



**Date of Board P+C: 05/22/24**

**Date of Board Approval (for CAC's only):**

**Date of Most Recent Update: 05/08/24**

*Please fill out this form if your project, program, or initiative includes community engagement beyond the "Inform" level. All Community Engagement Plans should be filed as Petitions and Communications with the MPRB Board of Commissioners and submitted to the MPRB Engagement Portal on SharePoint (<https://minneapolisparcs.sharepoint.com/planning/SitePages/Home.aspx>.)*

**Staff Lead: Crystal Passi**

**Department or Division: Planning**

**Project Name: Central Gym Park Skatepark**

**Engagement Level: Inform (See Engagement Assessment attached)**

---

This plan serves as a guide for the community engagement process for the **Central Gym Park Skatepark**. The plan may be modified as circumstance warrants during project duration. Substantial modifications are to be communicated to stakeholders and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation (MPRB) Board of Commissioners.

As required by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Community Engagement Policy, this project requires a Community Engagement Plan because the project falls under the Inform of community engagement for which MPRB design will be refined with some community input, but will largely focus on more technical, operational and safety related components. This is a project, program, or initiative that does not result in a change in the type, location, or extent of the current facility or service. This CE Plan was used with a GARE Racial Equity Tool Kit framework.

**Key Stakeholders should be engaged in the creation of this plan. Please explain who was engaged:**

*Green Central School, MPRB Recreational Staff, MPRB Spark'd Studio, City of Skate*

## **1. Project Description**

### **1a. Project Overview:**

This project will focus on implementing improvements at Central Gym Park identified in the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) South Service Area Master Plan (SSAMP). In 2017 & 2018, the first phase of implementation of the SSAMP was completed that included playground, field, gathering area and basketball court improvements. During that project the skatepark was also included at a concept level and approved by the Board in 2017, but the skatepark was not able to be constructed due to budgetary constraints. The primary focus of this next phase of work at Central Gym Park will be to implement the skatepark and project funding includes a Hennepin Youth Activities Grant that must be spent on the skatepark. The area designated for the skatepark has been identified in the already

approved concept plans and significant community engagement was done to determine general design elements for the skatepark. As such in this next phase of improvements the skatepark design will be refined with some community input, but will largely focus on more technical, operational and safety related components. To refine the skatepark design input will be gathered from stakeholders from skate community, Minneapolis Public Schools staff, students, and parents, MPRB recreation staff, neighbors and park users from the Central area neighborhood.

Community engagement and activities would occur in the spring and summer 2024, followed by design and bidding in winter 2025. It's anticipated that construction would begin in spring of 2025.

**1b. MPRB Outcomes** *(What goals, strategies, or values in the MPRB Comprehensive Plan does this project, program, or initiative relate to?):*

**Goal 1:** Foster belonging and equity; 15 Embed accessibility and universal design as a fundamental aspect of programming, design of park spaces and facilities, and when making temporary changes to park infrastructure and programming.

**Goal 1:** Foster belonging and equity; 19 create and support activities and welcoming spaces for teens and young adults in the park for both programmed and unprogrammed activities.

**Goal 3:** Provide core services with care; 7 Design, evolve, and maintain high quality athletic facilities including fields, diamonds, skateparks, ice rinks, courts, and tracks to support a range of multigenerational sports balancing traditional and emerging trends.

**1c. Project Timeline:**

The project is generally expected to follow a phased approach.

- **Phase 1: Community Engagement**  
Spring and early summer 2024. This phase will involve concept development with community input at key milestones. Initial feedback will be gathered to further develop the concept plan for the skatepark.
- **Phase 2: Design and Construction Documentation**
- Summer and fall 2024
- **Implementation**  
Phase three will be implementation of all improvements and is expected in 2025.

