REQUEST FOR QUALIFICATIONS

Services for
Cedar-Riverside Recreation Centers Predesign Study

Release Date: Tuesday, February 26, 2019
Pre-submittal Review Meeting (non-mandatory): March 12 at 2:30pm at MPRB HQ
Last Day for Questions: Monday, March 18, 2019 at 3pm
Due Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 at 3pm

REQUEST

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) seeks professional design services for the Cedar-Riverside Recreation Centers Predesign Study project.

Issued by the MPRB on behalf of:

MPRB
YMCA of the Greater Twin Cities (YMCA)
Augsburg University
Pillsbury United Communities (PUC)
Fairview Health Services

ABOUT MPRB

The MPRB is an independent, semi-autonomous body responsible for maintaining and developing the Minneapolis Park system to meet the needs of citizens of Minneapolis. This unique structure allows independent decision-making so the MPRB can efficiently oversee a diverse system of land and water. Nine Park Board Commissioners are elected every four years: one from each of the six park districts within the city and three that serve at-large. The Board of Commissioners appoints the Superintendent to provide high-level oversight and leadership to the nationally renowned park system. Three Assistant Superintendents, all appointed by the Superintendent, oversee operations, planning and recreation with a staff of 400+ full-time and 1200+ part-time employees and an annual operating budget of $60 million. The MPRB is one of five Minnesota park agencies and one of only 108 agencies in the United States that is accredited by the Commission for Accreditation of Park and Recreation Agencies (CAPRA).
The Minneapolis Park System consists of 182 park properties, including local and regional parks, playgrounds, triangles, golf courses, gardens, picnic areas, biking and walking paths, nature sanctuaries, and the 55-mile Grand Rounds National Scenic Byway. Together, these properties total 6,732 acres of land and water. The backbone of the park system is its full-service neighborhood recreation centers. It serves as host to approximately sixteen million visitors annually. The Park Board adopted a Comprehensive Plan (2007), after substantial public input, which will provide guidance through 2020.

**GENERAL INFORMATION**

This Request for Qualifications is intended to solicit responses from qualified consultants or consultant teams for services related to the creation of State of MN Predesign Packets for two recreation centers in the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood of Minneapolis. The State of MN Predesign Packet is governed by MN Statutes 16B.335 Subdivision 2. This Request for Qualifications is offered through the MPRB, which will act as the contracting authority for work resulting from this request.

The MPRB is the sole authority to speak to issues related to this Request for Qualifications.

This Request for Qualifications is open to all qualified firms and individuals. As described in Contractual Obligations, there are requirements for participation from small and underutilized businesses.

A Scope of Work and a fee for services will be negotiated with the successful responder.

**CONTACT INFORMATION**

The MPRB has assigned staff to manage the Request for Qualifications process, including any needs related to clarifications or questions. Any communications related to this request shall be directed VIA EMAIL ONLY to:

Daniel Elias  
DElias@minneapolisparks.org

No other staff is authorized to respond to questions or requests for clarification of this Request for Qualifications. Failure to follow this instruction may be cause for disqualification.

Questions or requests for clarification must be received by the date indicated in the Preliminary
PROJECT OVERVIEW

The MPRB, in concert with YMCA, Augsburg, PUC, and Fairview (collectively, the Partner Organization Team) seeks predesign services from a Minnesota-licensed architect and other design and affiliated professionals (collectively, the Design Team) to prepare two predesigns for recreation centers in the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood of Minneapolis.

The predesigns shall align with the State of Minnesota Department of Administration’s Predesign Manual for Capital Budget Projects and outcomes further described in this Request for Qualifications. The Design Team will be responsible for coordinating with the Partner Organization Team to deliver a responsive and compelling predesign based on work completed to date by the Partner Organization Team, community engagement to be conducted by the Design Team and the Partner Organization Team, and programming to be developed as part of the predesign.

This project will focus on the creation of a predesign for two facilities:

- a new recreation center, which will be integrated into a larger redevelopment project on the east end of the Augsburg University campus,
  - A preliminary plan to accommodate parking for the new recreation center is part of this project scope,
  - Other elements of the larger Augsburg University campus east end development, for which Augsburg University will independently retain design services, may include parking, student housing, and academic and programming space,
    - Coordination will be required with the Augsburg design team for the larger redevelopment project; and
- a renovation/relocation of Brian Coyle Community Center in its current location or at a site to be determined as part of the predesign process,
  - If relocated, the new Brian Coyle Community Center may be incorporated into a larger redevelopment and will include a preliminary plan to accommodate parking for the new recreation center.

The Design Team will be responsible for the development of a program related to each facility that fairly
and comprehensively assigns uses, activities, programs, and services to each facility. In that process the Design Team will be responsible to balance delivery of necessary services to both facilities without unnecessary duplication.

The intention of this process is to create a predesign plan for two recreation centers that will serve as a guide for further planning and design related to operations, programming, and implementation. An important aspect of the subsequent work is the pursuit of capital and operations funding for each facility, a process likely to take several years to complete and one which may require new and formal partnerships between existing and new project partners.

**PARTNER ORGANIZATION TEAM**

The Partner Organization Team have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) supporting the creation of a feasibility study performed by a third party and the preparation of a predesign as described herein. The Partner Organization Team, through the MOU, recognize their mutual goals for serving the Cedar-Riverside community through programs, activities, services, and facilities may be best accomplished through the creation of recreation centers providing efficient and effective service delivery. The MOU is included in this Request for Qualifications as Attachment A. The Partner Organization Team and a general statement of interests in this project include:

**YMCA of the Greater Twin Cities (YMCA)**

The YMCA brings expertise in the promotion of healthy living, youth development, and social responsibility; experience in fundraising and strategic real estate development related to recreation and social service facilities; and experience in delivering efficient and effective programming and services. The YMCA would be a programmatic and/or operational partner.

**Augsburg University (Augsburg)**

Augsburg is interested in providing expanded programs, activities, and facilities to the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood and its college community on a site that is prominent in the neighborhood and located on its property. Augsburg brings expertise in educating students to be informed citizens, thoughtful stewards, critical thinkers, and responsible leaders; supports the engagement of students, faculty, and staff in programs that address needs in the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood; and has expertise in fundraising and facilities management.
Pillsbury United Communities (PUC)

PUC provides services to the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood through the Coyle Community Center in a facility owned by the MPRB and leased to PUC but recognizes a need to improve and expand its facilities in order to serve the growing needs of the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood. PUC brings expertise in providing community services through an interconnected network of community centers and social enterprises; experience operating culturally-specific programs, education, and recreation at neighborhood community centers, and experience in delivering efficient and impactful services to diverse and underserved communities throughout Minneapolis. The Coyle Community Center provides services aimed specifically at the needs of Cedar-Riverside residents—largely of East African descent—including youth mentoring, STEAM education programs, family health and wellness services, including youth and senior citizen programming, and basic needs services including health education and a food shelf.

Fairview Health Services (Fairview)

Fairview has a long history of working in and partnering with our communities to improve health. From clinical care to community programs, we reach out and engage with people in our communities, develop new programs and partnerships while expanding current ones, and bring data research to address local health and health equity priorities. Together with people in our communities, we’re driving a healthier future.

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB)

The MPRB provides services to the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood through its programs, activities, and facilities, but recognizes the needs of the neighborhood exceed its capacity to deliver at a level that addresses needs through its current programs, activities, and facilities. The MPRB brings expertise in developing facilities supporting the delivery of programs and activities targeted to Minneapolis residents and communities, and by its mission and charter delivers services to residents of and visitors to the City of Minneapolis. The MPRB, by its ordinance, is mandated to deliver facilities in Minneapolis equitably, including in the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood which ranks as a high priority for the delivery of facilities supporting program and service needs.

The MPRB will be the contracting authority for all work related to this Request for Qualifications and will provide consultant management services supporting the work of the Design Team.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

The MPRB currently leases Coyle Community Center to PUC, retaining limited rights to program and use the gymnasium. PUC has long recognized that its leased space fails to meet program requirements and, in 2009, engaged in a schematic design for the current building that would expand the capacity of the building for its programs and services (see Attachment B). Those plans have not been executed.
The MPRB has secured funds from the State of Minnesota to study the feasibility and explore a predesign for a recreation center in the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood. While originally targeted to the Coyle Community Center, the MPRB, through discussions with the Partner Organization Team, believes those funds should be directed to the preparation of a predesign study for a new recreation center, currently imagined to be located on the Augsburg campus and incorporated into a larger redevelopment led by others, and a renovated or new recreation center at or near the Coyle Community Center.

The Partner Organization Team have engaged ANA Research | Anderson, Niebuhr & Associates, Inc. (ANA) to conduct a Market Analysis aimed at establishing the feasibility of the project from the perspective of a membership model as well as to begin a process of framing desired or needed components of the new recreation center at the Augsburg campus and the renovated or new recreation center at or near Coyle Community Center. The ANA effort is complete and a final report is included as Attachment D.

The Partner Organization Team will use the deliverables resulting from the predesign to seek capital funding for implementation of both projects. It is anticipated that capital funding will take three to five years, with efforts being directed to public funding for both projects and, to the extent aligned with the market or philanthropic community, private funding for either or both projects. Advancing a shared community and recreation center on either location are potentially more complex because of public and private partnerships likely required for implementation.

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The two facilities will be open and accessible to all communities but will target the following populations:

- Youth, families, and seniors, particularly immigrants
- Students, faculty, staff, and employees of Augsburg University, Fairview, and other institutions and businesses in the area.

The program of development for each site shall include, generally:

**A. A new Recreation Center proposed to be located on the campus of Augsburg University and integrated as one component of its larger Augsburg University campus east end development.**

A.1 Recreation, education, and community uses and programming, as distinct or integrated and multifunction spaces, including but not limited to:

a) A gymnasium accommodating multiple uses including free- and organized-play and based on a two-court basketball configuration;

b) A gymnasium accommodating culturally appropriate and separated use by women and girls for free- and organized-play and based on a single-court basketball configuration, with the space serving, on occasion as a flexible gathering or meeting space for events;

c) Group-focused wellness, fitness, aerobics, dance, and other health-related and low-impact exercise and activity spaces;
d) Individual-focused exercise, weight-training and other health-related training and activity spaces;

e) Support facilities for recreation activities including locker rooms, equipment storage;

f) Classroom spaces accommodating various ages for arts, enrichment, education programming, language, employment training, nutrition, and other classroom type activities, and counseling or support activities in groups, with at least one space extending to an exterior use area and at least one space having access to a teaching and kitchen;

g) Community spaces accommodating gathering, socializing, conferencing, presentations, and meeting in modular format, with all spaces having access to audio-visual facilities with at least one space extending to an exterior use area;

h) Spaces accommodating daycare for youth and adults and operated as a function of the MPRB;

i) Spaces as determined through the Market Analysis and continued Community Engagement;

j) Welcoming common spaces serving as an entry, lobby, common and gallery spaces that encourages general socializing and including exterior spaces that allow for similar activities;

k) Spaces for retreat and solitude, including spaces accommodating culturally appropriate activities; and

l) Administrative spaces supporting the programming and management of the facility and containing both shared and separated office spaces for various Partner Organization Team (YMCA, Augsburg, Fairview, and MPRB, in particular) and shared spaces for work, common, meeting, and support functions.

A.2 The program and predesign will be further shaped by engagement with the community, stakeholders and Partner Organization Team during the predesign process.

A.3 Augsburg may retain design services separate from the project to advance its needs and requirements, with its consultants contributing information and design direction toward the Predesign, or it may determine to contract separately with the chosen Design Team to ensure its program requirements are defined and reasonably incorporated into the Predesign.

A.4 An assessment of parking required to accommodate users who arrive by personal passenger vehicles for the new recreation center.

B. A renovation of Coyle Community Center or a new Recreation Center at a site to be determined as part of the predesign process.

B.1 Recreation, education, and community uses and programming, as distinct or integrated and multifunction spaces, including but not limited to:

a) A gymnasium accommodating multiple uses including free- and organized-play and based on a two-court basketball configuration;

b) A gymnasium accommodating culturally appropriate and separated use by women and girls for free- and organized-play and based on a single-court basketball
configuration, with the space serving, on occasion as a flexible gathering or meeting space for events;

c) Space accommodating group-focused wellness, fitness, aerobics, dance, and other health-related and low-impact exercise and activity spaces as well as individual-focused exercise, weight-training and other health-related training and activity spaces;

d) Support facilities for recreation activities including locker rooms, equipment storage;

e) Classroom spaces accommodating various ages for arts, enrichment, education programming, language, employment training, nutrition, and other classroom type activities, and counseling or support activities in groups, with at least one space extending to an exterior use area and at least one space having access to a teaching and kitchen;

f) Community spaces accommodating gathering, socializing, conferencing, presentations, and meeting in modular format, with all spaces having access to audio-visual facilities with at least one space extending to an exterior use area;

g) Spaces accommodating daycare for youth and adults and operated as a function of the MPRB;

h) Space specifically oriented to teen and young adult gathering and interactions;

i) Spaces as determined through the Market Analysis and continued Community Engagement;

j) Welcoming common spaces serving as an entry, lobby, common and gallery spaces that encourages general socializing and including exterior spaces that allow for similar activities;

k) Spaces for retreat and solitude, including spaces accommodating culturally appropriate activities; and

l) Administrative spaces supporting the programming and management of the facility and containing both shared and separated office spaces for various Partner Organization Team (PUC and MPRB, in particular) and shared spaces for work, common, meeting, and support functions.

B.2 A Recreation Center located on a new site might consider the potential to be integrated into a larger development/building, one with a residential focus and limited retail use created in partnership with a private sector entity. A site has not been determined. As part of a new facility on a new site, MPRB staff would address changes to Currie Park through a separate park master plan study and amendment process.

B.2.1 An assessment of parking required to accommodate the Recreation Center users who arrive by personal passenger vehicles for the recreation center.

OUTCOMES

The MPRB is not specifying or currently requesting a work plan or scope of work as a part of this Request for Qualifications, but instead offers outcomes that must be achieved by the design team as a part of the predesign process. The successful responder will be responsible for defining and providing a scope of work...
aligned with the outcomes framed below following the selection process and prior to award of an agreement for services.

The Partner Organization Team have defined the following as necessary outcomes of the predesign process:

**Facility-related outcomes:**
- A predesign accommodating the most practical range of uses, activities, and services, particularly accommodating the unique cultural and ethnic composition of the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood;
- A predesign for each site that maintains flexibility in its use as demonstrated by changes in neighborhood, community, and stakeholder needs;
- Explorations of models for ownership, programming, and operations that can be reasonably achieved by the Partner Organization Team through existing or new practices;
- A predesign for the Augsburg site that can be integrated into broader redevelopment plans for the east end of Augsburg University’s campus and implemented incrementally with respect for Augsburg future needs;
- A predesign for a facility on-site or near the Coyle Community Center accommodating expanding needs for services and programs for residents and stakeholders in its immediate proximity;
- Predesigns for both sites that demonstrate well-conceived and convenient connections to the public realm of the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood and that are the focus for social interaction in the neighborhood;
- An opinion of probable cost for each facility, established in year-of-implementation dollars, along with estimates of the costs of operating each facility;
- A set of documents demonstrating the predesign that can be used by each Partner Organization Team for their internal purposes and particularly for an eventual final design process that may be achieved by a different consulting team; and
- Two predesigns that individually align with the State of Minnesota Department of Administration’s Predesign Manual for Capital Budget Projects.

