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PREDESIGN CHECKLIST - continued
Complete this checklist, sign, and submit with the predesign document.

Complete N/A


☐ ☐ 2. Structure the format of your Predesign submittal to contain the Components of Predesign. Include component tabs to readily identify and access each component. The components are:
   a. Predesign Summary Statement
   b. Basis for Need – Project Background
   c. Agency/Organization Planning
   d. Project Description
      1. Architectural/Engineering Program
      2. Precedent Studies
      3. Technology Plan
      4. Sustainability, Energy Conservation, and Carbon Emissions
      5. Operations and Maintenance Requirements
      6. Statute Requirements
      7. Specialty Requirements
      8. Project Procurement and Delivery
      9. Quality Control Plan
   e. Site Analysis and Selection
   f. Financial Information
   g. Schedule Information

☐ ☐ 3. Section 1 – Predesign Summary Statement. Work with the user agency to develop the executive summary. Be brief, with a two or three paragraph scope description of the project. Below the description include costs, funding sources and schedule.

☐ ☐ 4. Section 1 Predesign Summary Statement: Complete the "Building/Project Data Sheet" to tabulate the pertinent data upon which the cost estimates are based. Include this sheet as a second page to the Section 1 – Predesign Summary Statement.

☐ ☐ 5. Section 1 Predesign Summary Statement: If the project involves remodeling of an existing building, use the "Building Audit Sheet" to perform an audit/survey of the building’s major components, systems and their conditions. Use and amend the "Building/Project Data Sheet" to indicate the scope of work for the proposed project. Insert behind the Summary Statement.

☐ ☐ 6. Section 2 Basis For Need-Project Background: Gather the Section 3 planning information from the Agency/Organization and synthesize it into the format shown in the example. Detailing the Mission, Strategic Plan, Operational Plan and Basis for Need for the project. At the back of this include any additional background information on the project from your work with the agency.

☐ ☐ 7. Section 2 Basis For Need-Project Background: Verify that the scope of the predesign complies with the language of the appropriation. (For projects that
have already received a legislative appropriation).

8. Section 3 Agency/Organization Planning: This Section supports the Basis for Need–Project Background. Obtain the following from the user agency/organization:
   a. Planning documents such as org charts, mission statement,
   b. Strategic plan, and
   c. Operational plan for the project.
This information would include any supporting data, analysis or studies which support the proposed project and demonstrates the need for the project by linking it to the agency’s mission, strategic and operational plans; which, in turn were used to prepare Section 2.

9. Section 3 Agency/Organization Planning: Included a list and narrative regarding the stakeholders involved and affected by the project (i.e. other agencies, organizations, and entities). Also include issues that remain to be resolved among stakeholders along with budget and schedule impacts upon the project.

10. Section 3 Agency/Organization Planning: Impacts on Operations, Budget and Facility Staff are detailed.

11. Section 4.A Architectural/Engineering Program: (For State Agency projects) Obtain and coordinate space planning standards with the Department of Administration. Then, include a review sign-off from The Department of Administration’s Real Estate and Construction Services Division. Focus on job related functional needs and the State’s Space Guidelines when developing the square foot areas of spaces. (Space Guidelines are located at http://mn.gov/admin/government/construction-projects/).

12. Section 4.A Architectural/Engineering Program. Work with the user/owner to develop the space program. Employ a participatory programming methodology similar to the example) to analyze operations and activities.
   a. Your methodology should consider Post-Occupancy Evaluation (POE).

13. Section 4.A Architectural/Engineering Program: Complete the Space Needs Inventory sheet for each room of the project. Include these sheets in the predesign document. The Space Needs sheet should also identify special Mechanical or Electrical needs or upgrades for the space. For instance, you would state the need for special humidification for wood instrument storage in a music classroom.

14. Section 4.A Architectural/Engineering Program: Prepare and include a detailed architectural space program with a Table of Spaces and their respective areas (square footages) with a total of assignable and gross square feet.

15. Section 4.A Architectural/Engineering Program: Provide adjacency diagrams of all spaces and a diagrammatic/conceptual layout of spaces. Superimpose these diagrams onto the Site Plan to show building/site fit and site relationships.

17. **Section 4.A Architectural/Engineering Program.** (for State Agency Projects): If applicable to the agency, work with the user agency to incorporate a *Telecommuting Plan* for this project. Include the *Telecommuting Plan* with the Predesign submittal document. Obtain review & response letter from MN.IT.

18. **Section 4.A Architectural/Engineering Program.** Develop the Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (FF&E) needs and include the associated costs as a line item in the project cost estimate. Consider Interior/Exterior Signage Exterior landscaping and fixtures, Telecommunication devices, Security Camera System, Lockers, Trash compactor, Window washing equipment, phasing costs, and Moving costs. (Note: moving costs are not bondable).

19. **Section 4.B Precedent Studies:** Research the project. Visit similar building types and include precedent projects into the predesign document and how the precedent affects the proposed project. Include information on the facilities (name, location, size, design features); Then indicate any features that will be incorporated into the proposed project. Special attention should be paid to design features that result in efficiency of program operations and ability to reduce long term operating costs.

20. **Section 4.C Technology Program** (for State Agency Projects): Identify and document the technology needs for the project. Develop a Technology Plan for the project using the State's Technology agency (MN.IT) guidelines ("Building Infrastructure Guidelines for State Owned Buildings") located at: [http://mn.gov/admin/government/construction-projects/](http://mn.gov/admin/government/construction-projects/). Technology plan is to be reviewed by MN.IT.

21. **Section 4.C Technology Plan** (for State Agency Projects): Forward the Technology Plan to MN.IT (The State’s Information Technology Agency) for review; and obtain a written letter from MN.IT. Incorporate any changes requested by MN.IT.

22. **Section 4.D Sustainability, Energy Conservation and Carbon Emissions:** In accordance with Minnesota Statute §16B.235 identify Sustainable and High Performance goals for the project using “The State of Minnesota Sustainable Building Guidelines” at [http://www.b3mn.org/guidelines/index.html](http://www.b3mn.org/guidelines/index.html). Include a summary table of goals & strategies. Also include the B3-MSBG project submittal report for the Predesign Phase that is generated by use of the B3-MSBG Tracking Tool at [http://www.b3mn.org/guidelines/index.html](http://www.b3mn.org/guidelines/index.html). This requirement applies when the project is new building, addition, or major renovation. See the Applicability rules at the B3-MSBG website.

23. **Section 4.D Sustainability, Energy Conservation and Carbon Emissions:** Include a table of strategies to comply with Sustainable Building (SB) 2030 requirements. For SB2030 requirements, see: [http://www.mn2030.umn.edu](http://www.mn2030.umn.edu)
24. For the Section 4.D Sustainability, Energy Conservation and Carbon Emissions:
   In accordance with MN Statute § 16B.32, identify alternative energy uses and associated systems. This applies to a new building or for a renovation of 50 percent or more of an existing building or its energy systems. Anticipate future designs which use active and passive solar energy systems, earth sheltered construction, and other alternative energy sources where feasible.

   When the project is for a State Agency, provide a cost-benefit analysis for
   a) including alternative energy (wind and/or solar) sources to provide 2% of the proposed building’s energy consumption. An example of an analysis is located at: http://mn.gov/admin/business/vendor-info/construction-projects/Guidelines/predesign.jsp
   b) a 40 Kw “Made in Minnesota” photovoltaic solar system

   For compliance with MN Statute 16B.326, provide a written plan in the predesign to consider providing Geothermal and Solar Energy Heating & Cooling Systems on new or replacement HVAC systems. An example of an analysis is located at the weblink above.

27. Section 4.D Sustainability, Energy Conservation and Carbon Emissions:
   Include a narrative in the predesign that the project specifications are to include requirements for the contractor to submit a “Waste Management and Recycling Program Plan” for both demolition and construction.

   Estimated yearly energy consumption and associated costs are included.

29. Section 4.E Operations and Maintenance Requirements:
   Conduct information gathering and program meetings with operations and maintenance staff. Document and include these needs into the predesign.

30. Section 4.E Operations and Maintenance Requirements:

31. Section 4.F Statute Requirements:
   See Appendix 4c for statute requirements related to all projects receiving any amount of state funding. Enter information on how the project will comply with each statute and include in the final predesign document.

32. Section 4.F Statute Requirements:
   Review the table of statutes contained in
this manual. Identify the statutory requirements for the project. These are to be included in the final Predesign Document.

☐ ☐ 33. **Section 4.F Statute Requirements:** Include any design requirements or other mandated requirements.
   a. The statute that gives authority for the operational program
   b. Licensing requirements. (i.e. Department of Health or other authority)
   c. Design requirements (i.e. American Correctional Association standards).
   d. Operating Standards (required State, Federal, & Industry standards)
   e. Federal Statutes/Laws/Requirements.
   f. Significant Building Code or land use/zoning requirements.

☐ ☐ 34. **Section 4.G Specialty Requirements:** Review the need to conduct a security and/or vulnerability assessment for the project. Include the study in the predesign document along with associated costs.

☐ ☐ 35. **Section 4.G Specialty Requirements:** Include any unique requirements that are applicable to the specific project. i.e. performance requirements, unique testing requirements, environmental reports, assessments, impact statements, facility condition audits that may have been done, hazardous materials surveys, unique construction, restrictions.

☐ ☐ 36. **Section 4.G Specialty Requirements:** For renovations and demolitions, verify if the building or structure or amenity is on the register of historic places and/or within a historic district. Meet with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to determine requirements. Include all SHPO requirements in the predesign as well as all specialty consultants (historic preservationist, archeologist) required for the future design team.

☐ ☐ 37. **Section 4.H Project Procurement and Delivery:** Provide a written statement and recommendation of the proposed construction delivery method to be used on the project. Include the reasons for this selection. Options include: Design-Bid-Build, Best Value, Construction Manager at Risk, Design-Build.

☐ ☐ 38. **Section 4.I- Project Design Services and other Owner Costs:** Provide a listing of all costs that will be incurred in order to build the project.

☐ ☐ 39. **Section 4.J- Quality Control Plan:** Provide a listing of all quality control services and costs that are needed and will be incurred in order to building the project.

☐ ☐ 40. **Section 5 Site Analysis and Selection:** Provide a narrative on why the preferred site was selected for the project based on the locations that best meet pre-identified site criteria. For State-owned buildings/State Agency projects, coordinate this effort with the Department of Administration, Real Estate and Construction Services.

☐ ☐ 41. **Section 5 Site Analysis and Selection:** When locating or relocating or when proposing a new building or renovation, the Predesign Document must include an
analysis of the agency’s location(s) using “Criteria for Locating State Offices and Agencies” located at: http://mn.gov/admin/government/construction-projects/

☐ ☐ 42. Section 5 Site Analysis and Selection: If the proposed project is a new building that will be in a campus setting (i.e. school, university, prison, extended care); review location options on the campus in regards to efficient operation and programs provided on the campus. (i.e. Agency masterplanning of a campus should occur in order to give direction as to future growth and organization - Note: Masterplanning is not a bondable activity).

☐ ☐ 43. Section 5 Site Analysis and Selection: Verify if the project will be required to undergo a State Environmental Review. To determine this, go to: http://www.eqb.state.mn.us/EnvRevGuidanceDocuments.htm. If required the predesign will need to include all applicable information and direction to the future design team to provide assistance to the owner and responsible government unit in conducting an environmental assessment (EAW) and environmental impact statement (EIS).
Note: If the project includes federal dollars, determine the need to complete an Environmental Assessment in accordance with the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA).
Include all applicable guidelines for EAWs and EISs into the predesign submittal document if available; if not include costs for these in the project budget. Identify required timelines in the project schedule.

☐ ☐ 44. Section 6 Financial Information: Compile the project costs using the Department of Minnesota Management and Budget’s Capital Budget Request spreadsheet form (this form is included in this manual). Complete this form and include it in the submitted Predesign document.

☐ ☐ 45. Section 6 Financial Information: Compile the projected operating costs using the State Operating Costs form (this form is included in this manual). Other formats/forms are also acceptable.

☐ ☐ 46. Section 6 Financial Information, review the Project Delivery Method (single prime, multiple prime, design/build) for impact on the Cost Plan for the project.

☐ ☐ 47. Section 6 Financial Information, include design fees for special consultants in the project costs (i.e. food service, acoustical, security, etc.).

☐ ☐ 48. Section 6 Financial Information, verify existing utility infrastructures for adequate capacity needed to support the proposed building/facility or renovation. Incorporate costs for upgrades into the budget.

☐ ☐ 49. Section 6 Financial Information: If applicable and/or desired, include percent for Art in the project cost. Statute 16B.35 Subdivision 1 applies [up to 1% of the appropriation can be allocated to art in public buildings – Detention facilities and non-public buildings are exempt.]
50. **Section 6 Financial Information:** Assist the user agency in identifying and incorporating contingency phasing and funding plans into the predesign to anticipate questions during legislative hearings.

51. **Section 6 Financial Information:** When the proposed project is for an existing correctional facility, obtain the contractor security requirements for the facility and include appropriate cost and schedule adjustments. (Working in a secure facility will add approximately 15-20% cost to the project).

52. **Section 6 Financial Information:** On major building projects, use the predesign to develop an options based strategy for the agency to use in approaching the governor and legislature when requesting funding. The predesign should anticipate possible questions by presenting options for varying scopes and costs. Examples are:
   1) It may make sense to break out options (and costs) to spread the funding over several capital bonding sessions.
   2) Phasing of the project

53. **Section 6 Financial Information:** For renovations, a Facility Condition Assessment has been conducted on the existing building and associated upgrade costs are included in the estimate.

54. **Section 6 Financial Information:** Conduct an industrial hygiene investigation to determine if there are any hazardous material/asbestos abatement clean-up costs, fuel tank removal and/or contaminated soils clean-up costs for the proposed project or site.

55. **Section 6 Financial Information:** Provide the Life Expectancy of the major building components and building as a whole and included in the predesign document. Show comparison costs of varying construction systems/components and their life span. Indicate the selected system that was used to prepare the cost estimates.

56. **Section 6 Financial Information:** (For State Agency projects) State’s Design Guidelines were reviewed and associated costs accounted for.

57. **Section 7 Schedule Information:** Include a schedule narrative and bar chart in the submittal document. Include time for hazardous material abatement, site clean-up, fuel tank removal and soils replacement costs, project schedule phasing time, relocation/move time, and any potential long-lead material deliveries.

58. **Section 7 Schedule Information:** Include a quality control/coordination review of the construction documents by a third party. Include the cost of this in the design budget. Indicate a minimum of 2 months in the schedule for this review.

59. For State Agency projects: Complete the Technology Checklist. Insert the MN.IT letter indicating they have reviewed and approved the Technology and
Telecommuting Plans.

☐ ☐ 60. This predesign document contains all the necessary requirements and costs for:
   a. The owner to confidently pursue funding based on the cost estimates contained.
   b. The owner to advertise for design services and structure their contract with a design firm as to the design scope of work and fee; and,
   c. The future design team for all project requirements in order to carry out the proposed design.
   d. All owner costs required to deliver the proposed project.

☐ ☐ 61. Include the SIGNATURE sheet, with signature of the ARCHITECT (see page 1).
1. Obtain a copy of MN.IT’s “Building Infrastructure Guidelines For State-Owned Buildings” and review the requirements for costs to be included in the project. For future design use, should the project be funded, include the Technology Plan and guidelines in the predesign submittal.

2. In coordination with MN.IT, determine the need for and develop a Technology & Telecommunications Plan for the project. Form and convene a Predesign meeting to determine the agency’s technology needs, goals, timelines and objectives. The Predesign Team will consist of, but will not be limited to:
   - Agency/customer
   - Real Estate and Construction Services’ (RECS) Project Manager
   - Telecommunications Analyst (S)/Designer (if required for predesign)
   Note: The State’s (RECS) Project Manager will provide the MN.IT contact name.

3. For remodeling projects, verify existing technology infrastructures for adequate capacity. Include upgrade costs in the Cost Estimate.

4. Identify the user agency’s short and long range plans for technology needs.

5. Identify if the project is or will be a single building or campus configuration.

6. Identify existing distribution rooms and their capacity.

7. Identify requirements for new distribution rooms.

8. Identify Fiber Optic requirements, existing locations, new fiber lines.

9. Identify copper-wiring requirements, existing and new.

10. If information technology work is to be within an existing building, identify existing conditions; i.e. floor & ceiling heights & conditions, piping and duct conditions, water problems, feeder cable limitations, equipment room limitations.

11. Identify existing telecommunications infrastructure service to the building.

12. Identify types of existing cable trays and requirements for new cable trays.

13. For projects in existing buildings, identify available communications “pairs” coming into the building.

14. Identify MPOP (Main Point of Presence), APOP (Alternate Point of Presence), Internet Point of Presence locations and needs.

