

Community Advisory Committee No. 5

Cedar-Riverside Recreation Center Predesign

September 22, 2020 from 4:00 – 6:00 PM

Held Virtually through Zoom

Attendees: Approximately 19 individuals were present including staff, consultants and partners

Staff and speakers present: Daniel Elias, Siciid Ali, Madeline Hudek, Alyssa Gilmore (MPRB); Kathryn Watson, Dave Dimond, John Slack, Chris Kastelic (Perkins + Will)

[Unless otherwise noted, comments below are by Daniel Elias, Project Manager]

1. Welcome

Dan Elias started by welcoming everyone—In new reality in gathering on virtual CACs, there are only 2 members that have been able to join at this time; what is the best way to advance this project given that we can't gather in person. CAC members to consider if we should be advancing with such little CAC participation, and other ideas that can assist us in moving project forward.

Welcome, it's been 14 months since we kicked off Community Advisory Committee (CAC) for Cedar-Riverside Recreation Center Predesign project. We had hoped to have this meeting back in May, but we delayed the meetings in the hope of gathering in person, however, still not feasible.

Passed it over to CAC Chair Abdirizak Bihi—welcomed everyone; gathering are allowed with 50 or less people indoors with social distancing and all the safety steps in place. For meeting 6 let's think about gathering in a safe manner, at the Brian Coyle Gym. Might be more encouraging. Bihi lead introductions.

Everyone introduced themselves.

2. Agenda

Dan read through the Agenda for CAC #5; delivered current MPRB Land Acknowledgement. Gave an orientation for how the online meeting would be run (what materials would be available online, etc). CAC Charge (from MPRB board of commissioners, the reason that the MPRB convenes at CAC)—moving toward the stage of the predesign report—make a formal recommendation based on predesign (stage we're at now)—Hope that for CAC #6, CAC members will be voting for options they would like us to advance, that is information we would bring to the Board for the project.

Staff hosted a virtual open house information session in June, all that information is available on the project website.

3. PROJECT SCHEDULE

Dan went over the project schedule, outlining the next steps. CAC 6 currently scheduled to be virtual but will look to the possibility of being in person.

Dan went over the 45-day comment period and the process of comment tabulation for the predesign report, with eventual adoption by the Board of Commissioners.

Identified the bonding period—Dan spoke to the state’s bonding bills.

CAC recommendation to ask the Board to add this project to legislative agenda, make it priority to work to advance this project with full funding

4. Small Group Discussion

How have the last 6 months changed the way you think about and value recreation?

**Instead of breaking out into small groups, we stayed in the main room

CAC members present share their thought.

5. Predesign Guiding Principles

Through this process, from individual community engagement work that has been done, CAC work, and stakeholder and partner work that’s been done, there are 7 guiding principles for project that underly the work being done. The intent is for the principles to guide the future work (design and construction project). CAC was asked if there’s anything missing (expanded), anything not appropriate for project?

- Dan read through the predesign guiding principles

6. General Project Update

Project started by envisioning two different (west and east) predesign reports. East on Augsburg University campus, co-located with other development. West side, still exploring site opportunities.

Now, the project is only focusing on the west side, still considering and evaluating different properties, will be introducing a range of options—More information about those options are available in the presentation.

Focus is on the west because community prioritized west side of Cedar-Riverside during early engagement, unlikely that state will fund two new rec centers in same neighborhood in same time frame. East CE has been documented, high priority has been documented.

We do not have clarity from City to definitively say or know the location. Lot A owned by City; A1 Hennepin County; F (privately owned); Coyle operation w Pillsbury United. Can design project for specific location as it becomes more clear.

Lot A update—City is working to evaluate RFP; Sherman Associates; feedback has been on hold because of pandemic. Staff recommendation has been postponed until those meetings can be held. NO UPDATE (ON HOLD UNTIL CITY ADVANCES ENGAGEMENT PROCESS).

MPRB staff are working to test a shuttle service, directly in response to community feedback, aquatics is high priority. Phillips Aquatic center is 1.5 mi away. As we advanced options that don't include aquatics, those options also include permanent shuttle service that people can access programs and services of that facility while living in cedar riverside.

Dan passed the presentation to Kathryn Watson of Perkins + Will to go through the programmatic Options

7. Programmatic Options – Kathryn Watson presenting

Options 1A and 1B include existing BCC. Listing the program pieces that are part of the total recreation space (on the right side). 21,000 sqft. 26,000 sqft (new center). Colors correspond to program space list (ie. orange are fitness spaces, blue are the community spaces, etc.); also see average people served per day based on programming available.

More detailed program of what's available, specific square footages for program options and support areas and more granular details are included in the draft predesign report that will be available this week.