**Process-related outcomes:**
- A design process that fully engages each Project Partner and that recognizes the unique and common needs of each Project Partner and their individual capacity to contribute to the ownership, programming, or operations of a recreation center in whatever form it takes;
- A public process that reaches to the broadest possible range of interests in the neighborhood and that equitably engages people of varying backgrounds and abilities to participate, both achieved in full collaboration with the Partner Organization Team;
- A process that respects the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board’s Community Engagement Plan and its requirement for engagement of a community advisory committee for guidance;
A vision for the recreation centers capable for being perpetuated through several additional years of planning and design and, especially, through a process aimed at delivering funding for implementation of both facilities;

• A coherent demonstration of subsequent design and planning explorations necessary to advance the predesign to a final design; and

• A design for each facility that can be approved by the governing body of each Project Partner.

Community-related outcomes:

• A predesign for recreation centers capable of serving all residents for generations, even as responsibility for cooperative programming and management evolves; and

• A predesign for recreation centers that accommodate users with culturally appropriate spaces.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

While the Partner Organization Team are not relying on a preconceived scope of work to determine a qualified consultant, there is an expectation that the following services will be provided as a part of the predesign:

• Assistance in the engagement of the community, stakeholders, and Partner Organization Team as necessary to prepare a facility program for each of the two facilities;

• Assistance in the engagement of the Community Advisory Committee as dictated in the draft Community Engagement Plan included as Attachment C.

• Review of context and conditions of sites and existing facilities to determine appropriate actions, siting, and relationships;

• Creation of concepts addressing a range of options for each facility;

• Orchestration of Partner Organization Team discussion related to ownership, management, programming, and operations of each facility;

• Definition of a preferred direction for a predesign for each facility based on community input and response and direction from the Partner Organization Team;

• Estimation of probable project costs for each facility based on year-of-implementation for each facility;

• Preparation of graphics, diagrams, illustrations, and narrative supporting the predesign process and preferred predesign for each facility;

• Assistance, as required, in presentations of the predesign at interim and final stages to the Partner Organization Team and other key stakeholders; and

• Definition of actions required to advance each project following acceptance of a preferred predesign for each facility.

PRELIMINARY PROJECT BUDGET AND FEE PROPOSAL
The MPRB, as contracting authority for this project, has a $225,000 budget for consultant services supporting the predesigns.

**PRELIMINARY PROJECT SCHEDULE**

The MPRB anticipates a predesign process that will extend for a period not exceeding 12 months from work initiation, not including final review and approval separately by the Partner Organization Team.

The Partner Organization Team will pursue the following schedule related to this Request for Qualifications and the engagement of a design team:

**2019**

- Feb 26  Release of Request for Qualifications
- March 12 @ 2:30pm  Pre-submittal Meeting at MPRB HQ (2117 West River Road N.)
- Mar 18 @ 3pm  Last day for Consultant RFP Questions
- Mar 21  Responses to Questions or Requests for Clarifications Posted
- Mar 26 @ 3pm  Consultant Qualifications Due
- April 12  Design Team Interviews (if necessary)
- May 1  MPRB Board approval of design consultant contract
- June to Summer 2020  Predesign Process

Updates to the schedule will occur only via an addendum to this Request for Qualifications.
PRE-SUBMITTAL MEETING

A pre-submittal conference will be conducted as a means of providing additional information regarding the project and this Request for Qualifications. The meeting will be conducted at the MPRB Headquarters Board Room, 2117 West River Road, Minneapolis according to the schedule above.

Representatives of the Partner Organization Team will participate in the pre-submittal conference. The pre-submittal conference will employ an agenda including the following topics:

- Project need and predesign expectations
- Community engagement
- Desired services as outcomes
- Response requirements and consultant selection
- Questions from meeting participants

Participation in the pre-submittal conference is not mandatory.

PROJECT GUIDANCE

In addition to guidance and direction through the Partner Organization Team, the predesign process is anticipated to include engagement and review by each of several committees or bodies according to a Community Engagement Plan created by the MPRB. The frequency and timing for meetings with each group will be determined in concert with the selected design team.

Throughout the predesign process, the Partner Organization Team will be engaging the community, formally and informally. While the committees or bodies listed in this section will play a key role in shaping a predesign, input from the community gained through a variety of methods will be important in shaping directions for a design.

Partner Organization Team

The Partner Organization Team will assign at least one staff per partner to meet with the design team on a regular basis throughout the predesign process. This group will be the design team’s most direct and regular interface, where key technical determinations are made and where information to be shared with the public, in any venue, is first reviewed.
Community Advisory Committee
It is the practice of the MPRB to engage the community through a wide range of methods, including a defined Community Advisory Committee (CAC) that meets frequently (monthly) through a design process to offer continual insights and guidance from the direct perspective of the community. The design team will be required to participate in meetings of the CAC to ensure the predesigns are as aligned with community interests, as presented by the CAC, as practicable. Community representation on the CAC will be as defined in the MPRB Community Engagement Plan (see Attachment C).

The CAC’s work will be guided by a charge defined in the MPRB’s Community Engagement Plan.

Where the CAC will offer a formal recommendation to the MPRB, it shall be recognized by the design team as one method of gaining input from the community. Input gained from other groups or through venues other than CAC meetings must be balanced with direct input from the CAC.

Project Advisory Committee
Throughout the predesign process, the Partner Organization Team intend to engage a Project Advisory Committee (PAC) composed on staff internal to the Partner Organization Team at key milestones. The design team may be asked to participate in meetings of the Project Advisory Committee.

Technical Advisory Committee
The project may require technical input from entities beyond the Partner Organization Team or other bodies described in this section. For this project, technical insights may be sought from various departments of the City of Minneapolis (land use, property, transportation, infrastructure), Hennepin County, or others. While the composition of the Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) has yet to be defined, the design team may be asked to participate in TAC meetings.
COMMUNICATIONS PLAN AND STRATEGY

The formal sharing of information during the predesign process is critical in maintaining fair and true participation. Therefore, the Partner Organization Team will prepare a communications plan and strategy to:

- Ensure, to the degree practicable, correct information is available to the public and project stakeholders;
- Deliver information to the public on a consistent basis and as new information becomes available;
- Post information, data, and other deliverables in a single location on the MPRB’s website;
- Distill key information into a Frequently Asked Questions document that, as directly as practicable, frames key aspects of the predesign process and likely possible future actions;
- Provide, as needed, media access to project leadership to gain a more complete understanding of issues and directions; and
- Provide notice of meetings and decision points related to the predesign process and any associated approvals.

The design team will not be responsible for the communications plan or directly for its implementation but may be asked to contribute materials supporting communication of directions and status of the predesign work.

QUALIFICATION CONTENT, SUBMISSION & EVALUATION

Due Date: Tuesday, March 26, 2019 – 3:00 PM CST

Submit to: Daniel Elias
Design Project Manager, Planning Division
Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board
delias@minneapolisparks.org

The email submittal must clearly state in the subject line that the communication contains:

“Statement of Qualifications for Cedar-Riverside Recreation Centers Predesign Study”

Submit one electronic copy in pdf format. Proposals should be no larger than 8 ½” x 11. Each page of content is considered 1 page. Proposals will become public data upon selection. No text shall be smaller than 11-point font for any portion of the primary narrative or smaller than 9-point font for any other text.

Any communications and/or inquiries by a bidder during this RFQ process must be submitted by 3pm on Monday, March 18th.
It is not the MPRB’s responsibility or practice to acknowledge receipt of any qualifications as a result of the Request for Qualifications process. It is the Proposer’s responsibility to assure that the qualifications are received in a timely manner and is responsive to any RFQ Addendums provided.

The proposal should contain the following information and be submitted in the following order:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Team identification</td>
<td>• The respondent shall provide the following information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(This section shall be limited to two pages)</td>
<td>1) The name, address, and telephone number of the lead consultant, and the office location from which the work would be conducted for a lead consultant not located in the Twin Cities area;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2) The name, address, and telephone number of other members of the consultant team, and the office location from which the work would be conducted if the consultant team member is not located in the Twin Cities area; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3) The name, title, email address, and telephone number of the person who is primarily responsible for preparation of the response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• This section shall contain no descriptive information about the design team other than the information requested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Project understanding (Two pages)</td>
<td>• The respondent shall respond to the following information:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4) Beyond information contained in this Request for Qualifications, describe the consultant’s or consultant team’s understanding of the need and intent of this project; frame parameters for a successful predesign; offer additional goals that might be important in delivering a successful predesign; share insights about why this project is important to the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5) How will the lead consultant ensure the work of this request is fully responsive to the outcomes identified in this request?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6) Why is the design team particularly well suited to perform the work based on the understanding of the responder?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• No other information shall be included in this section.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Skills and experience of the lead consultant (Three pages)

- The respondent shall respond to the following information:

  7) What two projects completed in the last 5 years, performed by the lead consultant is most similar to the focus of this request and what role did the lead consultant play in the project? Provide narrative, graphic, and pictorial support for that project.

  8) What makes this project substantively different than the projects identified as being most similar to the focus of this request?

  9) What role did the Project Lead play in the referenced project and how did their performance contribute to the project’s success?

  10) Who may be contacted as a reference for detailed questions about the projects identified as relevant similar experience?

- No other information shall be included in this section.

### Skills and experience of other consultant team members (Five pages)

- The respondent shall respond to the following information:

  11) What single project performed by each member of the consultant team is most similar to the focus of this request and what role did the consultant member play in the project? Provide narrative, graphic, and pictorial support for that project.

  12) For projects listed as a response to the preceding question, what makes this project substantively different than the project identified as being most similar to the focus of this request?

  13) What role did the Key Personnel play in the referenced projects?

  14) Who may be contacted as a reference for detailed questions about each project identified as relevant similar experience in the response?

- No other information shall be included in this section.
### Project Lead (Two pages)

- The respondent shall respond to the following information:

  15) *How was the consultant’s or consultant team’s Project Lead chosen for this effort?*
  16) *What skills and experience particular to this request does the project Lead Offer?*
  17) *Provide a summary of projects or other demonstration of the Project Lead’s capacity for performing this work.*

- The Project Lead shall be the single individual with primary responsibility for the consultant’s or consultant team’s work, interactions, and deliverables. The Project Lead shall have authority for making decisions for the design team, including negotiating changes in the professional services agreement, should modifications become necessary.

- In submitting a response and identifying a Project Lead, the MPRB assumes the Project Lead has sufficient time to fully serve in this role. No substitution in the role of Project Lead will be permitted unless the individual listed leaves the consultant firm or is physically unable to perform the work, in which case it shall be presumed that a Project Lead with substantially similar experience will be assigned and made similarly available to the project. The MPRB reserves the right to review and confirm the qualifications and suitability of any substituted Project Lead. In the event of a departure of a Project Lead, the design team assumes all responsibilities related to “onboarding,” gaps of information, delays of the project, or other similar issues resulting from a transition in high level project personnel.

- No other information shall be included in this section.

### Key Personnel (Four pages)

- The respondent shall respond to the following information:

  18) *What roles or areas of expertise are needed to fully satisfy the requirements of the requested work?*
  19) *Which members of the design team will be assigned to those roles or areas of expertise? Why are those individuals best positioned to perform those roles or address the areas of expertise?*
  20) *Provide a summary of projects or other experience demonstrating capacity for performing this work for each Key Personnel.*
  21) *What roles necessary to perform this work has the design team not included as part of its team?*

- Key Personnel shall be those individuals responsible for assuming significant tasks and assuring the quality of key deliverables.
In submitting a response and identifying Key Personnel, the MPRB assumes the individuals have sufficient time to fully serve in their respective roles. Substitutions after the project has commenced shall require review and confirmation by the MPRB. In the event of a departure of any Key Personnel, the design team assumes all responsibilities related to “onboarding,” gaps of information, delays of the project, or other similar issues resulting from a transition in high level project personnel.

- No other information shall be included in this section.

| 7 | Approach (Three pages) | The respondent shall respond to the following information:

22) In general terms, describe the general approach that will be pursued in the consultant’s or consultant team’s design process. In that description, outline the roles for the community, stakeholders, and Partner Organization Team. Highlight milestones and primary checkpoints in the consultant’s or consultant team’s predesign process. Frame the description in ways that the outcomes shared in this Request for Qualifications might be realized. Outline the deliverables that will be important in demonstrating directions of the predesign at various stages of this process.

23) What methods will the design team use in the engagement of the community and stakeholders? Will the design team play a lead role in the engagement or does it believe its role is better in supporting the Partner Organization Team in community engagement activities?

24) How will the consultant’s or consultant team’s approach create a highly interactive space for discussions with the community, stakeholders, and Partner Organization Team?

25) What tasks will be directed to the Partner Organization Team as a part of anticipated deliverables?

- No other information shall be included in this section.

| 8 | Schedule (One page) | The respondent shall respond to the following information:

26) What are the key milestones for delivery of the project by major deliverable, significant meetings and interactions with the public and staff of the MPRB, or other logical divisions of the work?

27) What are the key points for any incremental reviews by the MPRB?

28) What is the process proposed for engaging the MPRB in the review of incremental, draft, or final deliverables?

- No other information shall be included in this section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9 Risks  | (One page)   | The respondent shall respond to the following information:  
29) *What risks might be encountered in the pursuit of the predesign and how will the design team mitigate those risks?*  
No other information shall be included in this section. |
| 10 Quality management (One page) | The respondent shall respond to the following information:  
30) *What methods will be used to ensure the quality, completeness, and timeliness of interim and final deliverables?*  
31) *Which member of the design team will be responsible for quality management?*  
No other information shall be included in this section. |
| 11 Certification (One page) | The respondent shall respond to the following information:  
32) *The design team shall provide and agree to the following statement, executed by an individual with authority to represent fully the activities and interests of the responder:*  
I hereby certify that I am a duly authorized representative of the company and that the information contained within this response to the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board’s Request for Proposal is current, true and correct to the best of my knowledge. I hereby authorize and request any person, agency or firm to furnish any pertinent information requested by MPRB deemed necessary to verify the statements made in this application.  
*(Signature) (Title) (Date)*  
No other information shall be included in this section. |
EVALUATION OF RESPONSES

Responses to this Request for Qualifications will be reviewed by a combination of the following representatives of the Partner Organization Team:

- Daniel Elias, Project Manager, Planning Division, MPRB
- Abdirahman Mukhtar, Community Outreach, Equity, and Inclusion Coordinator, MPRB
- Siciid Ali, Planner, MPRB
- Michael Schroeder, Assistant Superintendent of Planning, MPRB
- Amanda Novak, Senior Director of New Development, YMCA
- Brian Birk, Enterprise Architect, YMCA
- Steve Peacock, Director of Community Relations, Augsburg University
- Beth Reissenweber, Vice President of Finance & Administration, Chief Financial Officer, Augsburg University
- Karen Durant, Augsburg University Regent
- Amano Dube, Director, Coyle Community Center, Pillsbury United Communities
- Brenna Brelie, Chief of Staff, Pillsbury United Communities
- Adair Mosley, President & CEO, Pillsbury United Communities
- Diane Tran, Senior Director, Community Engagement, Fairview Health Services
- Keith Allen, Manager, Community Collaborations, Fairview Health Services
- Nawal Hirsi, Engagement Manager, Fairview Health Services

Responses shall be reviewed using the following criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adherence to the required format of the response:</td>
<td>No consideration will be given to proposals failing to follow the format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity and directness of the response:</td>
<td>10 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications and experience of the Project Lead:</td>
<td>25 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualifications and experience of the Design Team excluding the Project Lead:</td>
<td>15 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrated understanding of the project:</td>
<td>20 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherent approach to the work, especially related to design process, engagement of stakeholders, interactions with Partner Organization Team, and appropriateness of anticipated deliverables:</td>
<td>20 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement and understanding of project risks, the need for managing quality of the work, and the timeliness of milestones leading to full delivery:</td>
<td>10 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Any determination relative to the selection of a design team made by the MPRB shall be considered final.
SELECTION OF CONSULTANT TEAM

Should it be determined after a detailed review of responses that interviews are necessary to determine the best qualified design team, the MPRB will organize interviews as follows:

- The design teams selected for an interview will be notified not less than four calendar days prior to the date scheduled for the interview;
- Participation in the interview will be limited to five members of the design team, and must include the following:
  - Project Lead;
  - No more than three Key Personnel of the design team;
  - Other members of the design team provided the total number of design team’s interview group is not greater than four. The MPRB expects that all members of the design team’s interview group will be members of the team that will be actively engaged in the work; and
  - In no circumstance will the MPRB allow more than four members of the design team to participate in the interview. If the design team enters the interview room with more than four people, the MPRB’s project manager, at his/her sole discretion, will determine which member(s) of the design team will be required to leave.
- The interview format will be provided to those selected for interviews at the time of notification. The Partner Organization Team requests that responders selected for an interview allow up to two hours for an interview, depending on the format determined for the interview.