15. Forward a copy of the project Technology Plan and Telecommuting Plan to MN.IT.

16. Obtain a written letter from MN.IT indicating acceptance of the Technology
PREDESIGN CHECKLIST – continued

TECHNOLOGY & TELECOMMUNICATIONS

Complete    N/A

Plan and Telecommuting Plan for the project. Incorporate MN.IT’s letter into the Predesign Document.

☐ ☐  17. Incorporate any changes into the Technology Plan as requested by MN.IT (resulting from review of agency’s technology plan for the project).

☐ ☐  18. Verify existing utility infrastructures for adequate capacity and cost upgrades needed to support the proposed building/facility or renovation.

PREDESIGN CHECKLIST
Check off the above items as they are completed and include this checklist with your final submittal document. Completion of this checklist is MANDATORY.

CONSULTANT SIGNATURE:

Signature: _______________________________

Name of Project: ________________________

Printed Name: __________________________

Agency: ________________________________

Title: _________________________________

Facility: ______________________________

Company: ______________________________

State Project No. ________________________

43
Community Engagement Assessment

Please fill out this form if your project, program, or initiative includes community engagement. All Community Engagement Assessments should be filed as Petitions and Communications with the MPRB Board of Commissioners and submitted to the MPRB Engagement Portal on SharePoint (Portal is in development – for now please send to christensen@minneapolisparks.org).

Staff Lead Name: Daniel Elias

Division/Department: Planning

Level of Engagement: Partner

Project Description (100 words max):

_Cedar-Riverside Recreation Centers Predesign Study_

This project will explore the potential for building a new recreation center, integrated into a larger development, on the east end of the Augsburg University campus to meet the growing needs of the Cedar-Riverside community. A 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.

*This document is guided by the pending Community Engagement Policy. The new policy will be Board adopted prior to the final submittal of the Community Engagement Assessment and Community Engagement Plan for this project.*
Answer the questions to determine the level of engagement that your program, project, or initiative falls under in the Justification section below. Provide an explanation of how your project meets the criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Engagement</th>
<th>Inform</th>
<th>Consult</th>
<th>Involve</th>
<th>Partner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement Goal</strong></td>
<td>To provide stakeholders with factual, accessible, balanced, and timely information to help them understand the project, program, or initiative.</td>
<td>To obtain stakeholder feedback on project, initiative, or program 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, program, or initiative decisions.</td>
<td>To partner with stakeholders in each aspect of decision making in order to develop and implement collaborative project, program, or initiative solutions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Criteria to Determine Level of Engagement (Which level of engagement best describes your project?)** | • This a decision that should be based on technical, operational, or safety constraints only.  
• This is a project that does not result in a change in the type, location, or extent of the current facility or service. | • This project takes place in a park that has been master planned.  
• This is a new city-wide initiative or program.  
• This is a new public policy or public policy update.  
• The outcome will change based on community input. | • This project requires a CAC.  
• This project does not have other policy guidance such as an existing master plan or public policy. | • This program, project, or initiative is being developed in partnership with another agency or organization. |
| **MPRB Promise** | MPRB will keep you informed. | MPRB will keep you informed, listen to and acknowledge feedback, work to integrate stakeholder feedback into the alternatives, and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision. | We will work with stakeholders for advice and innovation in formulating solutions and to incorporate recommendations to the extent possible. | The MPRB and partner entity will be accountable to their roles as negotiated in the partnership and regularly evaluate overall success of the partnership. |
| **Examples of project types** | • Repaving a parking lot, cutting down a tree, beach or swimming pool closures, ADA improvements, rehab | • Approved master plan design implementation, city or service area wide program development, public policy development, Participatory Project Scoping | • Master plans, any process that includes a formal public body making recommendations. | Jointly owned and/or operated facilities, co-creation, public/private partnership, community led projects. |

This engagement grid was adapted from the IAP2 International Federation 2014 Public Participation Spectrum.
March 5, 2019

**Justification (100 words max):** Please explain how your project meets the criteria in the engagement grid on pg. 2. Provide a justification for each criterion corresponding to the Level of Engagement that will guide your project.

While a Community Advisory Committee will still be formed, this project goes beyond the engagement level of “Involve” due to the partnerships necessary for the delivery of services to Cedar-Riverside.

The engagement level for this project is “Partner” because work with Pillsbury United Communities (who currently operates the Coyle Community Center under an existing 99-year lease) will be critical for project outcomes. Additionally, MPRB has partnered with the YMCA, Augsburg University, and Fairview Health Services to explore other partnership opportunities during this predesign phase. Revision to the PUC/MPRB lease is anticipated as part of the project process.
Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board Community Engagement Plan

**Today's Date:** June 24, 2020

**Staff Lead:** Daniel Elias

**Department or Division:** Planning

**Project Name:** Cedar-Riverside Recreation Center Predesign

**Engagement Level:** Partner

This plan serves as a guide for the community engagement process for the Cedar-Riverside Recreation Center Predesign Study. 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.

As required by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Community Engagement Policy, this project requires a Community Engagement Plan because the project falls under the Partner category of community engagement for which MPRB is required to obtain stakeholder feedback on project, initiative, or program analysis, alternatives, or decisions.

1. **Project Description**

1a. **Project Overview:** This project will explore the potential for a 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.

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

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

1c. **Project Timeline:**

- Community Engagement – December 2018 to June 2020
- Predesign – June 2019 to **November 2020** *(adjusted to allow for additional engagement in person once allowed following COVID-19 guidelines)*
1d. Project Funding:

<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>December 31, 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Project Data:

2a. What are the boundaries of the community engagement area? *(For regional facilities include neighborhoods adjacent to the park and city/regional boundaries)*

The Cedar-Riverside neighborhood and northern portions of the Seward neighborhood near the east end of the Augsburg University campus.

2b. What are the demographics of the community engagement area?

This community engagement area is represented by the following:

1. Growing Population (6,368 people in 1990 vs. 8,094 people in 2010 – 2010 MN Compass)
2. High population density (47% higher than Minneapolis average – 2016 US Census Bureau)
3. Majority minority (62.9% people of color – 2010 MN Compass)
4. High immigrant population including many recent immigrants (3.6% with different residence outside of US vs. 1.1% Mpls average – 2010 MN Compass)
5. Large English as a second language population (43% speak language other than English in the home vs. 19.2% Mpls average – 2010 MN Compass)
6. High rental populations (91.5% rental population – 2010 MN Compass)
2c. List any key findings or excerpts from relevant plans or policies that are informing this project, program or initiative, especially if community was engaged in the policy or plan:

1. South Service Area Master Plan for Currie Park – Coyle Community Center was not included in this work
2. MPRB RecQuest Phase 1 & 2
3. 2009 Coyle Community Center Expansion Study – commissioned by Pillsbury United Communities (PUC)
4. 2019 Market Analysis with statistically valid community survey – ANA Research, commissioned by MPRB, Augsburg, YMCA, PUC, Fairview
5. 2019 City of Mpls Health Department – Cedar-Riverside Women and Girls Physical Activity Engagement Results

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

Efforts are needed during this process to gain a better understanding of the recreational needs of:

1. Youth
2. Seniors
3. Recent Immigrants
4. Non-English speakers
3. Community Engagement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Stakeholder (students, ethnic communities, neighborhood groups, community leaders)</th>
<th>Outreach (i.e. go to parks, neighborhood listserv, engage with cultural media)</th>
<th>Engagement (i.e. online survey, focus group, community open house, intercept survey)</th>
<th>Reflecting Back (how will stakeholder groups be reflected back to about the project progress or outcomes?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cedar-Riverside NRP</td>
<td>Attend their monthly meeting</td>
<td>Project update and engagement discussion</td>
<td>Provide update of final design and anticipated next steps through existing contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar-Riverside Partnership</td>
<td>Attend their monthly meeting</td>
<td>Project update and engagement discussion</td>
<td>Provide update of final design and anticipated next steps through existing contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confederation of Somali Community</td>
<td>Specific outreach to organizational leadership</td>
<td>One on one meeting</td>
<td>Meeting follow-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar-Riverside Leadership Forum</td>
<td>Attend their monthly meeting</td>
<td>Project update and engagement discussion</td>
<td>Provide update of final design and anticipated next steps through existing contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation Center users</td>
<td>Pop-up engagement at Coyle Center</td>
<td>Intercept survey</td>
<td>Post project updates, final designs and anticipated next steps in MPRB bulletin board in Coyle Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General East African population</td>
<td>Pop up engagement in Coyle Center or Riverside Plaza</td>
<td>Intercept survey</td>
<td>Post project updates, final designs and anticipated next steps in MPRB bulletin board in Coyle Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East African elders</td>
<td>Attend Somali elder monthly meeting</td>
<td>Project update and engagement discussion</td>
<td>Provide update of final design and anticipated next steps through existing contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>Engagement Method</td>
<td>Discussion Type</td>
<td>Update Mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East African youth</td>
<td>TBD (potential CAC focus group)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Post project updates, final designs and anticipated next steps in MPRB bulletin board in Coyle Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East African mothers</td>
<td>TBD (potential CAC focus group)</td>
<td>Focus Group</td>
<td>Post project updates, final designs and anticipated next steps in MPRB bulletin board in Coyle Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean population</td>
<td>Attend Korean elder monthly meeting</td>
<td>Project update and engagement discussion</td>
<td>Provide update of final design and anticipated next steps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese population</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-English speakers</td>
<td>Pop up engagement at Coyle Center or Riverside Plaza</td>
<td>Intercept survey with interpretation</td>
<td>Post project updates, final designs and anticipated next steps in MPRB bulletin board in Coyle Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent immigrants</td>
<td>Pop up engagement at Coyle Center or Riverside Plaza</td>
<td>Intercept survey</td>
<td>Post project updates, final designs and anticipated next steps in MPRB bulletin board in Coyle Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People who work in Cedar-Riverside</td>
<td>Attend West Bank Business Association monthly meeting</td>
<td>Project update and engagement discussion</td>
<td>Provide update of final design and anticipated next steps through existing contacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augsburg University students</td>
<td>Leverage existing student listserv</td>
<td>On-line survey</td>
<td>Provide update of final design and anticipated next steps through listserv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U of MN students</td>
<td>Leverage existing student listserv</td>
<td>On-line survey</td>
<td>Provide update of final design and anticipated next steps through listserv</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3a. Advisory Committees:

**Technical Advisory Committee:** This roster is a list of agencies and groups that are on the TAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Minneapolis Land Use, Property, Transportation, and Infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hennepin County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Partner Organization Team:** This roster is a list of Partner Organizations*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YMCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augsburg University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M Health Fairview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pillsbury United Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Through a Memorandum of Understanding, the organizations above are collaborating to explore the potential for a recreation center to be built on Augsburg University’s campus as part of a larger redevelopment of the east end of their campus. This justifies their inclusion in the PAC.

**Project Advisory Committee:** This roster is a list of MPRB departments and divisions that are on the PAC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recreation staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset Management staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Police staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Outreach staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3b. Will a Community Advisory Committee be required for this project, program, or initiative?

Yes

CAC Charge:

- Become knowledgeable about the project and its scope and advise MPRB staff 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 this Predesign including program, vision, goals, and principles created through a community-driven process.
**CAC Composition**

**Goals:** Appointers and the CAC Selection Committee should appoint individuals that represent one or more of the identities/perspectives listed below to ensure diversity on the CAC. This is not an exhaustive or conclusive list, and categories should be based on self-identification, and not assumption.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racial/Ethnic Diversity</th>
<th>Generational Diversity</th>
<th>Socioeconomic Diversity</th>
<th>Linguistic Diversity</th>
<th>Diversity of Interests</th>
<th>Other Diversity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Somali</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td>Renters</td>
<td>English as a second language speakers</td>
<td>Women’s Recreation</td>
<td>Accessibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oromo</td>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>Public Housing Residents</td>
<td></td>
<td>Work in Cedar-Riverside</td>
<td>Educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>Parents with Children</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Youth with Autism</td>
<td>Geographic (Riverside Plaza, Seven Corners, Seward Towers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>People with High school education, no college</td>
<td></td>
<td>Male Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Home Owners</th>
<th>Public Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

|                                     | Business Owners         |                |
**CAC Selection Committee Roster:** This roster of groups and individuals that are participating in the CAC appointment process for the project, program, or initiative

| Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board |
| Pillsbury United Communities |
| Augsburg University |
| M Health Fairview |
| YMCA |

**Community Advisory Committee Slate (SC=Selection Committee):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appointer</th>
<th>Committee Recommended Slate</th>
<th>Board Approved Slate on June 26</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bourn</td>
<td>Abdirizak Bihi - Chair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowgill</td>
<td>Ali Saleh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forney</td>
<td>Abdi Gurhan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Fardowsa Osman Egal VACANT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassan</td>
<td>Bosteya Jama</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meyer</td>
<td>Furtune Del</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musich</td>
<td>Patrick Space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severson</td>
<td>Adam Ugas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vetaw</td>
<td>Yusra Arab</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Jamie Schumacher</td>
<td>Jamie Schumacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Kwangja Kwon</td>
<td>Kwangja Kwon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Amber Wiebe</td>
<td>Amber Wiebe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Aburazak Omar</td>
<td>Aburazak Omar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Abdul Sero</td>
<td>Abdul Sero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Mohamed Peters</td>
<td>Mohamed Peters (stepped down) Teri Kwant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Khadra Fiqi</td>
<td>Khadra Fiqi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Amina Hanafi</td>
<td>Amina Hanafi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Alternate #1</td>
<td>Teri Kwant</td>
<td>Teri Kwant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Alternate #2</td>
<td>Ahmed Mussa</td>
<td>Ahmed Mussa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Alternate #3</td>
<td>Pete Munene</td>
<td>Pete Munene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Alternate #4</td>
<td>Lul Osman</td>
<td>Lul Osman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Analysis:

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

The goal of this project is to create one Recreation Center Predesign package based on a community vision.

Efforts are being made to ensure that the CAC is representative of the Cedar-Riverside community with attendance at community events to make people aware of the project, the CAC application opportunity, and how to provide input into the project.

CAC meetings will be held regularly at the Coyle Community Center at the same time and day of the month to allow for more people to attend without the need for meeting notices.

Outreach outside of the CAC will focus on gaining an understanding from underserved community members and groups that do not have CAC representation through pop-up engagement in the Coyle Community Center and leveraging existing community organizations and groups that meet regularly to discuss Cedar-Riverside.

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

1. What do you want to see in a new or renovated recreation center?
2. What are the barriers that limit your use of the Coyle Community Center?
5. **Evaluation Summary:** *Summary pending project completion.*

5a. Who was engaged during the process? (i.e. demographic info from online survey participants, the CAC, and community engagement whenever possible)

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

5c. How did the project and engagement fulfill a goal or strategy in the MPRB Comprehensive Plan?

5d. Please describe any new or innovative engagement methods used during the process:
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This Memorandum of Understanding (“MOU”) is made as of the ___ day of _____, 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

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Shared Facility serving the Cedar Riverside Neighborhood
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
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 Lancelllo 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: _______________________________
    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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Methodology

STUDY BACKGROUND

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).**

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
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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of Findings – Interesting Differences Between Segments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ The <strong>East African and Hispanic</strong> populations have a higher interest level in the <strong>majority of programming/amenities</strong> asked about, and would be the <strong>most frequent users</strong> of the center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The <strong>East African</strong> population has a higher need for <strong>childcare services</strong>, and believe <strong>youth programming</strong> is missing from current community offerings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The <strong>Hispanic population is more supportive</strong> of the partnership and the positive benefits of the Center, whereas <strong>East Africans disagree more</strong> with many of the support measures. In fact, nearly <strong>4 in 10</strong> 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 (<strong>about 6 in 10</strong>) with these statements than disagree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The <strong>East African</strong> population believe each of the following is a <strong>major influence</strong> on their decision to go to the facility significantly more often than all other ethnicities: <strong>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</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The <strong>Hispanic population</strong> believes <strong>cultural enrichment programming</strong> is missing from current offerings; whereas the <strong>White population</strong> would like to see more <strong>sports &amp; fitness amenities</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ <strong>East African’s</strong> are most familiar with and utilize the <strong>Brian Coyle Center</strong> more so than other ethnicities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Likelihood to <strong>join</strong> is consistent amongst all income levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Households with incomes of <strong>less than $50,000</strong> believe each of the following is a <strong>major influence</strong> on their decision to go to the facility significantly more often than households with higher incomes: <strong>safety, availability of public transportation, diverse staff who can speak multiple languages, a focus on cultural/ethnic diversity, and the walkability of the Center</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Overview: Results Dashboards
Results Dashboard - Overall

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:...

