



**Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board**  
**Parks for All 2021 Comprehensive Plan**  
**Community Advisory Committee (CAC) Meeting #5**

5/12/2020 4:00-6:00pm  
Zoom Online Video Call

**CAC Members Present:** Carly Bad Heart Bull (CAC Chair), Alyssa Olson, Dan Miller, Daniel Cheng, David Hartwell, Mary McKelvey, Lolita Davis Carter, Hilary Lovelace, Zev Radziwill

**CAC Members Absent:** David Motzenbecker, Eleanor Skarbalus, Mira Klien, Lynne Crockett, Gerrod Williams, Jake Virden, Shree Varuna

**MPRB Staff Present:** Carrie Christensen (Project Manager), Adam Arvidson, Siciid Ali, Madeline Hudek, and Alyssa Gilmore

**Public Attendance:** Around 10-15 public present throughout the meeting

**WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION**

The Parks for All Community Advisory Committee Meeting #4 (CAC #5) was called to order around 4:03pm by Carrie Christensen who gave the floor to Carly Bad Heart Bull (CAC Chair) for welcome and introduction. Carly started by thanking everyone for joining the virtual meeting, and for all their participation, engaging with, and reviewing the plan. Carly went over the agenda for the meeting and explained the goal of the meeting was to gather further input on the plan as a CAC and hear from the community. Carly explained that this is the last formal CAC meeting, but that there are opportunities to meet together in the future as a celebration of the launch of the Comprehensive Plan after Board adoption.

Carly read through the Group Agreement and Online Meeting Ground Rules [*Staff Note: These can be found in the Meeting #5 presentation*]. Carly asked everyone to do quick introductions, sharing their name, role, and one word that describes something they're excited about seeing in the plan. Some words that were shared were: mission, welcoming, comprehensive, connectivity, trees. Carly read through the role of the CAC, reminding everyone what the CAC is tasked with.

Siciid talked about project updates, giving everyone an overview of the timeline for the project and the next steps. Siciid thanked people for participating in the Park Summit in May [*Staff Note: review materials generated at the Park Summit here*]. The feedback from the Summit resulted in the draft Comprehensive Plan that is currently out for public comment. Siciid explained that there is a survey where folks are able to make comments on the draft plan [*Survey is available in English, Spanish, Hmong, and Somali*]. Staff will review all the comments collected after the public comment period closes on January 18<sup>th</sup> and make revisions where necessary based on the feedback. Then the plan will go before the Board of Commissioners for

adoption, hopefully by late February or early March. Siciid also gave an overview of the engagement process for this project, have heard from at least 5,000 people to date, using tools like dream park cards, online surveys, CAC Meetings, PACs, Workgroups, etc.

## **PUBLIC OPEN TIME**

Siciid led open time, explaining that this was an opportunity for the public to share comments with the CAC, explaining that staff would not be responding to questions at this time, but there would be further opportunities in the meeting for discussion. Members of the public were asked to use the chat box to write their name or 'open time' to indicate that they would like to speak.

(Public) New to Minneapolis, really overjoyed with park and recreation opportunities. Joining the meeting a little late, link on the website wasn't working correctly missed agenda, asked if the plan had already been presented? Also expressed interest in joining budget conversations.

(Project Staff) Will be going over the plan overview next.

(Public *in chat*) Expressed interest in listening to Board's budget conversations.

(Project Staff *in chat*) Board meeting information:

<https://www.minneapolisparks.org/about-us/leadership-and-structure/board-meetings/> [Staff Note: by the time these notes have been posted, the 2021 budget will have already been adopted, information about the MPRB budget can be found [here](#)]

(Project Staff *in chat*) asked if others had issues with the Zoom link on the MPRB website.

(*in chat*) Some people explained the link didn't work for them, Project Staff confirmed that the link on the [Storymap](#) was correct and coordinated with other MPRB staff to update the link on the project update page.

