

Contents

December 16, 2013	2
November 18, 2013.....	5
October 21, 2013.....	8
September 16, 2013	19

December 16, 2013

North Minneapolis Greenway Outreach Steering Committee

Meeting Notes

Attendees: Ebony Adedayo, Alliance for Metropolitan Stability; Jim Skoog, resident; Matthew Hendricks, Twin Cities Greenways; David Kang, representing Hmong American Partnership; Ferome Brown, Urban Youth Conservation; Cedric Oko, Urban Youth Conservation; Malik Holt, Minneapolis Bicycle Coalition; Georgianna Yantos, resident; Michael Bash, Redeemer Center for Life; Sandy Loescher, Sandy Green Realty and resident; Russ Adams, Alliance for Metropolitan Stability; Sarah Stewart, Minneapolis Health Department

Agenda item	Notes
Review results of previous greenway engagement (focus on data from north Minneapolis residents)	Skipped – meeting attendees were either involved with the previous efforts or had recently viewed a presentation of the results
Report backs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant info session • North First event • Engagement and tactical urbanism trainings 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grant information session – At the session, Ebony and Sarah reviewed the greenway concept, what the previous engagement has looked like, and the application. The application deadline has been pushed back to January 3. Attendees suggested that we hold a training for grant recipients so that everyone is on the same page for engagement; they also suggested that we develop a video that grantees can use in engagement efforts. Jim mentioned that a video of north Minneapolis residents discussing Milwaukee Ave already exists (see: Greenway video), and that parts of the existing video might be useful for a new video. Safety concerns were part of the discussion. Malik, Matthew, Jim, Ebony and Sarah have done a lot of outreach to potential applicants, and the word has gotten out. <u>We are looking for more review committee members to attend a review session the 3rd week of January; let Ebony know if you are interested.</u> Funds are available for this first year of the grant; additional funds may be available in years two and three, but that is to-be-determined right now. • North First event – Kenya and Russ talked for 4 minutes at Neighborhoods First event at the Capri Theater and share the basic concept of the greenway; it was really warmly received • Ebony, Malik and Sarah attended two trainings last week – one on community engagement and the other on tactical urbanism. They share some lessons learned.
Begin planning “greenway experience”/open streets event for May 2014 -Discuss Minneapolis Bicycle Coalition’s open streets grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Malik shared that the Minneapolis Bicycle Coalition has submitted an application to Blue Cross for funds to hold open streets events in 2014, including an open streets event on the proposed greenway route. The MBC is asking for a letter of support for this application. Open streets events involve closing down a street for a day so that community members can use the space for other things, like walking, biking, yoga, performances, etc. For the greenway, the open streets event could be

<p>application to Blue Cross (which includes an event on the proposed greenway route)</p>	<p>used to help people visualize what might be built. The MBC has done several opens streets events before and brings that set of skills and experiences; they would work with the greenway committee to plan the event. <u>The committee agreed to provide a letter of support, which will be written and signed by Sarah and Russ (as the facilitators of the committee). The letter will be emailed out for final approval by the committee.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The group generated ideas for a greenway event (which would include open streets, and possibly closing part of the route for a longer period of time): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Have no street parking on the proposed route for an extended period of time, with pop-up parking lots at the ends of blocks (concerns about cars being broken into) ○ Include the experience of the ½ and ½ option on part of the open streets event route ○ Provide opportunities for people to talk about safety concerns (and explore things like the cameras that are downtown); ○ Organize a ride or bike parade on the proposed route ○ Have park benches for elderly people; think about how to involve them ○ Talk about jobs for community people in this and other economics opportunity, asset for the community ○ Figure out how community engagement efforts will tie into block clubs ○ Like the idea of streets closed for more than one day; creating a temporary park ○ As part of the door-knocking, ask whether or not people would like their street to be involved in a pilot project – use this to ID segment of greenway route to be closed for a longer period of time ○ Can this tie into Bike Walk Week – May 11 – 17th ○ Could tie into parking day on Sept. 20 ○ Could have a contest for different blocks that are closed and how they “decorate” for the greenway ○ We need to invite people who are not supportive of the greenway to come and experience it as well. ○ Parking day is an example of how people have created park space on city streets (google parking day to see images)
<p>Discuss community engagement expectations for funded groups and review draft survey – Sarah/Ebony</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The survey will be used in all outreach efforts to collect data in a uniform way • The group discussed the importance of educating community members and preparing them for the survey (otherwise people won’t be interested in answering the questions). Ideas: Fliers and information with the door knocking; a pre-survey; some type of educational tool; a press strategy with newspapers and KMOJ; leaving materials at the door before door knocking; informational meetings about the concept and survey. We should stress the potential benefits of the greenway so that

