the partners focused communications within their networks, as well. Over 60 residents attended and were invited to share their feedback.

In Spring 2021, staff reached out to neighborhood associations city-wide to partner and hope to partner with additional organizations to gather community feedback. As mentioned above, MPRB partnered with the Lowry Hill East Neighborhood Association to host a [virtual boat tour](#) and capture feedback from residents from Lowry Hill East. About 20 residents attended the tour alongside LHENA committee members. Communications for this event was shared through MPRB listservs. We have had several other neighborhood associations interested in hosting a similar event later this Spring and Summer.

In-person engagement: Staff attempted to host in-person engagement through two separate strategies in Fall and Winter 2020. The first engagement strategy was to speak with visitors at East Cedar Beach. By the time staff had clarified Covid-19 safety guidelines for in-person engagement, the weather had cooled down and residents had stopped visiting the beach. Staff also attended school lunch pick-ups at Whittier Rec Center in Winter 2020 to speak with parents picking up lunches. The lunch pick-ups were sparsely attended, and it felt awkward to try and engage folks around a master plan at a time when most people are not interested in meeting new people while running errands. Staff hopes to implement additional in-person engagement in Summer 2021, but of course, it will depend on the status of the pandemic.

Evaluating audience of online engagement

Staff did not collect demographic data of participants during each engagement strategy but did collect demographic data for the online survey participants, the most frequently used engagement tool. You can see staff's analysis of the demographic results [here](#).

Overall, observations of who has engaged with us overall mimic the demographic data outlined in the survey: we are getting very strong engagement from the local residents in the area, who are regular park visitors of Cedar-Isles. The demographics of the adjacent neighborhoods lean higher in homeownership, older in age, and whiter than the general population of Minneapolis. Staff anticipated this may be the case, and to be able to reach a broader audience, both demographically and regionally, also attempted focused engagement with focused community partners.

3.) Focused engagement of specific audiences and/or demographics

Historical and Contemporary Indigenous Context: Staff hosted a listening session with the Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) in October 2020 to gather some general input about the history of the site and where to seek out additional information about significant sites of significance for the Dakota community. MPRB will be hosting a second listening session with the THPOs to discuss the site further in March 2021. This feedback will inform future decision-making in the master planning process.

Paid engagement for community groups and individuals: Staff posted a paid Community Collaborator opportunity in October 2020. Six applicants applied and four applicants were selected by a selection committee, comprised of Cedar-Isles CAC members and MPRB staff, to support engagement within focused audiences. Staff is currently working with the selected applicants to complete their engagement and share findings by May 15th, 2021. These findings will be included in the community engagement input that will be shared at future CAC meetings. Staff will be posting a second Community Collaborators round to capture additional feedback.

Community partnerships to reach focused audiences: MPRB staff anticipated that there would be several demographics outlined on pages 6-7 in the community engagement plan who would not opt-in to virtual engagement or CAC meetings. Staff identified partners organizations who would hopefully be interested in supporting MPRB engagement to their communities and proactively reached out to work with them on engagement.

This list included:

- Internal MPRB groups and programming
- Senior living facilities
- Social service and/or housing organizations
- Youth organizations

- Schools
- Neighborhood associations in areas of the city who may not already be engaging with the project
- Committees who focused on people with disabilities

Most groups, both internal and external, have either not responded to requests to partner or reported that they were unable to partner on Cedar-Isles engagement due to barriers, capacity, and challenges that their communities and programs faced during Covid-19. These realities have impacted staff's ability to reach more diverse audiences outside of community members who are opting in to participate in CAC meetings and online engagement.

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

Based on our observations of who has engaged with us online and through demographic data [analysis](#) of the online survey, staff are confident that a large swatch of the local residents within the adjacent neighborhoods were effectively reached, but additional targeted engagement needs to be done to reach different audiences that have not sufficiently heard from, such as people under the age of 25, elders from cultural communities, people who rent their home, etc.

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

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

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

Staff implemented quite a few new virtual engagement strategies for Cedar-Isles, including:

- **Virtual walking tours** co-created with CAC members and community leaders
- **Recording and posting content videos for CAC meetings** (MPRB, consultants, and community partners): this videos have allowed folks to watch content outside of attending the actual meeting
- **Virtual CAC meetings:** MPRB had not hosted virtual CAC meetings before the Covid-19 pandemic, so staff has worked to create new guidelines and formats for online meetings. Programs like Miro and Mural have been used to visually brainstorm and document conversation topics on-screen
- **Crowdsourcing Reporter mapping:** A new mapping tool for collecting location-based input. A similar tool has been used in previous projects, which served as a model for creating this application in-house using existing programs that were available

- **Online listening sessions and open houses:** MPRB staff have historically hosted open houses and listening sessions in-person, and staff adapted these models for zoom during Covid-19

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

As mentioned during the original Milestone #1, it has been very difficult to engage several different demographics named on pages 6-7, specifically folks who do not visit this park regularly and people who do not live in close proximity to the master plan area.

Staff recommendations for 2021:

- Extend focused engagement through partnerships and community collaborators funding to reach a broader audience through Q1 and Q2 of 2021: staff understands that Covid-19 will most likely still be a barrier to engagement in 2021, however, staff believes that there may be new opportunities of in-person engagement and partnerships that weren't possible in 2020
- Staff recommends that once this additional community engagement work has been completed, staff then host the Vision and Values meeting (an engagement compilation and analysis will align with that meeting).

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

An unintended positive outcome has been to build capacity to engage residents online more effectively. We plan to use much of what has been created outside of the pandemic. For example, staff anticipates offering a combination of in-person and virtual meetings and events even after the end of the pandemic.

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

We have found that while virtual platforms makes it easier for some residents to attend meetings and engage, it also has made it very challenging for staff to engage residents that we would normally engage during a master planning process by "meeting them where they're at," or showing up in-person to cultural events or community conversations to get input. Virtual platforms are a challenging way to engage many demographics; to name a few audiences where virtual engagement has not been an effective strategy includes: people who do not have access to a personal computer or internet, people experiencing homelessness, people where English is not their first language, people who do not currently visit the Cedar-Isles area.

Additionally, we found that several community organizations that we reached out to about partnering on this project were not able to support engagement due to the safety or economic impacts from Covid-19, and/or the impacts of the uprisings from the murder of George Floyd. 2020 was an extremely challenging year for many in the city of Minneapolis, and not all community members were able to and/or saw value in participating in a master plan process. Though it's difficult to know or certain whether these same organizations would have engaged with us if we weren't in the middle of a pandemic, there were numerous barriers specific to situations in 2020 that staff were unable to overcome to obtain broader community engagement for the master planning process.

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

For a normal engagement year, we were adequately staffed. Staff is not clear whether having additional resources in 2020 would have resulted in a different outcome for the engagement challenges that were experienced.

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

It is important for the Minneapolis Park Board to do the work to build trust within communities, resulting in ongoing, long-term relationships at every level of the organization. Building new relationships for each project is a slow process and can feel tokenizing or transactional to community members in the moment, so having organizational relationships to work within is integral in implementing successful engagement that reaches a broad and diverse audience. This felt especially relevant during Covid-19, as staff did not have the ability to show up in-person at community conversations or events. Building these relationships at every level of the organization will ensure that community voice influences all aspects of MPRB' work, from policy to programming to hiring practices.

Project Milestone 3 – Community Engagement before Final CAC Recommendation Summer 2021

5a. 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.)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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