## **PLAN TOUR**

Carrie thanked Siciid and Carly for opening up the meeting. Carrie reminded everyone where in the project process the CAC is at, and what content was generated at the last CAC Meeting [Meeting Materials can be found [here](#)]. The CAC generated policy ideas that were presented alongside the ideas generated by Workgroups and Forums at the weeklong Virtual Park Summit [Materials can be found [here](#)]. Based on the feedback at the Summit, started drafting the plan in front of everyone, now at the Public Comment Period.

Adam started the tour of the Comprehensive Plan, explaining that the plan is organized in 3 chapters. Chapter One (1) explains what the plan is, how to use it, where the organization has been, the legacy moment the organization is in now, and the futures that MPRB needs to plan to for. Chapter Two (2) is Mission, Vision, Values, Goals and Strategies (the bulk of the plan, the policy direction). Chapter Three (3) is about Implementation and Measurement (how the organization is going to measure success of the goals and strategies, and how to report out).

Adam explained that the plan includes a Native Acknowledgement statement, as well as strategies that bring the organization beyond a statement, bringing Native Acknowledgement into programming and procedures. Adam read through the nine (9) futures that are being planned for, explaining that these futures were developed based on extensive research about current trends and forecasts. He explained that some futures are realities the MPRB hopes to mitigate through the policies contained in the document, and that these futures aren't absolute but are necessary to be aware of moving forward.

Adam highlighted the language changes to the Mission Statement. Added language about nonhuman beings that we cohabit with. Added language about dismantling historic inequities in the provision of park and rec opportunities; have to actively dismantle the inequities that have been part of policy for years, have to center around dismantling in core work, not enough to say work will be provided in an equitable way. Adam didn't read off the vision, which is a more robust statement that covers where MPRB hopes to be by 2030. Adam reiterated that all sections of the Comprehensive Plan, not just the Goals and Strategies, were available for public comment. Adam read off the six (6) values that will guide how the MPRB will work as staff, and how community and other partners will work with the MPRB.

Carrie and Adam then talked about the Goals and Strategies of the plan, the most policy-oriented aspects of the plan that provide the guiding policy umbrella for the Park Board for the next 10 years. The Goals are where the MPRB wants to go, and the Strategies are how the organization will get there. They highlighted the strategies that the CAC directly influenced as they went through the nine (9) Goals of the plan. Adam explained that these Goals and Strategies will apply to folks and departments across the MPRB and that the plan will help de-silo the organization because staff will be utilizing Strategies scattered throughout the Goals and more directly seeing how the Comprehensive Plan ties to their work.

Adam gave a tour of Chapter Three (3): Implementation and Measurement. Highlighting the Recreation Center Model information included in the chapter. The new model (City wide web model) is a modification of the model in the 2007 Comprehensive Plan. The new model works to continue to break down barriers between neighborhoods, allowing for more intentional offering of services citywide in the areas where it's most important to do so.

## **CAC DISCUSSION**

Alyssa shared their screen as the CAC began to discuss the draft Comprehensive Plan. Comments that were recorded in the PDF of the Draft Plan and added to the CAC Feedback Survey (recorded as public comment) are listed below by section of the plan the comment refers to. This list also contains feedback from the chat box. Staff responses were not recorded as survey feedback but will be used to help inform revisions and provide responses to the public comments received.