	<p>people know what's possible, but in a way that doesn't bias their opinion either way.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We should ask on the survey if people have heard about the greenway before today • Committee members will review a draft survey electronically
<p>Plan meeting schedule going forward – when will we meet? Discuss what else the committee needs to accomplish:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Finalize a survey tool for outreach b. Discuss coordinated communications efforts/plans c. Monitor outreach efforts; identify and address gaps d. Develop plans for May greenway event e. Receive updates on TAC f. Other things? 	<p>The committee ran out of time for this; Sarah will request feedback on this via email</p>

November 18, 2013

North Minneapolis Greenway Outreach Steering Committee Meeting Notes Folwell Park Recreation Center Multipurpose Room, 3:30-5:00

Attendees: Ebony Adedayo, Kenya McKnight, Russ Adams, Bill Fellows, Sam Rockwell, Georgianna Yantos, Sarah Stewart

I. Review results of previous greenway engagement (focus on data from north Minneapolis residents)

Agenda item postponed due to late meeting start. Sarah will email out the PowerPoint with a summary of engagement results to date. The data in the PowerPoint focuses specifically on north Minneapolis residents.

II. Discuss changes made to outreach framework

The group approved the changes to the framework. (One typo will be corrected – the word ‘intuition’ will be replaced with ‘institution’.)

III. Finalize outreach application and timeline

Ebony shared a draft application for community groups to apply for funding to conduct outreach.

Kenya shared concerns about the equity of the application, since neighborhood organizations are funded at a higher level (\$5,000) than community groups (\$500-\$3,000), and neighborhood groups receive funding to do outreach from other sources.

Russ shared reasons that neighborhood groups have been given some preference for funding: they will do door knocking along and near the route, and neighborhood groups must be part of the discussion if the project does move forward at some point.

The group came up with the following ways to address these concerns: the macro and micro contract applications will be merged into one application and reviewed in the same way, neighborhood groups will be encouraged to use the funding to increase staff capacity by hiring local residents to help with outreach, and the review committee will include neighborhood residents as well as representation from NCR and/or members of the Neighborhood and Community Engagement Commission.

Kenya stated that her concerns still stand, but she was OK moving forward.

Ebony shared the anticipated timeline for the applications and funding decisions: the application will be released before Thanksgiving, the applications will be due Dec. 23, A review committee would meet the week of January 6.

The review committee – neighborhood residents will be invited to participate; Robert Thompson from NCR will also be asked, as will Northside residents from NCEC (Brittany Lewis or Jeff Strand). Georgianna volunteered to be a part of the review committee.

IV. Discuss groups to reach out to (for steering committee and outreach application)

The group brainstormed lists of organizations to inform of the funding opportunity (and organizations to engage in general). Sarah will compile the lists; committee members will be asked to help conduct outreach to inform organizations of the opportunity and encourage them to apply.

	Organizations to inform of the funding available for community outreach	Organizations to engage in general
Seniors	Minneapolis Public Housing (senior committee)	Shingle Creek Commons (part of Common Bond Communities)
	Minneapolis Highrise Residents Council	Hamilton Manor (MPHA senior housing)
Youth	YMCA	Youth Farm
	North High School	Capri/PCYC
	Boys and Girls Club	
	Hospitality House	
	Venture North	
African American residents	Minneapolis Urban League	
	Major Taylor	
	Massid An-Nur (Somali and African American Muslims)	
	New Salem Church	
	Sub Zero Collective	
	One Step Family Shop	
	African American Leadership Forum	
	Urban Youth Conservation	
Latino residents	Latino Economic Development Center	
	CLUES	
	Church of the Ascension	
SE Asian residents	Lao Assistance Center	SEAC
	CAPI	HMAA
	AEDA/Hmong American Partnership	Hmong International Academy
Bu sin	West Broadway Business Coalition	Lowry Avenue Business Association

	NEON/Neighborhood Development Center	Victory Business Association
Other orgs	NorthPoint	FMR
	Minneapolis Bicycle Coalition	Minneapolis Bicycle Coalition
	Venture North	Bicycle Advisory Committee
	Juxtaposition Arts	St. Olaf
	NOC	UROC
	Northside Fresh	Twin Cities Greenways
	Shiloh Temple	
	HIRED	

V. Plan meeting schedule going forward

This agenda item was not covered because there was not time for it.

