

Metropolitan Council Minneapolis Community Meeting
Tuesday, January 7, 2014
Kenwood Community Center

1. “What part of the meeting was most valuable to you?” focused on the following themes:

- The table discussions and the summary of comments made
- The summaries from each table/topic
- Talking/listening in small groups
- Small group discussion after the first 20 minutes when the extremists had finished their rants and gone.
- Hearing table reports
- The small, civil group discussion
- Group discussions
- Summaries of each table
- Table discussions
- Discussion and review
- Reporting of the tables
- Round table
- Table discussion
- Review of discussion points from the breakout groups, hearing consensus of need for re-evaluating the current plan.
- Opportunity for tables to voice their views
- Concluding reports for table speakers
- Facilitating smaller, ‘deep’ conversations is very helpful in furthering understanding and reducing mistrust.
- Being able to voice my concern
- Free and open discussions although the group was highly biased
- Hearing from neighbors
- Hearing tremendous range of concerns and evaluations of planning
- Hearing how other members of the community feel
- Hearing what the consensus of the community was
- Good to see some shared feelings and frustrations from others
- Variety of viewpoints/new to me knowledge shared by table notes. Map showing multiple freight re-route alternatives. Great pens provided!
- Listening to the articulate, overwhelming resentment against the show job.
- The end- people were concerned it if this is the right thing to do
- The entire meeting was equally valuable

- The meeting did confirm that it is a NIMBY issue
- The speech
- Lack of speaking by part of politicians
- That these honest comments go back to Met Council and that body hears, addresses, and takes appropriate action that is pro-MPLS
- There is overall great distrust of an unelected Met Council and Gov Dayton
- Attempt to convey the impression that unlike all the meetings up to now, this time our input was going to be considered. Nice try.
- The posters, esp. with maps showing findings so far, AND opinions of all the tables- showing 'quite some' agreement.
- The little bits of factual info that was presented
- The table conversations, the posters, and handouts explaining the issues.

2. "What part of the meeting was least valuable to you?"

- The acoustics of the auditorium
- Obviously the format didn't work. People couldn't hear each other.
- Structure and inability to hear participants. And the posters were more propaganda than information.
- Seeming bias in printed materials. NOISE during feedback sessions- hard to hear, hard to engage in conversation.
- The space was not the best- hard to hear.
- It was hard to hear- the facilities were not very conducive to the intimate and intense nature of the small discussions.
- The boards and glad-handing to start. Just get to the discussion part.
- The first 20 minutes of group time.
- Some chaos at the beginning
- Opening remarks
- 'Facilitator' talking too much at outset.
- Introductions
- The table discussion had way too many people. Small groups are better.
- Our recorder did not summarize the thoughts of the group objectively. I hope the staff recorded notes to be reviewed as more objective input
- Our facilitator lost control of our table (tunnels)
- The discussion tables- free flowing, uninformed, and way too late in the process
- The Met Council takeover of our table
- Noisy, cramped, time to early and not enough time
- The first ½ hour I missed, due to my job
- Time of day
- The posters of info
- Having the posters when they were in the handout
- Posters
- Outcome- feel like it was an empty exercise. Perhaps I'll be proven wrong, but it seemed futile.
- Repeat of past input session- what's new?
- There were supporters of the current plan- there really wasn't any opportunity for us to be heard.

- Individual disrupting instruction/orientation portion with petition/asking focus to align position to loudly
- Data not already established values of acceptable - now and in the future
- PR Rep hired to make Met Council look better.
- (1) Meeting seemed to be designed to pacify dissent about the project (2) Concerns needed to be condensed by others to sound bites.

3. “What was not covered that you would have liked to have seen addressed?”