The design teams selected for an interview shall consider information contained in a response to this Request for Qualifications to be read and understood, with no need to repeat or review that information during an interview. Additional information regarding interviews may be provided to the prospective design team at any time up to the start of the interview.

It is intended that the same individuals identified as reviewers in the Evaluation of Responses will conduct the interviews. The interview panel may be modified based on review of the responses received.
ATTACHMENTS TO THIS RFQ (Included in original RFQ only)

- Attachment A: Memorandum of Understanding
  - The Partner Organization Team have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding focused on the exploration of a shared community and recreation facility serving the Cedar Riverside neighborhood.

- Attachment B: 2009 Coyle Community Center Design Study
  - Pillsbury United Communities engaged in a process that defined possible renovations and expansion of the current Coyle Community Center. While that process occurred more than ten years ago, information contained in the study may remain relevant.

- Attachment C: Draft Community Engagement Plan
  - The MPRB, according to its policies and procedures, has prepared a Community Engagement Plan establishing the minimum commitment for engagement during the process of creating a predesign.

- Attachment D: 2019 I-94/Riverside Corridor Shared Facility Market Analysis Final Report
  - During late 2018 and early 2019, the Partner Organization Team through ANA Research conducted a Market Analysis of residents and potential facility users.

- Attachment E: Small and Underutilized Business Program Participation Form
- Attachment F: Small and Underutilized Business Program MWBE List
CONTRACTUAL OBLIGATIONS AND OTHER INFORMATION

CONTRACT
The MPRB uses the AIA B101 contract. The selected consultant will be expected to complete the requirements of the agreement and submit signed copies prior to beginning work. The agreement MAY NOT be changed in any way without MPRB Board approval. This contract, if over $100,000, will require MPRB Board approval.

SMALL AND UNDERUTILIZED BUSINESS PROGRAM (SUBP)
I. Overview
MPRB policy is to provide equal opportunities to all businesses, with an effort to redress discrimination in the MPRB marketplace and in public contracting against Minority-owned business enterprises (MBEs) and Women-owned business enterprises (WBEs). Therefore, MPRB has included an SUBP goal to facilitate participation of qualified and available MBEs and WBEs (MBEs/WBEs) on this contract.

The goal on this contract will be 7% MBE/WBE (combined).*
* This project has a combined MBE/WBE goal. This SUBP goal may be met by utilizing either an MBE firm or a WBE firm, or by a combination of both MBE and WBE firms.

In order for the participation of an MBE/WBE firm to be counted toward the SUBP goal, the MBE/WBE firm must be certified by the Minnesota Uniform Certification Program (MnUCP). This is the only MBE/WBE certification accepted by the SUBP. Attached is a list of local MnUCP-certified MBEs and WBEs that perform relevant scopes of service. However, this list is updated periodically and may not be exhaustive. Consultants should search for additional MnUCP certified firms using the MnUCP directory, here: (http://mnucp.metc.state.mn.us/).1 Additionally, to be counted toward the SUBP goal, an MBE/WBE2 must be located within the Minnesota counties of Anoka, Carver, Chisago, Dakota, Hennepin, Isanti, Ramsey, Scott, Sherburne, Washington, or Wright.

1 If a Consultant identifies a business that is not yet certified, but may qualify for certification as MBE/WBE, the Consultant should encourage the business to immediately begin the application process for certification with the MnUCP. The Consultant should include this in their Good Faith Efforts documentation.

2 The MBE/WBE must be certified within in the scope of work that they will perform, and they must perform a commercially useful function. An MBE/WBE performs a commercially useful function when it is executes a distinct element of work and carries out its responsibilities by actually performing, managing, and supervising the work involved.
Consultants must make a Good Faith Effort to meet the SUBP goal prior to submitting their proposal. This means that Consultants must make every necessary and reasonable effort to subcontract with MBEs/WBEs prior to submitting their proposal. Commitment to use MBEs/WBEs, Good Faith Efforts to include MBE/WBE participation, and compliance with SUBP will be a factor in the selection of proposals.

II. GOOD FAITH EFFORTS EVALUATION

If a Consultant does not meet the project SUBP goal, the Consultant shall demonstrate its good faith efforts to do so. To determine if the Consultant solicited MBEs/WBEs in good faith, the following list of actions may be considered:

Soliciting through all reasonable and available means (attendance at pre-proposal meetings, advertising and/or written notices) the interest of all MBEs/WBEs certified in the scopes of work of the contract. The Consultant must solicit MBEs/WBEs in sufficient time prior to proposal submission or to allow MBEs/WBEs to respond to solicitations. The Consultant must determine with reasonable certainty if the MBEs/WBEs are interested by taking appropriate steps to follow up on initial solicitations.

Selecting portions of the work to be performed by MBEs/WBEs in order to increase the likelihood that the project goal will be achieved. This includes, where appropriate, breaking out contract work into smaller units to facilitate MBE/WBE participation, even when a consultant might otherwise prefer to perform these work items with its own staff.

Providing interested MBEs/WBEs with adequate information about the scope, specifications, design criteria, and technical requirements of the contract in a timely manner to assist them in responding to a solicitation.

The Consultant must negotiate in good faith with interested MBEs/WBEs and provide written documentation of such negotiation with each such business. In determining whether the Consultant negotiated in good faith, the Evaluation Panel may consider a number of factors including price, scheduling and capabilities as well as the contract goal.

The fact that there may be some additional costs involved in finding and using MBEs/WBEs is not itself sufficient reason for a Consultant’s failure to meet the project goal as long as such costs are reasonable.

If requested by a solicited MBE/WBE, the Consultant must make reasonable efforts to assist such MBEs/WBEs in obtaining bonding, lines of credit or insurance as required by the city or by the Consultant, provided that the Consultant need not provide financial assistance toward this effort. Effectively using the services of minority/woman community organizations; local, state and federal business assistance offices; and other organizations as allowed on a case-by-case basis to provide assistance in the solicitation and placement of MBEs/WBEs. A list of organizations can be found here:
Consultants must thoroughly document their efforts to solicit to and include MBE/WBE participation. The City of Minneapolis will monitor compliance with the SUBP throughout the contract. Compliance with the MBE/WBE goal and other SUBP requirements will be a material condition of the contract and failure to comply may be deemed a breach of contract.

Please review Minneapolis Code of Ordinances Chapter 423 for more information or the contact the City of Minneapolis Civil Rights Department (612.673.2602).

**MPRB RIGHTS**

The MPRB may reject any or all proposals, parts of proposals, accept part or all of proposals and to create a project of lesser or greater scope than described in this Request for Proposal, or the respondent's reply based on the financial components submitted. The MPRB also reserves the right to cancel the contract without penalty, if circumstances arise which prevent the Board from completing the project.

**RESTRICTED DISCUSSIONS/SUBMISSIONS**

From the date of issuance of the RFP until the Project Manager takes final action, the Proposer must not discuss the proposal or any part thereof with any employee, agent, or representative of the Board except as expressly requested by the Project Manager in writing and as stipulated in this RFP. Violation of this restriction will result in REJECTION of the Proposer’s proposal.

**INDEPENDENT PARTIES**

Except as expressly provided otherwise in the contract resulting from this RFP, if any, the Board and the Proposer shall remain independent parties and neither shall be an officer, employee, agent, representative or co-partner of, or a joint venture with, the other.

**PERFORMANCE INVESTIGATIONS**

As part of its evaluation process, the Board may make investigations to determine the ability of the Proposer to perform under this RFP. The Board reserves the right to REJECT any proposal if the Proposer fails to satisfy the Board that it is properly qualified to carry out the obligations under this RFP.

**SEVERABILITY**

If any provision of the contract resulting from this RFP, if any, is contrary to, prohibited by, or deemed invalid by applicable laws or regulations of any jurisdiction in which it is sought to be
enforced, then said provision shall be deemed inapplicable and omitted and shall not invalidate the remaining provisions of such contract.

NOTICES
All notices and other matters pertaining to the contract resulting from this RFP, if any, to a party shall be in writing, shall be hand delivered, or sent by registered or certified U.S. Mail, return receipt requested, and shall be deemed to have been duly given when actually received by the addressee at the address set forth on this RFP.

INTEREST OF MEMBERS OF BOARD
The Proposer agrees that no member of the governing body, officer, employee or agent of the Board shall have any interest, financial or otherwise, direct or indirect, in the contract.

EMPLOYEE INVOLVEMENT/COVENANT AGAINST CONTINGENT FEES
Employee Involvement: Proposer hereby certifies that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, no individual employed by the Proposer or subcontracted by the Proposer has an immediate relationship to any employee of the Board who was directly or indirectly involved in any way in the procurement of the contract, if any, resulting from this RFP or goods or services thereunder. For purposes of this provision, immediate relationship means: a current spouse, a person who currently has any interest including but limited to an equity interest in the Proposer’s business, and a person who is currently a party to a contract materially related to the work outlined in the RFP, or has any interest including but limited to an equity interest in an entity who is currently a party to a contract with the Proposer materially related to the work outlined in the RFP. Contractual party interest, as outlined above, does not include an agreement with a former owner and/or employee of the Proposer that is incident to the completed buyout of ownership interest and/or the final separation of employment with Proposer.

Covenant Against Contingency Fees: The Proposer also warrants that no person or selling agency has been employed, engaged or retained to solicit or secure any contract resulting from this RFP or any advantage hereunder upon an agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage or contingent fee, or in exchange for any substantial consideration bargained for, excepting that which is provided to the Proposer’s bona fide employees or to bona fide professional commercial or selling agencies or in the exercise of reasonable diligence should have been known by the Board to be maintained by the Proposer for the purpose of securing business for Proposer. In the event of the Proposer's breach or violation of this warranty, the Board shall, subject to Proposer's rights, have the right, at its option, to annul any contract resulting from this RFP without liability, to deduct from the charges otherwise payable by the Board under such contract the full amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee, and to
pursue any other remedy available to the Board under such contract, at law or in equity.

Violation of either of the above sections by Proposer shall be grounds for cancellation of the contract. Such cancellation shall not limit other contractual remedies against the Proposer provided in the contract, or in law, or in equity.

**HOLD HARMLESS**
The Proposer agrees to defend, indemnify and hold harmless the Board, its officers and employees, from any liabilities, claims, damages, costs, judgments, and expenses, including attorney’s fees, resulting directly or indirectly from an act of omission of the Proposer, its employees, agents or employees of subcontractors, in the performance of this contract or by reason of the failure of the Proposer to fully perform, in any respect, all of its obligations under this contract.

The Board agrees to defend and hold harmless insofar as the law allows the Proposer, its officers and employees, from any liabilities, claims, damages, costs, judgments, and expenses, including attorney’s fees, resulting directly or indirectly from an act or omission of the Board or its employees in the performance under this contract or by reason of the failure of the Board to fully perform its obligations under this contract.

**DATA PRACTICES**
The Proposer agrees to comply with the Minnesota Government Data Practices Act and all other applicable state and federal laws relating to data privacy or confidentiality. The Proposer shall immediately report to the contract monitor any requests from third parties for information relating to this agreement. The Board agrees to promptly respond to inquiries from the Proposer concerning data requests. The Proposer agrees to hold the Board, its officers, department heads and employees harmless from any claims resulting from the Proposer's unlawful disclosure or use of data protected under state and federal laws.

**CHANGES**
The MPRB may, from time to time, request changes in the Scope of Services to be performed by the consultant. Such changes, including any increase or decrease in the amount of consultant’s compensation, which are mutually agreed upon shall be incorporated in written amendments to the Professional Services Agreement and may require Board approval, which takes several weeks. Consultants shall monitor their budgets and plan and budget time accordingly.

**PROPOSAL CONTENTS**
The contents of the proposal and any clarifications to the contents submitted by the consultant
shall become part of the contractual obligation and be incorporated by reference into the ensuing Professional Services Agreement.

**DRAWING AND SPECIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

- Electronic drawing standard documents, front end specifications, AIA documents and templates shall be obtained from the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board FTP site. Contact Tom Johnson for password and login information: tjohnson@minneapolisparks.org.
- Compatibility with AutoCAD 2014.
- Half size drawing sets (pdf and printed copy) shall be provided for reviews.
- Use MPRB title block as provided.
- Pen Table line weights and fonts shall be included as e-transmittal package.
- AutoCAD site drawing files must be projected using the Hennepin County coordinate system.
- The Consultant will furnish the MPRB with as-built drawings for all issued sheets as follows: one half-sized paper set, electronic AutoCAD files, and a full-size PDF set. The Consultant will also supply to the MPRB one indexed electronic and one bound paper copy of the specifications.
- Effective April 28, 2017, All .pdf and word documents posted electronically for public review must comply with ADA digital standards, WCAG 2.0 requirements and Federal Guidelines. Any submitted .pdf that is not ADA compliant will be rejected and revised at the consultant’s expense.