October 21, 2013

Greenway Outreach Committee Meeting North Commons Park

Attendees: Matthew Hendricks (Twin Cities Greenways), Kenya McKnight (Old Highland resident), Bill Fellows (Public Works), Bob Carlson (Public Works), Jim Skoog (Bicycle Advisory Committee, Folwell resident), Sam Rockwell (Blue Cross Center for Prevention), Kathy DeKrey (Northside Residents Redevelopment Council), Roberta Englund (Folwell Neighborhood Association, Webber-Camden Neighborhood Organization), Cathy Spann (Jordan Area Community Council), Russ Adams Alliance for Metropolitan Stability), Ebony Adedayo (Alliance for Metropolitan Stability, Bill Dooley (Minneapolis Bicycle Coalition Diversity Taskforce), Malik Holt (Minneapolis Bicycle Coalition), Sarah Stewart (Health Department)

1. Recap of last meeting; (see handout 1)

2. Draft Committee Structure and Guidelines

- Main questions: How large should the outreach committee be, who does the inviting?
- See Public Works being lead on Technical Advisory Committee; Alliance for Metropolitan Stability and the Health Department lead on Steering (Outreach) Committee
- Steering committee – planning and overseeing on outreach process (see handouts 2 and 3)
 - o 4 neighborhoods have a seat, and two residents from each neighborhood have a seat. How do we make sure that the diversity of the North Side is represented?
 - o Who decided on the route and was it the choice of residents or outside (residents of Mpls who are not a part of the North Side)? Is there space to think about other options since people in the community did not help shape that decision?
- Roberta: do you intend to invite the elected from the neighborhood wards?
- Russ: meetings will be open, guests open to attend at any time
- Public works: elected will be invited to attend TAC meetings
- Kathy D: it's a little early to have residents to participate, evening meetings with food is always a good thing
- Russ: People can send proxy's in their place
- Question: can we switch the meeting schedule to earlier in the month so we don't run up against holidays?
- Russ: don't want to lose the momentum
- Kenya: Consider alternative ways for people to can participate where technology is available
- Russ: want transparency and openness in the meeting

- Russ: be mindful of what the total vote count is on the committee. We think that the way this is playing out is that there will be more of a community vote tally than the public agency. People come together and agree.
- Kenya: a guiding principle – best interest of N Mpls residents and stakeholders placed at front of work over and above any institution or public agency. Commit ourselves to continue to work for common good, allow for flexibility in conversations. Wants to send points about the committee for collaboration and things to consider. Make sure we do not harm to the collaboration, we are a team and we build from that. We can't do this work without some historical context of the community and what has happened here. Culture here of missing accountability. Part of what we are doing here is a lesson in accountability, teaching people to put the community and their needs first.
- Russ: having conversations about how do we grow. If engagement shows that there is substantial support for the project, important that we continue to grow.
- Sarah: Next step after meeting to reach out to people.

3. Draft outreach framework and timeline – goals and principles (see handout 4)

- Russ: a lot of the information here from the conversation we had. We want to be as objective as possible in gathering information. Don't want to be biased so having a script. People doing the outreach being fair in laying out the project in a way that is not biased in either direction
- Public works: good principles. Honoring previous engagement efforts piece, add any previous inclusions. Agree on what that is, define it succinctly. Might be questions about that.
- Russ: map says preferred greenway route, change it to proposed so that people know that there is room to talk about it.
- Kathy D – is there a way to show what the other alternatives were so people see what the other options are.
- Sarah: other options were kind of arbitrary as well.
- Roberta: taking into consideration what has come before. A lot of outreach that created a lot of benefits and stressors. If we are going to acknowledge previous engagement efforts, need to say proposed route. There had been a lot of people in the neighborhood engaged before group came together
- Russ: at next meeting, let's take a look at the alternatives. Have people look at the map and draw a line where they think the greenway might work and make it most direct as possible. See where people land.
- Kenya: Question is why are we here. Not everything worked so well the first time. Comment – what I am most interested in is respecting the work that was put in before who engaged in the process, but most interested in respecting the intelligence of the people that we are going to engaged. If we are thinking about getting input on an existing decision or get input about where people want it to be. Can we make another decision? Be clear about how we are doing the engagement, the clearer we are, more people will receive you

