NOTES FROM THE LAND USE COMMITTEE MEETING
FACILITATED SESSION by JASON FINK AND MICHELE WALLACE
November 13, 2018, 7:00 p.m. – 9:00 p.m.

Community Mediation and Restorative Services was asked to facilitate a meeting of the Land Use Committee, following approval of a development project that caused controversy in the Prospect Park neighborhood in Minneapolis.

The facilitated discussion covered four questions:

- Where there some positive aspects to the controversy or process?
- What could have been done better?
- What did the group see as possible solutions?
- What next steps did the group wish to see?

In sum, most of the positives identified centered around a revitalized community group. Most of the negatives spoke to not enough communication, and, not surprisingly, the solutions involved suggestions on how to improve communication. The International Association of Public Participation was lifted up as a way to adopt core values and best practices to encourage involvement.

The group will be delegating a task force to consider the solutions suggested, with a tentative meeting time selected of December 11 at 5:00 p.m.

POSITIVE ASPECTS TO CONTROVERSY OR PROCESS (specific comments).
- There was a lot of community involvement generated by the issue
- Community groups and members were energized
- Members of the community came together to try to make things better
- many neighbors connected
- those getting involved were able to draw upon a history of good work
- work was done around identifying the neighborhood values
- Care and effort was shown by others
- Good compromises were made
- other's love for the neighborhood was apparent
- opportunity was given to be informed and involved
- there were many contributions by others
- a forward thinking / forward looking mindset emerged
- many new board members
- a new tower hill group was formed

WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN DONE BETTER?
- undemocratic process
- people were not listened to
- people were not informed
- people weren't paying enough attention to existing communications
- presented as a done deal

- not enough effort to communicate by the committee
- not enough transparency / clarity
- not given good advice, not enough detail, especially re impact
- by the time the community was aware of the impact it was too late
- well intentioned but feelings were hurt
- communication not detailed enough re procedure, i.e. # days notice required
- "v" process not "W" process: V process is small group, then listening session, then implementation; W process gets early ideas, then develops, then back to the community more fleshed out, then finalized
- not enough weight given to historic preservation as a value
- bias towards density
- opinion of committee taken to be opinion of the neighborhood

SOLUTIONS OFFERED
- rethink Board and Land Use Committee interactions
- drive participation – market especially to reach underrepresented groups
- update Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), particularly with regard to notice as to conditional use, variance, or re-zoning requests
- recruit / cultivate Council member(s)
- specific notifications for block or street
- improve website and organize information there better
- amend the PPA bylaws
- improve communication, by leaflets or calls
- make communication proportionate to issue
- make communication earlier in process
- use model from International Association of Public Participation, adopt best practices and use core values therein as guide, such as keep your promises, encourage participation, and see documents

NEXT STEPS
- form task force to look at MOU process, to be delegated by Committee
- recommendation to be carried to Board
- consider whether all committees should adopt the core values for public participation
- make reports
- protect view corridor
- review past MOU's
- communicate what is done tonight
- notification to land use email list
- Dec 11, task force meets 2 hours prior to regular meeting at 7