Top 4 Factors Influencing Decision to go to Facility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welcome/inclusive environment</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours the facility is open</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of amenities</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main reason Employees/Residents Would Not Go to Center

- Welcome/inclusive environment: 76%
- Hours the facility is open: 74%
- Variety of amenities offered: 64%
- Safety: 70%

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."

Likelihood to Join

- Residents: 53%
- employees: 62%

Agreement With Support Measures

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

Familiarity with Brian Coyle Community Center

- Residents: Very 11%, Somewhat 47%, Not at all 42%
- Employees: Very 10%, Somewhat 43%, Not at all 47%
I have another fitness facilities are already available to Augsburg employees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement With Support Measures</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>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports Partnership</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Center be a part of my neighborhood</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corridor needs additional recreation facilities</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing culturally specific programs</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>47%</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>66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Likelihood to Join

- Augsburg: 61%
- Fairview: 69%

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

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."
- "If it’s too expensive or doesn’t have enough parking options."

* PUC data not shown due to small sample size.
Amenities – Employee Type

Support/Group Space

- Flexible Meeting/Rental Space: 60%
- Adult Enrichment Classes: 55%
- Adult Education Classes: 52%
- Large Room with Kitchen: 48%
- Female Only Space: 40%
- Space for Arts & Crafts: 55%
- Kitchen for Teaching: 54%
- Space for Meditation/Prayer: 34%
- Fairview: 66%
- Augsburg: 48%

Water Features & Activities

- Indoor Lap Pool: 68%
- Whirlpool & Sauna: 61%
- Warm Leisure Pool: 52%
- Water Aerobics: 52%
- Aquatic Therapy: 47%
- Swimming Lessons: 44%
- Religious/Cultural Swim Time: 32%
- Health & Wellness Programming: 61%
- Health Mini-Clinic: 54%

Athletic Activities

- Cardio Machines: 81%
- Indoor Track: 78%
- Group Fitness Classes: 75%
- Strength Machines/Weights: 75%
- Personal Training: 63%
- Multi-purpose Gym: 57%
- Sports Leagues: 39%
- Adaptive Physical Activity Classes: 29%

Health & Wellness

- Fairview: 87%
- Augsburg: 68%

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

**Agreement With Support Measures**

- **Cedar Riverside - Agree:** 79%
- **Cedar Riverside - Disagree:** 42%
- **Seward - Agree:** 72%
- **Seward - Disagree:** 51%
- **Others - Agree:** 75%
- **Others - Disagree:** 41%

<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>

**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**

- **Cedar Riverside:** Very 41%, Somewhat 28%, Not at all 31%
- **Seward:** Very 41%, Somewhat 27%, Not at all 32%
- **Others:** Very 9%, Somewhat 15%, Not at all 75%

**Likelihood to Join**

- **Cedar-Riverside:** 62%
- **Seward:** 49%
- **Others:** 52%

**Reason Resident Would Not go to Center**

- **Cedar-Riverside:** “No access to some women only spaces and amenities (sauna, steam room...).”
- **Seward:** “If parking were difficult in the early morning hours-safety concern. Would need free parking. Would not go most likely if no track.”
- **Others:** “Don’t qualify for gov’t assistance, so full costs proposed are too expensive for our household.”
Results Dashboard - Ethnicity

Agreement With Support Measures

Top 4 Factors Influencing Likelihood to Join

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></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

- Bring value to my neighborhood: White 75%, East African 76%, Hispanic 74%, Others 80%
- Supports Partnership: White 87%, East African 69%, Hispanic 73%, Others 62%
- New Center be a part of my neighborhood: White 91%, East African 61%, Hispanic 67%, Others 65%
- Corridor needs additional recreation facilities: White 65%, East African 55%, Hispanic 61%, Others 60%
- Missing culturally specific programs: White 57%, East African 52%, Hispanic 57%, Others 53%

Use of New Center

- Once a week +
  - White: 78%
  - East African: 84%
  - Hispanic: 97%
  - Others: 83%

Likelihood to Join

- White: 50%
- East African: 56%
- Hispanic: 56%
- Others: 53%

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."
Demographic Dashboard

**Age*  
- **Resident Results**  
- **Census**  
- **Employee Results**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</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>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-54</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethnicity**  
- **Resident Results**  
- **Census**  
- **Employee Results**

<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>49%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East African</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Length of Residency**  
- Residents: 48%  
- Residents: 33%  

- 0 to 5 yrs  
- 5 to 10 yrs  
- 10+ yrs

**Income**  
- **Resident Results**  
- **Census**  
- **Employee Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Level</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>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 - $100,000</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000+</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender**  
- **Resident Results**  
- **Census**  
- **Employee Results**

<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>51%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>73%</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>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect Park</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillips</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elliott Park</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventura Village</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average HH Size**  
Resident: 2.98

**HH with kids**  
Resident: 33%

**Education**

- **Residents**
  - High school/GED or less
  - Some college
  - College graduate
  - Post-graduate training

- **Employees**
  - 6%  
  - 36%  
  - 57%
Detailed Findings: Residents Employees
Overall interest in Athletic Activities:

- Residents: 65%
- Employees: 75%

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

Residents
Employees

Public health mini-clinic

Health and wellness programming

Overall interest in Health & Wellness:

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

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.

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

Overall interest in Residents and Employees:

- 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drop-off childcare that allows parents to work out for up to two hours</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family nights with open gym &amp; swim time</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and teen sports leagues, conditioning and training programs</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer camps</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs &amp; activities for kids &amp; families to do together, such as fitness classes</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fitness classes designed for youth</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen designated space</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring and areas designed for homework</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free summer meals for kids Monday-Friday</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership &amp; character development programs</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teen programs such as teen nights</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer classes</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall interest in Youth/Teen programming: 31% Residents, 42% Employees.

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

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

- Group exercise classes: 93% Residents, 97% Employees
- Water exercise classes: 88% Residents, 87% Employees
- Educational classes: 86% Residents, 85% Employees
- Technology/computer literacy programs: 83% Residents, 85% Employees
- Wellness programs (health fairs/screenings): 82% Residents, 85% Employees
- Field trips to places of interest (e.g. museum or theater): 79% Residents, 76% Employees
- Organized activities such as card games or clubs: 77% Residents, 66% Employees
- Special gatherings and events: 61% Residents, 69% Employees

Overall interest in older adult programming:
- Employees: 37%
- Residents: 20%
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### Interest in Specific Childcare Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible before- or after-school childcare for $12/child per session</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-day rec program on school breaks for $35/child per day</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-day childcare for preschool for $270 per child per week</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-day preschool 9:30-2:30 3 days a week for $400/child per month</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-day childcare for toddlers for $320 per child per week</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-day preschool 9:30-2:30 2 days a week for $300/child per month</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-day preschool 9:30-2:30 5 days a week for $675/child per month</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-day childcare for infants for $370 per child per week</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Showing percent of respondents who said they had a great deal or some interest in listed childcare need.*

**Overall interest in Childcare:**
- 11%
- 16%

---

Interest in Specific Childcare Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Description</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Flexible before- or after-school childcare for $12/child per session</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-day rec program on school breaks for $35/child per day</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-day childcare for preschool for $270 per child per week</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-day preschool 9:30-2:30 3 days a week for $400/child per month</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-day childcare for toddlers for $320 per child per week</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-day preschool 9:30-2:30 2 days a week for $300/child per month</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-day preschool 9:30-2:30 5 days a week for $675/child per month</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All-day childcare for infants for $370 per child per week</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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>
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Financial Support Awareness

**Aware YMCA provides financial support for those who qualify?**

- **Residents**
  - Yes: 48%
  - No: 36%
  - Don’t Know: 16%

- **Employees**
  - Yes: 66%
  - No: 22%
  - Don’t Know: 12%

**Aware Minneapolis Park & Rec Board offers recreation fee assistance?**

- **Residents**
  - Yes: 22%
  - No: 57%
  - Don’t Know: 20%

- **Employees**
  - Yes: 36%
  - No: 53%
  - Don’t Know: 11%

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

- **Residents**
  - Yes: 22%
  - No: 29%
  - Don’t Know: 10%
  - Unfamiliar: 39%

- **Employees**
  - Yes: 38%
  - No: 22%
  - Don’t Know: 4%
  - Unfamiliar: 36%
Likelihood to Join and Membership Type

Residents

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

Employees

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

- 53% for Residents
- 62% for Employees

Individual, Dual, Family
Residents’ Likelihood to Join Benchmark Data

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

- **51%**

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

- **53%**
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: 38%
  - No: 39%
  - Don’t Know: 23%

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency of Use</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than about once a week</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a week</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once every other week</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About once a month</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than once a month</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Frequency of Use

- **Residents**
  - More than about once a week: 63%
  - About once a week: 20%
  - About once every other week: 7%
  - About once a month: 2%
  - Less than once a month: 1%
  - Never: 1%
  - Don't know: 7%

- **Employees**
  - More than about once a week: 69%
  - About once a week: 18%
  - About once every other week: 5%
  - About once a month: 2%
  - Less than once a month: 1%
  - Never: 0%
  - Don't know: 5%
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.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIGGEST CONCERN</th>
<th>Residents</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>22% Cost</td>
<td>27% Cost</td>
<td>“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...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>10% Personal Reasons: Health/Time/Interest</td>
<td>10% Other Membership</td>
<td>“Costs, safety, I have what I need already.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>8% Location/Convenience</td>
<td>9% Amenities Offered</td>
<td>“Lack of parking would be the main deterrent for weekend visits. Budgeting the cost of membership.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>8% Other Membership</td>
<td>8% Personal Reasons: Health/Time/Interest</td>
<td>“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.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>5% Safety</td>
<td>7% Hours of Operation</td>
<td>“I would not go to the Wellness Center if it did not include a swim park, swim lessons, and a focus on teen activities.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>5% Amenities Offered</td>
<td>6% Location/Convenience</td>
<td>“I would need the new center’s hours to match when I am available, before and after work.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>3% Hours of Operation</td>
<td>5% Lack of Parking</td>
<td>“If it took away a community vision for project in the same area.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>2% Lack of Parking</td>
<td>4% Safety</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Resident vs Employee Concerns

- BIGGEST CONCERN:
  - Residents: Cost 22%
  - Employees: Cost 27%
- SMALLEST CONCERN:
  - Residents: Lack of Parking 2%
  - Employees: Safety 4%

Additional comments from respondents:
- "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."
Factors Influencing Support

*Agree= Strongly agree/agree  
*Disagree= Strongly disagree/disagree
## Current Need Not Being Met in I-94/Riverside Corridor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOST NEEDED</th>
<th>Community Need Residents</th>
<th>Community Need Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>25% Sports and Other Fitness Activities</td>
<td>43% Sports and Other Fitness Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>23% Youth Programming</td>
<td>16% Youth Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>9% Community Education</td>
<td>6% Senior Programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>9% Cultural Enrichment Programs</td>
<td>5% Cultural Enrichment Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>8% Senior Programming</td>
<td>5% Community Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>7% Help Finding Social Services</td>
<td>4% Help Finding Social Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>17% None</td>
<td>17% None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MOST NEEDED

1. **Education for our youth dealing with law enforcement and education on more for the future.**
2. **Teen activities.**
3. **Opportunities for community interaction and cooperation.**
4. **Open, multi-use space for community use.**
5. **More public gathering spaces.**
6. **Indoor exercise gym and definitely a swimming pool.**

### LEAST NEEDED
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**

- 15% Residents
- 8% Employees

---

**Programs Used**

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

**Belong to/use fitness facilities:**

- 66%
- 52%

**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, 1% Employees
- About once a month: 4% Residents, 8% Employees
- Less than once a month: 5% Residents, 1% Employees
- Never: 6% Residents, 0% Employees
- Don't know: 0% Residents, 3% Employees
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
**Desired Characteristics of New Recreation & Wellness Center**

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?

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?

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.

<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. Leadership and character development programs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Family nights with open gym and swim time?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Youth and teen sports leagues, conditioning and training programs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Summer camps?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Programs and activities for kids and families to do together, such as fitness classes designed for families?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Fitness classes designed for youth?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Computer classes to teach youth how to use new technology and social media appropriately?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Tutoring and areas designated for homework to help children complete their schoolwork?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Free summer meals for kids Monday through Friday?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Teen programs such as teen nights?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Teen designated space with a game room, coffeehouse or snack bar?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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
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.
   b. Full-day recreational program on school release days or school vacation breaks for $35 per child per day?
   c. All-day childcare for infants for $370 per child per week?
   d. All-day childcare for toddlers for $320 per child per week?
   e. All-day childcare for preschool for $270 per child per week?
   f. Part-day preschool from 9:30 am to 2:30 pm for 2 days a week for $300 per child per month?
   g. Part-day preschool from 9:30 am to 2:30 pm for 3 days a week for $400 per child per month?
   h. Part-day preschool from 9:30 am to 2:30 pm for 5 days a week for $675 per child per month?

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?
   b. Hours the facility is open?
   c. Safety at the Recreation & Wellness Center?
   d. Public transportation to and from the Center?
   e. Ease of parking near the Recreation & Wellness Center?
   f. Diverse staff who can speak multiple languages?
   g. A focus on cultural and ethnic diversity?
   h. A welcome and inclusive environment?
   i. Ability to walk to the new Recreation & Wellness Center?

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 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></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 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. A new Recreation &amp; Wellness Center will bring value to my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The I-94/Riverside Corridor is missing community and culturally-specific programs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></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
- Sports and other fitness activities
- Help finding social services
- 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?

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.
Mission The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board shall permanently preserve, protect, maintain, improve, and enhance its natural resources, parkland, and recreational opportunities for current and future generations.

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board exists to provide places and recreation opportunities for all people to gather, celebrate, contemplate, and engage in activities that promote health, well-being, community, and the environment.

In 1883, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board was created by an act of the Minnesota State Legislature and a vote of Minneapolis residents. It serves as an independently elected, semi-autonomous body responsible for governing, maintaining, and developing the Minneapolis park system. Every four years, nine commissioners are elected to this Board – one from each of the six park districts within the city and three that serve at-large. In 2008, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board will celebrate 125 years of providing outstanding park and recreation services to residents and visitors of Minneapolis. As this milestone is achieved, the future is envisioned through this document.

The Board’s governance structure is unique and reflects the commitment residents have made to parks and recreation in Minneapolis. Credited in part for the success of the park system, the Board’s structure affords it the ability to focus on permanently preserving and protecting natural resources, parkland, and recreational opportunities for current and future city residents and visitors. Its governance powers include, but are not limited to, the ability to levy taxes, and own land within and outside the City of Minneapolis.

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board engages many partners including government agencies, non-profit organizations, and for-profit organizations to provide an outstanding park and recreation system. A primary partner is the City of Minneapolis. The Park Board’s comprehensive plan provides the City of Minneapolis with information it will need to address Metropolitan Council requirements for parks in the City’s 2008 comprehensive plan update.
Dear friend of the Minneapolis park system,

The early visionaries of the Minneapolis park system made no small plans; they dared to dream. More than a century later, we still marvel at their vision as we provide ongoing stewardship of one of the finest park systems in the country. We emulate the dedication, uncompromising will to succeed, and the value they placed on providing relevant park and recreation opportunities. We continue the tradition of shaping the character of the city and enhancing the quality of life for its residents through quality parks and recreation.

As Minneapolis and the lifestyles of its residents and park visitors continue to change, the park system will also evolve, sparking new development and providing parks, programs, and services that are relevant to peoples’ lives. To ensure that future generations have an opportunity to enjoy an outstanding park and recreation system, we approach the future with a focus on sustainability. It is with great pride that we set forth a direction for the Minneapolis park system in this Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Comprehensive Plan. It is with even greater pride that we invite you to enjoy the Minneapolis park system.

Sincerely,

Jon C. Olson, President

Superintendent Jon Gurban

“Look forward for a century, to the time when the city has a population of a million, and think what will be their wants. They will have wealth enough to purchase all that money can buy, but all their wealth cannot purchase a lost opportunity, or restore natural features of grandeur and beauty, which would then possess priceless values.”

H. W. S. Cleveland
1883

(Front, left-right)
Annie Young, At Large; Bob Fine, District 6; Mary Merrill Anderson, At Large; Walt Dziedzic, District 1

(Back, left-right)
Vice President Tracy Nordstrom, District 4; Scott Vreeland, District 3; President Jon Olson, District 2; Carol Kummer, District 5, Tom Nordyke, At Large
The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board's vision for the future continues the long tradition of preserving land and emphasizes connecting people to the land and to each other. The Minneapolis park system will continue to enhance the quality of life for city residents and will play a significant role in shaping the character of the city through quality parks and recreation.