- Russ: TAC could come back and say that the proposed route has problems. The geographic parks might also have problems. There may be a way to look at this differently, keep engagement activities flexible enough to do engagement.
- Kenya: ultimately what goes forth to the city council, city makes a decision based on all of the factors. Not a decision that is solely up the neighborhood groups, ultimate decision from city council and the residents that come from the neighborhoods
- Public works: people doing outreach may want to have flexibility, implies that someone else doing outreach may not. May be helpful to have the same message. How much flexibility is there and what conclusions are we honoring. How are we narrowing this down?
- Matt: some segments of the route have been positively affirmed. Neighborhood group could say that this is the route we are focusing on. Where is there heavy support and where were people divided
- Roberta: Neighborhood orgs are recognized participants of the city of Mpls, seek opinion of the residents. It is not a case where 10 – 12 people sit in a room and assume they are making a decision for the people. Result of citizen participation. Paid to go out and engage in multiple topics
- Kenya: in the next meeting, can you provide with what those routes are before we get into the engagement. Flexibility for how people do engagement .
- Kathy: senior and disabled residents along Irving concerned about the route, what do the other routes present. Helps our discussion more. Able bodied individuals can maneuver more. Knowing where there was some flexibility may be great
- Sarah: there are no final decisions.
- Kathy: Public Works should be able to tell us by now works or not so we don't have these conversations
- Public Works: from a preliminary planning side, it works
- Kenya: discussion is good and helps us in the target outreach
- Sarah: is there anyone interested in helping to refine the document outside of the meeting?
 - o Kathy at Jordan

4. Money conversation:

- Sarah: we have 43k for micro-contracting for neighborhood groups and other groups. Some of it may need to support these meetings with residents for food, etc. 20 – 24k for neighborhood orgs and their outreach about \$5 -6k for each neighborhood groups so that outreach can be robust and thorough. Remaining \$19 to 23k reserved for micro contracts as small as an organization convening a certain group together for a dinner, bike ride, different than door knocking, meeting people where they already are. Getting people to work with different cultural communities, youth, etc. will this help us reach our goal of reaching into the community?

- Roberta: If the intent of the greenway is the benefit of N Mpls and its residents, bike community has a role. Last month's meeting benefit of bike community person to person. If you separate the piece out what do you accomplish. If this group can get their heads around a presentation of the greenway and
- Kathy: I didn't hear that, we are still hammering out what the expectations are. W=You are asking if the funding is enough. For us, it is. Jordan and NRRC has already talked about partnering and we will bring matching dollars from our budget.
- Kathy D: not sure if we will bring matching dollars but there is enough
- Kenya: Don't think it's fair but willing to move forward. Neighborhoods are resourced to do this work, should see themselves as allies that can add resourced to the table. Engagement work is not a part of every group or agencies. I support Neighborhoods getting resourced but think we need to think about this.
- Russ: Hearing that their needs to be some expectations with the MOU. Hearing that folks are looking for what the neighborhood groups are putting in beside the micro grants and joint partnering opportunities. We can put that in. We are not just going to hand folks money. We need to reach renters, people of color, people with disabilities, seniors and others to see what they want. Get out there and make contact with as many folks as they can. Going to try to be respectful of as many people as we already can. Not a lot of money.
- Kenya: Don't forget that this is one of many projects that residents are faced in their communities'
- Sarah: we have work to do. What is our frame and process for getting people the funds and start reaching out to the other folks.
- Kenya: What happened to the existing committee?
- Sarah: some of those people are either at this table or will participate in TAC

Handout 1: Greenway Outreach Committee Meeting 9/16/13 – Notes and follow-up

Who to reach out to:

- Faith-based leaders (work with Venture North on this?)
- Camden Lions/Bears – have successfully reached out to the Hmong community in partnership with Webber Camden in the past
- Council member aides and/or resident reps for council members
- Neighborhoods Organizing for Change
- Park Board and specific park sites (to the TAC for technical questions, like ownership and maintenance; to the outreach committee for thoughts on how the greenway would be used and how to reach people to talk about it)
- Boys and Girls Club, other youth serving organizations
- Nice Ride
- Minneapolis Public Schools (specific sites or the district?)
- Neighborhood and Community Relations (NCR)
- Per Matthew – issue an all-call to groups that are out there
- Per Jim – reach out to residents, not just agencies

Ideas:

- Have a project committee composed of a Technical Advisory Committee and a Community Engagement Committee
- Do a greenway experience – shut down part of the route for a period of time (maybe a weekend) with temporary changes, like planters.