**ENTIRE AGREEMENT**

The Proposer’s written submission in response to this RFP shall be considered the Proposer’s formal offer. The content of the RFP, the Proposer’s submission in response to the RFP and the resulting contract, if any, shall be the entire agreement between the successful Proposer and the Board. It is understood and agreed that nothing herein or in the resulting contract is intended or should be construed as in any way creating or establishing the relationship of co-partners between the parties hereto, or in any manner whatsoever. The Proposer, if any, is, and shall remain, an independent Proposer operating in accord with the terms and conditions of the rights granted as a result of this RFP.
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Shared Facility serving the Cedar Riverside Neighborhood

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is made as of the 5th day of September, 2018, by and between the Young Men’s Christian Association of the Greater Twin Cities, a Minnesota corporation ("YMCA"), Augsburg University ("Augsburg"), a Minnesota nonprofit corporation, Pillsbury United Communities ("PUC"), a community-centric, human serving not-for-profit organization, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, a body corporate and public under the laws for Minnesota ("Park Board"), Fairview Health Services ("Fairview"), a Minnesota nonprofit corporation, which collectively comprise the Parties to the MOU.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, the YMCA, Augsburg, PUC the Park Board, and Fairview have the authority to enter into this MOU in furtherance of an exploration of providing independent and/or jointly delivered programs and activities through one or more shared facilities in the City of Minneapolis’ Cedar Riverside Neighborhood ("Community"); and

WHEREAS, The Community is the most densely populated neighborhood in Minneapolis, with a population comprised largely of underserved communities and communities of color, and with a significant proportion of the population being recent immigrants;

WHEREAS, The YMCA provides services aimed at the needs of residents, students, and local workforce, but does not currently offer programs and activities in the Community and does not have a facility in the Community;

WHEREAS, Augsburg is interested in providing expanded programs, activities, and facilities to the Community and its university community on a site that is prominent in the neighborhood and located on its property;

WHEREAS, PUC provides services to the Community through its community center located at the Brian Coyle Center in a facility owned by the Park Board and leased to PUC, but recognizes a need to improve and expand its facilities in order to serve the growing needs of the Community;

WHEREAS, The Park Board provides services to the Community through its programs, activities, and facilities, but recognizes the needs of the Community exceed its capacity to deliver at a level that addresses needs through its current programs, activities, and facilities;

WHEREAS, Fairview maintains a corporate campus in the Community and partners with numerous efforts to support Community vitality, including the Cedar-Riverside Opportunity Center, Sisterhood Boutique, and Cedar Riverside Health Commons, but recognizes the opportunity to enhance its role as an anchor institution;
WHEREAS, The Parties recognize their mutual goals for serving the Community through programs, activities, and facilities may be better accomplished through a partnership aimed at efficient and effective provision of services to the Community;

WHEREAS, The YMCA brings expertise in the promotion of Healthy Living, Youth Development and Social Responsibility; experience in fundraising and strategic real estate development related to recreation and social service facilities, and experience in delivering efficient and effective programming and services;

WHEREAS, The YMCA provides services aimed at the needs of residents, students, and local workforce, the YMCA currently provides mentoring programs at the Brian Coyle Center through our U-Y program, and the YMCA is looking to broaden programs and activities in the Community and does not have a facility in the Community;

WHEREAS, Augsburg brings expertise in educating students to be informed citizens, thoughtful stewards, critical thinkers, and responsible leaders; supports the engagement of students, faculty, and staff in programs that address needs in the Community; and has expertise in fundraising and facilities management;

WHEREAS, PUC brings expertise in providing community services through an interconnected network of community centers and social enterprises; experience operating culturally-specific programs, education, and recreation at neighborhood community centers, and experience in delivering efficient and impactful services to diverse and underserved communities throughout Minneapolis;

WHEREAS, PUC's Brian Coyle Center provides services aimed specifically at the needs of Cedar Riverside residents—largely of East African descent—including youth mentoring, STEAM education programs, family health and wellness services, including youth and senior citizen programming, and basic needs services including health education and a food shelf;

WHEREAS, The Park Board brings expertise in developing facilities supporting the delivery of programs and activities targeted to Minneapolis residents and communities, and by its mission and charter delivers services to residents of and visitors to the City of Minneapolis;

WHEREAS, The Park Board, by its ordinance, is mandated to deliver facilities in Minneapolis equitably, including in the Community, which ranks as a high priority for the delivery of facilities supporting program and service needs of the Community;

WHEREAS, Fairview provides leading clinical and community programs to drive a healthier future; offers data and research related to local health and well-being through the Community Health Needs Assessment and Community Health Implementation Plan; and brings experience in creating innovative partnerships to improve community health and health equity;

WHEREAS, In a fully developed community with limited resources, creative approaches to dealing with capital needs and unmet service needs are crucial and the Parties view a collaborative
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exploration as an essential part of delivering programs, activities, and facilities to the Community; and

WHEREAS, The Parties desire to formalize a relationship in this MOU with the desired outcome of understanding the potential for creating a shared facility supporting jointly delivered programs and activities to the Community, with the potential for expanding the exploration should the feasibility of such an effort be viewed favorably by each Party.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the foregoing recitals, the Parties hereby agree as follows:

A. The Parties agree to immediately commence diligently working together to identify shared opportunities for the delivery of services unique and common to each Party, including, but not limited to identification of a location in the Community for a facility supporting needed programs and activities that includes shared spaces and features.

B. Principles

1. Market Analysis:
   i. The Parties agree to work together to collect and synthesize the information and data related to Community needs, share information and data related to the Community that has already been gathered by the Parties, and to cooperate in the collection of additional market analysis.
   ii. The Parties will work jointly to define a range of services, programs, activities, and other offerings that might be identified during the term of this MOU, and the necessary spaces and facilities to support those services, programs, activities, and other offerings to be provided by the YMCA, Augsburg, PUC, the Park Board, Fairview or other partners, or any combination thereof.
   iii. The Parties agree to jointly and equally fund cost of the market analysis in an amount not to exceed $70,000.

2. Funding and Financing. The Parties agree to work together to define potential sources and mix of funding and financing for the implementation and operation of a facility or facilities supporting the services, programs, activities, and other offerings identified through the market analysis.

3. Facility Programming, Design, and Operation. Following the market analysis and using the results of the market analysis, the Parties agree to develop a preliminary programming, design, and operations plan as a means of demonstrating the alignment of a facility and its associated programs, activities, and other offerings to the community. The costs of such a preliminary plan shall be borne by the Park Board provided the costs do not exceed $200,000. The preliminary plan shall be consistent with the requirements of the State of Minnesota Department of Administration’s Pre-Design Manual for Capital Budget Projects and according to Minnesota Statute §16B.33.
   i. Engagement. As a part of Facility Programming, Design, and Operation, the Parties agree to work together to collect input from the Community and any reasonable extensions of the Community in order to most fully understand.
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the needs and opportunities for the delivery of services to the Community as might be demonstrated in the programming, design, and operation of a facility. The Parties will support Engagement by providing staff or volunteers to assist in engagement events.

4. Partnerships with Others. The Parties agree to discuss partnering options, as identified through the market analysis or other activities related to this MOU, in furtherance of the delivery of services, programs, activities and other offerings including but not limited to housing, schools, and recreation.

5. Coordination. The Parties will coordinate communication, progress, deadlines, approvals, and other partnership or development dynamics in a manner that recognizes the realities of the meeting schedules of the governing bodies of the YMCA, Augsburg, PUC, the Park Board, and Fairview and other ad hoc groups related to or arising out of this MOU.

6. Governance. The Parties agree that their respective staff members are empowered to create, shepherd, and manage the processes required by this MOU but that the ultimate approval lies in the governing bodies of the YMCA, Augsburg, PUC, the Park Board, and Fairview, respectively. The Parties assign the following staff to activities supporting this MOU:

   i. YMCA: Anita Lancello Bydlon, Chief Real Estate Development Officer
   ii. Augsburg: Vice President of Finance and Administration, Chief Financial Officer
   iii. PUC: Amano Dube, Director, Brian Coyle Center
   iv. Park Board: The Superintendent or the Superintendent’s designee
   v. Fairview: John Swanholm, Vice President Community Advancement Diane Tran, Senior Director, Community Engagement

C. Duration, Amendment, Termination

1. The Parties agree to evaluate the partnership resulting from this MOU periodically and whenever any major milestone is not met.

2. This MOU shall automatically terminate one year from its date of execution or upon the completion of the market analysis, definition of funding and financing options, whichever occurs first.

3. This MOU may be extended by mutual written agreement of the parties.

D. Nonbinding. This document represents a framework of principles expressing the current understanding between the Parties and does not constitute a legally binding agreement. The Parties agree to utilize the principles expressed in this document as a framework for all subsequent legally binding documents between the YMCA, Augsburg, PUC, the Park Board, and Fairview.

E. No third party rights. This MOU does not confer any rights on any third party.

[Remainder of page intentionally blank]
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the authorized representative of the Parties have entered into this Memorandum of Understanding in triplicate as of the date stated above.

AUGSBURG UNIVERSITY

By: [Signature]
Its: VP for Finance and Admin

Date: 10-12-2018

THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF THE GREATER TWIN CITIES

By: [Signature]
Its: [Title]

Date: 

PILLSBURY UNITED COMMUNITIES

By: [Signature]
Its: President & CEO

Date: 11/06/18

FAIRVIEW HEALTH SERVICES

By: [Signature]
Its: [Title]

Date: 11/17/18
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IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the authorized representative of the Parties have entered into this Memorandum of Understanding in triplicate as of the date stated above.

AUGSBURG COLLEGE

By: 

Its:

Date: 

THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF THE GREATER TWIN CITIES

By: 

Its: 

Date: 

PILLSBURY UNITED COMMUNITIES

By: 

Its:

Date: 

FAIRVIEW HEALTH SERVICES

By: 

Its:

Date: 
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MINNEAPOLIS PARK & RECREATION BOARD

By: [Signature]

Its: President

Date: 2-5-18

By: [Signature]

Its: Secretary

Date: [Signature] 9-5-18

Approved as to form:

[Signature]

Attorney for the Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board
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PROJECT DESCRIPTION
Brian Coyle Center at Currie Park
420 15th Ave. S.
Minneapolis, MN

DJR Job No 08-0117

Project Description:
The project consists of an addition and renovation to the existing Brian Coyle Community Center located at 420 15th Ave. S in Minneapolis.

- Existing 20,000 sf slab-on-grade building has exterior masonry bearing walls and interior steel columns and joists. Existing building has a high-ceiling gymnasium flanked with one-story offices and classrooms.
- Addition and renovation will bring square footage to 35,000 sf.
- West Side Addition:
  - New multi-purpose room designed to free up the demand on the gymnasium (gymnasium currently serves as an overflow gathering area).
- North Side Addition:
  - New fitness room
  - Expanded food shelf area.
- South Side Addition:
  - Expand footprint with designated rooms for preschool, youth, meditation, computer/career center, adult lounge, women’s room and classrooms
  - New second floor with office suites leased to non-profit community support groups
- Renovation Existing:
  - Remodeled front entry
  - Expand lobby/lounge area to include coffee/café amenity
  - New wood flooring, bleachers, backboards, mats in gymnasium
  - Additional stainless steel storage units in existing kitchen
  - Creation of teen lounge
  - Enlarged locker area
  - New bathrooms
- Site:
  - Additional surface parking over vacated street easement
  - Proposed Currie Park amenities to include new soccer field and 2 basketball courts
  - Consideration of geo-thermal tubing or wells in Currie Park.

END
Coyle Center and Currie Park Cost Estimate
Construction Estimate Provided by Flannery Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certification - LEED</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond Fee</td>
<td>$25,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Builder's Risk Insurance</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Conditions</td>
<td>$74,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permit</td>
<td>$29,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAC &amp; WAC</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design &amp; Inflation Contingencies</td>
<td>$424,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Fee</td>
<td>$232,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>$119,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Tests</td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumpster</td>
<td>$13,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Tools</td>
<td>$1,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment Rental</td>
<td>$13,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finish Clean</td>
<td>$12,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition</td>
<td>$53,813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excavation Fill/Backfill</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>$45,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball CT</td>
<td>$28,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stripe Marking</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Curbs</td>
<td>$10,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete - Exterior</td>
<td>$34,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation System</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site Furnishing</td>
<td>$11,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Purpose Field</td>
<td>$30,254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plantings</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footing and Foundations</td>
<td>$145,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti Control</td>
<td>$5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Floor/Topping</td>
<td>$23,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Ground masonry</td>
<td>$318,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metals</td>
<td>$89,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stair Sections</td>
<td>$17,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural upgrades</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ornamental metals</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor - Demolition Interior</td>
<td>$78,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Carpentry Finish</td>
<td>$70,643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cabinets</td>
<td>$41,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>millwork</td>
<td>$14,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tops/Sills</td>
<td>$10,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulation/Vapor barrier</td>
<td>$3,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Insulation</td>
<td>$12,279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>roofing</td>
<td>$169,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metal Canopy/Sun Screen</td>
<td>$3,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>joint Sealant</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doors/Hardware</td>
<td>$108,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows/Storefront/glazing</td>
<td>$34,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows</td>
<td>$56,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screens SS</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stucco</td>
<td>$35,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheetrock</td>
<td>$18,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheetrock Labor</td>
<td>$35,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceramic Tile</td>
<td>$49,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acoustical Ceiling</td>
<td>$62,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flooring - Epoxy</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drywall Suspended</td>
<td>$12,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpet</td>
<td>$35,920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCT</td>
<td>$71,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Interior</td>
<td>$71,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint Exterior</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd Floor build out</td>
<td>$213,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toilet Accessories</td>
<td>$11,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folding panel Partition</td>
<td>$48,875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flagpoles</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage Exterior</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signage Interior</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym Floor</td>
<td>$149,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoops</td>
<td>$23,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bleechers</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wall Mats</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divider Curtain</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White board</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator</td>
<td>$45,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lockers</td>
<td>$24,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Equipment Upgrade</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen food shelf shelving</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Window Treatments</td>
<td>$10,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbing</td>
<td>$104,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hvac</td>
<td>$287,616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Spinkler</td>
<td>$98,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electric/Low Voltage</td>
<td>$377,496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Voltage</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cable TV Wiring</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>$60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,698,814</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Add Alternates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VAV System w/automation</td>
<td>$251,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geothermal</td>
<td>$590,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roof Mounted Turbines</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*F.F.E not included in Quote</td>
<td>$10,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$863,408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Fee 10% - PUC</td>
<td>556,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architectural Fees - DJR</td>
<td>333,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Room Furniture</td>
<td>127,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,016,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>$6,578,444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT PLAN
Project Title: Cedar-Riverside Recreation Centers Predesign Study

MPRB Division: Planning
Project Manager: Daniel Elias

As required by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Code of Ordinances, every construction or redevelopment project undertaken within the MPRB Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is to have a community engagement plan. The plan serves as a guide for the community engagement process through the multiple phases of planning and project development. The plan may be modified as circumstance warrants during project duration. Substantial modifications are to be communicated to stakeholders and the MPRB Board of Commissioners.

Project Description

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB), Pillsbury United Communities (PUC), YMCA, Augsburg University and Fairview Health Services (Partner Organization Team) are exploring the potential for building a new recreation and wellness center in the Interstate 94/Riverside Corridor.

The new facility would supplement Brian Coyle Community Center programming that already serves this community. A renovation or nearby relocation of the Brian Coyle Community Center is also being explored as part of this project.

The project will unfold in two general phases:

- Phase 1: Market Analysis
- Phase 2: Preliminary Design

It is expected that the Preliminary Design (Concept Plan) will come before the board in a public hearing and for approval in Q1 2020.

Project Funding Source(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Sources</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Expiration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Bonding</td>
<td>$330,000</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supplemental Sources</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fairview/PUC/Augsburg/YMCA</td>
<td>1/5\text{th} each org toward Market Analysis cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Engagement Recommendation**

**Level of Engagement: Collaborate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Collaborate</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To provide stakeholders with factual, balanced, and timely information to help them understand the project.</td>
<td>To obtain stakeholder feedback on project analysis, alternatives, or decisions.</td>
<td>To work directly with stakeholders throughout the process to ensure that perspectives are consistently understood, considered, and reflected in project decisions.</td>
<td>To partner with stakeholders in each aspect of decision making in order to develop and implement collaborative project solutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Engagement Goal:**

- The MPRB will keep stakeholders informed.

**MPRB Promise to the Public:**

- The MPRB and partner entity will be accountable to their roles as negotiated in the partnership and regularly evaluate overall success of the partnership.

The Market Analysis will help the Partner Organization Team understand the programmatic needs of the community in this area and where those services can best be offered. The market analysis includes a statistically valid survey conducted using random residential mail surveys with follow-up survey assistance to ensure the demographics of the area are accurately represented. The market analysis will provide the Partner Organization Team a baseline of information to help make critical project decisions.