Direction from park commissioners and insights from residents, visitors, staff, and elected officials shaped the ambitious direction set forth in this comprehensive plan.

**The Commitment and Outreach**

In 2005, a two-year commitment was made to complete the comprehensive plan. The five-phase development process for the comprehensive plan is:

- **Phase I – Assessment**
  Where are we today?

- **Phase II – Community Outreach and Research**
  What are the current demands and needs, and what are the evolving trends?

- **Phase III – Comprehensive Plan Development**
  Based on what is known, what outcomes are desirable?

- **Phase IV – Priority Setting and Decision Making**
  What priorities and short- and long-term actions are in the best interests of the public?

- **Phase V – Implementation**
  What resources should be allocated to accomplish goals?

This comprehensive plan marks the completion of the first three phases of the comprehensive planning process. Nearly 4,000 residents, visitors, and elected officials contributed to the development of this plan, and more than 100 staff have been involved in one or more phases of the comprehensive planning process.

During Phase I, staff teams collected information regarding infrastructure, demographics, and programs and services. The teams focused on creating methods or tools that could be updated regularly and would increase the park system's capacity to use this information for future planning. Six additional teams were established during the assessment phase – information management, sustainability, planning, community outreach and research, evaluation, and art and history. Many of these teams will continue beyond the development of the plan. Their focus ranges from completing inventories of artistic and historic elements of the park system to developing a sustainability plan.

When Phase II began in the fall of 2006, the community outreach and research team launched a process that gave all city residents, park users, and local elected officials the opportunity to share their thoughts about the community's park and recreation needs. The process included a questionnaire mailed to 172,300 Minneapolis households, seven town meetings, twenty focus groups, three appointed community leader workshops, and a statistically valid phone survey. The goal was to determine top community park and recreation needs.

After careful listening and analysis of comments received, the following top community needs emerged:

- Involving children and youth in positive activities
- Protecting and spending time in the natural environment
- Pursuing health and physical fitness
- Keeping parks clean and well maintained
- Providing safe parks
The Direction
Throughout the first two phases, commissioners participated in working sessions. During these sessions they articulated their vision for the future of the park system, and the values that depict what the organization stands for and the manner in which it carries out its activities. Their direction was guided by the results of the community outreach and research process. Key directions include:

**Be a sustainable organization** When considering how work will be conducted at the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, sustainability tops the list. This will require meeting current park and recreation needs without sacrificing the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by balancing environmental, economic, and equity concerns. This comprehensive plan calls for the development and implementation of a sustainability plan that will further articulate how sustainability will be integrated into the everyday work of the park system.

**Provide urban forests, natural areas, and waters that endure and captivate** Land, trees, and water – the foundation of the park system – require long-term investment and care. Parks are protected to benefit the entire city; therefore, all residents have a stake in the future of these resources and bear responsibility for their stewardship. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is committed to providing leadership in natural resource management, connecting people to their natural environment, and fostering a sense of stewardship. The plan articulates goals and strategies that call for outstanding management of the park system’s natural resources, programming that connects people with the natural environment, protection and care of boulevard trees, and development of partnerships that will further the goals of protecting natural resources and connecting people to them. It also calls for balancing the distribution of natural areas throughout the city, giving particular focus to north and northeast Minneapolis.

**Deliver recreation that inspires personal growth, healthy lifestyles, and a sense of community** The future calls for leadership that inspires all people to engage in recreation. In this plan, recreation includes all activities that make leisure time more interesting, enjoyable, and personally satisfying. Furthermore this plan recognizes that the benefits of quality recreation are astonishing, ranging from the development of life-long skills to fostering community and crime prevention. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is committed to enriching the lives of individuals, families, and the entire community through positive and fulfilling recreation experiences. It will offer physical, artistic, environmental, and social activities tailored to the diverse communities throughout the city. The plan calls for the development of a new community center service model that is relevant to community members, provides the personal touch and easy access of the current model, creates a social gathering space for the community, and is delivered from a sustainable number of community center hubs. The plan also sets forth goals and strategies to support the health and fitness goals of residents and to connect people to each other through recreation.

**Create dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs** As the city’s demographics evolve, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board must create parks and amenities that are flexible, sustainable, and aesthetically beautiful, and with which residents and visitors can identify. This includes recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce that reflects the city’s demographics. Achieving this vision requires that the organization listen carefully, anticipate future needs, explore new operating models, and obtain new funding sources. The Park Board will continue to be a strong leader by retaining an independent focus on parks and recreation, stretching the imagination for shaping the city, and seeking partners to fulfill the mission of the organization. The plan calls for the development of park plans for areas where the city’s population is growing or expected to grow. Similarly, the plan articulates a need to fill service gaps throughout the system, especially in north and northeast Minneapolis. The plan also calls for determining the service and delivery goals of existing and new recreation activities through thoughtful examination. This will allow the park system to be proactive in offering new facilities, removing outdated or under-utilized facilities, and partnering with other service providers to prevent duplication.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Maintain a safe place to play, celebrate, contemplate, and recreate Keeping the parks safe requires a long-term commitment to people and places by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board and its many partners. Safety, both real and perceived, is achieved through a combination of preventive and corrective measures. Delivering consistently safe parks also requires that they are well maintained and designed to prevent accidental injury. The plan calls for bolstering preventive measures that include developing ongoing relationships with park visitors, setting clear expectations of appropriate behavior in the park system, providing training to staff and visitors, and providing parks and park facilities that are safe by design.

The Research
The plan recognizes the organization’s need to evolve to meet the changing park and recreation needs of Minneapolis residents. The directions set in the plan are guided by the insights gained through the community outreach and research process. They are also guided by knowledge of changes in the city since the last major system-wide study, the 1965 Brightbill Study. The changes in the city that are most significant to future park and recreation delivery include:

- **Demographic shifts** The number of households with individuals living alone has increased from 27.6% in 1960 to 40% in 2000. During the same time period, the number of households with children has declined from 34.8% to 25% of households. The city has also become more diverse and home to an increasing number of foreign-born residents.

- **Recreation trends** Adults, especially Baby Boomers, are staying active longer. Young adults raised on youth athletics are seeking to maintain active lifestyles. In addition, interest in non-traditional and self-directed recreation is rising.

- **Health trends** Nationally, research shows obesity and related health concerns are rising along with health care costs. Parks and recreation play an important role in supporting the active lifestyles that can reduce health concerns and bolster preventive care.

Guiding Statements
The mission, vision, and values are the guiding statements for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. These statements will be connected to the work of the organization through annual budgets, work plans, and a five-year implementation plan. Progress toward achieving the vision set forth in the plan will be evaluated at an individual, organizational, and community level. The guiding statements are as follows:

The mission statement articulates why the organization exists:

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board shall permanently preserve, protect, maintain, improve, and enhance its natural resources, parkland, and recreational opportunities for current and future generations.

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board exists to provide places and recreation opportunities for all people to gather, celebrate, contemplate, and engage in activities that promote health, well-being, community, and the environment.

The values statements identify how the organization performs its work:

- **Sustainability** Meet current park and recreation needs without sacrificing the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by balancing environmental, economic, and equity concerns.

- **Environment** Sustain and enhance parklands, waters, and urban forests.

- **Economic** Develop short-term and long-term financial stability of the park system.

- **Equity** Provide residents with the opportunity to improve their quality of life and well-being through outstanding parks and recreation services that are suited to their respective needs.

- **Visionary Leadership** Respect the vision and leadership that built the park and recreation system and recognize the need for ongoing leadership in achieving excellence.

- **Safety** Work safely to support a thriving work environment and an outstanding park experience for visitors.
system and its beauty are part of daily life and shape the character of Minneapolis. Natural, cultural, artistic, historical, and recreational resources cultivate outstanding experiences, support of an extraordinary park and recreation system.

 responsiveness and innovation  Anticipate and thoughtfully respond to the diverse needs of the city’s communities, continually seeking ways to better deliver park and recreation services.

 independence and focus  Independence allows the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board to focus on providing and obtaining the resources necessary to accomplish its mission and form effective, responsible partnerships.

 the vision statement  describes what the organization hopes to become by 2020:

In 2020, the Minneapolis park system is a premier destination that welcomes and captivates residents and visitors. The park system and its beauty are part of daily life and shape the character of Minneapolis. Natural, cultural, artistic, historical, and recreational resources cultivate outstanding experiences, health, enjoyment, fun, and learning for all people. The park system is sustainable, well-maintained, and safe. It meets the needs of individuals, families, and communities. The focus on preserving land continues, with a strong emphasis on connecting people to the land and each other. Aware of its value to their lives, residents are proud stewards and supporters of an extraordinary park and recreation system.

 the promise  This plan embraces innovation. It also communicates that ongoing learning and community outreach and research are required to provide the best park and recreation services to Minneapolis residents and visitors. The success of this vision is tied to the commitment of the Park Board, its employees, and its partners, and to the value the community places on maintaining and improving the Minneapolis park system.

As the plan is implemented, residents and park visitors can look forward to an exciting future in which services are continually evaluated and improved to ensure community needs are met, facilities are renewed, connection with the natural environment is strengthened, sustainable practices are expanded, and parks are safe for everyone.
Map I:  
Existing Minneapolis Park System
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▲ Parkland less than 1 Acre
   Existing Parkland

Park properties shown are those where the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board has site control through ownership or lease. Water bodies shown are those where the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board has site control of part or all of the land surrounding it.

Not shown on this map is approximately 605 acres of land within the Minneapolis-Saint Paul Airport jurisdictional boundary in which the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board retains an interest.
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Founders of the system understood that parks play an essential role in a healthy, livable, and balanced city.

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board envisions not only preserving land, but also enhancing people’s connection to the land and to each other.

Commissioners, staff, residents, and local leaders had the opportunity to share their impressions of the park system.

Setting direction until 2020, this comprehensive plan ensures the Minneapolis park system will continue to be essential to quality of life in Minneapolis.

Minneapolis residents deeply value their parks.

Residents often remark that the Minneapolis park system is essential to their quality of life and to the identity of the city. Founders of the system understood the role parks play in a healthy, livable, and balanced city. They made preserving land for future generations a priority. Their success shaped the character of Minneapolis and continues to improve people’s lives. This comprehensive plan builds on this strong foundation: it boldly envisions a sustainable park system that continues to be integral to the health and well-being of the city, its residents, and its communities.

Current trends suggest that the health and well-being of future generations are threatened by obesity, minimal leisure time, concerns about safety, social isolation, and separation from nature. While technology and new discoveries open up marvelous new opportunities for future generations to fulfill their dreams, they will not replace or diminish the need for personal wellness and connection to nature and one’s community. Therefore, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board envisions not only preserving land, but also enhancing people’s connection to the land and to each other.

Since 1883, the independent Park Board has and continues to serve as the guardian and advocate for parklands and natural areas throughout the City of Minneapolis. It builds and maintains a wide range of parks and recreation facilities. It also invites people of all ages and abilities to engage in a host of recreation activities, to attend community celebrations and events, and to reconnect with nature. It extends park-like beauty into every residential street through the planting and maintenance of boulevard trees. It attracts more than 14 million visitors a year, helping to support a strong local and regional economy.

In 2005, a two-year commitment was made to complete a comprehensive plan for the Minneapolis park system. Throughout 2006, commissioners, staff, residents, and local leaders had the opportunity to share their impressions of the park system, including its strengths and areas needing improvement. The vision, goals, and strategies put forth in this plan were shaped by this outreach process. Setting direction until 2020, this comprehensive plan and the organization’s commitment to implementing it, ensure the Minneapolis park system will continue to be essential to quality of life in Minneapolis, and play a vital part in supporting the health and well-being of Minneapolis residents and visitors.
The vision statement and the four vision themes will guide future development, operations, and maintenance of the Minneapolis park system into 2020. A series of goals and strategies for each vision theme further guides the work of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board.

**Vision Statement**  In 2020, the Minneapolis park system is a premier destination that welcomes and captivates residents and visitors. The park system and its beauty are part of daily life and shape the character of Minneapolis. Natural, cultural, artistic, historical, and recreational resources cultivate outstanding experiences, health, enjoyment, fun, and learning for all people. The park system is sustainable, well-maintained, and safe. It meets the needs of individuals, families, and communities. The focus on preserving land continues, with a strong emphasis on connecting people to the land and each other. Aware of its value to their lives, residents are proud stewards and supporters of an extraordinary park and recreation system.

**Vision Themes**  As a renowned and award winning park and recreation system, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board delivers:

**Vision Theme 1**

*Urban forests, natural areas, and waters that endure and captivate*

**Vision Theme 2**

*Recreation that inspires personal growth, healthy lifestyles, and a sense of community*

**Vision Theme 3**

*Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs*

**Vision Theme 4**

*A safe place to play, celebrate, contemplate, and recreate*
“For in the end we will conserve only what we love. We will love only what we understand. We will understand only what we are taught.”

BABA DIOUM

1970

Land, trees, and water – the foundation of the park system – require long-term investment and care. Parks are protected to benefit the entire city; therefore, all residents have a stake in the future of these resources and bear responsibility for their stewardship. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is committed to providing leadership in natural resource management, connecting people to their natural environment, and fostering a sense of stewardship.

**Connection, Leadership, Stewardship**

Preserving, managing, and enhancing the city’s natural lands, waters, and urban forests is a core responsibility of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. For more than a century, the Board has protected and preserved natural areas for future generations; monitored the quality of lakes, streams, ponds, and wetlands; and managed trees throughout parks, natural areas, and boulevards. The Park Board creates opportunities for people to experience the beauty of nature through a variety of gardens, environmental programs, and self-guided explorations. All of these efforts attract people to the natural environment and foster the next generation of stewards.
FINDINGS The following findings helped shape the goals and strategies for Vision Theme 1:

Community Outreach and Research* 
Minneapolis residents value the natural environment and seek opportunities to preserve and spend time in nature. When asked to rate the importance of various park system amenities, residents rank natural areas and boulevard trees highest. Related amenities such as trails and environmental programming also receive high rankings. When comparing resident satisfaction and the level of importance they place on amenities and activities in the park system, the satisfaction level was significantly lower than the importance level for boulevard trees and environmental programming. This indicates additional focus is needed for these areas.

Within the natural environment, residents indicate they enjoy walking, biking, viewing nature, and picnicking. Residents indicate they want more focus on keeping parks clean, improving water quality, providing environmental programming, and preserving natural areas and boulevard trees.

Impact of the Built Environment 
As the Twin Cities area continues to grow, access to natural areas decreases and open space becomes increasingly fragmented. Minneapolis’ natural areas become refuges within otherwise developed settings. Consequently, natural areas within the Minneapolis park system are more susceptible to invasive species. Lakes, streams, creeks, wetlands, and other water bodies are especially affected by flooding, shoreline erosion, and other storm water impacts. Applying best practices in land and water management will help mitigate the impact on natural areas. Those best practices require stable, adequate funding to be effective.

Disconnected from Nature 
Nationally, there is growing concern that people, especially children, are losing their connection to nature. Some cite technology as directly competing for their leisure time, while others fear that technology is replacing hands-on learning with indirect learning. There is also concern that immigrant populations and people of color are not pursuing nature-based activities in their leisure time. Forging a connection between people and natural areas will help ensure the long-term stewardship of the park system and build valuable life lessons.

Sustainability 
Sustainability is most commonly associated with the protection and management of the natural environment. The Minneapolis Park Board supports the perspective that the environment, economics, and equity are equally important when considering sustainability. Therefore, sustainability is integrated throughout this document and featured specifically in the values section. A sustainability plan for the organization will further articulate how sustainability will be incorporated into the entire system.

Changing Conditions and Regulations 
The park system is affected by local, regional, national, and even global changes, many of which demand the commitment of significant resources. Over the past 30 years, the park system has fought invasive species, managed specific tree diseases, and adapted to new regulatory requirements. Looking to the future, new invasive species, diseases, regulations, and the effects of pollution and climate change will require increased commitment and financial investment in managing the park system’s natural resources.

* This is a summary of the key community outreach and research results as they relate to this vision theme. Please see the Comprehensive Planning Process in Review section for more details about the outreach and research process.
VISION THEME 1: GOALS AND STRATEGIES

Urban forests, natural areas, and waters that endure and captivate

GOAL

Sound management techniques provide healthy, diverse, and sustainable natural resources.

STRATEGIES

■ Develop and implement a natural area management plan that ensures natural areas (prairies, shorelines, and woodlands) are ecologically diverse, sustainable, and managed with scientifically-based methods, giving preference to remnant native plant communities (see Map II, page 15).