Engagement principles:

- Honor the previous engagement efforts and what was learned from them
- Be careful not to set unrealistic expectations – this process is exploratory, and a greenway is not funded
- The priority voices in this are north Minneapolis residents
- Explain how the greenway would connect with other projects, like 26th Ave. and River First
- The engagement process should be grassroots-driven, and done neighbor to neighbor
- Hire residents as it makes sense (e.g., for door-knocking)
- Hold microgatherings, but also meet people where they already go (e.g., attend existing gatherings)

Questions to answer through engagement:

- Does the community want this?
- Where do we start building?

Key messages:

- This is an exploratory planning process. Right now, this project is not funded and there is no timeline for building a greenway.
- This greenway connects the regional parks (but kind of side-skirts north commons)

Outreach plan –

(need to develop goals/objectives/targets)

- Youth outreach component (engaging youth serving organizations)
- Neighborhood outreach component (door-knocking and small-scale events (maybe even street closings)– more intense along the route, but expanding a certain distance from the route as well; can use existing greenway listserv to get volunteers)
- Cultural outreach component (work with culturally-based groups to reach people; attend existing gatherings – faith-based orgs, culturally-based orgs)
- Overarching communications strategies and agreed-upon messages

Issues to resolve:

- More clearly define the role of the group – neutral outreach vs. coalition in support of the greenway
- Right now we're more focused on neutral outreach, education, and engagement. What's the home for people who like this idea and want to see it move forward?
- How can we build flexibility in for different neighborhoods that are in different places?
- Who should be on the committee vs. who should be actively engaged and how to keep the committee at a manageable size while still being able to incorporate a diversity of opinions?
- How much additional \$ neighborhood groups need vs. how much they should do with their existing funding and capacity? (consult with NCR)
- Consider how this project ties in with other projects in the area, e.g., work on 26th Ave.
- Who is the spokes-organization on this? Or at least on the different components of this project?
- What are the lines of communication between the people/organizations in charge of carrying this thing out?
- What would it take to close down streets a-la-Times Square?

Handout 2: **DRAFT Greenway Planning Committees Structure, 10/16/13**

We propose two committees involved in the greenway planning process:

The Outreach Steering Committee (see separate draft membership guidelines):

- This committee will be charged with planning and overseeing the community outreach process.
- Membership will include city staff from Public Works and Health, the Alliance for Metropolitan Stability, neighborhood organizations from the 4 neighborhoods along the proposed route, 2 resident members from each neighborhood, a youth-serving organization, a school, a park located on the route, a business owner or business association, Twin Cities Greenways, the Minneapolis Bicycle Coalition, and Major Taylor Bicycling Club. (*Note: this list reflects current membership plus proposed additional members*). Anyone is welcome to attend meetings and provide input, but members will be responsible for attending all meetings and making decisions.
- Decision-making will be consensus-based. However, if the group is not able to come to a consensus, decisions will be made by voting, with a simple majority ruling. All committee representatives will have one vote (each organization will only have one vote, no matter how many representatives they have on the committee). Most decisions will be made at committee meetings, but there may be times when committee members are asked to make decisions electronically.
- The committee will meet monthly through December 2013 and will establish a regular meeting schedule thereafter. Meetings will be held on the 3rd Monday of the month from 3:30-5:00 at a location in North Minneapolis. Through December, meetings will be held at North Commons Park.
- Three non-city members from this committee who also sit on the TAC (see below) and will ensure that the TAC incorporates community feedback into the technical planning work. Other committee members are welcome to attend TAC meetings as well.
- Health Department and Alliance for Metropolitan Stability staff will facilitate this committee, including scheduling meetings, developing draft agendas, taking notes, etc.
- Committee members may be asked to volunteer to take on tasks between meetings
- Once the TAC begins to meet, part of each meeting agenda will include an update on the work of the TAC, as relevant.

The Technical Advisory Committee:

- This committee will be tasked with advising Public Works on the technical aspects of the greenway planning work (including, but not limited to: design, water management, network connectivity concerns, maintenance issues, selecting a consultant, reviewing a consultant's work, etc.)
- Public Works will convene this committee. Meetings time, frequency, and location are TBD.