- Hennepin Ave should be considered instead of Kenilworth
- How to get these alternatives back into the process to impact a derailed decision
- Why is Met Council not doing ‘additional study’ of the Uptown route?
- Alternative ideas and response from the decision makers
- A discussion of a route that includes the planned development project around the new football stadium.
- Uptown option is not being considered- why? It was nearly unanimous at this meeting that it is the preferred route!!!
- Responses to the concerns!!!!
- It seemed that some people want to ask questions to gain more information and as someone newer to these issues, it would be useful to hear such conversation
- A summary of the current plan (verbal)
- A factual presentation of the ‘givens’ – costs of various options, weighing between Suburban/City, etc.
- Facts- real time
- Nothing I can think of
- Nothing
- Surprisingly, most important issues were brought up by participants.
- You did an overall good job
- Talk more about who did the studies, procedures, etc. Help dispel distrust!
- Why the original promise of relocation was broken. A presentation by Met Council members that would help rebuild trust in the process.
- Summary comments should go to Minneapolis Park Board Commissioners!!
- What are the layers of the government, how are they communicating with each other
- DEEP TUNNEL
- Deep tunnel analysis
- Positive aspects of the current plan- How about questions like: What is positive about the plan?
- No one really talked about the larger values of the light rail, and multi-modal transit solutions. Fear divides; values we share bring us together.
- How to stop this project
- Parking for the LTR
- More discussion of the basic premise that this project should even be done.
- Like to make it easier to jump around topics, shifts
- If data results were not acceptable for our future – revisited other options that data as reported not accurate

- Noise, and noise of LRT combined with the new FAA flight routes over Lake of the Isles

4. “What would you like to see the next round of community meetings look like, after the reports on water and freight rail are released?”

- Larger, bigger venue
- We need to have a public mic option in order for the people to be heard
- Breakout rooms
- Either more, smaller meetings or break out rooms
- I liked this format. A little bit better space and a better trained facilitator would be great.
- I like the participatory technologies
- Venue will be different we were told.
- Better environment
- Factual review
- Met Council fund consulting engineers working for MPLS neighborhoods to evaluate reports of Met Council Consultants
- Reliable data
- Easily identifiable people from whom we can ask questions about the project. (i.e. people with a name tag, green shirt, etc.)
- I’d like to see decision makers be put on the spot to answer some of the concerns.
- Small room discussion, more elected officials
- Don’t know for sure
- Charettes – better model
- Concession from Met Council, that LRT alignment WILL be revised.
- In advance Met Council decision to NOT apply for fed funding until these many concerns are addressed
- Tell us what and how you’re going to do
- How we will mitigate concerns
- Address all issues and facts
- Reports distributed in advance, opportunity for community reaction
- A lot of work needs to be done before these reports are released to make any future meetings more productive.
- Discussion criteria should be agreed upon before reports are issued and discussed. Also narrowly focusing on water or freight rail ignores the issue of ROUTE SELECTION which is the most important question.
- Report out, conversation and following like this to challenge these reports
- More of this – Please include nametags for all participants.

5. Additional Comments From Evaluation:

- I do not want Southwest LRT. It destroys everything.
- In our case, at least, table spokesperson gave an accurate reflection of the discussion to the table, but when he spoke on the group at large it did not accordingly repeat the discussion. Very difficult to hear each other in the table meetings.

- Biggest concern is that this process is a show, and the powers that be are hell-bent on clinging to previous decisions.
- I like this method for discussions, particularly for 'grand challenges' that lack quick, easy, and purely technical solutions. There is lots of best-practice ideas available through the Art of Hosting practice. Take a look at it- I think it could help you refine these meeting and lead to more positive outcomes as you seek to manage the paradoxes among us. Thank you.

Content & Structure

Please rate the following aspects of your meeting experience on the below scale:

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 - Strongly agree | 4 - Disagree |
| 2 - Agree | 5 - Strongly Disagree |
| 3 - Neutral | |

- | | |
|--|------------|
| 1. I felt like I could share my thoughts openly and honestly. | 2 |
| 2. Decision-makers and Met Council staff were present to hear the thoughts and concerns of my community. | 2.4 |
| 3. The meeting was well-facilitated. | 2.4 |