■ Develop and implement management plans for all lakes and water bodies within the Minneapolis park system that ensure these resources will be protected and enhanced. Outline in the plan the partnerships with cities and watershed organizations that will aid in managing these resources.

■ Develop and implement a land management plan for the grounds, trees, and gardens of parks and golf courses in the Minneapolis park system.

■ Work with and advise the City of Minneapolis as necessary to develop an integrated tree canopy plan that is consistent with the specified roles of each governing unit in existing agreement and policy documents.

■ Provide leadership and coordination with area partners and regulatory agencies in monitoring, regulating, and improving water quality and the ecological integrity of water bodies throughout the park system. Enforce regulations and policies as necessary.

■ Collaborate with local, state, and federal organizations to plan for and fund ongoing ecological management and restoration.

GOAL

Healthy boulevard trees connect all city residents to their park system.

STRATEGIES

■ Revise and maintain the master planting plan for boulevard trees.

■ Plant boulevard trees that complement the park system’s natural areas and are appropriate for the conditions of the boulevard.

■ Formalize a boulevard tree management plan that promotes a pleasant and safe street environment and focuses on scientifically-based methods of planting and caring for boulevard trees.

■ Maximize every opportunity to reforest city boulevards.

■ Work with the city to ensure that boulevard conditions and designs heighten tree longevity.
GOAL
Residents and visitors enjoy and understand the natural environment.

STRATEGIES
■ Encourage people to experience the natural environment by providing and maintaining, where feasible, trails and access points that serve people of all ranges of ability.
■ Provide environmental education, and nature-based recreation that encourages all people, especially children and new populations, to explore, protect, understand, and become stewards of natural areas.
■ Develop a strong connection between community/neighborhood center programming and the natural areas in the regional parks.
■ Provide or support other entities in providing programming that teaches residents to reduce their individual negative impact on the natural environment.

GOAL
People and the environment benefit from the expansion and protection of natural resources.

STRATEGIES
■ Ensure day-to-day operations and construction does not damage natural resources within parklands, and require replacement when loss or damage occurs.
■ Within the park system, protect natural resources recognized as significant city, regional, or national resources due to historical, ecological, or aesthetic value.
■ Enforce leash laws and use of designated trails to protect sensitive ecosystems and wildlife.
■ Balance public access to natural areas throughout the city, giving priority to acquiring, developing and/or restoring areas in north and northeast Minneapolis.
■ Enhance natural features in neighborhood and community parks to increase residents’ awareness and enjoyment of the natural environment.
VISION THEME 1: GOALS AND STRATEGIES

Urban forests, natural areas, and waters that endure and captivate

GOAL

Knowledgeable stewards and partners generously support the system’s natural resources.

STRATEGIES

■ Develop programming to educate residents and park visitors of the importance of preserving and properly managing natural resources for health, water, and air quality, and general environmental benefits.

■ Be a resource for residents and visitors seeking information about the park system’s natural resources and urban forests.

■ Engage volunteers in the restoration, maintenance, and preservation of the system’s natural resources.

■ Lead efforts to establish public and private partnerships that enhance the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board’s management of natural areas, waters, and urban forests. Sponsor programs and events that promote exploring, protecting, and enhancing these resources.

■ Strengthen opportunities for research and cooperative exchange of information with universities, state and federal agencies, and recognized experts.

■ Participate in efforts sponsored by local partners that enhance the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board’s goals for managing natural areas, waters, and urban forests within the park system.
Map II:

Remnant Native Plant Communities

Legend:
- ▲ Parkland less than 1 Acre
- ■ Existing Parkland
- ◊ Remnant Native Plant Communities

1. Theodore Wirth Park Back 40
   Restored Prairie
2. Theodore Wirth Quaking Bog
3. South Wirth Oak Forest
4. William Berry Park Woodland
5. Thomas Sadler Robert’s Bird Sanctuary
6. West River Parkway and 36th Street East
7. West River Parkway and 44th Street East
8. Minnehaha Park - Black Ash / Skunk Cabbage Seep
9. Minnehaha Park - Morley's Prairie

Park properties shown are those where the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board has site control through ownership or lease. Water bodies shown are those where the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board has site control of part or all of the land surrounding it.
Inspiration adds spice and zest to our lives and allows them to be lives not just existences.

ANNE WILSON SCHAFF

Recreation that inspires personal growth, healthy lifestyles, and a sense of community

The future calls for leadership that inspires all people to engage in recreation. Recreation includes all activities that make leisure time more interesting, enjoyable, and personally satisfying. The benefits of quality recreation are astonishing, ranging from the development of life-long skills to fostering community to crime prevention. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is committed to enriching the lives of individuals, families, and the entire community through positive and fulfilling recreation experiences. This will require offering physical, artistic, environmental, and social activities tailored to the diverse communities throughout the city.

Healthy Fun

Whether one wishes to walk along the river, coach a sport, help restore a park area, picnic under an oak tree, have fun on a playground, join a hockey team, create a ceramic bowl, attend a concert, or watch nature unfold, the Park Board provides a wide range of healthy recreation choices. The park system’s numerous recreation and volunteer opportunities inspire people to make a difference in their own lives, in the lives of others, and to their surroundings.
FINDINGS The following findings helped shape the goals and strategies for Vision Theme 2:

**Community Outreach and Research**
Overall, residents feel the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is doing a good job of providing for their household’s park and recreation needs. Residents say it is important for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board to provide health and physical fitness opportunities and positive recreation activities for children and youth. They frequently mention the need for additional or improved programming, especially for children. The main barriers to participating in recreation activities and programs were lack of time and concerns about personal safety.

Residents rank recreation centers, athletic fields, programming (all ages), and athletic courts as moderately important. Program recommendations typically focused on providing more programming for each age group. Common requests across the age groups were for arts and crafts and physical fitness classes. When considering recreation centers, some residents felt gaps exist between what recreation centers provide and what their community needs. Suggestions to improve recreation centers include:
- Heightened security
- Better or improved access to

**Community Center Model**
Minneapolis residents enjoy a greater diversity of recreational interests and lifestyles than in the 1960s when the current recreation center model was designed for the park system (see Key Challenges and Opportunities section for demographic and recreation trends). The small size of existing park centers adequately served that earlier era, but no longer supports the extensive recreation needs of today’s children, youth, young adults, single adults, adults, older adults, and families, making it difficult to foster community among diverse lifestyles. A new model is needed; one that retains the personal touch and easy access of the 1960s model, while effectively meeting the recreation needs of today’s diverse communities. As current centers are increasingly in need of upgrading, it is vital that this new model be sustainable, be cost-efficient, and maximize the value of existing development, operations, and maintenance resources. (See Diagram 1, page 21.)

**Health, Physical Fitness, and Wellness**
Since their creation, parks have been viewed as key to the health and well-being of Minneapolis residents and visitors. The challenges facing society today may be different, but the expectations of the park system have not changed. Today’s park system continues to be a positive influence by aiding individual health and fitness, and by countering obesity and related complications, isolation from community, and the stress of hectic lifestyles. Increasingly, people recognize the relationship between health care costs and lifestyle choices. Parks and recreation are a link to the active lifestyles that can have a profound affect on community wellness.

“We do not cease to play because we grow old.
We grow old because we cease to play.”
*George Bernard Shaw*

---

*This is a summary of the key community outreach and research results as they relate to this vision theme. Please see the Comprehensive Planning Process in Review section for more details about the outreach and research process.*
Recreation that inspires personal growth, healthy lifestyles, and a sense of community

**GOAL**

People play, learn, and develop a greater capacity to enjoy life.

**STRATEGIES**

- Provide programming, especially for children, youth, and teens, in four key areas – physical, artistic, environmental, and social – at a level where high quality can be ensured.
- Adapt programming to busy lifestyles and make it easy for individuals and families to participate.
- Enrich physical, artistic, environmental, and social program delivery by partnering with other agencies, professionals, and providers.
- Identify and reduce physical and financial barriers to participation in programming.
- Develop connections between programming in the community/neighborhood park system and the regional park system.
- Provide opportunities to interpret the park system’s history and historic features through venues that are engaging and fun.

**GOAL**

Residents, visitors, and workers enjoy opportunities to improve health and fitness.

**STRATEGIES**

- Provide access and encouragement for children and youth to participate in fundamental-level athletics.
- Provide team sports for all age groups.
- Provide opportunities for self-directed recreation on land and water throughout the park system.
- Form or encourage groups and clubs that help motivate individuals to reach their health and fitness goals.
- Explore ways to integrate non-traditional recreation opportunities for all ages into the park system.
- Provide recreation opportunities that support active lifestyles for workers before, after, and/or during their workday.
- Ensure recreation opportunities are available for persons with disabilities.
GOAL
People connect through parks and recreation.

STRATEGIES
■ Offer a culturally rich selection of programs, expanding cross-cultural programming and interpretive opportunities.
■ Be the source of information about recreation opportunities city-wide.
■ Develop programming partnerships with groups and organizations that provide life-long learning or work readiness skills, such as community education.
■ Encourage opportunities that nurture relationships, develop an understanding of differences, and develop team-building skills.
■ Encourage the use of parks for public cultural, art, and history events, giving priority to those that support local artists or foster an understanding of local cultures and history.
■ Create and support events, concerts, festivals, athletic events, and celebrations that can be enjoyed by the entire community.
■ Tell the story of the park system through interpretive displays and programming, and by celebrating key milestones in park history.

GOAL
Volunteers make a vital difference to people, parks, and the community.

STRATEGIES
■ Provide volunteer opportunities that are meaningful to individuals of all ages and families and further the work of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board.
■ Promote volunteer opportunities in each park.
■ Recruit neighborhood adults to be positive role models in the lives of youth through mentoring and coaching.
■ Encourage and manage large scale volunteer projects that accommodate the desire of local businesses and corporations to volunteer in the community.
■ Initiate, sponsor, and support city-wide volunteer projects and events.
VISION THEME 2: GOALS AND STRATEGIES

Recreation that inspires personal growth, healthy lifestyles, and a sense of community

GOAL

Parks provide a center for community living.

STRATEGIES

■ Design and implement a community center service model that is relevant to community members, provides a personal touch and easy access for all residents, creates a social gathering space for the community, and is delivered from a sustainable number of community center hubs (also a component of Vision Theme 3).

■ Provide programs for family members to enjoy within the same location.

■ Tailor programs and services to the demographics and needs of the community.

■ Deliver programming that connects individuals to the land and to each other.
Diagram I:
Minneapolis Past to Present: Changing Recreation and Community Needs

1960: Free-standing Recreation Centers

Minneapolis Characteristics at a Glance
- Relatively homogenous population (see Chart IV, page 46)
- Similar park and recreation needs in each neighborhood
- Building schools
- 34.8% of households have children (1960 Census)
- 27.6% of households have individuals living alone (1960 Census)
- No digital communications or media
- Primarily detached single family housing

2007: Community Center Hub Model

Minneapolis Characteristics at a Glance
- More diverse population (see Chart IV, page 46)
- Larger and more diverse range of park and recreation needs across the city
- Closing schools
- 25.0% of households have children (2000 Census)
- 40.0% of households have individuals living alone (2000 Census)
- Explosion of digital world
- Increased housing in previously industrial or commercial areas of the city
"...it is the duty of a Park Commission to open the way to new, not to follow old customs; to lead public opinion, and not to tag after it."

FREDERICK LAW OLMSTED 1886

As the city’s demographics evolve, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board must create parks and amenities that are flexible, sustainable, and aesthetically beautiful, and with which residents and visitors can identify. Achieving this vision requires careful listening, anticipating future needs, exploring new operating models, and obtaining new funding sources. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board will continue to be a strong leader by retaining an independent focus on parks and recreation, stretching the imagination for shaping the city, and seeking partners that will help fulfill the mission of the organization.

Vision, Leadership, Renewal

A rich history of visionary leadership created a legendary park system that shapes the character of Minneapolis and the quality of life for its residents. The central Mississippi riverfront is a prime example of how new development and private investment frequently follow public investment in park amenities. Plans are in place to expand this success into the upper Mississippi River area. Similarly, plans to realize a century-old vision of completing the Grand Rounds through northeast Minneapolis are in progress. To support the park system, a diverse range of funding sources, such as a park dedication ordinance and private partnerships, are being explored. Increased emphasis is being placed on sustainable practices, communication, demographic trends, and effective outreach to ensure new and renewed facilities meet the needs of current and future generations.
FINDINGS The following findings helped shape the goals and strategies for Vision Theme 3:

Community Outreach and Research
According to residents, parks define the city and are very important to the quality of life in Minneapolis. Residents want more investment in the care and upkeep of park and recreational facilities and enhanced communication, as well as a greater connection between community needs and the services provided by the park system. They emphasize a desire for greater development and maintenance of all types of trails. Residents encourage the development of partnerships with public and private entities that further the goals of the Park Board. When considering the private sector, they recommend partnerships with local businesses and those that do not commercialize the park system.

State of the Park System
The Minneapolis park system, over 6,400 acres in size, is comprised of both regional (75% of the park system – see Map III, page 28) and neighborhood and community parks (25% of the park system). It equates to approximately 16% of the land and water in Minneapolis, and includes land in Edina, Hopkins, Golden Valley, St. Louis Park, Robbinsdale, St. Anthony, and Fridley. Significant changes to the park system since 1920 include land acquisition along the Mississippi River to develop the central riverfront, to implement sections of the Above the Falls master plan, and to provide the first permanent headquarters for the Park Board; reconfiguration of Minnehaha Park; Leonard H. Neiman Sports Complex and Fred Wells Tennis Center; land acquisition for part of the Cedar Lake Trail; and the land purchase and lease for Edward C. Solomon Park.

Growth of the Minneapolis Park System
Future growth of the park system is anticipated in two areas — filling existing service gaps and serving new growth areas of the city. To reduce existing service gaps, the system will focus on providing parkland within walking distance for each resident and better distribution of significant amenities, especially in north and northeast Minneapolis. Growth areas of the city are typically former non-residential areas that are not well served by park amenities. Park development will focus on serving and helping to spark additional growth in these re-development areas.

Funding Fluctuations
Traditional capital improvement funding sources have diminished for the Minneapolis park system in recent years. In 1999, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board developed an “Infrastructure Replacement Model” that replicated a model used by the City of Minneapolis. At that time, the assets of the neighborhood park system totaled $147 million, resulting in an annual capital funding need of $6 million, based on an average useful life of 20 years. A 2000 agreement between the City of Minneapolis and the Park Board was designed to increase funding for the neighborhood park system. This would have provided $8 million from net-debt bonds and property taxes in 2004, with property tax-based funding anticipated to increase with inflation after that point.

In 2003, the City reduced the annual funding by $4.2 million to meet other funding priorities and to cope with budget deficits it faced. Since that time, the funding commitments of the 2000 agreement have not been met. Based on current projections, neighborhood park system capital funding from 2003 to 2011 will be significantly less than the 2000 agreement (Charts I and II). Unpredictable funding levels make it difficult to project capital improvements for the system. Cultivating a diverse range of consistent funding sources will help assure a sustainable and well maintained park system.

* This is a summary of the key community outreach and research results as they relate to this vision theme. Please see the Comprehensive Planning Process in Review section for more details about the outreach and research process.

---

**Chart I: Actual and 2000 Agreement for Proposed Net-Debt Bonding for Neighborhood Parks**

**Chart II: Actual and 2000 Agreement for Property Taxes for Neighborhood Parks**
VI S I O N T H E M E 3 : G O A L S A N D S T R A T E G I E S

Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs

G O A L

Parks shape an evolving city.

S T R A T E G I E S

■ Continue to expand physical access to the Mississippi River in a manner that is aesthetically compatible with the riverfront and sensitive to ecological function, giving priority to implementing the Above the Falls Master Plan.

■ Provide a well-maintained, safe, and continuous trail system (see Map III, page 28), giving priority to completing the “missing link” of the Grand Rounds Parkway (see Map IV, page 29), and providing trail connections in north and northeast Minneapolis.

■ Balance the distribution of premier park and recreation features across the city, giving priority to adding features to north and northeast Minneapolis (see Map IV, page 29).

■ Help shape the built form of the city by developing and/or implementing park plans to acquire parkland and build amenities in current or projected growth areas of the city: Bassett Creek Valley, Hiawatha LRT Corridor, Downtown, Southeast Minneapolis Industrial, Midtown Greenway Corridor, Upper River, Northeast Industrial, North Loop, and Central Riverfront (see Map IV, page 29). Periodically examine trends in household and population growth or shifts to identify additional study areas.

■ Ensure park access for all residents by providing parks within an easy walk from their homes (no more than six blocks) and achieving a ratio of .01 acres of parkland per household (see Map IV, page 29 for service gap study areas).