- The members of this committee will serve an advisory role. Public Works will be the final decision-maker and will incorporate the TAC's opinions into its decisions.
- This committee will review the input gathered via community engagement and will incorporate community input into its work.

Handout 3: Draft Guidelines for serving on the greenway outreach committee

- Treat everyone with respect: Express opinions responsibly by focusing on the issues and not attacking anyone personally. Value the contributions of others. Stay focused on the person who is speaking and keep side conversations to a minimum.
- Share all relevant information: present all information that might affect how people solve a problem or make a decision. It ensures that all team members have a common pool of knowledge from which to make informed choices
- Participate fully. Be present during the meeting and do not use laptops or other devices unless you are taking notes or looking up relevant information.
- Stay focused on the topic. Again, this shows respect of other participants' time. Stay on topic unless the group chooses to change topics.
- Success depends on participation: share ideas, ask questions, draw others out, do not dominate the conversation
- Please attend monthly meetings. If you are not able to make it, please send an organizational representative in your place or weigh in on meeting materials sent around electronically.
- This is a collaborative recess. Community members are expected to be active participants. We want to foster a culture of shared ownership and shared work.

Handout 4: **DRAFT** Greenway Outreach Framework, 10/18/13

Engagement principles: This engagement process...

- Is grassroots-driven, conducted neighbor to neighbor
- Prioritizes the voices of north Minneapolis residents
- Is adaptable to meet needs of different neighborhoods, different cultural groups, and other constituents, but still provide people/organizations with the same information and opportunities to weigh in.
- Is as objective as possible, so that people are able to consider what's possible with this project without feeling pressured or directed to have a particular opinion.
- Honors previous engagement efforts and input gathered
- Avoids setting unrealistic expectations about what can or will happen
- Provides a context for how a proposed greenway might connect to other projects in north Minneapolis

Goals:

- North Minneapolis residents, agencies, institutions, and businesses are well-informed about potential greenway plans and the possible impacts on the community. This includes communications about the results of Public Works' feasibility study.
- North Minneapolis residents, agencies, institutions, and businesses representing the diversity of north Minneapolis indicate their support for or objection to a greenway and provide input on any greenway plans.
- Community input is incorporated into the City's greenway plans so that the plans meet the needs and interests of community members.

Objectives:

Households and individuals

- 100% of households directly along the proposed route are visited up to 2 times and provided with information about the greenway (either receiving materials handouts or having a conversation with someone associated with the project)
- 100% of households within 1-2 blocks of the route receive information about the greenway (could be mailing, fliering, door-knocking)
- 50% of households directly along the route provide input the greenway (both owners and renters included in total #, when applicable)
- Respondents approximately represent the diversity of north Minneapolis (based on % renters/owners, % of racial/ethnic groups represented among all respondents compared to the greenway neighborhoods as a whole)

Note: as of January 2013, there are an estimated (non-vacant) 443 single family homes, 51 multi-family residential buildings, 2 multi-family apartment buildings, and 2 group residence directly on the proposed route.

Organizations (Institutions, agencies, businesses)

- 100% of institutions and businesses directly along the proposed route are visited up to 2 times and provided with information about the greenway (either receiving materials handouts or having a conversation with someone associated with the project)
- 100% of organizations within 1-4 blocks of the route receive information about the greenway (could be mailing, fliering, door-knocking)
- 50% of institutions and businesses directly along the proposed route provide input the greenway

Note: based on a Google maps search, there are approximately 26 organizations directly on the proposed route and more than 50 within 4 blocks.

Key questions to answer:

- What are the potential impacts (positive, negative, and neutral) of a greenway on the community?
- What is the community support or opposition for the greenway, including the proposed route and designs?
- What changes would community members like to see to the proposals? What amenities and designs would residents, institutions, and businesses like to see in a greenway, if it is built?
- What are respondents concerns about the greenway, and how might these concerns be alleviated?

Key messages:

- The proposed greenway is intended to provide a safe, attractive space for biking and walking for transportation and recreation.
- A proposed route with proposed greenway types along the route has been developed based on previous community input; however, no final decisions have been made about the route or designs, or whether or not a greenway will actually be built.
- The City is still working to gather community input and conducting a feasibility study, both of which will inform future plans and decisions. This is an important time for community members and intuitions to weigh in on their preferences.
- As the City completes its feasibility study, residents will receive additional information about potential impacts to the community, including:
 - Cost, both capital and long-term operations and maintenance
 - Vehicle Traffic, including travel times, traffic volumes (cut-through traffic)
 - Parking
 - Transit
 - Small Business impacts
 - Environmental Impacts (storm water, biodiversity)
 - Construction impacts
- This project is exploring the possibility of building a greenway; however, only a planning process is funded. No funds are currently available to actually construct a greenway. A planning process is an essential first step to securing funding for construction.
- No timeline is available for when a greenway may be constructed.

