

Community Environmental Workgroup Meeting # 4 Agenda

Date: Friday, September 16, 2011
9:00 am to 11:00 am

Location: Maria's Café - 1113 East Franklin Avenue
612.870.9842

Meeting objectives

- Review where we are in the project / project status
- Refine list of community issues and environmental/health risks
- Determine need for “community advisory group”
- Identify existing data and fact sheets for environmental risks

Agenda

- 9:00 **Welcome and Introductions**
- 9:05 **Project Time Line and Deliverables** – review where we are on the project
- 9:10 **Summer Community Engagement** – review project team’s engagement activities
- 9:20 **Engagement Results** – review the extensive list of environmental and health (and other) issues identified by community members
- 9:30 **Results Categorization** – small group exercise to aggregate and name issue categories
- 10:25 **Existing Data / Fact Sheets** – review next step: developing fact sheets for identified environmental and health risks
- 10:40 **EPA Site visit** – discuss / plan for upcoming EPA visit to corridor
- 10:50 **Community Advisory Group** – discuss whether we should convene an advisory group of interested community members to work with CEW on issue identification and prioritization process
- 11:00 **Adjourn**

Minnehaha-Hiawatha Corridor Environmental Collaboration Community Environmental Workgroup Meeting #4

Date: September 16, 2011, 9:00 to 11:00 am

Location: Maria's Café, 1113 East Franklin Avenue, Minneapolis

Meeting Objectives

- Review where we are in the project/project status
- Refine list of community issues and environmental /health risks
- Determine need for “community advisory group”
- Identify existing data and fact sheets for environmental risks

I. Welcome and Introductions

Meeting Attendees

- Dan Swenson – Alexander's Import Auto Repair
- Jon Hunter – American Lung Association of Minnesota
- Kirsten Saylor – Gardening Matters
- Candace Dow – Hennepin County Community Works
- Robb Luckow – Hennepin County Community Works
- John Evans – Hennepin County Environmental Services
- Kathie Doty – Hennepin-University Partnership
- Jay Bad Heart Bull – Little Earth of United Tribes
- Nou Ka Yang – Little Earth of United Tribes
- Spencer Agnew – Longfellow Community Council
- Melanie Majors – Longfellow Community Council
- Joanna Solotaroff – Longfellow Community Council
- Mallory Anderson – Minnehaha Creek Watershed District
- Dave Stewart – Minnesota Department of Health
- Kevin McDonald – Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
- Lorrie Stromme – Mississippi Watershed Management Organization
- Julia Earl – Preventing Harm Minnesota
- Marchelle Hallman – St. James African Methodist Episcopal Church
- Aisha Gomez – Women's Environmental Institute

II. Time Line and Deliverables

Attendees reviewed the detailed timeline. To date, the project is in the process of completing the CARE Project Timeline through Task 6 – Develop Findings Summary of summer community engagement work. This Summary was discussed later in the meeting. The project's next steps are:

- Task 7: Work with CEW to collect all existing cumulative environmental health data on all risks, identify information gaps - DEVELOP FACT SHEETS
- Task 8: Identify and map presence of environmental risks, EPA provide technical assistance - DEVELOP MAPS
- Task 10/11: Educate and inform community on prevalence and severity of various environmental risks
- Task 13: Develop risk ranking methodology.

This fall, the project will collect information, map data, and provide information on the 20 to 25 key risks identified by community members. The project will use fact sheets, workshops, information tables, websites, or other means to educate community members and partners on the identified risks, enabling an informed prioritization and risk ranking process. Attendees received and discussed a fact sheet template example from the Wichita, Kansas, CARE project.

After developing the information sheets, the project will work with the community to prioritize the 20 - 25 risks. Project staff reviewed one of EPA's templates for evaluating and prioritizing environmental risks.

III. Summer Community Engagement

Based on CEW comments and the exercise at the June CEW meeting, project staff from Hennepin County Community Works, Longfellow Business Association, Longfellow Community Council, and Women's Environmental Institute conducted community engagement over the summer. The project team had project information and survey in English, Somali, and Spanish. The survey asked about (1) the community's assets, (2) the community's issues, and (3) the most important environmental and health issues facing the respondent, the respondent's family, and the respondent's community.

The project team asked persons who lived, worked, shopped, visited, or worshipped in the corridor to complete the survey. On weekdays, evenings, and weekends, the project team went to community events, churches, libraries, parks, the Midtown Farmers Market and other locations in the project area. The team also left materials at businesses and door-knocked at locations in the corridor area.