**1d. Project Funding:**

<u>Capital Sources</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
2023 NPP20	\$424,418.00	N/A
2022 Capital Levy	\$240,418.00	N/A

<u>Supplemental Sources</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
2023 Capital Levy	\$200,000.00	N/A
2023 Park Dedication	\$22,832.00	N/A
Hennepin County Youth Activity Grant	\$250,000.00	December 31, 2023-but can request extension
Total:	<b>\$1,137,668.00</b>	

## 2. Project Data:

**2a. What are the boundaries of the community engagement area? E 37<sup>th</sup> street, E 33<sup>rd</sup> Street, Nicolet Avenue and Portland Avenue.** *(For regional facilities include neighborhoods adjacent to the park and city/regional boundaries.)*

**2b. What are the demographics of the community engagement area?** *(Please refer to percentages of the population when possible and note the sources of the data.)*

### Total Population - 2020

Central Neighborhood	8,132
City of Minneapolis	429,954

### Age Percentage of Population 2018-2022

<u>Age</u>	<u>Powderhorn</u>	<u>City of Minneapolis</u>
Under 5	7.60%	6.40%
5-9 years	9.50%	5.70%
10-14 years	7.70%	5.00%
15-17 years	5.00%	2.70%
18-24 years	9.00%	13.50%
25-34 years	23.00%	22.20%
35-44 years	13.20%	14.00%
45-54 years	11.00%	10.50%
55-64 years	8.30%	10.10%
65-74 years	3.60%	6.30%
75-84 years	1.30%	2.40%

85 years and older	Not Enough Data	1.20%
--------------------	-----------------	-------

**Race by Percentage of Population**

2018-2022

<b>Ethnicity</b>	<b>Powderhorn</b>	<b>City of Minneapolis</b>
White	38.50%	59.70%
Of Color	50.5%	37.10%
Black or African American	23.5%	18.60%
American & Alaskan Native	Not Enough Data	1.10%
Asian or Pacific Islander	Not Enough Data	5.9%
Other	Not Enough Data	0.6%
Two or More Races	3.8%	4.50%
Hispanic or Latino (Of Any Race)	30.40%	9.6%

**Median Household Income**

2022 dollars

2018-2022

Central	\$76,467
City of Minneapolis	\$66,068

**Percentage of the Population that Speaks a Language Other than English at Home**

2018-2022

	<b>English Only</b>	<b>Language Other than English</b>
Central	62.60%	37.40%
City of Minneapolis	78.40%	21.6%

**Percentage of the Population with a Disability**

2018-2022

Central	12.0%
City of Minneapolis	10.9%

**Renter v. Homeownership**

2018-2022

	<b>Owner-Occupied Housing</b>	<b>Renter-Occupied Housing</b>
Central	52.0%	39.9%
City of Minneapolis	44.6%	49.5%

## Analysis:

The Central neighborhood is a racially and ethnically diverse area with a more diverse population than several neighboring communities and in comparison, to Minneapolis as a whole. The population of the neighborhood has a significantly higher population of people of color compared to the rest of Minneapolis and some nearby communities, notably Powderhorn, with 23% Black AND 30% Hispanic or Latino. It should be noted that the neighborhood has a higher percentage of youth between the ages 5 and 9, 10-14 and young people ages 18-24 and 23-34. The median income in this community is slightly higher than the rest of Minneapolis combined. There is a fairly close divide between renters and owner-occupied residences with slightly more owner-occupied housing at 52% and just under 40% renters. This neighborhood has higher percentages of people who speak languages other than English in their homes. The neighborhood also has a HIGHER percentage of people who have a disability when compared to the City of Minneapolis as a whole.

Most Data is from 2020 or 2022 unless otherwise noted.

Sources: Data is from <https://www.mncompass.org/profiles/city/minneapolis/central-neighborhood>

**2c. List any key findings or excerpts from relevant plans or policies that are informing this project, program or initiative, especially if community was engaged in the policy or plan.**

### The Skate Park Activity Plan

**OVERVIEW**

**1 GOAL ONE: Increase the number, variety, and distribution of skate parks in Minneapolis**

- **STRATEGY 1A:** Align total skate park area with city population
- **STRATEGY 1B:** Provide a variety of skate park types and sizes
- **STRATEGY 1C:** Plan for an equitable distribution of skate parks in appropriate locations throughout the city (system planning)

**2 GOAL TWO: Address policy barriers to high quality skate park experiences**

**3 GOAL THREE: Improve the overall skate park experience through design, operations, inclusion, partnerships, and safety measures**