Look at 3D diagrams to give feel of what space looks like, think about it more architecturally, how they will be configured. Each space is numbered on diagram, see a picture that correlates to diagram, existing spaces they've worked on, give feel/visual for what spaces could look like. See icons at the top that show layout and square footage.

OPTION 1B—this includes the teaching pool. Everything on existing diagram is same as 1A. Less variety of programming in this diagram, to keep similar capital and operations between 1a and 1b there was reduction of sq ft to accommodate teaching pool. 4,000 sq ft difference to equalize costs between two options. Teaching pool takes up about half, aquatics/mechanical support, larger locker rooms to support pool. Serves less people, teaching pool is intended to be for classes, specific programming, not necessarily for open swim (secondary purpose). Also showed more detailed program and 3d view of what Option 1B might start to look like. Pool notes as well—primarily support lessons/water safety/women only swim; secondarily support open swim. New splash pad at Currie park will be open upon completion and re-opening, part of construction project.

OPTION 2—brand new recreation center, 46,000 sqft. include demolition of existing Brian Coyle Center, program spaces would be accommodated in new building (not going away). There is also an in-depth program review and 3d diagram available for option 2.

COMPARISON—See all the options/tradeoffs in a couple of slides, that shows what’s included sq ft, and number of people served. Fairly equal in total recreation space for each option. The differences especially between 1A and 1B are programmatic elements available. Operations and maintenance cost for each cost/day/person AND LOOKED AT cost/sqft/year.

8. Project Scalability – Kathryn Watson presenting

If the funding does fall short how is this project scalable? Chart shows all data collected from in person CAC meetings, prioritized spaces (identified 5 highest priority activities), online survey. Shows all the data gathered, lists all the activities and the number of responses. Top 7 most prioritized spaces are outlined by red box. Pool, gym, group fitness, individual spaces, art/creative, tech lab, food shelf. Thinking about if funding doesn’t fully come through, start thinking about narrowing this band of programming, prioritizing it even more. Create utilization matrix, how many users a space can accommodate based on what’s desired. Think about “how do we target spaces that serve the largest need or broadest programs”. Thinking about “double or triple duty multi-use spaces”. Thinking about how down the road these spaces are functionally used (materials, lighting, storage, operable walls, etc.)

9. CAC Q&A / DISCUSSION – Daniel Elias presenting

1. Guiding principles
2. Option 1A and 1B, which do you prefer and why? Should we prioritize teaching pool (highest priority, at the expense of many of the other program spaces that could be included).

CAC Question from Pete Munene—What have you learned over the last 10 years in building these types of structures, in terms of things that have really worked well, things that you would avoid?

Chris Kastelic from Perkins + Will answered—thinking of buildings of this nature, meant to serve across generations, need to think about doing the right thing over long period of time. Whenever possible build spaces that can serve many possible uses, don’t know what trends will come and go. No substitute for thoughtful multi-use spaces. Be FLEXIBLE. Be DURABLE. (not too narrowly focused in their purpose) Mandate is giving buildings that can stand the test of time; easy to maintain and operate. Shy away from single purpose or narrow focused spaces, look to spaces with broad appeal. Special interest spaces don’t sustain, take away for opportunity cost for other programs for community use.

CAC Chair Bihi—What is the opportunity cost for swimming pool, what is being eliminated?

Staff—Option 1B is Coyle center as it exists, new facility with teaching pool and support spaces, and one small multi-purpose room and health and wellness suite

Option 1A- fitness center, group exercise, multipurpose gym, child sitting, computer lab, meditation space, large and small multi-purpose room. 1B loses almost all other programmatic

features of new facility when including teaching pool. 1A include all highest prioritized programs other than aquatic facility.

CAC Chair—1.5 miles on roads to get to the Phillips, but will we have a shuttle?

Staff- Can't speak to what currently exists, know there was a pilot shuttle program back when. MPRB was trying to work on this this summer, would like to advance a more permanent shuttle service between two facilities. Have heard community express desire for aquatic facilities. Respond to that need to the best of MPRB ability. We have included shuttle service in 1A and 2. Between now and when facility is built, need to figure out funding and logistics for more permanent shuttle service. Consider for LONG TERM, trying to bake it into options 1A and 2 the shuttle service as a more permanent option for 2 facilities.

CAC Chair Bihi-- Rather have transportation available and have aquatics available as is because of the opportunity costs. Community is growing. We will lose a lot of space and a lot of amenities for children and seniors. Have aquatics in next door neighborhood. Will be better if regular transportation is embedded in the project for foreseeable future.

Staff- as we advance, need to see if other CAC members feel similarly, need to think about how to communicate this to receive feedback.