## **Chapter 1: Process, current profile, futures**

- The document is beautiful, great design
- Confused by the similarity of the graphics for values and futures. Delineate which ones the Park Board controls and the other that controls how the Park Board can operate.
- When Land Return opportunities come up, the Tribal communities should have a seat at that table, sometimes that's not the case. What's the MPRB's role when conversations come up about Land Return, how can MPRB be part of the conversation? [Specifically talking about acquisition—how to support Native representation is at the decision-making table] Need to ensure relationships and practices are embedded on a continual basis, across roles/departments. Have to go BEYOND a statement; what comes next?  
(Project Staff) Pointed to Goal 3, Strategy 11—if parkland is disposed, need to prioritize public benefit, specifically call out Indigenous communities. Pointed also to Goal 1, Strategy 3 which will help deepen the work done around Native Acknowledgement at the MPRB; as well as Goal 8 (Cultivate a thriving workforce) which will help make sure that relationships and practices are embedded. MPRB still needs to go through district court and follow State processes for land disposition. This does not change the process, just the prioritization internally for MPRB.
- [In reference to pg. 11—Gentrification and Displacement Statement] Are property value and tax increases near park renovation/amenities a major driver in displacement? If so, does the MPRB have power to be proactive with the city/county about keeping taxes low even if home values go up? What about at resale?  
(Project Staff) This Comp Plan is calling for us to be proactive with the City and County about strategies around anti-displacement, may have to do with tax policy (the MPRB does not have the power to set this). Plan explicitly calls the MPRB to be proactive and work with partners in advance of improvement where there is risk. Know where there is risk for physical or cultural displacement, these areas are mapped (by partner agencies).

## **Chapter 2: mission, vision, values, goals, and strategies**

- Kudos, I could really see the CAC impact on the plan in the Goals and Strategies even before we went through it with the highlights.
- Goal 1, Strategy 4; question about how broad some of the strategies seem to be. Would like to see specific examples included in the document (ex. Food trucks in parks from people of diverse backgrounds)  
(Project Staff) The food truck example given is an illustration of how the plan can be utilized. Strategies kept broad so that there are many ways to accomplish them, MPRB looking across departments to implement the strategies creatively.

- Like the icons for the Values and Futures to help de-silo and connect the 9 Goals to the Values and Futures. Wondering if it would be helpful to have strategy icons to see where they are repeated among the goals as another way to de-silo. There are so many strategies—is there a prioritization that the MPRB will publish? There are so many Goals and Strategies, how are the priorities set, where are resources focused?

(Project Staff) Directed to pg. 67—every 4 years the Strategic Directions are set by the Board of Commissioners, which will influence which strategies will be prioritized to accomplish those directives. There will also be influences at an annual basis (ex. setting budget and work plans with performance reviews for staff). Will be tracking progress on the strategies, measuring success, and keep MPRB accountable. Reporting will happen out to public through a dashboard and the Annual Reports.

- Goal 4: Need to assign more responsibility about where the MPRB is responsible for outcomes v. when the MPRB is reliant on partnerships/is more of a participant. How is success with partnerships defined? More specifics about MPRB role will add to level of accountability.
- Goal 4, Strategy 9: Sounds a bit political, clarify the role of the Park Board in mitigating the harmful effects of community development projects.

(Project Staff) Recognize that the MPRB doesn't control housing but can still have a hand in that via the work we do in parks. MPRB needs to be at the table to help mitigate the effects of additional developments and capital improvements. Need to be aware of differences between neighborhoods and the different risk factors, need to be active participants in pre-strategizing how to stave off displacement that may come with park improvements. Gave example of process for Luce Line improvements, worked with Harrison Neighborhood, TPL and City to do studies in advance to help the neighborhood remain stable. Strategy recognizes that this work cannot be done in a vacuum and requires partnership with other agencies. Project Staff pointed to the Gentrification and Displacement Statement on pg. 11, which further names that the MPRB has a role in this work. The City of Minneapolis has anti-displacement policies in its Comprehensive Plan, hoping there is synchronization that removes political concern between the two agencies.

### **Chapter 3: Implementation and measurement**

- One thing added to the Mission is “dismantle historic inequalities”, which is appreciated, however when I look through metrics/measurement in the implementation section of the plan, most of the examples of data are generic, system level data. Wondering how measurement may reflect this key change in the Mission.