At the end of the Market Analysis, an appointed Community Advisory Committee (CAC) is recommended, based on the MPRB’s Community Engagement Policy, because the Cedar-Riverside Recreation & Community Service Center Design project will set a vision and make recommendations for service programming and service location that is not guided by a Board approved master plan. The CAC will be initiated at the beginning of Phase 2 (Preliminary Design). The Cedar-Riverside Recreation & Community Service Center Design CAC will be primarily engaged in providing stakeholder feedback on program, vision, goals, and objectives.

Open houses, community events, and focus groups will be the secondary engagement tools for the overall project.
**Anticipated Project Outcomes**
The primary outcome will be a Preliminary Design for the new Shared Facility and the renovated or relocated Brian Coyle Community Center that addresses community needs and provides a guiding vision and principles for operations, maintenance, programming, and capital improvements.

The project supports the following elements of the MPRB Comprehensive Plan:

- **Theme: Recreation that inspires personal growth, healthy lifestyles, and a sense of community**
  - Goal: Parks provide a center for community living

- **Theme: Dynamic parks that shape city character**
  - Goal: Park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility, and beauty.

**Stakeholder Roles and Responsibilities**
All stakeholders are expected to work collaboratively to create and refine research and take an active role in the education of MPRB staff, staff from the Partner Organizations, and community members. Stakeholders shall provide input toward final project recommendations for approval by the Board of Commissioners. Participants are expected to engage in the process in a manner that promotes respectful civil discourse and enhances mutual understanding of all stakeholder viewpoints. Any requests for public or project information should be directed to the project manager.

**Identification of Project Stakeholders**
This project may, in some way, impact every person who lives, works, or visits this portion of Minneapolis. Therefore, the various groups and public outreach methods will attempt to involve, engage, and notify as many people as possible. Special attention will be paid to ensure that recent immigrant groups, those living near the poverty line, and persons of color are engaged in the project.

**Partner Organization Team**
A Partner Organization Team has been established to provide decision-making and frequent oversight of the entire project. The role of the Partner Organization Team has been established through the Memorandum of Understanding dated September 5, 2018. The Partner Organization Team will be a small group comprised of key staff from MPRB, PUC, YMCA, Augsburg, and Fairview. The CAC will make a recommendation to the MPRB Board of Commissioners but will serve in an advisory role only to the Partner Organization Team.
Project Advisory Committee (PAC)
Staff will convene a PAC of MPRB staff and key staff from other agencies. The PAC will provide technical insight into the research, outreach, planning, and proposed vision and goals associated with the project. The PAC will assist with understanding of agency processes and capabilities as they relate to the project and will then assist with acceptance and institutionalization of the plan. The PAC will include members from the following departments and agencies:

- MPRB Environmental Stewardship Division (Forestry, Asset Management, Environmental Management departments)
- MPRB Community Outreach and Access
- MPRB Marketing and Communications
- MPRB Recreation Division (Athletics, Youth development and Recreation departments)
- Pillsbury United Communities staff
- YMCA staff
- Augsburg University staff
- Fairview Health Services staff

Technical Advisors
Staff will utilize other resources outside MPRB as needed, to provide additional review and technical insight into the process and to leverage existing Community Engagement resources already developed. Staff may meet with these advisors in small groups or individually, as schedules and needs warrant.

- Cedar-Riverside Partnership
- City of Minneapolis Public Works department
- City of Minneapolis Health department
- Hennepin County public works department
- Minneapolis Parks Foundation staff
- Public Health Advisory Committee
- Neighborhood and Engagement Commission
- Youth Coordinating Board
- Others as appropriate
Community Advisory Committee (CAC)
An appointed CAC will assist with community outreach, review the Preliminary Design and communicate the project outcomes. See the full description below.

Outreach and Research Methods

1. Appointed Community Advisory Committee (CAC):

   **CAC Composition Goals**
   The appointed CAC shall be comprised of appointments based on the pending Community Engagement Policy, expected to be approved by the Board of Commissioner in early 2019, for a total of 17 CAC members:
   - Nine members will be appointed by Commissioners (one each Commissioner), and
   - Eight will be appointed by a Selection Committee with input from the Partner Organization Team.

   **CAC Charge**
   The Cedar-Riverside Recreation & Community Service Center Design CAC shall:
   - Become knowledgeable about the project and its scope and advise MPRB staff, the Partner Organization Team and consultants throughout the planning process.
   - Contribute to broad community engagement by acting as primary contact for the CAC’s represented communities, and by enhancing the project’s interaction with a wide range of stakeholders and stakeholder groups.
   - Assist with ongoing communication of technical plan elements to the community and public.
   - Report back to appointers, as requested, on the plan process, information presented, and possible recommendations.
   - Make recommendations to the MPRB Commissioners on Preliminary Design program, vision, goals, and principles.
   - Advise the Partner Organization Team on Preliminary Design program, vision, goals and principles.
   - Make recommendations to the MPRB Commissioners in support of the Preliminary Design created through community-driven processes.

2. Direct Community Engagement
   MPRB staff, consultants, and the Partner Organization Team will engage directly with community members through attendance at meetings and events, organizing open houses and focus groups, creative engagements, and collaborations with neighborhood organizations and community service organizations. The exact type of engagement will vary by project phase.

   **Phase 1: Market Analysis.** Direct engagement is limited to the market analysis, which includes a statistically valid survey conducted using random residential mail surveys with follow-up survey assistance to ensure the demographics of the area are accurately represented.
Phase 2: Preliminary Design. Direct engagement will focus on open houses, focus groups and pop-up events. Staff will work with community partners to determine appropriate venues and events.

Existing events that have already been identified are:
- Multicultural Dinner at Brian Coyle Center – 1/31/19

3. Existing Research
There has been a significant amount of community engagement and research completed in the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood and surrounding communities. The Partner Organization Team will make efforts to gather all pertinent existing data and engagement resources prior to initiating additional direct engagement.

4. Public Hearings
A public hearing on the Preliminary Design will take place around Q4 2019/Q1 2020.

5. Social/Digital Media and Website
MPRB staff will maintain an up-to-date project website and will use news releases, the GovDelivery email subscription service, and other digital media, as appropriate, to keep stakeholders up to date on the project. Planning staff will work with Community Outreach and Communications staff to determine when/if to translate digital media (see below).

6. Language Translation
MPRB Planning staff will work with the CAC and MPRB Community Outreach and Access staff to determine translation needs. Translation services may vary by geographic area. MPRB Community Outreach and Access staff, established neighborhood organizations, and community service organizations will be asked to advise on what materials should be translated and when/if to provide verbal translation services at open houses and other community events.

Project Schedule
- Phase 1: Market Analysis – complete around Q1 2019
- Phase 2: Preliminary Design – complete around Q1 2020

Resources
A portion of the funding dedicated to staff time and consultant fees will be utilized for public engagement. In addition, the project budget includes costs of mailings and other notifications.
Evaluation Summary
Following project completion, the project manager will analyze the effectiveness of the engagement process from both stakeholder and organization points of view and will provide a brief summary statement. The summary statement will indicate how the process advances policy goals and will assist the Board and staff in evaluating and informing an ongoing community engagement process.

Summary Statement: Statement pending plan completion.
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Methodology

The YMCA of the Greater Twin Cities (YMCA), the Minneapolis Park Board, Augsburg University, Pillsbury United Communities (PUC), and Fairview Health Services are interested in determining if the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood is a feasible site for a new Recreation & Wellness Center. Specifically, the research stakeholders wanted to learn:

- **Level of interest in a new Cedar-Riverside Recreation & Wellness Center** among various populations: residents and employees of nearby large organizations (Augsburg University and Fairview Health Services).
- **Familiarity** with the existing Brian Coyle Community Center.
- **Identification of key features, services and programs** that target populations consider to be missing from current neighborhood offerings, as well as those most desired in a new facility.
- **Potential usage of and membership to new Cedar-Riverside facility.**
- **Favorability of partnership** between key stakeholders.
- **Potential barriers** to utilizing the facility.
- **Specific opinions from prevalent ethnicities in the diverse neighborhood.**
- **Favorability of proposed location on the Augsburg campus (Intersection of Riverside Ave & 25th Ave S).**

**STUDY BACKGROUND**

**POPULATION & SAMPLE**

- **Current employees** of Augsburg University, Fairview Health Services, and Pillsbury United Communities.

**COMPLETIONS & DATES**

986 total surveys: 683 Residents, 303 Employees (224 Augsburg/62 Fairview/17 PUC)
Data collected September-December 2018

**COLLECTION METHOD**

For **Residents**, data was collected utilizing an address based sample pulled from the US Postal Service’s Computerized Delivery Sequence File, which covers nearly 100% of all US households. This area included approximately 24,500 households (both single-family and multi-family dwellings). A random sample of 5,000 households was drawn from this broader population and invited to participate in the survey. These residents received a survey in the mail with the option to complete the survey online if desired. The invite letter enclosed in the mail packet included web link invitations in 6 different languages (Somali, Oromo, Spanish, Chinese – Cantonese/Mandarin, Vietnamese, and Korean). 2 total mail packets were sent to residents. Additionally, a targeted telephone sample was used to contact Somali, Oromo and Spanish speakers in the targeted neighborhoods.

**Augsburg University** provided email addresses for all 600 of their employees. Employees were sent an initial invitation, plus a follow-up reminder to participate in the survey via web.

**Fairview Health Services** placed a web link on their intranet, providing information in their bi-weekly e-newsletter giving employees information about the research and directing them to the link.

**Pillsbury United Communities** also shared a web link with their employees for survey participation.

**DATA PRECISION**

Resident responses were weighted by age range to match census data of the designated neighborhoods. Additionally, results are subject to a margin of error of ±3.70% at a 95% confidence level for **residents** and ±5.19% for **Augsburg employees** at this same confidence level.

*Fairview and Pillsbury had fewer completions (either due to number of employees or methods). Thus caution should be taken if looking at results individually and not as part of the larger employee population.*
Resident Sample Footprint

[Map showing various neighborhoods in Minneapolis, such as Elliot Park, Prospect Park, Cedar-Riverside, Ventura Village, Seward, Phillips, Midtown Phillips, Phillips West, and Longfellow.]
Summary of Findings – Important Factors to Consider

✓ The community is supportive of the proposed facility with **two-thirds or more** of both residents and employees agreeing that: **they would like to see a new Recreation & Wellness Center become part of the neighborhood, they support the partnership group, and they believe a new Center will bring value to their neighborhood.** The latter received the most strongly agree/agree responses.

✓ When asked specifically what factors would influence respondents decision to go to the Recreation & Wellness Center, the top four factors for both populations were: **having a welcome and inclusive environment, hours the facility is open, safety at the Center, and the variety of amenities offered.**

✓ Just over half (53%) of employees are very or somewhat familiar with Brian Coyle Community Center, while only one-third (31%) of residents can say the same. However, of those familiar, more residents use the Center than employees (15% vs. 8%).

✓ Employees and residents agree that the largest community need that is not currently being met in the neighborhood is **fitness related activities**, followed by **youth programming**.

✓ About **one-quarter** of both populations agree that **cost** would be the biggest reason they would not go to the proposed Center. Additionally, residents in particular have a relatively low awareness of the **financial support** offered by some of the research sponsors. Awareness of YMCA financial support is highest at 48%. However, less than half that (22%) are aware that the Park Board offers fee assistance or that the programs/services at Brian Coyle are offered at no cost. Increasing awareness of financial support offerings could improve both support and likelihood to use the proposed Recreation & Wellness Center.
Summary of Findings – Who Would Join?

✓ 53% of residents and 62% of nearby employees are likely joiners of the proposed Recreation & Wellness Center.

✓ Younger residents (those age 18 to 54) are significantly more likely to join the proposed facility than residents age 65 or older. Additionally, households with kids are also more likely to join than those without (62% vs. 48%).

✓ The majority of employees (54%) would want an individual membership, while residents are split between individual and family memberships (39% Individual; 38% Family).

✓ About 40% of residents and employees alike say that if the new Center did not include a pool, it would decrease their likelihood of joining.

✓ The availability of financial support to households who receive government assistance does make a difference in residents likelihood of joining, with 38% saying this support would increase their likelihood to join.

✓ Compared to other market studies conducted by ANA Research in the Twin Cities metro area, interest in joining the proposed I-94/Riverside Corridor facility is slightly higher (53% I-94/Riverside Corridor; 51% average other metro studies).

✓ Survey results suggest projected membership units to be just over 2,500 units. However, this does not include Fairview employees who did show a relatively high interest level in joining the proposed facility. The number of Fairview survey completions, as well as the methodology utilized, make it difficult to include this population in membership projections.
Summary of Findings – Desired Programming

**General programming/features with greatest interest:**
- ✓ Cardiovascular machines
- ✓ Indoor walking and jogging track
- ✓ Group fitness classes
- ✓ Strength conditioning machines/free weights
- ✓ Indoor pool for lap swimming

**Youth/teen programming with greatest interest:**
- ✓ Drop-off, free childcare
- ✓ Family nights
- ✓ Summer camps

**Older adult programming with greatest interest:**
- ✓ Group exercise classes geared towards older adults
- ✓ Water exercise classes geared towards older adults
- ✓ Educational classes

**Themed groupings with greatest interest:**
- ✓ Athletic activities
- ✓ Health and wellness features
- ✓ Aquatic features
### Summary of Findings – Interesting Differences Between Segments

**Resident vs. Employee**

- Residents have a significantly greater interest in **all but 5 general programs/features** than employees do. Interestingly, the 5 in which residents are **not** more interested in are all athletic related: *group fitness, indoor track, personal training, cardio machines, and strength equipment.*
- Employees are significantly more likely to **join** the proposed facility than residents.
- The following **factors influencing the decision to go** to the facility are significantly more important to residents: *having a welcome/inclusive environment, availability of public transportation, having a diverse staff, and a focus on cultural/ethnic diversity.* Interestingly, **40-60%** of employees said the latter three factors had **no influence** on their decision to go. However, it is important to note that these were the three factors with the **fewest major influence responses** among both populations.
- Residents feel **youth programming** is a missing community need more so than employees.

**Cedar-Riverside Neighborhood vs. All Other Neighborhoods**

- The Cedar-Riverside neighborhood is **most likely to join** the proposed Wellness Center (**62% for Cedar-Riverside vs. 51% all other neighborhoods combined**). Furthermore, Cedar-Riverside has significantly more definite and probable joiners than other neighborhoods.
- The Cedar-Riverside neighborhood is more influenced by the **availability of public transportation, the presence of a diverse staff, focus on cultural/ethnic diversity, and the walkability of the Center** than other neighborhoods.
- The Cedar-Riverside neighborhood is in more agreement than all other neighborhoods that the **I-94/Riverside Corridor needs additional recreation facilities and is missing community/culturally-specific programs.**
- Cedar-Riverside residents are more familiar with and utilize the **Brian Coyle Center** more so than other neighborhoods.
### Summary of Findings – Interesting Differences Between Segments

#### Ethnicity

- The **East African and Hispanic** populations have a higher interest level in the **majority of programming/amenities** asked about, and would be the **most frequent users** of the center.
- The **East African** population has a higher need for **childcare services**, and believe **youth programming** is missing from current community offerings.
- The **Hispanic population is more supportive** of the partnership and the positive benefits of the Center, whereas **East Africans disagree more** with many of the support measures. In fact, nearly **4 in 10** East Africans disagree with all 5 support statements: the area needs additional recreation facilities, I would like to see new facility become part of my neighborhood, the partnership is a good idea, the facility will bring value to my neighborhood, and the I-94/Riverside Corridor is missing community/culturally-specific programs. However, it should be noted that more agree (**about 6 in 10**) with these statements than disagree.
- The **East African** population believe each of the following is a **major influence** on their decision to go to the facility significantly more often than all other ethnicities: **safety, availability of public transportation, ease of parking, diverse staff who can speak multiple languages, a focus on cultural/ethnic diversity, and the walkability of the Center**.
- The **Hispanic population** believes **cultural enrichment programming** is missing from current offerings; whereas the **White population** would like to see more **sports & fitness amenities**.
- **East African’s** are most familiar with and utilize the **Brian Coyle Center** more so than other ethnicities.