CAC Munene- Seward resident, not immediately going to be utilizing 1B, but appreciation at previous meetings that a small and vocal group felt strongly about it. MPRB should get feedback on how the shuttle service was working. Formalized survey/information to solidify that it was successful/well utilized? Explain more support? In terms of demolishing BCC, what is the time that everyone will be without services, sense of that?

Staff—good question, Option 2 calls for the demolition, however, we don't know exactly where that will be. If new building is to be located outside of Currie Park, we will be able to operate up until new facility can operate. Built if Option 2 is built at the Coyle site, there are varying estimates and varying ideas about how project could be phased/initiated around existing BCC. Fairly clear there would need to be a down time (6-12 months, depends on a more detailed design analysis). Predesign, not focusing on one single site. Have heard the concern, has a place in the predesign report in phasing/working to build out project in way that limits downtime for services for community members.

CAC Munene—for the Africa Village Minneapolis Project, how closely connected is it to this project?

Staff—staff are kept aware of progression/lack of. Understanding, MPRB has seat at proposal review/evaluation through Assoc. Superintendent (Michael Schroeder). Don't know what two community members who were selected to participate in the process, that is the individual that is most keyed in to Somali Mall/Africa Village project at lot A.

CAC Munene—mentioned bonding not panning out, does that change things or not?

Staff—2020 bonding that's not moving forward?

CAC Munene- Yeah.

Staff—impacts of the legislative agenda are on more than the individual project. 2020 was a unique year in which MPRB had multiple projects funded through state bonds at least in the Governor's initial release of bonding package. With those projects funded, other projects could become prioritized in future years. This project will be on a more crowded list of projects competing for funds. Have been moving this forward, continual request for bond funds at earliest possible time the state will fund the project, we are currently not funded for design and construction. Timeline for those two phases determined once funding is received. Unique project, engaging community in deep way that may have 4-10 year horizon. Predesign report will become board policy, guide legislative agenda and future project, whatever funding arises for improvement. Doesn't impact project itself and how we plan to move forward; just impacts the likelihood and timing of funding coming to MPRB.

CAC—Option 2 BCC demolished, considerations for utilization of that space

Staff—We have a rendering/idea of Currie Park expansion. If Currie expands, MPRB would initiate separate project with own CE plan to do with space that would become available. Nothing predetermined but noted as a benefit to option 2. Partner team in agreement that's ideal scenario as well

Karen-Augsburg-- Option 2A and option 2B—big difference between keeping BCC going until there is a new rec center at a different spot. Having to keep new rec. center at site of BCC with phasing. Existing BCC goes away, but two very different scenarios based on rebuild on site or off.

Staff- Correct that it's two different design projects, the numbers to move around from cost estimate as it relates to phasing. What we've tried to do to boil down Option 2 is a single facility; the how and where is being left out of this report because there are so many factors that have been left unanswered. At the time in which we engage in design project at a determined location, Option 2 at Coyle site versus off-site are two different projects. Predesign will be a guide regardless of that distinction.

CAC Munene—the average people served per day is a compelling thing to be paying attention to. How did you arrive at those numbers?

Perkins and Will – Chris Kastelic—we created an understanding based on amenities, how many hours can programs be operated, how would those be staffed. Given certain area, spaces, programs, through course of day, through year, we established a range of people that would be likely to use and be able to use (capacity).

OPENED UP FOR PUBLIC COMMENT FOR CAC/PROJECT TEAM

Questions in chat

Jenna—maintenance space; building support space in each of the plans, in line with national averages for maintenance spaces.

Staff--Those would really be built out in detailed design process as project is advanced around where/how those facilities would be operated.

Karen—Option 2; there is a perception that any amount of downtime would be unacceptable to neighborhood. What kind of resistance could we expect from community members if Coyle was down for a period of time?

CAC CHAIR Bihi—BCC is very vital for such a huge community in a small, dense area. Opportunity cost, what are we going to miss, we can look at other spaces. Maybe in downtime we can use that challenge to engage with community to have them utilize other available spaces if the downtime is worth it. Hoping there won't be COVID during the downtime. Can look to other spaces in the community.

10. WRAP UP AND NEXT STEPS

Presentation, notes, questions and answers, and draft predesign report will be posted later this week. We will host virtual staff office hours and we will put our heads together around CAC meeting #6 and how to increase participation from the CAC to work towards what is hopefully the final meeting, members voting on 1A and 1B and providing feedback on guiding principles.

Currie Park update—splashpad and restroom almost 100% complete, fencing pulled down soon. Too cold, restroom should be operational this winter. Improvements generally complete.

Dan thanked everyone for attending the meeting and it was adjourned around 5:25pm