■ Work with the City of Minneapolis and other entities to identify and support multi-mode transportation corridors between parks, with preference given to routes that encourage non-motorized linkages between parks.
GOAL

Park facility renewal and development respects history and focuses on sustainability, accessibility, flexibility, and beauty.

STRATEGIES

■ Integrate sustainable practices, ecological design for landscapes, and green building techniques into new construction and renewal of all amenities, giving priority to those practices that meet or exceed established standards, improve ecological function, and minimize long-term maintenance and operating costs.

■ Design and implement a community center hub model that serves community members, is sustainable, and taps the resources of area neighborhood, community, and regional parks (also a component of Vision Theme 2).

■ Implement a sustainable, long-term renewal plan based on a complete inventory of the system, life-cycle cost analysis, and condition assessment of all park facilities.

■ Systematically develop activity plans that outline the delivery goals, benefits, facilities, operations, and maintenance required to provide each major recreation activity (or group of similar activities) in the park system. Use these plans to guide capital improvement and facility maintenance programs.

■ Build or renew facilities to meet or exceed standards for accessibility.

■ Build quality facilities that can be adapted to new uses as community needs change.

■ Maintain an inventory of historic structures, documents, landscapes, features, and archeological sites that includes site analysis, evaluation of integrity, and historic significance. Develop a management and interpretive plan for significant historic resources.

■ Beautify the park system by integrating gardens and art into park designs, and provide strategically placed gardens and art displays throughout city parklands and facilities.
VISION THEME 3: GOALS AND STRATEGIES

Dynamic parks that shape city character and meet diverse community needs

GOAL

Focused land management supports current and future generations.

STRATEGIES

■ Maintain a vital park system for city residents with a thoughtful acquisition and disposition plan and practice.

■ Acquire land that meets one or more of the following criteria (in priority order): fulfills park needs for growing areas or implements adopted park plans, meets the needs of areas underserved due to poor access or insufficient parkland acreage per household, provides trail connections or natural areas, establishes clear park boundaries, eliminates easements and leases, promotes ecological function, and secures unique sites or facilities.

■ Ensure parcels considered for disposition meet one or more of the following criteria: removing the parcel does not diminish recreation or environmental function of the park system, the parcel is not accessible by the public, the parcel does not serve the needs of individuals within a growth area of the city or is not part of an adopted park plan, and the parcel is too small for future park or natural area development.

■ Monitor and update lease and joint-use agreements to meet current and anticipated park and recreation needs.

■ Pursue public and private partnerships to acquire, or promote access to, land for parks, open space, and recreation.

■ Pursue land trades when the trade will result in equal or more parkland that will provide greater function to the park system.

GOAL

Financially independent and sustainable parks prosper.

STRATEGIES

■ Increase revenue and develop sustainable spending practices throughout the park system that consider the short- and long-term costs and priorities for projects, programs, or services.

■ Work with necessary partners to enact and implement a park dedication ordinance to ensure new city development is adequately served with park and recreation facilities.

■ Prepare for future opportunities by increasing funding reserves and establishing a park endowment fund.

■ Obtain grants that further the work of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board.

■ Engage local businesses, corporations, foundations, and individuals in sustainable partnerships that build on the value of the system without jeopardizing aesthetics or over-commercializing the public realm.

■ Create opportunities for entrepreneurs, both non-profit and for-profit, to enrich the park experience and implement innovative approaches to revenue generation.

■ Work with all levels of government to secure consistent, dedicated funding for park development, maintenance, and operation.

■ Develop and maintain a five-year financial plan that includes disaster recovery provisions.
GOAL

Through outreach and research, park and recreation services are relevant today and tomorrow.

STRATEGIES

- Create a community outreach and research plan that focuses on identifying the park and recreation needs of the city’s dynamic populations.
- Evaluate current facility and program delivery based on key indicators and park visitation to determine the best way to meet the park and recreation needs of residents and visitors.
- Regularly review social and demographic trends that affect service delivery. Be the first to identify and address new recreational needs and to reposition those recreational facilities that are no longer relevant.
- Ensure staff are prepared to engage a diverse public by training staff to be sensitive to the park system’s users, recruiting bilingual staff, and recruiting and retaining people of color for staff and volunteer positions.
- Engage and involve residents in identifying the program, service, and facility needs of their respective communities.
- Anticipate and respond to the cultural diversity of the population.

GOAL

Easily accessible information supports enjoyment and use of the park and recreation system.

STRATEGIES

- Implement communication strategies to provide timely, accurate information to Minneapolis residents and park visitors, including those who do not speak English.
- Enhance technology to share information effectively and efficiently across the organization and with the community.
- Cultivate open communication with the city, county, Metropolitan Council, and other elected officials or appointed groups.
- Develop and implement a customer service program, including training, to ensure customer service techniques are applied effectively and consistently across the organization.
- Effectively utilize technology to make program registration and enjoyment of services easy.
Map III:
Minneapolis Trail System and Regional Park System

LEGEND
1 Ridgway Parkway Regional Trail
2 Above the Falls Regional Park
3 Central Mississippi Riverfront Regional Park
4 Mississippi Gorge Regional Park
5 Minnehaha Regional Park
6 Minnehaha Parkway Regional Trail
7 Nokomis – Hiawatha Regional Park
8 Minneapolis Chain of Lakes Regional Park
9 Cedar Lake Trail
10 Theodore Wirth Regional Park
11 Luce Line Regional Trail
12 Wirth Memorial Parkway Regional Trail
13 Shingle Creek Regional Trail
14 North Mississippi Regional Park
15 Columbia Parkway Regional Trail
16 St. Anthony Parkway Regional Trail
17 Stinson Parkway Regional Park

---

Park Board properties shown on this map are designated as regional facilities in the Minneapolis park system, and are shaded to reflect their boundaries. Park Board and other publicly owned off-street trails are also shown on this map. Those that are numbered are designated as regional trails. When the property adjacent to the trail is also designated as regional, its boundary is reflected by the shaded area. Note that the Luce Line Regional Trail only includes the trail and not the adjacent park property. Similarly, note that the Cedar Lake Regional Trail is maintained by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board and resides partially on Park Board property, but is not owned by the Board.
Map IV:
Future Parkland and Facility Study Areas and Adopted Plans

LEGEND
- ▲ Parkland less than 1 Acre
- Green Existing Parkland
- Adopted Plans
- Red Project Growth Area Study Areas
- Gray Service Gap Study Areas
- Pink Premier Park and Recreation Feature Study Areas

Park properties shown are those where the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board has site control through ownership or lease. Water bodies shown are those where the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board has site control of part or all of the land surrounding it.
Regional Connections and Pressures
The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is one of ten implementing agencies that provide regional parks in the metropolitan area. Since 2000, the regional parks of the Minneapolis park system have received approximately 13.8 million visits annually: 26.8% or approximately 3.7 million of those visits are made by non-residents. As regional development and growth continues, the demand on the Minneapolis park system is expected to grow. Several watersheds and the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area also span across the Minneapolis park system, underscoring its significance regionally, as well as nationally, in providing high quality parks and recreation and protecting natural resources.

Map V:
Seven County Metropolitan Area

LEGEND

- Minneapolis
- Cities Adjacent to Minneapolis
- County Boundary
- Minneapolis Parkland
- Lakes, Rivers and Creeks
- 7 County Metro Regional Parks
- Mississippi National River and Recreation Area
- Bassett Creek Watershed Management Commission
- Mississippi Watershed Management Organization
- Minnehaha Creek Watershed District
- Shingle Creek Watershed Management Commission

Not shown on this map is approximately 605 acres of land within the Minneapolis-St. Paul Airport jurisdictional boundary in which the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board retains an interest.
“...It is my earnest desire to make the parks of Minneapolis useful and safe for the people.”

THEODORE WIRTH 1921

Keeping the parks safe requires a long-term commitment to people and places by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board and its many partners. Safety, both real and perceived, is achieved through a combination of preventive and corrective measures. Delivering consistently safe parks requires that they are well maintained and designed to prevent accidental injury. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is committed to making choices that foster the safety and well-being of its park visitors and staff.

**Prevent, Protect, Welcome**

Safety within the Minneapolis park system is a core responsibility of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. While its independent police force is a key factor in fulfilling this responsibility, all staff members play a vital role in keeping parks safe. Park programs inspire youth to engage positively in their communities. High standards for removing graffiti, addressing vandalism, and keeping the parks in good condition set high expectations for behavior. Park police build relationships with youth and communities, and redirect behavior through education instead of arrests and citations whenever possible. Renewal and development of new amenities are designed with safety in mind.
Community Outreach and Research*
Aside from lack of time, Minneapolis residents and park visitors report that their concerns about safety are the greatest barrier to using the park system. Their concerns include both personal and property safety and range from fears about off-leash animals to gang activity. People want to see more police presence in parks, enhanced lighting, and a more visible staff role in park and recreation center safety.

Additional recommendations for improving the safety of the parks include:
- Greater adult presence
- Well-maintained facilities
- Clear expectations for park users
- Well-designed facilities
- Multi-cultural and bilingual staff
- Walking and activity groups
- Community dialogue about safety needs within the parks

An Integrated Approach
Park police alone cannot provide a safe park system. Each employee and park visitor plays a role in fostering a safe, welcoming environment. An approach is needed that integrates prevention through safe design, well-maintained facilities, proper training of park visitors and all park staff, clear communication, and swift modification of inappropriate behavior.

City-wide Trends
Fluctuations in crime statistics across the city play a large role in the real and perceived safety of the park system. Between 2001 and 2006, reported crimes across the city ranged from a low of 60,767 in 2004 to 76,361 in 2006. These numbers included crimes ranging from vandalism to homicides. On average 2.5% of all crimes committed in the city each year occurred in the parks (Chart III). Similar to crimes reported in the city as a whole, crimes most commonly reported in parks are vandalism and theft.

Work Place Safety
Safety at work is also important to the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. Staff that work safely are more likely to provide a safe environment for park visitors. Considerable time and resources are required to adequately train staff and provide a safe working environment. Work place safety is further discussed in the values section.

* This is a summary of the key community outreach and research results as they relate to this vision theme. Please see the Comprehensive Planning Process in Review section for more details about the outreach and research process.
A safe place to play, recreate, contemplate and celebrate

VISION THEME 4: GOALS AND STRATEGIES

GOAL
Positive recreation experiences and welcoming parks prevent crime.

STRATEGIES
■ Get to know and positively influence youth.
■ Communicate clear expectations of behavior to park visitors.
■ Train all staff to recognize and divert dangerous activity within the park system.
■ Balance the ratio of children to adults at neighborhood, community, and regional parks by engaging all in positive activities.
■ Implement a safety first policy in which programs are cancelled when established minimum safety standards are not met.
■ Ensure that all staff are visible, welcoming, and positive.
■ Set park hours to promote safe use of the parks and safety in the community.
■ Ensure facilities are well-maintained (see park facilities renewal goal of Vision Theme 3).

GOAL
Residents, park visitors, and staff make safe choices in the parks.

STRATEGIES
■ Educate park visitors on personal safety and actions they can take to avoid being a target of crime.
■ Install clear signage that instructs park visitors to safely use or access park amenities.
■ Teach drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists the rules of the road and path safety.
■ Educate residents and park visitors about the negative impacts of feeding or interacting with wild animals.
■ Dedicate staff time to safety training and risk assessment to prevent accidents that can lead to injuries and lost staff time.
GOAL

Intervention and communication reduce safety concerns.

STRATEGIES

■ Identify recurring safety concerns and devise new prevention plans using available resources. Eliminating a service or facility will happen only when attempts to modify the problematic behavior have failed.
■ Increase visibility of park police officers.
■ Modify behavior that may cause harm to persons, the environment, or property within the park system.
■ Warn park visitors and staff of one-time, seasonal, and periodic hazards related to natural occurrences, environment, operating and maintenance practices, and property damage.
■ Facilitate quick emergency response by installing distinguishable markers and building addresses that are recognized by 911.
■ Develop and maintain a disaster recovery plan for the park system.

GOAL

Parks are safe and welcoming by design.

STRATEGIES

■ Design parks to meet or exceed safety standards, building codes, and Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles.
■ Develop and implement lighting standards by park amenity to promote a safe, welcoming environment while respecting natural habitats.
■ Provide access to restrooms, drinking water, bike racks, and shade throughout the park system.
■ Monitor park amenities to ensure safety standards and codes are continually met, and develop plans to meet standards or remove facilities that do not meet minimum safety requirements.
■ Adopt new technology proven to effectively enhance safety throughout the system.
■ Work with communities and the city to provide safe pedestrian and bicycle routes to and within parks.
VISION THEME 4: GOALS AND STRATEGIES

A safe place to play, recreate, contemplate and celebrate

GOAL

Communities, public and private partners, and staff cooperate to promote safety.

STRATEGIES

■ Ensure at least two adult staff are present during open building hours within neighborhood and community parks.

■ Support community policing efforts.

■ Cooperate with other agencies to develop an integrated approach to chronic issues within and beyond park borders.

■ Work with communities to identify necessary safety improvements within parks.

■ Pursue public and private partnerships to promote safety in the parks and expand available resources.
Values guide how commissioners, staff, and volunteers do their work.
Applying the values of good conduct – respect, integrity, fairness, and dignity – sets an example for behavior within the park system.

The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board has identified five additional values to apply to all of the work in the park system. These values are:

**Sustainability**  Meet current park and recreation needs without sacrificing the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by balancing environmental, economic, and equity concerns.

**Visionary Leadership**  Respect the vision and leadership that built the park and recreation system and recognize the need for ongoing leadership in achieving excellence.

**Safety**  Work safely to support a thriving work environment and an outstanding park experience for visitors.

**Responsiveness and Innovation**  Anticipate and thoughtfully respond to the diverse needs of the city’s communities, continually seeking ways to better deliver park and recreation services.

**Independence and Focus**  Independence allows the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board to focus on providing and obtaining the resources necessary to accomplish its mission and form effective, responsible partnerships.
Values guide how commissioners, staff, and volunteers do their work.

**Sustainability**
Meet current park and recreation needs without sacrificing the ability of future generations to meet their own needs by balancing environmental, economic, and equity concerns.

**Environment** Sustain and enhance parklands, waters, and urban forests.

**Economic** Develop short-term and long-term financial stability of the park system.

**Equity** Provide residents with the opportunity to improve their quality of life and well-being through outstanding parks and recreation services that are suited to their respective needs.

Sustainability is a high priority for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. It cannot, however, succeed in isolation as the environmental, economic, and equity concerns it faces require action on a broad scale. A sustainability plan for the system will be prepared and implemented to make sure that sustainable practices are integrated throughout the organization. This commitment to sustainability will create a diverse workforce ready to actively and creatively respond to local issues and allow the Minneapolis park system to be a role model and resource for residents and partners.

**Visionary Leadership**
Respect the vision and leadership that built the park and recreation system and recognize the need for ongoing leadership in achieving excellence.

A visionary sees the future and a leader gets you there. The Minneapolis park system is the product of both vision and leadership. To further this tradition the system must recruit bright, talented staff and volunteers. It must also cultivate new leadership, encourage implementation of best practices, and provide opportunities to explore new ideas.

**Actions:**
- Identify opportunities to test and/or showcase best practices throughout the system.
- Provide park system infrastructure at a sustainable rate.
- Reduce energy use in buildings, vehicles, and equipment.
- Purchase “green” products made from high recycled and post-consumer waste material content and focus on quality versus quantity.
- Choose economically sustainable options, taking into consideration staff time, resource use, and life span costs with the understanding that initial costs might be greater than other methods.
- Balance the economic and environmental costs and benefits of providing parks and recreation across the city.
- Reduce the release of human-made chemicals into the environment.
- Build a diverse workforce at all levels of the organization that reflects city demographics.

**Actions:**
- Learn and apply best practices.
- Participate in training opportunities.
- Openly explore new ideas and trends.
- Foster new leadership.
- Share knowledge with co-workers.
- Encourage bold, effective ideas.
- Increase training opportunities.
**Safety**

Work safely to support a thriving work environment and an outstanding park experience for visitors.

It is important to the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board that the work of the organization be done safely. Setting and achieving high goals for safety in the workplace is essential to reducing the cost of injury and loss of staff time. Commitment to this value means that staff are trained to safely complete their work and that unsafe situations in the working environment are identified and addressed. As a result, it will be possible to place more focus on providing outstanding programs, services, and facilities for residents and park visitors.

**Actions:**
- Dedicate staff time to safety policy development, risk management, and safety training.
- Participate in periodic safety trainings and share safety information with co-workers and park visitors.
- Support the work of the staff safety committee.
- Report and address safety concerns promptly to ensure safety of visitors and staff.
- Be visible, welcoming, and professional.
- Implement and revisit safety agreements developed by recreation, operations, and park police staff to provide safe, clean, welcoming parks.
- Eliminate on-the-job injuries by staying informed and following safety guidelines.