- *Key message about context with other projects*

Outreach Activities and Timeline

- Through November 2013: Engage outreach partners (includes neighborhood groups, community institutions, residents)
 - Implement a process to select partners for microcontracts
- November 2013-January 2014: Conduct outreach activities to gather input via surveys (and other ways??) on existing plans and to start promoting “Greenway Experience” event in the spring:
 - Door-knocking along the entire route (coordinated by neighborhood organizations)
 - Holding micro-events like block parties, dinners, etc, as relevant
 - Attend existing events and meetings, e.g., events at faith-based institutions, culturally-specific events, neighborhood meetings, school classes, youth gatherings
- February 2014: Summarize input gathered through Jan ‘14
- “Greenway experience” event held at one or at multiple locations along the greenway – Spring 2014 (May?)

Overall Communications Activities*

- Updated website available on Public Works pages; website updated regularly
- Communicate through the City’s and partner’s existing channels (e.g., facebook pages, websites, newsletters, etc.)
- Produce news release and generate earned media announcing funding and planned activities for the fall; notify residents of ways to provide input
 - Outreach to local press and other communication venues (e.g., neighborhood org websites and newsletters; church bulletins, etc. – need to brainstorm this list)
- Mailings to households about project and door-knocking?? (seems like we can leave info when we actually door knock instead – mailings may not be the best use of funds)
- News release about input gathered + temporary greenway event (“Greenway Experience”)

**Note – the funding from Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Minnesota’s Center for Prevention requires that a communication plan be created, and Blue Cross will be providing support for the plan creation*

September 16, 2013

Greenway Project Meeting
Northpoint Health and Wellness
Notes

Working on idea for a long time – high quality green facilities. One of the corridors identified in North Minneapolis.

Initial engagement – around where the Greenway could be. Collected input via open house and online surveys. Collected 452 surveys, many liked the most intensive design (full-linear) and the half and half design.

Humboldt and Irving Street – 30 blocks

Focused heavily on people who lived on the route – 5 neighborhood meetings, open house and online. Heard from 108 ppl who lived on the route.

Press releases, news, radio shows. Connecting with neighborhood groups. Attended some events including open streets, post card mailings

Full spectrum of N Mpls not represented, not done a good job in reaching ppl of color or renters – both make up large portion of N Mpls. City will have to do a lot more community engagement and study of it.

Will Lumpkins: DO they plan on doing Nice Rides along the corridor

Sarah: No timeline, a possibility. A lot of work that needs to be done before we get to the planning stages

Kathy: for the preferred alignment, did you get demographics or addresses from online survey

Sarah: Saw that the diversity of N Mpls not represented at the meetings. Back at the table now, we learned a lot but still work to do. A lot of issues that need to be figured out.

Want to see the demographics of people who will be impacted by the project. Is there funding for canvassing and nontraditional forms of outreach. The good news, is that the failure of engagement allowed for the Blue Cross

Kenya: A lot of decisions have already been made, operating from a place of disadvantage from the start. We missed a good opportunity. Are there any engagement efforts happening now.

Matthew: Twin Cities greenway – put things on pause

Sarah: Intended outcomes are robust community engagement

Sam: BCBS – funding focused on community engagement. 3 year funding. Explore community interest

Russ: it is vague what the community engagement outcomes in the proposal, steering committee of neighborhood orgs, institutions, residents. Lets find where the gaps are and focus on the diverse populations on the N Side. For year one, 43,000 available to support community engagement efforts. One of the things we said is that we want to start with neighborhood associations. We are interested in supporting efforts, starting with the neighborhood associations. Reaching various communities along

the route. Can support door knocking and canvassing, culturally competent and specific to the folks who live on the line. Steering committee would make decisions on how the money is allocated. In yrs 2 and 3, potentially more money for community engagement. How complicated, how disruptive, how expensive, a technical component. Where would the money come from – would there be assessments from home owners .

