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Implementation of planned park improvements is a critical aspect of planning. This has been a key community desire throughout the planning process (see ACTION 2) and is the most important factor in gaining and keeping the public trust. The SSAMP envisions dramatic change throughout the service area—change that is necessary to ensure parks truly benefit the people that use them. This plan not only sets forth the guiding designs for capital improvements, it sets forth a process by which the public, MPRB staff, and elected officials can perform and be kept up to date on the process of implementation.

Most of the projects identified in this plan will be implemented through MPRB’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The CIP charts a six-year plan for funding specific park projects. It is revised each year through a public process led by the MPRB Commissioners and staff. Beginning with the 2017-2022 CIP, MPRB is implementing new racial equity and investment/condition measures to guide selected capital improvements. This is in large part the result of “Closing the Gap,” a public education effort aimed at helping park users and neighbors understand the financial situation for their local park as well as the MPRB system as a whole. This process resulted in an historic agreement between MPRB and the City of Minneapolis to fund the neighborhood parks at increased levels until 2037 (20 years from the inception of the agreement). Through this additional funding, many of the projects identified in the SSAMP will be considered for implementation based on the new project selection criteria. Though not driven by the SSAMP process, these new selection criteria accomplish SSAMP ACTION 1, and are in line with several of the SSAMP LENSES, most notably the Racial Equity Lens.

Some SSAMP projects may be implemented in collaboration with outside agencies, including the City of Minneapolis and Minneapolis Public Schools, or community and nonprofit partners. In these cases, it is likely that non-MPRB funding will be brought to the table to implement projects identified in this plan. Such collaborations are encouraged, to further leverage MPRB funds for implementation (see section 6d).
ACCOUNTABILITY

Without consistent and regular tracking of implementation efforts, the importance of the planning process will be lost and the public trust will be broken.

To improve accountability and spur implementation, this document consolidates all ACTIONS into a single checklist showing implementation status of the various improvements. A printed version of the blank checklist (which includes cost estimates) is included in Appendix A, but the primary implementation checklist lives in a digital format on the MPRB Planning Division network.

In its digital form, the checklist can be updated regularly. It can also serve as a guide to work planning across Divisions. Some items on the implementation checklist will not be accomplished simply through a funding allocation and a design and construction project. Some require partnership with other agencies or community groups; some require policy assessment, land management tasks, or changes in maintenance practices. Regardless of MPRB Division or outside partnership, all implementation shall be documented on the checklist and reported at least annually to the MPRB Commissioners and general public.

MPRB Staff shall complete the appropriate line item on the digital implementation checklist upon completion of a project or task. MPRB Planning staff shall submit a current checklist to the MPRB Commissioners at least annually.
The cost to transform neighborhood parks is a critical element of this master plan. A realistic understanding of the project costs (all costs involved in design and construction) will help the MPRB to prioritize the many projects identified across the system. At this stage in the development of these projects, the costs are based on the preliminary design and planning for each site, detailed in Chapter 4.

The overall implementation checklist and cost estimate is based on the park-by-park cost estimates included in Chapter 4, along with other Actions from Chapter 3 not necessarily associated with a capital improvement project. The cost estimates break the park plans down into logical “projects,” such as a wading pool, basketball court, or walking path rehabilitation. The unit prices are based on analysis of past construction projects and are priced at the base year of 2017. Capital improvement planning and budgeting for later years will require addition of an escalation factor, typically five percent per year.

These cost estimates are just that: estimates. Over the life of the SSAMP, construction practices, materials, design detailing, and labor costs will certainly change. At five year increments after adoption of the SSAMP, MPRB staff should revisit the unit prices that form the basis for these cost estimates and revise them if necessary. This can be done in the digital implementation checklist; revised cost numbers do not need to appear in the SSAMP document.

In addition, the final cost of a park project is often determined by the details that are finalized or better understood in the latter stages of design—or even as the improvements are about to be constructed. Time also plays an important role as the cost of construction can vary with time due to inflationary factors as well as factors relating to construction activity and economic conditions. The costs presented in this master plan should be considered “planning level” and reflect 2017 dollars. That is, they are not based on final construction documents and they utilize assumptions about the cost to permit, mobilize, and prepare the park site for development. Significant contingencies (as a percentage of construction costs) have therefore been included for both design and construction, but will be refined as timing and plans become more definite.
### THE COST ESTIMATE AND IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST HAVE A STANDARD SERIES OF COLUMNS:

**Park Name** refers to the park in which a project will take place. Projects without a specific park are noted in this column as “South Service Area.”

**Asset Type** refers to one of seven categories of improvement, as shown in the keys and park plans throughout this document: Aquatics, Play, Athletics, Courts, Winter, Landscape, and Other.