Most respondents came from south Minneapolis, demonstrating an "influence area" beyond the boundaries of the project area. The wide dispersion also demonstrates the difficulty of reaching residents in the narrow geographic area. Door-to-door canvassing allowed the project to reach more residences and businesses within the corridor area.

IV. Engagement Results

Through September 16, project staff talked to over 660 community members about the CARE project. These conversations results in over 1,100 responses for each of the three CARE survey questions. Project staff provided CEW members with a handout of survey responses aggregated

into around 65 “assets” and 155 “concerns,” such as “climate change,” “water quality,” and “graffiti.”

This first phase of community engagement demonstrated the breadth of respondent’s concerns. Ultimately, the community will take the 156 issues and identify three or four to address in the project’s Action Plan. Today’s meeting begins the intermediate step to turn the 156 issues into a manageable 20 to 25 issues without losing any of the breadth of information and issues.

V. Results Categorization

Attendees received the handout with aggregated issues/concerns and worked in three groups to identify ways to aggregate the 156 issues into 20 - 25 issues or concerns for the data collection and community prioritization process. Groups discussed structures for organizing the issue categories, recorded their thoughts, and shared with the large group.

Group 1

- **Air quality**
 - Air pollution: reliance on cars, trees/urban forest, radon, recreation
 - Particulates: grain elevators, backyard burning, diesel – trucks and train, motor vehicles
 - Stationary sources: backup generators, two-cycle motors, snow blowers
- **Water quality**
 - Stormwater: trees with winter/fall maintenance, lawn chemicals, stormwater runoff, watershed friendly yards
 - Drinking water: taste
- **Urban forestry:** local food/food access, blighted properties, walkable and bikeable community, maintain natural environment, climate change, light pollution, traffic noise/speed, sense of community, water quality and air quality
- **Safe and green home:** smoking, radon, native plants, energy efficiency, toxins, lawn chemicals

Group 2

- **Individual and household.** What I can do on my own? Maintaining a safe home: not keeping house up, rodents, mold, mildew, lead and household danger (legacies), asbestos, dust (grain or building or railroad), graffiti (scary...gang?), lung cancer
- **Community place to live and work.** What can I do in my neighborhood?
- **System/broader issues.** What I need help from others to do/address? Impact of poverty on prioritization/addressing health care

Group 3

- Individual action. What we can individually do/address, e.g., litter, dumping
- Built environment, e.g., housing, schools, parks
- Environmental health: toxicant, pathway
- “Outside” built environment, e.g., outdoor air quality, government support
- Short term vs. long term (bed bugs vs. healthy housing)

- Educational opportunity, e.g., decrease radon exposure, health care
- Health endpoints
- Social determinants of health (poverty, education)
- Degree of risk posed by issue

VI. EPA Site Visit October 5 and 6, 2011

On October 5 and 6, three EPA Region V staff members will make a site visit. Potential activities include touring the project area, reviewing specific environmental concerns, and meeting with CEW members. Attendees recommended that the tour highlight locations and activities, such as watershed management. Attendees suggested setting one or two meetings with the EPA with all CEW partners invited to attend if available. EPA has technical assistance available for various project phases and possible priorities. Hennepin County staff will update the CEW as more information becomes available.

VII. Community Advisory Group

At prior CEW meetings, attendees discussed creating an Advisory Group of community members to help guide the project process. Potential roles include:

- Review 20 - 25 issues to ensure they reflect community perspective.
- Review educational materials to determine if they will be useful for the public.
- Help develop risk ranking methodology and criteria to reflect community perspective.
- Help raise community interest in the project.

The community engagement process provides a potential source for Advisory Group members – almost 100 persons indicated they would like to be involved in the project. Attendees discussed the potential role, benefits, and drawbacks to the Advisory Group.

- Participation may be self-selecting.
- Advisory Group members would need to be brought up to speed on the requirements of the CARE project.
- Self-identified neighborhood leaders may choose to participate in the CARE project.
- Creating another group may take staff time away from other project activities (such as community meetings or outreach)

Instead of creating a new Advisory Group, CEW members recommended focusing on the existing community engagement structure to keep community members informed and engaged in the project:

- Use community-based events as an opportunity to break into small groups.
- Attach CARE dialogue to another event and solicit input from interested persons.
- Set up micro grants to carve out topics or interest to have a community information gathering.

- Reach out to neighborhood self-identified leaders.
- Vary input opportunities based on the number of persons attending a meeting.

IX. Next Steps and Adjourn

- Project team – complete community engagement efforts in Longfellow and East Phillips
- HCWT – email CEW information on EPA site visit, including meeting locations.
- Project team – Revise Issues / Concerns categories based on CEW comments