#### Income

- Likelihood to **join** is consistent amongst all income levels.
- Households with incomes of **less than $50,000** believe each of the following is a **major influence** on their decision to go to the facility significantly more often than households with higher incomes: **safety, availability of public transportation, diverse staff who can speak multiple languages, a focus on cultural/ethnic diversity, and the walkability of the Center**.
Overview: Results Dashboards
Residents - Agree
Employees - Agree
Residents - Disagree
Employees - Disagree

Bring value to my neighborhood
Supports partnership
Would like to see new center as part of neighborhood
I-94/Riverside Corridor needs additional recreation facilities
Missing community and culturally specific programs

Main reason Employees/Residents Would Not Go to Center

COST $$

Top 10 General Programs – Employees/Residents Combined

Cardio Machines 87%
Indoor Track 82%
Group Fitness Classes 80%
Strength Machines/Weights 80%
Indoor Lap Pool 79%
Whirlpool/Sauna 73%
Multi-purpose Gym 72%
Arts & Crafts Space 70%
Health & Wellness Programming 69%
Public Health Mini-Clinic 69%

Top 4 Factors Influencing Decision to go to Facility

Residents Employees
Welcome/inclusive environment 76% 76% Hours the facility is open
Hours the facility is open 74% 69% Variety of amenities offered
Safety 70% 69% Safety
Variety of amenities 64% 67% Welcome/inclusive environment

Other Reason Employee/Residents Would Not go to Center

“I would not join if the center was not welcoming to diverse communities, or if it did not honor various cultural and religious traditions. It should incorporate diverse cultural, racial, and religious components.”

Agreement With Support Measures

Resident - Agree
Employees - Agree
Residents - Disagree
Employees - Disagree

Familiarity with Brian Coyle Community Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likelihood to Join

About 4 in 10 likely joiners say the exclusion of a pool would decrease their likelihood to join.

53% Residents
62% Employees

Top 4 Factors Influencing Decision to go to Facility

11% Residents
20% Employees

Top 10 General Programs

- Cardio Machines: 87%
- Indoor Track: 82%
- Group Fitness Classes: 80%
- Strength Machines/Weights: 80%
- Indoor Lap Pool: 79%
- Whirlpool/Sauna: 73%
- Multi-purpose Gym: 72%
- Arts & Crafts Space: 70%
- Health & Wellness Programming: 69%
- Public Health Mini-Clinic: 69%
Results Dashboard - Employee Type

Agreement With Support Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Augsburg Residents - Agree</th>
<th>Fairview - Agree</th>
<th>Augsburg - Disagree</th>
<th>Fairview - Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bring value to my neighborhood</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports Partnership</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Center be a part of my neighborhood</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor needs additional recreation facilities</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing culturally specific programs</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 4 Factors Influencing Likelihood to Join

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Augsburg</th>
<th>Fairview</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hours the facility is open</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>Hours the facility is open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of amenities</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>Variety of amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome/inclusive environment</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>Ease of parking &amp; Welcome/inclusive environment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EMPLOYEES ARE MORE INTERESTED IN INDIVIDUAL MEMBERSHIPS

Reason Employee Would Not go to Center

“I have another membership. Some fitness facilities are already available to Augsburg employees.”

“If we lived near campus, I would walk to the Center. But if I go after dark or when I’m commuting, I need to be able park easily. It would be worth seeking an exemption from the city’s parking limits in order to include a ramp at or by the new facility.”

“I work near the area so it would depend on what is offered, fitness vs. not, and walkability.”

Likelihood to Join

3 out of 4 Augsburg Employees say they would use the Center more than once a week

Augsburg 61% Fairview 69%

* PUC data not shown due to small sample size.
Results Dashboard - Neighborhood

Agreement With Support Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Cedar Riverside - Agree</th>
<th>Seward - Agree</th>
<th>Others - Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bring value to my neighborhood</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports Partnership</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Center be a part of my neighborhood</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor needs additional recreation facilities</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing culturally specific programs</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 4 Factors Influencing Likelihood to Join

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Cedar-Riverside</th>
<th>Seward</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome/inclusive environment</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours the facility is open</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of amenities</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Familiarity with Brian Coyle Community Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Familiarity</th>
<th>Cedar-Riverside</th>
<th>Seward</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likelihood to Join

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Cedar-Riverside</th>
<th>Seward</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reason Resident Would Not go to Center

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Cedar-Riverside</th>
<th>Seward</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“No access to some women only spaces and amenities (sauna, steam room...).”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“If parking were difficult in the early morning hours-safety concern. Would need free parking. Would not go most likely if no track.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Don’t qualify for gov’t assistance, so full costs proposed are too expensive for our household.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Amenities - Neighborhood

Support/Group Space

- Adult Education Classes: 60% (Cedar-Riverside), 74% (Seward), 66% (Others)
- Kitchen for Teaching: 67% (Cedar-Riverside), 73% (Seward), 71% (Others)
- Flexible Meeting/Rental Space: 56% (Cedar-Riverside), 75% (Seward), 71% (Others)
- Space for Arts & Crafts: 73% (Cedar-Riverside), 74% (Seward), 76% (Others)
- Adult Enrichment Classes: 73% (Cedar-Riverside), 75% (Seward), 71% (Others)
- Large Room with Kitchen: 55% (Cedar-Riverside), 70% (Seward), 66% (Others)
- Space for Meditation/Prayer: 39% (Cedar-Riverside), 69% (Seward), 57% (Others)
- Female Only Space: 54% (Cedar-Riverside), 64% (Seward), 61% (Others)

Water Features & Activities

- Indoor Lap Pool: 84% (Cedar-Riverside), 78% (Seward), 82% (Others)
- Whirlpool & Sauna: 72% (Cedar-Riverside), 78% (Seward), 82% (Others)
- Aquatic Therapy: 63% (Cedar-Riverside), 65% (Seward), 77% (Others)
- Swimming Lessons: 64% (Cedar-Riverside), 68% (Seward), 75% (Others)
- Warm Leisure Pool: 63% (Cedar-Riverside), 74% (Seward), 70% (Others)
- Water Aerobics: 68% (Cedar-Riverside), 68% (Seward), 66% (Others)
- Religious/Cultural Swim Time: 47% (Cedar-Riverside), 60% (Seward), 56% (Others)

Athletic Activities

- Group Fitness Classes: 79% (Cedar-Riverside), 80% (Seward), 86% (Others)
- Cardio Machines: 86% (Cedar-Riverside), 90% (Seward), 88% (Others)
- Strength Machines/Weights: 77% (Cedar-Riverside), 85% (Seward), 82% (Others)
- Multi-Purpose Gym: 65% (Cedar-Riverside), 80% (Seward), 82% (Others)
- Indoor Track: 81% (Cedar-Riverside), 83% (Seward), 83% (Others)
- Personal Training: 58% (Cedar-Riverside), 69% (Seward), 79% (Others)
- Sports Leagues: 53% (Cedar-Riverside), 65% (Seward), 74% (Others)
- Adaptive Physical Activity Classes: 47% (Cedar-Riverside), 65% (Seward), 57% (Others)

Health & Wellness

- Public Health Mini-Clinic: 66% (Cedar-Riverside), 76% (Seward), 84% (Others)
- Health/Wellness Programming: 66% (Cedar-Riverside), 66% (Seward), 72% (Others)
**Results Dashboard - Ethnicity**

### Agreement With Support Measures

- **White - Agree:** 75%
- **East African - Agree:** 76%
- **Hispanic - Agree:** 76%
- **Others - Agree:** 63%
- **White - Disagree:** 25%
- **East African - Disagree:** 24%
- **Hispanic - Disagree:** 24%
- **Others - Disagree:** 37%

### Top 4 Factors Influencing Likelihood to Join

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>East African</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome/inclusive environment</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours the facility is open</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of amenities</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Use of New Center

- **Percent of Residents Using the Center:**
  - **Once a week +:**
    - White: 78%
    - East African: 84%
    - Hispanic: 97%
    - Others: 83%

### Reason Resident Would Not go to Center

- **“If they are not welcoming other diversity, meaning the different cultures.”**
- **“If they don’t have a good intention and if they are racial. Also if parking is available.”**
- **“I would not go to the Wellness Center if it did not include a swim park, swim lessons, and a focus on teen activities.”**
- **“The facility didn’t offer enough for the entire family. The price needs to reflect the offering/membership.”**
### Amenities - Ethnicity

#### Support/Group Space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>East African</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Space for Arts &amp; Crafts</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Enrichment Classes</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen for Teaching</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education Classes</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible Meeting/Rental Space</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Room with Kitchen</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Only Space</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Space for Meditation/Prayer</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Water Features & Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>East African</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Lap Pool</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whirlpool &amp; Sauna</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm Leisure Pool</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Aerobics</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming Lessons</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Therapy</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious/Cultural Swim Time</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Health & Wellness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>East African</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Mini-Clinic</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health/Wellness Programming</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographic Dashboard

### Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Resident Results</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Employee Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-34</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Resident Results</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Employee Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East African</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>Resident Results</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Employee Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$50,000</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $100,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Resident Results</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Employee Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Neighborhood

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Census</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seward</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Riverside</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfellow</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect Park</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott Park</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura Village</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High school/GED or less</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Post-graduate training | 24% | |%

* Resident responses were weighted by age.
Detailed Findings: Residents
Employees
Interest in Athletic Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiovascular fitness machines</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indoor walking/jogging track</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group fitness studios</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength conditioning machines/free weights</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-purpose gym</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal training/fitness assessments</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports leagues</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptive physical activity classes/leagues</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall interest in Athletic Activities:
- Residents: 75%
- Employees: 65%

*Showing percent of respondents who said they had a great deal or some interest in listed program.*
Interest in Health and Wellness

- **Public health mini-clinic**
  - Residents: 75%
  - Employees: 54%

- **Health and wellness programming**
  - Residents: 72%
  - Employees: 63%

Overall interest in Health & Wellness:
- Residents: 59%
- Employees: 74%

*Showing percent of respondents who said they had a great deal or some interest in listed program.*
Interest in Aquatic Features

- **Indoor pool for lap swimming**: 82% (Residents) 72% (Employees)
- **Whirlpool & sauna**: 77% (Residents) 63% (Employees)
- **Indoor warm water leisure pool**: 69% (Residents) 57% (Employees)
- **Swimming lessons**: 68% (Residents) 49% (Employees)
- **Water aerobics or other water exercise classes**: 67% (Residents) 55% (Employees)
- **Aquatic therapy**: 66% (Residents) 51% (Employees)
- **Swim time for religious/cultural groups**: 55% (Residents) 36% (Employees)

*Overall interest in Aquatic features:*

- Residents: 55%
- Employees: 69%

*Showing percent of respondents who said they had a great deal or some interest in listed program.*
Interest in Support/Group Space

- Dedicated space for arts and crafts: Residents 75%, Employees 57%
- Adult enrichment classes (gardening, photography): Residents 72%, Employees 60%
- Kitchen for teaching: Residents 72%, Employees 58%
- Adult education classes (language, finance): Residents 72%, Employees 53%
- Flexible meeting and rental space for groups/events: Residents 69%, Employees 60%
- Large room with kitchen for meetings/gatherings: Residents 64%, Employees 49%
- Female only gathering space: Residents 60%, Employees 41%
- Dedicated space for meditation/prayer: Residents 55%, Employees 35%

*Showing percent of respondents who said they had a great deal or some interest in listed program.*
Interest in Youth & Teen Programming

- **Drop-off childcare that allows parents to work out for up to two hours**: 94% of respondents had a great deal or some interest in this program.

- **Family nights with open gym & swim time**: 89% interest among residents and 93% among employees.

- **Youth and teen sports leagues, conditioning and training programs**: 86% interest overall.

- **Summer camps**: 91% interest overall.

- **Programs & activities for kids & families to do together, such as fitness classes**: 90% interest overall.

- **Fitness classes designed for youth**: 88% interest overall.

- **Teen designated space**: 88% interest overall.

- **Tutoring and areas designed for homework**: 77% interest among residents and 87% among employees.

- **Free summer meals for kids Monday-Friday**: 78% interest overall.

- **Leadership & character development programs**: 74% interest overall.

- **Teen programs such as teen nights**: 74% interest overall.

- **Computer classes**: 70% interest overall.

*Showing percent of respondents who said they had a great deal or some interest in listed program.*
Interest in Older Adult Programming

- **Residents**
  - Group exercise classes: 93%
  - Water exercise classes: 88%
  - Educational classes: 86%
  - Technology/computer literacy programs: 83%
  - Wellness programs (health fairs/screenings): 76%
  - Field trips to places of interest (e.g. museum or theater): 79%
  - Organized activities such as card games or clubs: 77%
  - Special gatherings and events: 61%

- **Employees**
  - Group exercise classes: 97%
  - Water exercise classes: 87%
  - Educational classes: 85%
  - Technology/computer literacy programs: 85%
  - Wellness programs (health fairs/screenings): 82%
  - Field trips to places of interest (e.g. museum or theater): 76%
  - Organized activities such as card games or clubs: 66%
  - Special gatherings and events: 69%

*Showing percent of respondents who said they had a great deal or some interest in listed program.*
Interest in Specific Childcare Options

Residents

Employees

Flexible before- or after-school childcare for $12/child per session

65%

51%

Full-day rec program on school breaks for $35/child per day

62%

49%

All-day childcare for preschool for $270 per child per week

44%

33%

Part-day preschool 9:30-2:30 3 days a week for $400/child per month

20%

41%

All-day childcare for toddlers for $320 per child per week

29%

41%

Part-day preschool 9:30-2:30 2 days a week for $300/child per month

18%

41%

Part-day preschool 9:30-2:30 5 days a week for $675/child per month

18%

36%

All-day childcare for infants for $370 per child per week

32%

27%

Overall interest in Childcare:

11%

16%

*Showing percent of respondents who said they had a great deal or some interest in listed childcare need.
## Programming Summary Residents & Employees Combined

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOST INTEREST</th>
<th>General Programming (including aquatics)</th>
<th>Youth/Teen Programming</th>
<th>Older Adult Programming</th>
<th>Childcare Programming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Cardiovascular fitness machines</td>
<td>Drop-off, free childcare</td>
<td>Group exercise classes</td>
<td>Full-day rec program on school breaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Indoor walking/jogging track</td>
<td>Family nights (gym/swim)</td>
<td>Water exercise classes</td>
<td>Flexible before/after school childcare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Group fitness classes</td>
<td>Summer camps</td>
<td>Educational classes</td>
<td>All-day childcare for preschool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Strength machines/weights</td>
<td>Family programs/activities</td>
<td>Wellness programs</td>
<td>All-day childcare for toddlers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Indoor pool for lap swimming</td>
<td>Sport leagues/training</td>
<td>Tech/Computer programs</td>
<td>Part-day preschool 3 days/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Whirlpool &amp; sauna</td>
<td>Fitness classes</td>
<td>Field trips</td>
<td>Part-day preschool 2 days/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Multi-purpose gym</td>
<td>Tutoring &amp; homework space</td>
<td>Organized activities</td>
<td>All-day childcare for infants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Dedicated space for arts/crafts</td>
<td>Teen designated space</td>
<td>Special gatherings/events</td>
<td>Part-day preschool 5 days/wk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Health/Wellness programming</td>
<td>Leadership/character programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Public health mini-clinic</td>
<td>Free summer meals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Adult enrichment classes</td>
<td>Teen programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Kitchen for teaching</td>
<td>Computer classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Personal training/fitness assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Adult education classes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Flexible meeting/rental space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Indoor warm water leisure pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Water aerobics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Swimming lessons</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Aquatic therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Large room with kitchen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Sports leagues for adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Female only gathering space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Adaptive physical activity classes/leagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Swimming time for religious/cultural groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Dedicated space for meditation/prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## LEAST INTEREST
Financial Support Awareness

Aware YMCA provides financial support for those who qualify?