**Project** is a description of the improvement.

**2017 Estimated Cost** is the estimated dollar amount to implement the project, and includes design, construction, contingency, and incidental costs like turf establishment, demolition, and associated pathways.

**Implementation** sequence provides guidance on which projects must or should happen before others. Projects within parks have not been prioritized against each other.

**Status** features four categories:
- “Funded” projects are those that have been approved for capital or operational funding through the Park Board. Ideally these projects are not only identified in the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for construction or renovation but also have identified funding for any increase in operating costs resulting from improvements.
- Projects in the “Planned” category are not currently funded and are not conditional on an outside factor. These projects are ready to move forward to the next step but require a commitment of capital dollars and staff time to make this happen. Anything that appears in the SSAMP park plans is considered planned, as adoption of this plan constitutes a commitment to these improvements over time.
- “Conditional” projects are important to the long-term vision of the parks and recreation system, but require a major trigger event that is outside of the Park Board’s control before they can move forward. The type of conditions that could be a trigger for action on a Conditional project include acquiring site control, progress on adjacent or overlapping development proposals, coordination with or leadership by outside agencies, and action or the completion of funding agreements for park specific improvements. These project sites require monitoring to allow for quick action when a trigger event occurs.
- “Complete” projects are those that have been identified in the master plan and have been implemented. There are currently no projects in the category.

**Applicable SSAMP Actions** links a project to the ACTIONS in Chapter 3. This is the policy basis for the improvement.
Figure 6.1 summarizes the total cost of improvements for each park currently included in this master plan. Costs for replacing ALL assets in the park plans are included in the estimates, even if the asset is in good condition and will not be relocated. The assumption is that during the 20-30 year life of the SSAMP, ALL assets will be replaced. Project-by-project cost estimates are included in the “park packets” in Chapter 4 and as part of the implementation checklist in Appendix A.

There are no cost estimates for “Special Consideration” parks including Bossen Field, Cedar Avenue Field, East Phillips, Meridian Garden, and Rollins Triangle.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>2017 Estimate</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Improvement cost per acre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams Triangle</td>
<td>$297,371</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>$929,283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bossen Field</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brackett</td>
<td>$5,518,117</td>
<td>10.32</td>
<td>$534,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Avenue Field</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Gym</td>
<td>$2,910,599</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>$757,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corcoran</td>
<td>$2,127,000</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>$681,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currie</td>
<td>$7,002,499</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>$2,574,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Lake</td>
<td>$1,519,840</td>
<td>73.04</td>
<td>$20,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Phillips</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiawatha School</td>
<td>$4,172,888</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>$1,032,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keewaydin</td>
<td>$2,956,070</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>$731,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfellow</td>
<td>$4,464,188</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td>$549,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>$4,059,565</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$405,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McRae</td>
<td>$4,395,104</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>$554,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Garden</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>$3,071,170</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>$793,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murphy Square</td>
<td>$647,246</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>$205,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normanna Triangle</td>
<td>$22,383</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>$139,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl</td>
<td>$10,537,216</td>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>$359,264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peavey</td>
<td>$6,609,439</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>$933,537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phelps</td>
<td>$4,949,191</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>$632,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips Community Center</td>
<td>$795,262</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>$285,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powderhorn</td>
<td>$12,265,494</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>$185,841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rollins Triangle</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreview Triangles</td>
<td>$23,331</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>$40,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Oaks Oval</td>
<td>$599,285</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>$266,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sibley</td>
<td>$3,801,893</td>
<td>7.96</td>
<td>$477,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon</td>
<td>$2,797,737</td>
<td>45.16</td>
<td>$61,952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stewart</td>
<td>$4,836,572</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>$771,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd</td>
<td>$5,080,277</td>
<td>13.31</td>
<td>$381,689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSAMP TOTAL</td>
<td>$95,459,737</td>
<td>323.21</td>
<td>$295,349</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.1 - Total estimated improvement costs
NOTES ON COST ESTIMATES FOR MPRB STAFF

- Costs incidental to a project (including turf restoration, demolition, fencing, etc.) are included in the project cost.
- Furniture and other amenities (including signs, benches, tables, etc.) are included in the “Miscellaneous signs, landscaping, furniture” line item for each park. Capital improvement planning may want to include additional funds for other amenities to be implemented along with major projects.
- Items included in the ADA Transition Plan are not specifically tabulated in the cost estimates are not shown in detail on the plans. Project managers involved in projects in South Service Area parks should review the ADA Transition Plan and consider adding complementary improvements to their projects.
USING THIS DOCUMENT

This document is intended to be used by MPRB staff, elected officials, and the general public as a resource to implementation. It is a guide for future designers, elected officials, and partners.

