

## CHAPTER 2: Community Involvement

This chapter provides an overview of the outreach conducted for the plan and community involvement in the development of the document.

### APPROACH

The concept of producing an urban agriculture land use plan was developed during the first phase of Homegrown Minneapolis which involved over 100 stakeholders representing the city, schools, parks, local businesses, neighborhood groups, non-profit organizations, and residents. That effort culminated in a City Council directive to undertake this planning process.

Because of this previous work, public outreach and brainstorming typically undertaken at the beginning of a plan process had already taken place. Thus, staff focused on working closely with a steering committee and technical advisory committee and bringing in specialized input through a series of “topical discussions.” When a draft plan was complete, it was made available for a public review period which was widely advertised.

While this planning process was underway, the Implementation Task Force that was established for the second phase of Homegrown Minneapolis met regularly and conducted additional outreach for several Homegrown Minneapolis related efforts including this plan. In March 2010, information about the planning process was made available at a Homegrown Minneapolis Stakeholder meeting and in an update about Homegrown Minneapolis efforts made to the City Council. In December 2010 another Homegrown Minneapolis stakeholder meeting was held at which the public review period for the plan was announced to approximately 70 attendees. In addition, the Homegrown Minneapolis Coordinator sent out e-mails announcing key opportunities for public involvement in the plan to a mailing list of over 300 people.

A project website was established ([www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/urban\\_ag\\_plan.asp](http://www.ci.minneapolis.mn.us/cped/urban_ag_plan.asp)) and draft work products and meeting materials were posted throughout the process.

### STEERING COMMITTEE

A project steering committee was established in January 2010 and met approximately monthly throughout the year. The committee provided guidance on the scope of the plan and the public involvement process and provided specialized knowledge about urban agriculture related activities. The committee originally consisted of:

- Maggi Adamek representing academic research
- JoAnne Berkenkamp representing urban agriculture small enterprise
- David Denham representing youth programs
- David Nicholson representing farmers markets interests
- Kirsten Saylor representing community garden interests
- JobyLynn Sassily James representing neighborhood/resident interests
- Jeff Ricker representing neighborhood/resident interests
- Valerie Martinez representing the American Indian community
- Bob Patton representing state agriculture programs
- Patty Bowler representing local health programs

- David Motzenbecker representing the City Planning Commission
- Robin Garwood representing Council Member Cam Gordon

While not all members were able to participate for the whole process, a core group met regularly. All meeting agendas and summaries from the steering committee meetings can be found in the appendices.

### **TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

A project technical advisory committee was also established in early 2010 and met approximately monthly during the development of this plan. The role of the Technical Advisory Committee was to provide technical review and input and to inform the departments or organizations that they represent about the plan.

The Technical Advisory Committee was made up of:

- Clyde Kane, Minneapolis Public Schools
- Jennifer Ringold, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
- Elizabeth Wieland, U of M Extension office/ Hennepin County
- Courtney Tschida, University of Minnesota
- Elfric Porte, CPED Housing
- Aly Pennucci, CPED Planning (zoning)
- Tim Jenkins, Regulatory Services
- Greg Goeke, Public Works
- Kristen Klingler and June Mathiowetz, Health and Family Support

### **TOPICAL DISCUSSIONS**

In order to explore a variety of topics to be addressed in this plan, a series of “topical discussions” were held to inform the recommendations. These discussions involved City staff and key people interested in a particular topic. The meetings were advertised to the Homegrown Minneapolis Implementation Task Force, steering committee, and technical advisory committee; and while anyone was welcome to attend, the goal was to keep the conversations focused and generate a thorough discussion rather than to broadly inform people about a topic. The following topics were covered over a series of months:

- Zoning and non-commercial growing (community gardens and private yards)
- Zoning and commercial growing
- Innovative design (incorporating growing into new development)
- Rooftop farming
- Farmer markets
- Animals
- Local foods and restaurateurs
- Economic opportunities and challenges to urban agriculture

Many of these meetings focused on narrowing down recommendations found in *The Homegrown Minneapolis Report* that were to be explored in this plan. Summaries of all of the topical discussions can be found in the appendices.

## **PUBLIC REVIEW**

A public comment period for the draft plan opened on December 9, 2010. The plan was placed online and hard copies were placed at the Central, Hosmer, and Pierre Bottineau libraries. A hard copy and e-mail notice were widely distributed to encourage people to review the draft and provide written comments.

In addition to the Homegrown Minneapolis stakeholder meeting mentioned above, two community meetings were held during the comment period to discuss the plan content. Upon the closing of the public comment period on January 31, 2011, all of the comments were reviewed and the document edited as appropriate. Approximately 80 comment letters were received. The vast majority of letters were very supportive of the plan. Many suggested additional efforts that could be undertaken. These comments were summarized and presented with the draft report to the City Planning Commission and the City Council for their consideration.

- Page intentionally left blank -