- Residents: 48% Yes, 36% No, 16% Don't Know
- Employees: 66% Yes, 22% No, 12% Don't Know

Aware Minneapolis Park & Rec Board offers recreation fee assistance?

- Residents: 22% Yes, 57% No, 20% Don't Know
- Employees: 36% Yes, 53% No, 11% Don't Know

Aware Brian Coyle Center programs/services offered at no cost?

- Residents: 22% Yes, 29% No, 10% Don't Know, 39% Unfamiliar
- Employees: 38% Yes, 22% No, 4% Don't Know, 36% Unfamiliar
Likelihood to Join and Membership Type

Residents

- Definitely join: 28%
- Probably join: 25%
- Maybe join: 15%
- Probably not join: 7%
- Definitely not join: 16%
- Don't know: 9%

53%

- Individual: 39%
- Dual: 23%
- Family: 38%

Employees

- Definitely join: 33%
- Probably join: 18%
- Maybe join: 16%
- Probably not join: 4%
- Definitely not join: 14%
- Don't know: 15%

62%

- Individual: 54%
- Dual: 20%
- Family: 26%
Residents’ Likelihood to Join Benchmark Data

**Interest in Joining: average seen in other Twin Cities Metro market feasibility studies**

- **Interest in Joining Proposed I-94/Riverside Corridor Facility**
  - Interest Low: 0%
  - Interest High: 53%

**Interest in Joining Proposed I-94/Riverside Corridor Facility**

- **Interest in Joining Proposed I-94/Riverside Corridor Facility**
  - Interest Low: 0%
  - Interest High: 51%
Does Inclusion of Pool & Availability of Financial Assistance Impact Joining

If the new facility included exercise equipment, a gym and studios for fitness classes, but not an indoor pool, how would this impact your likelihood to join?

- Residents:
  - Increase: 50%
  - Decrease: 44%
  - Stay about the same: 6%

- Employees:
  - Increase: 58%
  - Decrease: 38%
  - Stay about the same: 4%

If the YMCA were to offer financial support for households receiving government assistance, would this make you more likely to join?

- Residents:
  - Yes: 39%
  - No: 23%
  - Don’t Know: 38%

- Employees:
  - Yes: 65%
  - No: 18%
  - Don’t Know: 17%
Expected Frequency of Use

- **Residents**
- **Employees**

**Frequency of Use**

- More than once a week: 63% (Residents), 69% (Employees)
- About once a week: 20% (Residents), 18% (Employees)
- About once every other week: 7% (Residents), 5% (Employees)
- About once a month: 2% (Residents), 2% (Employees)
- Less than once a month: 1% (Residents), 1% (Employees)
- Never: 1% (Residents), 0% (Employees)
- Don't know: 7% (Residents), 5% (Employees)
Factors Influencing Decision To Go To Facility

*Showing percent of respondents who said the listed factor had a major or no influence on their decision to join the facility. Those saying the factor had a minor influence are not shown.*
## Reasons Respondents Would Not Go To The Proposed Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>22% Cost</td>
<td>27% Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>10% Personal Reasons: Health/Time/Interest</td>
<td>10% Other Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>8% Location/Convenience</td>
<td>9% Amenities Offered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>8% Other Membership</td>
<td>8% Personal Reasons: Health/Time/Interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5% Safety</td>
<td>7% Hours of Operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>5% Amenities Offered</td>
<td>6% Location/Convenience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3% Hours of Operation</td>
<td>5% Lack of Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2% Lack of Parking</td>
<td>4% Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14% Not Sure/None</td>
<td>9% Not Sure/None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BIGGEST CONCERN**

- "Cost would be it. They need to be more transparent around how much would be off up front and if you’re not on assistance some type of a sliding scale..."

- "Costs, safety, I have what I need already."

- "Lack of parking would be the main deterrent for weekend visits. Budgeting the cost of membership."

- "I would not go to the center if it was cost prohibitive, didn’t offer anything outside of the current gym I go to, and wasn’t open at hours that worked for me."

- "I would not go to the Wellness Center if it did not include a swim park, swim lessons, and a focus on teen activities."

- "I would need the new center’s hours to match when I am available, before and after work."

- "If it took away a community vision for project in the same area."

**SMALLEST CONCERN**

- "I would not go to the center if it was cost prohibitive, didn’t offer anything outside of the current gym I go to, and wasn’t open at hours that worked for me."

- "I would need the new center’s hours to match when I am available, before and after work."

- "If it took away a community vision for project in the same area."
Factors Influencing Support

- Bring value to my neighborhood: 73% Agree, 71% Disagree
- Supports stakeholder partnership: 72% Agree, 69% Disagree
- Would like to see new center as part of neighborhood: 67% Agree, 67% Disagree
- I-94/Riverside Corridor needs additional recreation facilities: 56% Agree, 61% Disagree
- Missing community and culturally specific programs: 44% Agree, 43% Disagree

*Agree = Strongly agree/agree
*Disagree = Strongly disagree/disagree
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Need Not Being Met in I-94/Riverside Corridor</th>
<th>MOST NEEDED</th>
<th>LEAST NEEDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> 25% Sports and Other Fitness Activities</td>
<td>Residents: 25%</td>
<td>Employees: 43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> 23% Youth Programming</td>
<td>Residents: 23%</td>
<td>Employees: 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> 9% Community Education</td>
<td>Residents: 9%</td>
<td>Employees: 6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> 9% Cultural Enrichment Programs</td>
<td>Residents: 9%</td>
<td>Employees: 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> 8% Senior Programming</td>
<td>Residents: 8%</td>
<td>Employees: 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> 7% Help Finding Social Services</td>
<td>Residents: 7%</td>
<td>Employees: 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> None</td>
<td>Residents: None</td>
<td>Employees: None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Quotes from community members:*

- “Education for our youth dealing with law enforcement and education on more for the future.”
- “Opportunities for community interaction and cooperation.”
- “Indoor exercise gym and definitely a swimming pool.”
- “Open, multi-use space for community use.”
- “More public gathering spaces.”
- “Teen activities.”
**Brian Coyle Familiarity & Use**

### Familiarity with Brian Coyle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Use of Brian Coyle

- Residents: 15%
- Employees: 8%

### Programs Used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None, Only Familiar</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports/Gym</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Space/Events</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Social Services/Voting</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Programming</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes/Educational Programs or Help</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer/Donate</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>&gt;1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- None, Only Familiar: Residents 91%, Employees 88%
- Meeting Space/Events: Residents 1%, Employees 2%
- Public/Social Services/Voting: Residents 1%, Employees 2%
- Youth Programming: Residents 1%, Employees 2%
- Classes/Educational Programs or Help: Residents 1%, Employees 1%
- Volunteer/Donate: Residents 1%, Employees >1%
- Sports/Gym: Residents 1%, Employees >1%
Currently Belong to a Fitness Facility

**Belong to/use fitness facilities:**

- 66% Residents
- 52% Employees

**Current Fitness or Recreational Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>% Residents/Employees Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YMCA/YWCA General</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midtown YMCA (Lake Street)</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of M Rec Center</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Fitness</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifetime</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Frequency of Use**

- More than once a week: 64% Residents, 73% Employees
- About once a week: 12% Residents, 15% Employees
- About once every other week: 6% Residents, 4% Employees
- About once a month: 1% Residents, 8% Employees
- Less than once a month: 5% Residents, 1% Employees
- Never: 6% Residents, 6% Employees
- Don't know: 0% Residents, 3% Employees

66% Residents and employees use fitness facilities.
Projected Membership
Potential Membership

Maximum Potential Memberships

Obtainable Potential Memberships
Assumptions of who will actually join:

- **Residents**
  - 40% of definitely joiners
  - 20% of probably joiners
  - 10% of maybe joiners

- **Employees**
  - 85% of definitely joiners
  - 65% of probably joiners
  - 25% of maybe joiners

Represents best-case scenario by including all who said they would definitely, probably, or maybe join.

Represents more realistic scenario by including only some who said they would definitely, probably, or maybe join.
### Projected Membership & Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Type</th>
<th>Maximum Projected Memberships</th>
<th>Obtainable Projected Memberships</th>
<th>Projected Annual Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual Memberships</td>
<td>4,338</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>$647,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$68 per month; $816 annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dual Memberships</td>
<td>2,588</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>$635,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$112 per month; $1,344 annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Memberships</td>
<td>4,762</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>$1,294,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$124 per month; $1,488 annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Memberships</td>
<td>1,098</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>$110,160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45 per month; $540 annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memberships from Augsburg Employees</td>
<td>201 Individual</td>
<td>99 Individual</td>
<td>$196,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on rates above</td>
<td>73 Dual</td>
<td>36 Dual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92 Family</td>
<td>45 Family</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>13,152</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,516</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,883,648</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Given limited number of completions from Fairview employees, projections do not include this population. However, it should be noted that Fairview employees who did respond to the survey did express the highest likelihood of joining (69% Def/Prob/Maybe).
Appendix: Questionnaire
1. The following is a list of programs and services a new Recreation & Wellness Center might offer you or your family. Please indicate how interested you or someone in your household would be in that particular program or service.

### ATHLETIC ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Great Deal Of Interest</th>
<th>Some Interest</th>
<th>Little Interest</th>
<th>No Interest At All</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Group fitness studios for classes such as Zumba, Spinning or Cycling, Strength Conditioning, Yoga, or Pilates?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Indoor walking and jogging track?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Personal training and fitness assessments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A multi-purpose gymnasium?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Cardiovascular fitness machines, such as treadmills, cross-trainers, or bikes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Strength conditioning machines and free weights?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Sports leagues for adults?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Adaptive (limited mobility) physical activity classes and leagues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### HEALTH AND WELLNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Great Deal Of Interest</th>
<th>Some Interest</th>
<th>Little Interest</th>
<th>No Interest At All</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i. A public health mini-clinic, offering vaccines and other basic healthcare?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Health and wellness programming, such as nutrition and weight management, programs focusing on woman’s health, and culturally specific wellness?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUPPORT/GROUP SPACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Great Deal Of Interest</th>
<th>Some Interest</th>
<th>Little Interest</th>
<th>No Interest At All</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k. Dedicated space for arts and crafts, including classes such as pottery, ceramics, or music?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Large room with kitchen for meetings and large gatherings, such as weddings and family events?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Flexible meeting and rental space for community groups and events such as Job Fairs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Kitchen for teaching adults and kids about healthy eating?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. Adult Education classes, such as English as a second language, citizenship courses, or classes on finance or investing?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p. Adult Enrichment classes, such as gardening or photography?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q. Female only gathering space?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r. Dedicated space for meditation or prayer?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. A new Recreation & Wellness Center could offer a variety of different water features and activities. Please indicate how interested you or someone in your household would be in that particular program or service.

| a. Indoor pool for lap swimming? | Great Deal Of Interest | Some Interest | Little Interest | No Interest At All | Don’t Know |
| b. Indoor warm water leisure pool equipped with water slides, fountains, a play area for children, and a zero-entry pool? | | | | |
| c. Water aerobics or other water exercise classes? | | | | |
| d. Whirlpool & sauna? | | | | |
| e. Aquatic therapy? | | | | |
| f. Swimming lessons? | | | | |
| g. Swim time for religious or cultural groups, for example an allotted hour for either all-male or all-female groups? | | | | |

**ACTIVITIES FOR OLDER ADULTS**

3. The Center could also offer programs for adults age 65 and over. Would you or a member of your household be interested in programming for adults age 65 and over?

- Yes
- No → [You may skip the next question. Please start again at Q5]

4. For each of the following activities for adults age 65 and over, please indicate how interested you or someone in your household would be in that particular program or service.

| a. Group exercise classes specifically designed for older adults? | Great Deal Of Interest | Some Interest | Little Interest | No Interest At All | Don’t Know |
| b. Water exercise classes? | | | | |
| c. Wellness programs, including health fairs and screenings? | | | | |
| d. Field trips to places of interest (e.g., museum or theater)? | | | | |
| e. Educational classes? | | | | |
| f. Organized activities, such as card games or clubs? | | | | |
| g. Special gatherings and events such as potlucks? | | | | |
| h. Technology and computer literacy programs? | | | | |
5. The Recreation & Wellness Center could also offer programs for youth and teens. Would anyone in your household be interested in programming for youth or teens?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   [You may skip the next question. Please start again at Q7]

6. Following is a list of youth and teen activities. Please indicate how interested you or someone in your household would be in that particular program or service.

   a. Leadership and character development programs?  
   b. Family nights with open gym and swim time?  
   c. Youth and teen sports leagues, conditioning and training programs?  
   d. Summer camps?  
   e. Programs and activities for kids and families to do together, such as fitness classes designed for families?  
   f. Fitness classes designed for youth?  
   g. Computer classes to teach youth how to use new technology and social media appropriately?  
   h. Tutoring and areas designated for homework to help children complete their schoolwork?  
   i. Drop-off, free childcare that allows parents to work out for up to two hours while their children are cared for in a safe and fun environment?  
   j. Free summer meals for kids Monday through Friday?  
   k. Teen programs such as teen nights?  
   l. Teen designated space with a game room, coffeehouse or snack bar?

7. Are you aware that the YMCA provides financial support for memberships and programs to those who qualify?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - Don’t know

8. Are you aware that the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board offers recreation fee assistance for those who qualify?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - Don’t know

9. Are you aware that Brian Coyle Community Center programs and services are offered at no cost to the community?  
   - Yes  
   - No  
   - Don’t know  
   - Unaware/unfamiliar with Brian Coyle Community Center
INTEREST IN MEMBERSHIP

The proposed location of the new Recreation & Wellness Center would be near the intersection of Riverside Avenue and 25th Avenue S, on the Augsburg University campus. The Center, operated in partnership with the YMCA, could include an indoor pool, gym, exercise equipment and studios for fitness classes. A YMCA membership would include access to these amenities along with basic fitness classes, open swimming and no added fee for drop-off childcare, while parents/guardians exercise at the facility for a maximum of 2 hours. This membership could be used at other Twin Cities YMCA’s as well.