Roberta: have you considered agencies who should be at the table, they can suggest how and criteria for neighborhood organizations. Use what you have and do your outreach appropriately.

Russ: Neighborhood department

Cathy: We are doing community engagement

Kenya: regardless of whether it is a foresighted project, part of the neighborhood association work. There are resources that neighborhood associations have access to that could contribute to the project. Immediately concerned that neighborhood associations are the only organizations we are focused on, needs to be broadened to culturally specific orgs to make sure they are engaged.

Sarah: as we come up with how the community engagement looks like

Thinking about the role and structure of the group, drive community engagement process. Help represent the community interest as planning process goes forward. Who else should be at the table. Nice Ride, NOC (does political organizing in N Mpls), Venture North, Park Board (involved in last round from technical stand point), Mpls public schools and faith based leaders (have bigger base than most institutions) culturally specific orgs

Russ: project committee with subsets with engagement and technical pieces to that. Who wants to help design public outreach, who wants to help give assistance to the technical piece.

Kenya: keep council members in the loop whether they come to the meeting or not, important for them to care about the economic development

Russ: Assessing homeowners, how can we limit the impact on the immediate neighbors, and parking/ traffic woes. If this thing is done, will create problems with property values and rising rents. If enough blocks adopt this, if you have a few that do this. Elementary schools – have to get youth involved.

Kenya: Encourage physical activity

Sarah: concerns about gentrification and safety

Bill: this is not funded, need to make that clear in our messaging.

Roberta: not everyone who lives on the route will be here when this happens.

Roberta: what would happen if people began to experience what this would actually look like. You cant introduce this as some major master plan.

Kenya: goal is to help us think about this long term. How we deliver nad frame the message around this long term thinking

Russ: Goals and principles. Exploring a decision, no decision has been made. Three potential routes and a decision has been made on one route. Most imp thing on community engagement – test whether people want more places to walk, bike, green space, and have healthy places. Need to build levels of agreement. A great community organizing project, door knocking, get at the folks most immediately affected.

Ishmael: Messaging, a proposal to connect regional parks – Folwell and north commons. North commons is excluded. Question is this because we had a limited engagement on round 1 that led us to this path. Is this path final, will an impact assessment be made.

Bob: Not committed to whether or not this is the exact piece at this time. Concept that we came away with is not to have so much east/ west movement on a north/ south greenway.

Ishmael: would be a huge miss if we missed north commons and ymca.

Kathy: not a big deal for bicyclists to go a little bit out of the way, Sabo bridge an example of that. How do we weigh in on changing the route, keep be given the map so feels like the only option

Matthew: the map is a rough draft, north where it is red and on Irving, got some feedback on neighbors about keeping it on homebody, a starting point. Make that clear, make some improvements, do it right.

Kenya: Folwell is on the line to, a part where the park boards need to enter, connecting those actual sites is critical, have them at the table. Also the boys and girls club, a lot of different institutions that come into play here. Different access points for youth. Neighborhood associations – know what their limitations are and their possibilities.

Jim: There is some fluidity in this mapping. First, need to find out if the community wants this, has to make sure we have overwhelming public support. If we find if this is what the community wants, what do we do first. Prioritization so that when we go to funding partners, we can show that this is what the community wants. Easy to be overwhelmed with 30 blocks, find 4 -6 blocks where this is desired.

Kenya: see value in honoring the engagement before, whites opinion should be included but it just needs to be broadened. Use the information from before so we are not starting completely over.

Russ: what common principles should we follow?

Kenya: Making sure that the voices we are mostly prioritizing are actual residents, see it driven from the community on the north side.

Matthew: making sure connections at the north/ south ends of the greenway

Roberta: other enhancements and bike way opportunities. If a connector, is it for the bicycle transportation network'

Kathy: is it going to connect to uptown

Matthew: bike lanes on Plymouth connect to van white bridge

Kenya: see this as a connection of the regional bike system, trail development, connect to other regional system

Roberta: can't expect it to be neighborhood association driven, neighbor to neighbor, trusted advocates that people know.

Kenya: helps to have agency accountability at the table, driven from a more grassroots perspective.

Kathy: NRRC plans to do face to face engagement around this project, trusted advocate in the community. Use the money to hire community members to do the outreach

Cathy: Less than 10 percent of people showed up at the meeting, do people really buy into the proposed greenway? Be concrete with this, have to be purposeful and intentional about what we are doing. What would you expect as a partner to come to the table