**Responsiveness and Innovation**

Anticipate and thoughtfully respond to the diverse needs of the city’s communities, continually seeking ways to better deliver park and recreation services.

A successful park system is relevant to the community it serves. This requires acting on knowledge of the park and recreation needs of the community, as well as providing visitors with customer service that maximizes their experience. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board must not only react to change, but anticipate and address it with ingenuity, creativity, and innovation.

**Actions:**
- Research and report observations on the changing needs of residents, visitors, and workers.
- Provide excellent customer service with every visitor interaction.
- Stay informed and provide visitors with accurate park information.
- Systematically research and respond to trends, opportunities, and external influences.
- Look for innovative ways to provide park and recreation services.

**Independence and Focus**

Independence allows the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board to focus on providing and obtaining the resources necessary to accomplish its mission and form effective, responsible partnerships.

The semi-autonomous governing structure of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board guarantees strong, ongoing advocacy for the park system. By continuing this governing structure, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board will maintain its focus on permanently preserving and protecting the parks for future generations.

**Actions:**
- Understand the history of the park system and the significance of its independence.
- Ensure all work is consistent with the mission and vision for the park system.
- Seek funding to maintain, operate, and enhance the system.
- Periodically revisit and refresh the mission, vision, values, and goals of the organization to maintain a clear focus.
A unified approach to decision-making will swiftly propel the organization toward a common direction. The following decision principles will be considered when making decisions that have a district or system-wide impact.

**Research conducted for this comprehensive plan reinforces the importance of basing program and facility decisions on specific community needs and the demographics of the city.**

**Identified Community Need and Demographics**
The 2005 reorganization of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board better positioned staff to address the needs or requests of individual communities. The new geographically based structure brings decision-making closer to the community. The research conducted for this comprehensive plan reinforces the importance of basing program and facility decisions on specific community needs and demographics, since recreation needs vary across the city. Moving forward, emphasis will be placed on researching community need and demographics of the area. Equity, therefore, will be measured by how well a community’s needs are addressed.

**Overbuilt or under-utilized facilities will be removed and replaced with sustainable options or other amenities that better meet the needs of the community.**

**Quality versus Quantity**
The amenities provided to meet the park and recreation needs of communities will be high quality and sustainable. Overbuilt or under-utilized facilities will be removed and replaced with sustainable options or other amenities that better meet the needs of the community. Amenities that have completed their useful life-cycle, especially those with a blighted appearance, will be removed and, as funding becomes available, replaced with new amenities.

**Embracing Technology**
Beyond gadgets, video games, and cyberspace, technology is transforming the delivery of meaningful park and recreation experiences: new artificial turf technology provides hours of play on a single surface, new playground equipment enhances a child’s experience, new modes of communication increase information sharing, and renewable energy sources reduce operating costs. Decision-making will embrace technology to better serve the community.
Fostering a New Face for Partnerships
Partnerships are commonplace for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, often resulting in enhanced service delivery. Some, however, are less mutually beneficial. In the future, the Park Board will evaluate partnerships on an ongoing basis and will actively seek a new contingent of partners. The decision to enter or rejuvenate a partnership will be based on how it contributes to the organization’s mission, vision, goals, and strategies. Non-traditional partners that provide new opportunities for residents and are consistent with the organization’s mission will be encouraged.

Focusing on the Activity, Then the Infrastructure
In the 1960s and 1970s, when much of the park system’s infrastructure was built, the demographics of the city were considerably more homogenous than they are today. In that era, evenly spacing infrastructure across the city was an effective delivery model. Today, new recreation trends, shifting demographics, and more private recreation options highlight the need for a new model. Infrastructure decisions will begin by determining the need for a particular recreation activity and the value and service it delivers. After thorough evaluation of what the Park Board currently provides, the status of other service providers, and existing infrastructure, infrastructure will be provided to meet the service goals for that activity. Service goals for an activity will be based on demographics of an area, identified community need, and the identified target audience for the activity. See Table I (page 42) for additional details.

Sustainable Rate
Increasing operational costs, environmental regulations, expanding requests for services, land use pressures, environmental degradation, and social disparity can create a sense of scarcity and compromise the long-term vitality of an organization. An alternative is to provide services at a sustainable rate, such as providing infrastructure that can be reasonably maintained, setting realistic program and service delivery targets, or modifying land management techniques to increase efficiency. Future decisions will support a sustainable park system that prevents crisis situations, protects the land for future generations, and actively balances services across the city.
**Guidelines for Activity Delivery or Opportunities Within the Minneapolis Park System**

Focusing first on the activity and then the infrastructure needed to deliver or accommodate that activity opens up new opportunities to form partnerships and to maximize the use of the resources available within the park system. It also introduces residents and visitors to new expectations for services and activities. Service goals for an activity will be based on demographics of an area, identified community need, and the identified target audience for the activity. Then, after thorough evaluation of what the Park Board currently provides, the status of other service providers and partners, and existing infrastructure, infrastructure will be provided to meet the service goals. The guidelines below provide direction regarding the point of access residents and park visitors can expect for a particular activity. The point of access is the minimum level at which an activity is provided, with the most concentrated level being activities that people access within their neighborhood. In this model, some activities may shift between points of access over time due to changes in popularity of the activity, community needs, demographics, and funding sources.

**Examples:**

1) Lacrosse is an emerging sport in Minneapolis. Initially a resident may be able to access this sport within the park service district in which they live. An increase in popularity may cause it to be offered at a more concentrated level such as within a resident’s community or neighborhood.

2) Kayaking, canoeing, and sailing are limited to areas of the park system that have publicly accessible water. A resident, therefore, can expect to access this activity within the city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Point of Access</th>
<th>Guidelines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within the city</strong></td>
<td>■ The activity draws participants from across the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Infrastructure needed for the activity can be delivered at a sustainable rate at a city-wide level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ The activity requires natural, artistic, or historic resources that are only available in specific locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ The activity serves both local and regional park visitors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Parkland or water limitations restrict activity to one or two locations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Participants have transportation or can access transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within one or more of the three park service districts</strong></td>
<td>■ The activity draws participants from across the district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ The activity is new or emerging and needs to be tested before further integration into the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ The activity addresses a specific need of a park district.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Infrastructure needed for the activity can be delivered at a sustainable rate at a district-wide level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Participants have transportation or can access transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within a community</strong></td>
<td>■ The activity draws participants from across the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ The activity can help create community cohesion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ The activity is well-established and in high demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Infrastructure needed for the activity can be delivered at a sustainable rate at a community-wide level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ The activity addresses specific needs of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Participants have transportation or can access transportation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Within a neighborhood</strong></td>
<td>■ The activity draws participants from across the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ The activity is focused on children and youth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Infrastructure needed for the activity can be delivered at a sustainable rate at a neighborhood-wide level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ The activity addresses specific needs of the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>■ Participants do not have easy access to transportation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This section outlines how the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board will use this plan to guide the system to 2020. A complete review of the comprehensive plan is recommended to begin in 2018.

Planning for Change
The comprehensive plan consists of a number of key elements that complement and support each other to provide simple, concise direction. Each part of the plan has a function. The mission articulates why the organization exists. This is supported by the values, which identify how the organization performs its work. Vision statements follow, describing what the organization hopes to become by 2020. Goals represent incremental steps toward accomplishing the vision, and strategies set out plans or specific directions that lead to the goals. The pyramid (see Figure I, page 45) indicates how these separate statements support each other. Organizational implementation commitments are the base of the pyramid.

Three primary processes will ensure that the work of the commissioners and staff reflects the direction provided in the comprehensive plan. These processes are:

Five-year Implementation Plan The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board will rely on a five-year implementation plan, updated yearly, as a blueprint for achieving the strategies, goals, and ultimately the vision of the comprehensive plan. This implementation plan will reflect the specific tactics, measures of success, timetables, and resources required for a five-year period.

Work Plans Each department, district, and work group will develop annual work plans that tie to the strategies, goals, and visions outlined in the comprehensive plan. Developed annually, these plans will include indicators and will help manage workflow and ensure that daily work corresponds to the direction set forth in the comprehensive plan. The actions set forth in these plans will be specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-framed.

Annual Budget Annual budget requests by each department, district, and work group will be tied to the strategies, goals, and visions outlined in the comprehensive plan. The budgeting process will allow spending across the organization to relate to both the implementation plan and the comprehensive plan. Financial reporting will correspond to the plan’s strategies, goals, and vision statements.
Details about park management, future park development, and the goals, objectives, and strategies for providing specific recreation opportunities will be captured in separate complementary plans. These documents are:

**Future Development of Planning Documents** As an overarching guiding document, the comprehensive plan calls for additional planning in several areas. This future planning will allow for greater exploration, evaluation, and community research on several topics. The resulting plans will also provide greater detail of the Board’s goals and objectives in these areas. Plans identified for development in the comprehensive plan include (not an exhaustive list): a land management plan, a natural area management plan, a sustainability plan, park plans for growth areas, a communications plan, an overall physical system plan, and a recreation activity plan. These plans will be structured so they can easily be updated as social trends change, population grows and shifts, and as research reveals new best practices. Each plan will stipulate how frequently it should be reviewed and updated.

**Measuring Progress**

Each direction suggested in the comprehensive plan may be achieved by numerous methods. The professional expertise and experience of commissioners and staff will enable the organization to achieve the vision set forth in the plan. Careful monitoring will allow commissioners and staff to determine if a selected course of action is achieving desired outcomes, allowing corrections to be made and successful outcomes celebrated.

To comprehensively monitor the progress of the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, evaluation will be viewed from three perspectives: impact on community, organization performance reviews, and individual performance reviews.

**Community Impact** Measuring the Park Board’s community impact helps determine if the community’s park and recreation needs are being met. Measuring the impact of a program or project becomes increasingly important in a tight funding climate and is a key to judging the effectiveness of the comprehensive plan. Key indicators that anticipate program and project outcomes will be identified and monitored over time. The information obtained from these measurements will allow the five-year implementation plan and work plans to be adjusted appropriately to achieve the vision of the organization.

**Organizational Performance Reviews** An organizational performance review will measure the overall success of the organization in meeting its vision. Key indicators relating to the goals, vision, and values will be selected and monitored on a yearly basis. The results of the review will allow appropriate changes to be made to the five-year implementation plan and work plans.
Individual Performance Reviews  Employees move the organization toward the vision set by commissioners and they will be evaluated on the work they do to achieve that vision. Employees will also be evaluated on how their work upholds the values of the organization. This tool will be used to effectively direct the skills of individuals and teams toward achieving the vision of the organization and will include opportunities for personal growth. Reviews will help identify when adjustments should be made and when achievements should be celebrated. Individual performance reviews will also help supervisors monitor workflow and keep their annual work plans on target.

Relationship to Other Guiding Documents
The comprehensive plan sets a direction for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board through 2020. It will help apply resources to best meet the park and recreation needs of residents, visitors, and workers. The Park Board’s policies, ordinances, and laws pre-date this plan and address topics ranging from park classification to operating hours. These policies will be systematically updated to assure consistent direction is provided throughout the life of the plan.
The development of the comprehensive plan revealed several challenges and opportunities for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. The following circumstances will have the greatest impact on the future of the park system.

Minneapolis is a Built City
Unlike the late 1800s when the park system was created, Minneapolis is a fully developed urban city: its boundaries are established, re-development commonly transforms former industrial space into residential, and few parcels remain that are suitable for parkland. Consequently, the high cost of land will limit the ability to add new parks to the system. At the same time, demand on the park system is expected to grow as the metropolitan area expands and residents and visitors throughout the region rely more heavily on it for the recreation amenities and natural resources it offers.

Demographic Shifts in the City
At a population of approximately 382,000, the city’s population is smaller than it was at its 1950s peak, even though its total number of households has increased slightly. Changes in the city’s population include:

- Higher number of individuals living alone (27.6% of households in 1960 to 40% of households in 2000)
- Fewer households with children (34.8% of households in 1960 to 25% of households in 2000)
- Broader race and ethnic composition (Chart IV)

Current projections show that households will increase by 15.2% by 2030 which is estimated to add 24,650 people to the city. Much of the development will occur in former industrial areas and along the commercial and community corridors defined by the City of Minneapolis. An evaluation of the park and recreation needs for these growing areas will be necessary.

Environmental Pressures
Today, due to invasive species, tree diseases, and pollution, the management of natural areas, trees, and water bodies requires a new level of investment of both time and finances. This need for investment is expected to grow as development outside of the city reduces natural resources in the metro area and as new invasive species and diseases are introduced into the parklands.

Regional Connections and Pressures
Within Minneapolis, some parks are designated as regional parks (see map III, page 28). The development and maintenance of these parks are partially funded by the Metropolitan Council. The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board is one of ten implementing agencies that provide regional parks in the metropolitan area. Since 2000, the
regional parks of the Minneapolis park system have received approximately 13.8 million visits annually: 26.8% or approximately 3.7 million of those visits are made by non-residents. As regional development and growth continues, the demand on the Minneapolis park system is expected to grow. Several watersheds and the Mississippi National River and Recreation Area also span across the Minneapolis park system, underscoring its significance regionally, as well as nationally, in providing high quality parks and recreation and protecting natural resources (see map V, page 30).

Signs of the Times
Local, state, national, and world events also shape the perceptions and needs of city residents and park visitors. Key factors include:

- Trends toward global conflict have led to greater interest in emergency preparedness. Park facilities provide a possible resource to city emergency preparedness plans.
- Economic trends including rising health care costs, anti-tax movements, and increasing fuel and material costs are reducing the resources available to provide park and recreation services.
- A greater understanding of the environment and recognition of climate change will increase the need for park operations and facilities to continue focusing on issues like carbon dioxide emissions and chemical use in parks.
- An increase in the appeal of public and private partnerships, which was well documented in the community outreach and research, presents an opportunity for the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board to expand service delivery in cooperation with local businesses, and public and private entities.

Heritage and Historic Preservation
As the park system ages, its features gain historic importance. This opens up opportunities for greater historic interpretation as well as new programming or creative new use of existing facilities. It can also increase maintenance costs and limit the introduction of new facilities into the park system. These limitations can be minimized or eliminated by integrating historic preservation into early planning stages.

New Recreation Trends
Recreation is shaped by a number of factors, from shifting demographics to the introduction of new activities. Local, state, and national trends influencing recreation in Minneapolis include:

- Greater numbers of young adults are pursuing active lifestyles.
- The introduction of club sports for youth is leading to greater sport specialization and year-round engagement in one sport versus a rotation of sports throughout the year.
- Interest in traditional sports, including baseball, softball, golf, and football, is declining while interest in non-traditional sports such as skateboarding, mountain biking, soccer, disc golf, lacrosse, and cricket is increasing.
- Older adults, primarily Baby Boomers, are re-writing the script for aging by participating in active recreation decades longer than previous generations. They also have more discretionary income than previous generations, and are increasingly applying those funds toward programming and activities for their grandchildren.
- New technology is enhancing performance and delivery of existing recreation activities.
- Self-directed sports such as running and biking are popular among adults.
- More leisure time, especially among youth, is spent enjoying a multitude of media, technology, and entertainment options.
- Hobbies, gardening, history, and other self-directed activities are increasingly popular among adults.
- An increase in foreign-born residents requires focus on reducing language barriers and gaining better understanding of the recreational needs for these individuals.

While several trends indicate a growth in recreation or leisure activities, especially among adults, competition for leisure time requires greater attention to delivering programs and services that residents value. It is especially important to maintain strong public support for the park system during challenging economic periods.
In 2005, a two-year commitment was made to complete the comprehensive plan.

A goal of the process was to identify or cultivate the expertise among staff to develop the plan, utilizing the talents of consultants as necessary. More than 100 staff have been involved in one or more phases of the comprehensive planning process. The five-phase development process for the comprehensive plan is:

- **Phase I – Assessment**
  Where are we today?

- **Phase II – Community Outreach and Research**
  What are the current demands and needs, and what are the evolving trends?

- **Phase III – Comprehensive Plan Development**
  Based on what is known, what outcomes are desirable?

- **Phase IV – Priority Setting and Decision Making**
  What priorities and short- and long-term actions are in the best interests of the public?

- **Phase V – Implementation**
  What resources should be allocated to accomplish goals?

Phases I and II are integral to developing the plan and are highlighted below. Phase III was the actual writing of this plan and phases IV and V will be part of its implementation.