- **STRATEGY 3A:** Design and construct skate parks with an understanding of the unique and specialized needs of specialized needs of the activities it supports, and by involving partners and industry experts
- **STRATEGY 3B:** Operate and maintain skate parks to a level equivalent to other park facilities
- **STRATEGY 3C:** Provide increased skate park programming, while reserving majority of skate park time for unstructured use
- **STRATEGY 3D:** Promote safety at skate parks
- **STRATEGY 3E:** Preserve and cultivate partnerships in the implementation of the Skate Park Activity Plan

34 Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board | Skate Park Activity Plan

### *Shared Space*

*Recognizing both the need for unfettered public access as well as specific safety requirements of skateboarding, design for and allow for all non-motorized wheeled sports in skate parks including BMX riding without pegs, scooter use, and in-line skating. Explore the possibility of a few skate spots and/or neighborhood skate parks within the network restricted to skateboarding only, and/or scheduling of shared skate parks to allow skateboard-only or BMX-only time periods. Continue research and discussion on impact of BMX pegs on skate park infrastructure. Community Engagement STRATEGY 3A: Design and construct skate parks with an understanding of the unique and specialized needs of this activity, and by involving partners and industry experts The following design, sustainability, and contractor selection guidelines are designed to assist project managers in the implementation of skate parks throughout the system. Every project is different and will have different requirements, needs, and limitations. These guidelines should be considered in light of the entire project and incorporated to the extent possible. Stepping away from any of these guidelines should be a conscious decision made through evaluation with public stakeholders.*

**2d. What are the data gaps? What additional research needs to be done to understand the project stakeholders and project scope?**

- Connect with Green Central students, parents and staff from the school to understand how they use the park and their needs.
- Connect with MPRB rec staff to better understand use of the site and how to support safety, visibility and use for folks using the recreation center.
- Connect with Rec Staff to help plan programming for the amenity.
- Connect to the all-wheel community, such as mountain & BMX riders, skateboarders, inline skaters and scooter users to understand needs for design development of the skatepark.

**3. Community Engagement:**

**3a. Identify Project Stakeholders**

*The MPRB supports the use of a variety of techniques to interact with and obtain information from stakeholders. Outreach and research tools and methods can be applied for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to the following:*

- a. *Evaluate success and measure community impact of existing programs, services or facilities.*
- b. *Gain stakeholder insight and perspective regarding development of a new program, service or facility.*
- c. *Proactively identify or explore park and recreation trends or ideas.*
- d. *Determine essential services to be provided for a community or park area.*
- e. *Query stakeholders when proposing or revising policy.*
- f. *Resolve persistent conflicts or problems.*
- g. *Educate or inform the public on proposed changes, projects, programs, and initiatives.*
- h. *Reflect on projects, programs, and initiatives after adoption by the Board or report on how community input has been integrated.*
- i. *Learn the history of local context and community.*

<b>Project Stakeholder</b> <i>(students, ethnic communities,</i>	<b>Outreach: How will you reach out to the stakeholder?</b> <i>(i.e. go</i>	<b>Engagement: How will they participate?</b> <i>(i. e. online survey, focus</i>	<b>Reflecting Back: How will stakeholder groups be reflected back to</b>
---	---	--	--

<i>neighborhood groups, community leaders)</i>	<i>to parks, neighborhood listserv, engage with cultural media)</i>	<i>group, community open house, intercept survey)</i>	<b>about the project progress or outcomes?</b> <i>(Posted on project website, ribbon cutting, e-blast, site visit, celebration)</i>
General Park Users	On site signage, neighborhood newsletter, social media, attendance at park or school events, community connectors, on site signage at Rec Center and nearby Rec Centers.	Online survey, in-person/virtual/hybrid open house, attendance at park events, community events	Project updates via email and project website updates, subsequent in person/virtual/hybrid open house
Area Residents	Postcard mailing, neighborhood newsletter, social media, South Service Area Master Plan Listserv, On site signage, attendance at park events	Online survey, in-person/virtual/hybrid open house, attendance at park events, community events.	Project updates via email and project website updates, subsequent in-person/virtual/hybrid open house
Green Central School Students, staff and parents	Direct e-mail, school newsletter, visit school and workshop with kids, in person attendance of school events	Online survey, virtual open house, direct engagement at neighborhood organization meeting	Project updates via email and project website updates
Youth (Rec Plus, Youth Sports teams)	Direct e-mail to youth service organizations/agencies, social media, attendance at park events, community connectors	Online survey, in person/virtual/hybrid open house, attendance at park or other youth-centered events, community connector events. Project plans up in Rec Center to target youth feedback.	Project updates via email and project website updates, social media, subsequent in person/virtual/hybrid open house
Community Organizations that work in Central and possibly adjacent but close by neighborhoods	Direct e-mail	Share concept plans and surveys for feedback and to share with members and community. Invite to open-houses and	Project updates via email and project website updates.