FOR CAPITAL PLANNING

The projects identified in the park plans and cost estimates are those that should be added to the CIP as it is developed annually. The CIP selection criteria will determine which parks will be considered for improvement, based on ongoing analysis. Once parks are identified, capital improvement planners should consult the appropriate park plans and project cost estimates to determine specific projects. During this process, planners should:

• Consider the “implementation sequence” to determine which projects can happen first, and which need to follow or happen concurrently with other projects
• Look for complementary projects within parks, to ensure the least inconvenience to the public and to leverage the most economical construction costs
• Escalate the costs shown in this document to the projected year of implementation
• Typically include a portion of the “Miscellaneous signs, trees and furniture” to ensure adequate funding for visitor comfort and enjoyment through benches, drinking fountains, park signage, and signage for connections to other parks

FOR PROJECT DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION

Once a project is funded and a project manager is assigned, that project manager shall consult the resources contained in this document as a basis for the final design. This document shall govern the type of asset to be constructed (natural play v. traditional play; wading pool v. splash pad) as well as its general location and size. All park plans are available in CAD. These files can be overlain on a surveyed base to guide detailed design. During the detailed design process, project managers should:

• Communicate clearly with the community about the parameters set forth in this master plan and the level of decision-making and input community members can have
• Verify that any known land use issues have been resolved by first checking the “park packet” to see if their park has any, and then referencing the implementation checklist to ensure completion, where applicable
• Examine other projects in the list for their park, to consider if other leveraging opportunities exist, through grants, private fundraising, park dedication fees, or other funding sources
• Accurately fill out the implementation checklist at the conclusion of the construction project.
IN PARTNERSHIPS WITH OUTSIDE AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND NONPROFITS

It is likely that portions of this master plan will be implemented in partnership with outside groups. There is significant community interest in certain elements of these designs, and financial wherewithal throughout the south service area. Partnerships in funding and implementation are encouraged, but should be guided by the plans contained in this document. During discussions with potential outside partners, MPRB staff should clearly communicate that ONLY items contained in this document will be considered for partnership, in respect for the community priorities in these neighborhood parks.

TO GUIDE EXPENDITURES OF PARK DEDICATION FEES

MPRB collects park dedication fees from all development projects within the City of Minneapolis, with some exemptions and exceptions. These fees—in most cases—must be spent within the neighborhood they were generated. They must be spent on NEW park amenities and cannot generally be used for like-for-like replacement. There are many new proposals in this master plan that would be eligible for park dedication funding. In fact, because this plan is the community’s guide to park implementation, park dedication fees should almost always be directed toward implementation of this plan. Park dedication fees are allocated through the CIP process and are most effective when they leverage existing capital projects. Therefore, CIP planners should use this plan as a guide during the CIP process to consider options for park dedication fee allocation. In addition, the general public should use this document as a guide to making suggestions on allocation.

TO GUIDE LAND-IN-LIEU OF PARK DEDICATION FEE PROPOSALS

Per the park dedication ordinance, a developer may propose providing land for public park use in lieu of a portion of fees paid. All such proposals must be approved individually by the MPRB Commissioners. Because most South Service Area parks do not share land with potential redevelopment sites, it is unlikely that park expansion will take place through this method. Instead, two main uses of land-in-lieu might be considered under this plan:

- Connections to parks: ACTION 8 calls for collaboration with the City and other partners in creating improved connections between parks. In cases where a trail or pedestrian connection might be implemented in concert with a development project, a land-in-lieu proposal could be positively entertained.
- New park access: ACTION 12 identifies two specific locations for improved park access: the Midtown Greenway Corridor west of Hiawatha Avenue and the Hiawatha Avenue Corridor in the vicinity of Lake Street. In both cases, development projects could provide land for public use as a means of implementing this plan.
AMENDING THIS PLAN

In order to remain a living, useful document for future park planners, designers, elected officials, partners, and community members, the SSAMP must be able to change when necessary. Any departure from the lenses, actions, and plans contained in this document must be accomplished by an action of the elected Board of Commissioners according to applicable policies and procedures. The affected community should also be involved in that decision-making, per MPRB community engagement policy.

There are several likely reasons that the SSAMP will need to be amended. The following checklists outline the tasks necessary to amend and update the SSAMP. It is critical that SSAMP documents and resources are updated after amendment approval, so MPRB staff and the general public have only the most up-to-date plans. Appropriate MPRB staff shall perform the tasks in the applicable checklist when an amendment is contemplated.

AS A RESULT OF REQUEST

Because the park plans in the SSAMP assume the existing footprints of recreation centers, any planned modification to recreation center buildings will impact the design of the park. In the case of a recreation center expansion, reconstruction, or decommissioning, the SSAMP must be amended.