10. How likely or unlikely would you be to join the YMCA if the cost of membership was $68 per month for an individual membership, $112 per month for a dual membership including two adults in the same household, and $124 per month for a family membership.
   - [ ] Definitely join
   - [ ] Probably join
   - [ ] Maybe join
   - [ ] Probably not join [You may skip the next 3 questions. Please start again at Q14]
   - [ ] Definitely not join [You may skip the next 3 questions. Please start again at Q14]
   - [ ] Don’t know [You may skip the next 3 questions. Please start again at Q14]

11. Would you be interested in an individual membership, a dual membership, or a family membership?
   - [ ] Individual
   - [ ] Dual
   - [ ] Family

12. If the new Recreation & Wellness Center included exercise equipment, a gym and studios for fitness classes, but did not include an indoor pool, would your likelihood to join increase, decrease or stay about the same?
   - [ ] Increase
   - [ ] Decrease
   - [ ] Stay about the same

13. How often would you and/or your family use the Center?
   - [ ] More than once a week
   - [ ] About once a week
   - [ ] About once every other week
   - [ ] About once a month
   - [ ] Less than once a month
   - [ ] Never
   - [ ] Don’t know

14. If the YMCA were to offer financial support for households receiving government assistance, would this make you more likely to join?
   - [ ] Yes, financial support would make me more likely to join
   - [ ] No, I would still be unlikely to join if financial support were provided
   - [ ] Don’t know/Not applicable
15. Does your household currently have a need for paid childcare outside the home on a regular basis?
   □ Yes □ No → [You may skip the next question. Please start again at Q17]

16. For each of the following childcare options, please indicate your level of interest.

   a. Flexible before- or after-school childcare for $12 per child per session? A session can be either before-school or after-school.
      □ Great Deal Of Interest □ Some Interest □ Little Interest □ No Interest □ At All □ Don't Know

   b. Full-day recreational program on school release days or school vacation breaks for $35 per child per day?
      □ Great Deal Of Interest □ Some Interest □ Little Interest □ No Interest □ At All □ Don't Know

   c. All-day childcare for infants for $370 per child per week?
      □ Great Deal Of Interest □ Some Interest □ Little Interest □ No Interest □ At All □ Don't Know

   d. All-day childcare for toddlers for $352 per child per week?
      □ Great Deal Of Interest □ Some Interest □ Little Interest □ No Interest □ At All □ Don't Know

   e. All-day childcare for preschool for $270 per child per week?
      □ Great Deal Of Interest □ Some Interest □ Little Interest □ No Interest □ At All □ Don't Know

   f. Part-day preschool from 9:30 am to 2:30 pm for 2 days a week for $300 per child per month?
      □ Great Deal Of Interest □ Some Interest □ Little Interest □ No Interest □ At All □ Don't Know

   g. Part-day preschool from 9:30 am to 2:30 pm for 3 days a week for $400 per child per month?
      □ Great Deal Of Interest □ Some Interest □ Little Interest □ No Interest □ At All □ Don't Know

   h. Part-day preschool from 9:30 am to 2:30 pm for 5 days a week for $675 per child per month?
      □ Great Deal Of Interest □ Some Interest □ Little Interest □ No Interest □ At All □ Don't Know

RECREATION & WELLNESS CENTER SUPPORT

17. Below are some factors that may influence your decision to go to the proposed Recreation & Wellness Center. For each, please indicate how much each influences your decision to visit.

   a. Variety of amenities offered?
      □ Major Influence □ Minor Influence □ Not An Influence □ Don't Know

   b. Hours the facility is open?
      □ Major Influence □ Minor Influence □ Not An Influence □ Don't Know

   c. Safety at the Recreation & Wellness Center?
      □ Major Influence □ Minor Influence □ Not An Influence □ Don't Know

   d. Public transportation to and from the Center?
      □ Major Influence □ Minor Influence □ Not An Influence □ Don't Know

   e. Ease of parking near the Recreation & Wellness Center?
      □ Major Influence □ Minor Influence □ Not An Influence □ Don't Know

   f. Diverse staff who can speak multiple languages?
      □ Major Influence □ Minor Influence □ Not An Influence □ Don't Know

   g. A focus on cultural and ethnic diversity?
      □ Major Influence □ Minor Influence □ Not An Influence □ Don't Know

   h. A welcome and inclusive environment?
      □ Major Influence □ Minor Influence □ Not An Influence □ Don't Know

18. What are the reasons you would not go to the proposed new Recreation & Wellness Center? (Please write your response below.)

   ____________________________________________________________
19. How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Please use a scale where a 1 means you strongly disagree with the statement and a 5 means you strongly agree with the statement. (Please circle one number for each of the statements.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The I-94/Riverside Corridor needs additional recreation facilities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I would like to see a new Recreation &amp; Wellness Center become a part of my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. It is a good idea for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, YMCA, Augsburg University, Pillsbury United Communities &amp; Fairview Health Services to partner on a joint Recreation &amp; Wellness Center.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A new Recreation &amp; Wellness Center will bring value to my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The I-94/Riverside Corridor is missing community and culturally-specific programs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Which of the following is the ONE community need that you feel is NOT currently being met in the I-94/Riverside Corridor that the new Recreation & Wellness Center could potentially fulfill?

- Youth programming
- Senior programming
- Community education
- Cultural enrichment programs
- Help finding social services
- Sports and other fitness activities
- Other, please explain: ________________________________
- None/No needs

AWARENESS & CURRENT USAGE

21. How familiar are you with the Brian Coyle Community Center?

- Very familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Not at all familiar → [You may skip the next question. Please start again at Q23]

22. Do you currently use the Brian Coyle Community Center?

- Yes → What programs do you go to Brian Coyle Center for?

- No

23. Do you or members of your household belong to or use public or private fitness or recreational facilities?

- Yes → What are the names of the facilities you use? (Please specify name and location of all facilities)

- No [You may skip the next question. Please start again at Q25]
24. On average, how often do you or members of your household use a public or private fitness or recreation facility?

- More than once a week
- About once a week
- About once every other week
- About once a month
- Less than once a month
- Never
- Don’t know

**DEMOGRAPHICS**

25. In what neighborhood do you currently live?

- Cedar-Riverside
- Seward
- Prospect Park
- East Phillips
- West Phillips
- Midtown Phillips
- Longfellow
- Ventura Village
- Elliott Park
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

26. How long have you lived in your current neighborhood?

- Less than 2 years
- 2 years but less than 5 years
- 5 years but less than 10 years
- 10 years but less than 20 years
- 20 years or more
- Prefer not to answer

27. What is the highest grade or degree you completed in school?

- Eighth grade or less
- Some high school
- High school graduate/GED
- Some college, associate’s degree or technical school
- College graduate
- Post-graduate training
- Prefer not to answer

28. What is your annual household income, before taxes?

- Less than $20,000
- $20,000 but less than $30,000
- $30,000 but less than $40,000
- $40,000 but less than $50,000
- $50,000 but less than $75,000
- $75,000 but less than $100,000
- $100,000 but less than $150,000
- $150,000 or more
- Prefer not to answer
29. Which one or more of the following would you say is your race or ethnicity? (Please select all that apply.)

- African American
- African-born
- American Indian or Native American
- Asian or Asian American
- Hispanic or Latino
- White
- Some other race, please specify: ____________________________
- Prefer not to answer

30. Is English the primary language spoken in your household?

- Yes [You may skip the next question. Please start again at Q32]
- No
- Prefer not to answer

31. What is the primary language spoken in your household? (Please select only ONE.)

- Chinese
- Hmong
- Korean
- Oromo
- Somali
- Spanish
- Vietnamese
- Some other language, please specify: ____________________________
- Prefer not to answer

32. In what age group do you belong?

- 18 and 24
- 25 and 34
- 35 and 54
- 55 and 64
- 65 and older
- Prefer not to answer

33. How many children do you have in your home in each of the following age groups? (Please enter the number of children in each age group, or check the box next to “does not apply”)

____ Age 0 to 2
____ Age 3 to 5
____ Age 6 to 12
____ Age 13 to 17
- Does not apply

34. Including yourself and all people who live at your address, how many people make up your household?

____ Number of persons

35. What is your gender?

- Female
- Male
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION! YOUR RESPONSES HAVE BEEN VERY HELPFUL!

Please return your survey in the enclosed envelope (no postage is necessary).

Go to bit.ly/94riversidefacility for more information and enter your email address to receive project updates.
Small and Underutilized Business Program (SUBP) Participation Form

Please list all contractors (including your company), sub-consultants, suppliers, and service providers who submitted a bid/quote and will be selected.

Please Note:
- Only Minnesota Unified Certification Program\(^1\) (MNUCP) certified minority-owned and women-owned business enterprises (MBEs or WBEs) count toward the SUBP goal. Please place a mark “x” in the appropriate column below.\(^2\)
- If an MBE/WBE subcontracts work to a non-MBE/WBE, that value of work will not count toward the SUBP goal.
- An MBE/WBE must perform a commercially useful function\(^3\) to count toward the SUBP goal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Phone &amp; Email</th>
<th>Contact Method (fax, phone, email)</th>
<th>Date of Solicitation</th>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
<th>Bid/Quote Amount</th>
<th>MNUCP MBE</th>
<th>MNUCP WBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) Link to Online MnUCP Directory: [http://mnucp.metc.state.mn.us/](http://mnucp.metc.state.mn.us/)

\(^2\) The MBE/WBE must be certified in the scope of work they will perform, and must be located in the 11-county metropolitan area (Anoka, Carver, Chisago, Dakota, Hennepin, Isanti, Ramsey, Scott, Sherburne, Washington and Wright).

\(^3\) An MBE/WBE performs a commercially useful function when it executes a distinct element of work and carries out its responsibilities by actually performing, managing, and supervising the work involved.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Firm Name</th>
<th>City, State</th>
<th>Phone &amp; Email</th>
<th>Contact Method (fax, phone, email)</th>
<th>Date of Solicitation</th>
<th>Scope of Work</th>
<th>Bid/Quote Amount</th>
<th>MNUCP MBE</th>
<th>MNUCP WBE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The prime proposer certifies that all consultants (including your company), sub-consultants, suppliers, and service providers that submitted a bid/quote and will be selected are listed.

Company Name ___________________________  Contact Name & Title ___________________________  Phone & Email ___________________________  Date ___________________________  Signature ___________________________

**Failure to complete, sign, and submit this form may result in a non-responsive proposal.**
**City of Minneapolis Small and Underutilized Business Program (SUBP)**

I94/Riverside Corridor Shared Facility Design

This report lists MBEs and WBEs that have been certified by the Minnesota Uniform Certification Program (MnUCP) in scopes of services relevant to this project. If additional scopes of services are identified, the MnUCP online directory (http://mnucp.metc.state.mn.us/) should be utilized to find additional certified MBEs and WBEs in those scopes.

The scopes of services are categorized using the North American Industry Classification System (NAICS). For definitions and more information about NAICS Codes visit the U.S. Census Bureau (http://www.census.gov/eos/www/naics/).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAICS CODE: 541310</th>
<th>Architectural Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4RMULA</td>
<td>ERICK GOODLOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENTZ/THOMPSON/RIETOW INC</td>
<td>ANN VODA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3 DESIGN INC</td>
<td>CARLETON CRAWFORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERMAK RHAODES ARCHITECTS P.A.</td>
<td>TERRI CERMAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEVER ARCHITECTURE LLC</td>
<td>MARCIA STEMWEDEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DECO CULTURAL SERVICES LLC</td>
<td>ANDREA PIZZA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DUAN CORPORATION</td>
<td>FRANK DUAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMO CONSULTING GROUP</td>
<td>ISMAEL MARTINEZ-ORTIZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KODET ARCHITECTURAL GROUP LTD.</td>
<td>EDWARD DANIEL KODET III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LADOUCEUR ARCHITECTURE &amp; DESIGN LLC</td>
<td>JANIS LADOUCEUR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAWAL SCOTT ERICKSON ARCHITECTS INC (AKA LSE ARCHITECTS)</td>
<td>MOHAMMED LAWAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUKEN ARCHITECTURE PA</td>
<td>ELLEN LUKEN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILIZE DESIGN &amp; ARCHITECTURE LLC</td>
<td>JAMIL FORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAMOZI (DBA SPECIFICATIONS &amp; GREEN BUILDING CONSULTANTS NETWORK)</td>
<td>SUNNY ONADIPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company</td>
<td>Contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3HM LLC</td>
<td>HECTOR NANKA BRUCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASSOCIATED CONSULTING SERVICES LLC DBA ACS</td>
<td>ANNA SCHWARTZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARK. L CONSULTING d/b/a ABACUS ENGINEERING</td>
<td>KAEKO LEITCH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDINGS CONSULTING GROUP INC</td>
<td>LEWIS NG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSSELL COMPANIES INC</td>
<td>ANGIE BUSSELL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHASE ENGINEERING LLC</td>
<td>AMY TRYGESTAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMUNITY DESIGN GROUP</td>
<td>ANTONIO M. ROSELL PE AICP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRB CONSULTING LLC</td>
<td>DEBRA ROSE BRISK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELAN DESIGN LAB INC</td>
<td>MARCELLE WESLOCK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELFERING &amp; ASSOCIATES PLC</td>
<td>KRISTINA ELFERING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENGINEERING DESIGN &amp; SURVEYING (EDS INC)</td>
<td>VLADIMIR SIVRIVER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVS INC</td>
<td>K. DENNIS KIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOURTH FACTOR ENGINEERING LLC</td>
<td>ELIZABETH BECKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAIFENG TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING INC</td>
<td>HAIFENG XIAO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HALLBERG ENGINEERING</td>
<td>RICHARD LUCIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HANSEN THORP PELLINEN OLSON INC</td>
<td>LAURIE JOHNSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HZ UNITED LLC</td>
<td>HUGH ZENG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMO CONSULTING GROUP</td>
<td>ISMAEL MARTINEZ-ORTIZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INGENSA INC</td>
<td>JACQUELINE COLEMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTELLIGENT UNMANNED AIRCRAFT SYSTEM &amp; INTEGRATION</td>
<td>KINWAI CHAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Name</td>
<td>Contact Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISTHMUS ENGINEERING INC</td>
<td>KATHERINE TOGHARAMADJIAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JPMI CONSTRUCTION CO.</td>
<td>JAVEED HADI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KASKASKIA ENGINEERING GROUP</td>
<td>GERI BOYER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHTING MATTERS INC</td>
<td>DEB EDWARDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV ENGINEERING LLC</td>
<td>TRACY LAVERE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARTINEZ GEOSPATIAL INC</td>
<td>ANTHONY MARTINEZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MN BEST INC.</td>
<td>HYON KIM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOBILIZE DESIGN &amp; ARCHITECTURE LLC</td>
<td>JAMIL FORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOULI ENGINEERING INC.</td>
<td>MOULI VAIDYANATHAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-P CONSULTANTS PC</td>
<td>BEATRIZ MENDEZ-LORA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE PINI AND ASSOCIATES INC</td>
<td>RHONDA PIERCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRESERVATION DESIGN WORKS LLC (DBA PVN)</td>
<td>MEGHAN ELLIOTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERING SERVICES LTD</td>
<td>ANNA JOHNSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTIONS &amp; SOLUTIONS ENGINEERING INC</td>
<td>CRAIG ELLIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RANI ENGINEERING LLC</td>
<td>STEVEN CARLETON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAMBATEK INC.</td>
<td>SIRISH SAMBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STANDARD CONTRACTING INC</td>
<td>REBECCA SEIDENKRANZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATICS ENGINEERING SOLUTIONS LLC</td>
<td>AHMED ISSAHAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STONEBROOKE ENGINEERING INC</td>
<td>BRENDA ARVIDSON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VEDI ASSOCIATES INC</td>
<td>P.S. VEDI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WALKER ENGINEERING INC</td>
<td>SHIRLEY WALKER STINSON</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>