Such as Powderhorn		attend existing events to connect with community.	
Park Commissioner Becky Alper, District 3	Emails and meetings	Share concept plans and surveys for feedback and to share with constituents. Invite to open-houses.	Share updates by email, invite/share invites to open house meetings or to attend site visits.
Ward 8- Andrea Jenkins	Direct e-mail	Share concept plans and surveys for feedback and to share with constituents. Invite to open-houses.	Share updates by email, invite/share, invites to open house meetings.

**If needed, describe the outreach, engagement, or reflection methods you will use that are referenced above:**

It is important to make many opportunities for the community to provide feedback, weigh in on priorities and concepts both in person and online. Online surveys can be effective but may not be accessible or approachable to all communities. As such MPRB staff will try and schedule in person connection points with pre-existing community events. Staff will also include ways for people who are dropping in at the Rec Center or visiting the park where they can provide passive input or access information about the project. Events will be open house style or coordinated with existing events or community-based activities. Postcards that both introduce the project and include dates for engagement opportunities will be most effective in that repeated outreach in this way tends to be ignored. Flyers could also be used if placed in libraries, local skateparks etc.

City of Skate and Minneapolis Bike Parks should be engaged through invites to both organizations to encourage members and community to open house events, links to online survey's, sharing out draft concept plans for feedback etc. Project info, upcoming events or online survey's can be shared on these group's social media as well.

Engagement inside or outside if weather allows should allow for social distancing whenever possible. As risks associated with Covid-19 ebb we expect to connect with community through the Recreation Events and neighborhood events as well as planned workshops in person or virtually.

**3b. Advisory Committees:**

<b>Project Advisory Committee:</b> This roster is a list of MPRB departments and divisions that are on the PAC
Director of Strategic Planning
Planning (South Planning Liaison)
Asset Management
Forestry Department
Recreation Staff & Recreation Center Manager
Park Police
Information Technology Services
Community Connections and Violence Prevention
Communications Department
Planning Director

**3c. Will a Community Advisory Committee be required for this project, program, or initiative?**

NO

**3d. CAC Charge:** N/A

**4. Analysis:**

**4a. What questions will you be asking community to respond to in your outreach and engagement?**

**4b. How will your community engagement outreach, engagement, and methods make MPRB a more equitable system?**

**4c. Identify one or more key project milestones when project evaluation will be performed** (*i.e. Draft design review, draft policy review, project mid-point*)

*Draft concept review and project mid-point*

**5. Evaluation Summary:** *To be completed at one or more project milestones as identified in 4c.*

**5a. Who was engaged during the process?** (*i.e. demographic info from online survey participants, the CAC, and community engagement whenever possible. Refer back to Section 2 in the CE Plan and how your engagement reflects the diversity of the community in the engagement area.*)

**5b. How did the engagement inform the project outcome?** *(i.e. public tabulation and amendments following a public comment period)*

**5c. Please describe any new or innovative engagement methods used during the process:**

**5d. What recommendations do you have for future engagement around this topic, park, or area?**

**5e. What, if any, were the unintended outcomes of your CE Plan?**

**5g. Were there any barriers to successful implementation of your CE Plan?**

**5h. Were you adequately resourced, including staff support, expertise, and funding?**

**5i. If applicable, how can this project, program, or initiative, or MPRB continue to partner and deepen relationships with underrepresented communities?**