- Refer to the community engagement summary in this document for the park in question, to understand the baseline community desires at the time of the SSAMP
- Engage with the community around and users of the park to determine how the park design should change to accommodate changes in the recreation center. Follow MPRB community engagement policy.
- Achieve MPRB Commissioner approval for the modified park plan
- Modify park plan in CAD and replace CAD basemap in network park folder
- Modify and update digital cost and maintenance estimates
- Modify park narrative sections to reflect new design, and note date and reason for amendment
- Replace PDF park packet in network park folder and main SSAMP document
- Modify overall service area facilities map and spreadsheet, if park change adds or removes planned facilities, and replace in main SSAMP document
- Update the digital implementation tracking form, if change adds or removes planned facilities
- Add the note “Amended, Month/Year” to the cover of the SSAMP document
- Add the signed amendment resolution to Appendix Z
AS A RESULT OF DETAILED SITE DESIGN
It is possible that, during detailed design, unknowns will come to light that require modifications to locations of elements within the park. Such modifications should be the result of actual site conditions that prevent implementation of the plan as drawn, not merely a desire to depart from the plan. In such cases, the SSAMP must be amended, with the amendment coming forward for approval concurrent with approval of the schematic design that forced the amendment.

- Achieve MPRB Commissioner approval for the modified park plan
- Modify park plan in CAD and replace CAD basemap in network park folder
- Modify and update digital cost and maintenance estimates
- Modify park narrative sections to reflect new design, and note date and reason for amendment
- Replace PDF park packet in network park folder and main SSAMP document
- Modify overall service area facilities map and spreadsheet, if park change modifies or removes planned facilities, and replace in main SSAMP document
- Update the digital implementation tracking form, if change adds or removes planned facilities
- Add the note “Amended, Month/Year” to the cover of the SSAMP document
- Add the signed amendment resolution to Appendix Z

TO INCLUDE CEDAR AVENUE FIELD AND EAST PHILLIPS PARK
Once a community-driven design is accomplished for Cedar Avenue Field, being the result of additional community engagement, the SSAMP must be amended. In addition, the SSAMP calls for a full master plan to be prepared for East Phillips upon the need to replace the first major asset in the park to reach the end of its useful life. This is likely to be the premier soccer fields in YEAR. Once a new community-driven master plan is created, with community engagement per MPRB policy, the SSAMP must be amended.

- Create a park packet similar in format to those included in this document for other parks
- Hold a public hearing before the MPRB Commissioners to achieve approval of the park plan
- Insert the park packet in the main SSAMP document
- Place CAD basemap and park packet in network park folder
- Modify overall service area facilities map and replace in main SSAMP document
- Modify references in the main SSAMP document to Cedar Avenue Field or East Phillips being a “special consideration park”
- Update the digital implementation tracking form
- Add the note “Amended, Month/Year” to the cover of the SSAMP document
- Add the signed amendment resolution to Appendix Z
- Remove this section from the main SSAMP document

BY ADDING DESIGNATED URBAN AGRICULTURE AREAS
The neighborhood park plans serve as the official designation of urban agriculture areas in the MPRB system. When urban agriculture areas are added, removed, or modified, the SSAMP must be amended. Typically, amendment in this case will accompany an agreement with a community group to do urban agriculture on park property. The amendment should come forward for approval concurrent with the agreement.

- Achieve MPRB Commissioner approval for the modified park plan(s)
- Modify urban agriculture designation on park plan(s)
- Modify park narrative sections to reflect new design(s), and note date and reason for amendment
- Replace PDF park packet(s) in network park folder and main SSAMP document
- Modify overall service area facilities map and spreadsheet, and replace in main SSAMP document
- Update the digital implementation tracking form
- Add the note “Amended, Month/Year” to the cover of the SSAMP document
- Add the signed amendment resolution to Appendix Z
- Remove this section from the main SSAMP document
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APPENDICES*

A: Implementation Tracking Form
B: Park Condition Assessment
C: Demographic/Trends Analysis
D: Utilization Analysis
E: Community Engagement Documentation
F: Initial Design Concepts
G: CAC Meeting Notes
H: Operations and Maintenance Analysis
- 
Z: Signed Approval Resolution

*The Appendices are not included in the printed document nor on the project website. This background information is contained in approximately one thousand pages of documents, making it cost-prohibitive and cumbersome to produce and store. Summaries of each appendix topic are included in the body of this document. Appendices may be made available for review via e-mail transmittal by requesting them from the project manager. Visit minneapolisparks.org/currentprojects and select South Service Area Master Plan to find applicable contact information.