(Project Staff) Implementation is a work in progress, still figuring out the exact metrics and indicators for how the goals will be accomplished. The examples

included in the plan are data that is currently available, as data becomes more sophisticated, will continue to refine the metrics and indicators. There is a gentrification and displacement statement included on pg. 11 that addresses MPRB's role in taking action on gentrification and displacement, with policies that support that stance.

- In maintaining/continuing relationships with community, metrics should come from the community. Should continue to ask, what does success look like to community? How are folks showing up to the table to inform the metrics, how are relationships evolving over time?

(Project Staff) Pointed to Goal 1, Strategy 17: Elevate voices of those most impacted by health disparities to inform policies, programming, activities and services in parks.

- Curious about the measures of success in terms of preservation of habitat (quality not just quantity) and wildlife in parks. How will we be sure they are as important, or perhaps more important in natural areas than people. Feel like the priority is reflected in the strategies but need to also include measurement Need a habitat quality indicator on page 63 (goal 6).

(Project Staff) Will look at Goal 2 and Goal 6 to look where language could be strengthened. Deep prioritization of ecological systems in this plan. Intersection of equity and ecology is an underlying theme in this plan that has emerged as a through line across workgroups, CAC, public.

(Project Staff) Can make habitat quality more robust in Goal 6 Implementation and Measurement section. One of the things that might be referenced as a metric is natural areas management plans, will provide quality ratings associated with all natural as in the system. Could re-evaluate to see if that quality rating is improving or not.

- Curious about the web model of recreation centers to bridge neighborhoods. It is interesting and promising. Wondering exactly what the web model means, does it mean that the MPRB will locate certain recreational centers in different places, or does it mean different types of programs the recreational centers will implement?

(Project Staff) The map on pg. 70 shows all existing rec centers and the changes proposed by service area master planning efforts [*Staff Note: you can find all the service area master plans here*]. Not envisioning a major shuffle of infrastructure, what currently exists in the system will have improvements that are guided by this section. Key piece (pg. 73) is that recreation centers will not operate in isolation//small groups. Encourage staff to know the community around them, know what they can and can't offer, and seek opportunities across the city. Interconnections are encouraged and required looking at the system as a whole, instead of small groupings.

- The recreation center web model would be a great area to collaborate with Minneapolis Public Schools and with transportation, as they are trying to figure out how to get people to programs without depending on cars.

### **General Comments and Questions**

- Given the importance of maintaining and improving environmental health of our parks, what changes does this plan take over other plans? (Referring to Ecological System Plan, Natural Areas Plan)  
(Project Staff) Pg. 34, Ecological Systems Plan and Natural Areas Management Plans included in the context of Goal 2 (Steward a continuum of recreation and nature). Plans work together, operating at different scales. The Ecological Systems Plan is a more detailed plan on how to improve the performance of the entirety of the whole park system. Natural Areas Management Plans are detailed on the ground, site specific plans.
- Does the Natural Area Planning process include community engagement? When will there be community engagement in that process?  
(Project Staff) Because it's a technical management plan and inventory, there is not community engagement on this plan. This is an assessment of our existing natural areas, with a classification and rating system that will be used over time.

### **ENGAGEMENT: CAC OUTREACH PLAN**

Project staff asked that the CAC members help extend the word about the draft Comprehensive Plan Public Comment Period. Asked CAC members to utilize the landing page and the tools provided there to commit to at least one element of outreach (ex. posting link on personal Facebook page, talking to Neighborhood Org, etc.) Many CAC members committed to sharing through their social media and some to their neighborhood organizations.

### **THANKS AND NEXT STEPS**

Carly shared her appreciation and thanks to the CAC for their participation throughout this process during this especially challenging year. Expressed that this will be a living document, something that incorporates so many people's feedback, values, and goals for the world they want to live in and be a part of creating. Carly encouraged everyone to provide input on the plan, submit thoughts, and continue to stay involved. Carly shared the words "Mitakuye Owas" which is a Dakota term that recognizes how everything/everyone is connected as people, animals, the land.

### **ADJOURN: 6:03pm**