**Phase I – Assessment**

Staff teams that focused on infrastructure, demographics, and programs and services were developed during this phase. The infrastructure team conducted an inventory of park amenities. The programs and services team developed a method of categorizing the programs and services delivered in the park system and made recommendations to improve existing data collection methods. The demographics team identified demographics of the city that most impact park and recreation service delivery. Each team focused on creating methods or tools that could be updated regularly and would increase the park system’s capacity to use this information for future planning.

Six additional teams were initiated during the assessment phase – information management, sustainability, planning, community outreach and research, evaluation, and art and history. The information management team continues to work to heighten the capacity of the organization to collect, store, and use the information collected by the assessment teams. The sustainability team is writing a sustainability plan that will integrate sustainability – environment, economics, and equity – throughout the park system. The planning team developed a process for reviewing and analyzing new projects or program proposals relative to the comprehensive plan. The community outreach and research team coordinated the community outreach and needs assessment for the comprehensive plan. The evaluation team is developing the processes to evaluate the park system’s progress toward achieving the directions set forth in the comprehensive plan. Finally, the art and history team is developing an inventory of the artistic and historic features of the park system.
Phase II – Community Outreach and Research

In September 2006, the community outreach and research team launched a program to give all city residents, park users, and local officials the opportunity to share their thoughts about the community's park and recreation needs. A summary of key findings as they relate to each vision theme can be found in the vision section of the document. The outreach and research process included the following:

Town Meetings  The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board invited city residents and park visitors of all ages to attend one of seven town meetings held throughout the city in September and October. The meetings were promoted through a mailing to 172,300 households, news releases to Minneapolis newspapers, neighborhood association newsletters, and the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board website. More than 229 residents attended the meetings. Children and teens also participated in the town meetings. Park staff, with assistance from Minneapolis Institute of Art staff, provided fun, engaging, age-appropriate activities designed to capture kids’ thoughts and ideas about parks. Language interpreters were provided at three town meetings and available at the other meetings upon request.

Questionnaire  Community members and park visitors were also encouraged to complete a brief questionnaire. The questionnaire was available online, at golf courses, and at all 49 recreation centers from September 15 to October 15. In early September, all Minneapolis households were mailed an informational map about the park system that featured the questionnaire and town meeting dates. The questionnaire was interpreted into other languages upon request. In total, 2,728 questionnaires were received.

Focus Groups  In order to gather input from the broadest spectrum of community perspectives, focus groups were conducted with individuals from communities who were not heavily represented through the questionnaires and town meetings. When forming the focus groups, Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board staff took into consideration communities that experience language, cultural, or physical barriers to traditional community participation formats. In total, 20 focus groups were conducted. Pre-existing Park Board databases were used to mail questionnaires to seven additional groups. Focus groups were aimed at individuals or individuals representing groups that included the following: teens, single parents, elected officials, racial and ethnic communities*, foreign-born communities*, people with disabilities, vulnerable teens and adults, university students, environmental groups, local history and arts communities, active older adults, local business owners, and downtown workers and residents. Questionnaires were mailed to the following: Rec Plus parents, coaches, faith-based community groups, park facility reservation groups, sports councils, volunteers, and neighborhood organizations.

Community Leader Workshops  The Park Board sought the input of people who are recognized leaders in their communities to discuss not only community needs but to provide input on some of the broad themes articulated in questionnaires and town meetings. Each Park Board Commissioner nominated three community leaders to participate in three workshops.

Phone Survey  A phone survey was undertaken in order to gather statistically valid information. Questions for the phone survey were developed from responses to questionnaires, town meetings, and focus groups. The survey was conducted during December 2006 by an external market research firm. Efforts were made to ensure the survey takers closely reflected citywide demographics as detailed in the 2000 U.S. Census. The survey was administered in other languages as needed to reach foreign-born residents.

* As defined by the 2000 U.S. Census
Activity Plans
Plans that outline the delivery goals, benefits, facilities, operations, and maintenance required to provide each major recreation activity (or group of similar activities) in the park system.

Baby Boomers
People born between (and including) 1946 and 1964.

Community Park
These parks are a minimum of two blocks (6 acres) in size and provide facilities for an entire community.

Land Management Plan
A plan that sets management guidelines for the grounds, trees, and gardens of parks and golf courses, excluding natural areas.

Natural Areas
Sites that have been planted as part of a landscape plan to restore a native landscape or habitat, stabilize shorelines, reduce mowing, or improve water quality.

Natural Resources
The urban forests, natural areas, and water bodies within the Minneapolis park system.

Natural Area Management Plan
A plan that sets out the management guidelines for natural areas.

Neighborhood Park
Parks that are one block or less in size and provide basic facilities within a neighborhood.
Open Space
An undeveloped piece of land that is accessible to the public and is suitable for future development as a park, natural area, or recreation facility.

Recreation
Activities that a person or group chooses to do to make their leisure time more interesting, enjoyable, and personally satisfying. These activities may promote personal growth, healthy lifestyles, developing new skills, and a sense of community. Not confined solely to sports and physical activities, it includes artistic, social, and environmental activities.

Regional Park
These parks are owned, operated, and maintained by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, but they are also designated as part of the Metropolitan Council System of Regional Parks and Trails. These parks are usually large in size, often over 100 acres, and contain most of the natural areas in the Minneapolis park system. These parks serve regional visitors as well as Minneapolis residents. As such, they are eligible for regional funding through the Metropolitan Council. (See Map III, page 28.)

Remnant Native Plant Communities
Plant communities that existed prior to European settlement. While they might be altered by invasive species and urbanization, a semblance of the original native plant community remains.

Sustainability
Meeting current park and recreation needs without sacrificing future needs, by balancing environmental, economic, and equity concerns.
Deep gratitude is extended to all those who contributed to this process. Your work will shape the future of the Minneapolis park system.

The dreams of many are captured in the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board Comprehensive Plan. Thousands of people, including residents, park visitors, and elected officials (city, county, and state), participated in the comprehensive planning process. The time and talent of more than 100 staff was instrumental throughout this process. Completion of this plan is the result of dedicated leadership by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board of Commissioners and its Superintendent.

The sincerity, dedication, team-work, and “can do” nature of those involved in developing this plan is reflective of their deep commitment to improving the lives of those who work, live, and play in Minneapolis. The effect of this type of dedication is reflected in a thank you received during the process from a local resident.

“I've always wanted to thank the park system for helping me bring up my son. We moved next to Longfellow Park when he was four. He played hockey, baseball, football, and soccer. The park staff were his mentors. They helped shape his character.”

While park and recreation needs of a community will change over time, the desire and commitment to positively impact the lives of Minneapolis residents will persist. This focus on meeting the ever-changing needs of the community brought together individuals from across the city.
The Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board does not discriminate on the basis of disability in the admission or access to, or treatment or employment in, its services, programs or activities. Upon request, accommodations will be provided to allow individuals with disabilities to participate in all Park Board services, programs and activities. Upon request, this information can be available in Braille, large print, audio tape and/or computer disk.
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SOUTH SERVICE AREA MASTER PLAN

MINNEAPOLIS PARK & RECREATION BOARD

This is an abbreviated version of the full master plan. It shows only some introductory material and the plans for a single park. To view the entire document, visit the project webpage. Go to minneapolisparks.org/currentprojects and click on South Service Area Master Plan

Minneapolis, Minnesota
Approved September 28th, 2016
INTRODUCTION & PURPOSE

NEIGHBORHOOD PARKS

Neighborhood parks are where people come together. They are the literal and figurative centers of communities—the places where people learn a new sport, gather for a festival, bring out the extended family for a weekend picnic, soak up the fleeting winter sun, stroll under the trees, throw or hit or kick or shoot a ball, and squeal with delight at new experiences like zooming down a slide or swooshing through the air on a swing. Neighborhood parks are fun, active, and necessary for mental, physical, and environmental health.

Minneapolis is home to a park system that puts 95% of people within 1/2 mile of a park. The neighborhood parks are a critical piece of the puzzle, something early superintendent Theodore Wirth knew when he started securing land for them and designing them in the 1910s and 1920s. The earliest visions for neighborhood parks were as squares of green within the rapidly developing city. Following the lessons from the city parks movement that gave rise to landmarks like Boston's Emerald Necklace and New York’s Central Park, Minneapolis’ parks were to be the city’s green lungs—places of health and respite, available to all people but meant especially for those who could not otherwise access green space for recreation and relaxation.

Beginning in the late 1960s, the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board (MPRB) built recreation centers across the city, and redesigned the neighborhood parks around them. Playgrounds, wading pools, and ball diamonds provided active recreation opportunities. Parks played baseball and football against each other, sporting their own colors and mascots and vying for city titles.

A SHIFTING CITY

Since around 2009, population growth in center cities has remained close to that of outer-ring suburbs—typically within several tenths of a percent. This reverses a decades-long trend of significantly higher growth in the suburbs than in the urban core. In fact, between 2011 and 2013, it was statistically even. Urban growth is being driven by an increase in children born to parents who are older on average than any previous generation (and who are more likely to live in the city), an increase in empty nesters moving back to the city from the suburbs, and an increase in recent immigrants who have come to the city for many reasons but who are all seeking to make a new life for themselves and their own children. Established sports and activities continue to be played, but newer ones ranging from soccer to traditional lacrosse, skating to archery, outdoor fitness to birding and nature photography have become important.

At the same time, certain health issues have reached what can be described as epidemic proportions. Childhood obesity and diabetes have a higher occurrence than ever before. Inactivity is considered a root cause of these and other health issues among children and adults. Mental illness among children and adults is becoming more recognized as a real health concern, and afflictions such as ADHD, autism spectrum disorders, and even allergies are more in the public eye. In all these health considerations, the science is clear: access to physical activity and the outdoors has profound benefits.

And inequity still exists. Institutional biases prevent equitable access to government services for people of color and those who self-identify as other than male. City and neighborhood parks were originally conceived in the late 1800s specifically to provide an escape from dense tenement blocks for lower class working immigrants and recently freed slaves. Frederick Law
Olmsted, the landscape architect of Central Park, had been a traveling journalist critical of the racial atrocities in the antebellum south. At Central Park and other parks he wanted to create spaces where all were equal. He went so far as to use his position as Superintendent of New York Parks to cajole the wealthy into donating substantial sums to improve the health and welfare of southern blacks moving north after the Civil War. H.W.S. Cleveland & Theodore Wirth worked in Minneapolis from the same model.

In Minneapolis, the 1911 Elwell Law determined that parks would be acquired and built through assessments on the surrounding neighborhood residents—with their consent. This practice put undue burden on lower income communities and led to inequities in the distribution of early parks. In the 60s this practice was largely discontinued in favor of city-wide funding of parks, a fact that led to the widely distributed system we have today.

Though the historic legacy of the city parks movement is to ensure equitable access for all people, barriers still exist. Facilities for sports most likely to be played by people of color may be too few or nonexistent.

The same is true for sports most likely to be played by women and girls. And above all, communities of color must have a voice in this new vision. The transformation of the neighborhood parks must be based on the expressed needs of all people, with particular attention to the people of color and the women that were likely excluded from the planning efforts of a half-century ago.

**WHY PLAN NOW?**

Minneapolis today is more diverse in terms of age, race and ethnicity, and recreational need than ever before. Minneapolis has long planned, designed, and redesigned its parks. Wirth produced dozens of park plans in the annual reports of the early part of the century. The construction of the recreation centers meant the redesign and reconstruction of the parks around them. And the 2007 Comprehensive Plan envisioned new models for service delivery in neighborhood parks. But never before has a major portion of the park system been redesigned all at once, comprehensively, with an eye to what can exist in each park and also how those parks work together.

We are a very different city than we were in the 1920s and the 1960s. It is time to rethink the neighborhood parks. It is time to set a vision for remaking them in the image of the community that surrounds them and gives them life.
PARKS INCLUDED

1. Adams Triangle
2. Bossen Field*
3. Brackett Field
4. Cedar Avenue Field*
5. Central Gym Park
6. Corcoran Park
7. Currie Park
8. Diamond Lake
9. East Phillips Park*
10. Hiawatha School Park
11. Keewaydin Park
12. Longfellow Park
13. Matthews Park
14. McRae Park
15. Meridian Garden*
16. Morris Park
17. Murphy Square
18. Normanna Triangle
19. Pearl Park
20. Peavey Field Park
21. Phelps Field Park
22. Phillips Community Center
23. Powderhorn Park*
24. Rollins Triangle*
25. Seven Oaks Oval
26. Shoreview Triangles (3 park properties)
27. Sibley Park
28. Solomon Park
29. Stewart Park
30. Todd Park

These parks are considered as a part of the overall service area master plan but are considered special consideration parks. More on these special considerations parks can be found in chapter 4.
PURPOSE OF THE PLAN

The South Service Area Master Plan (SSAMP) establishes the vision for all the neighborhood parks south of downtown and east of Interstate 35W. Figure 1.1 shows a map of the thirty-two neighborhood park properties that are included in this plan. This South Service Area Master Plan is one of five such master plans that will collectively redesign every neighborhood park.

This is a vision that will span decades. The physical transformation of the parks will happen gradually over time, project by project, like puzzle pieces fitting into place to form the overall design that is set forth in this plan. This vision will guide capital improvements to reconstruct or build new playgrounds, aquatic facilities, athletic fields, hard surface courts, and some amenities new to the neighborhood parks, like climbing walls and adult fitness areas. It will allow MPRB to leverage additional financial resources by inspiring and then directing outside philanthropy and grant funding. This vision will—like the parks themselves—bring the community together to imagine and then build the future of Minneapolis’s neighborhood parks.

On April 29, 2016, an historic agreement was reached between MPRB and the City of Minneapolis to fund neighborhood parks of Minneapolis at significantly increased levels until 2037. This agreement demonstrates the importance the Minneapolis community places on its neighborhood parks, and addresses a long-simmering need to accelerate maintenance, rehabilitation, and reconstruction of aging park assets. Instead of using this additional funding to merely put back what currently exists, the SSAMP and the other service area master plans are asking the community what it wants and then providing guidance for spending. That is the most important reason for this planning effort: to ensure MPRB uses its increased funding on things that are important to the people.

A community-driven park system is a well-used park system. A well-used park system can combat physical, mental, and societal ills—by bringing people together for active recreation, relaxation, companionship, or solitude. This is the next legacy moment for Minneapolis parks.
INTRODUCTION
The South Service Area Master Plan is guided by a series of Lenses and Actions.

LENSES
are the general basis for each decision contained within the SSAMP. They are the windows through which decision-making is viewed and the measures by which decisions are evaluated.

ACTIONS
are the specific items contained in the SSAMP. Actions are means of community engagement, decisions on park design, the mix of outdoor facilities, and any assurances regarding process and transparency going forward.

Actions are what the plan proposes. Lenses are why. Lenses are the intangible reasons behind the decisions in the plan (and, in fact the reasons for the plan). Actions are how the plan accomplishes change on the ground.
EXAMPLE

ACTION: Reduce the number of multi-use diamonds, in order to increase acreage of multi-use field areas

- COMMUNITY FOCUS LENS: This reduction reflects overall community desire for more fields, while still maintaining a variety of sports opportunities in most parks. The communities around some parks have specifically requested fields instead of diamonds, a request that is reflected in those parks.

- RACIAL EQUITY LENS: People of color are more likely to, and have expressed more desire to, participate in field sports (specifically soccer and football) than diamond sports. This transformation provides more space for these desired activities.

- GENDER EQUITY LENS: This transformation increases the amount of park space dedicated to soccer and other field sports in which women and girls are more likely to participate.

- LIFELONG ACTIVITY LENS: This change increases the flexibility of park space overall, allowing larger fields for adult and teen use, general open space for other all-ages programming, and larger areas for team sports increasing in popularity among non-youth, such as ultimate, rugby, flag football, and others.

- DESIGN LENS: This change allows greater flexibility in park design as a whole, and also removes safety concerns associated with overlapping outfields.
LENSES

The project’s Community Advisory Committee made its recommendations on the basis that the six identified lenses were used in good faith by MPRB staff and consultants to design each of the 32 parks in the South Service Area and develop the service area’s overall facility mix. MPRB staff will continue to use these six lenses in the implementation of this plan.

THE COMMUNITY FOCUS LENS
Consider local community need and desire, which is determined primarily by engaging with local residents and park users. Focus on local need, not area-wide equality. Reflect that need and desire in design, planning, and process decisions.

THE RACIAL EQUITY LENS
Ensure that people of color are not disproportionately and negatively affected by decision-making. Identify areas where existing conditions create a bias against people of color and work to rectify those biases to the benefit of all people. Include people of color, including recent immigrants, in the planning and design process. Ensure that parks are welcoming to people of all races and cultures. Continue to be transparent and make available to the public any and all efforts to involve the community through direct engagement, surveys, and email. Consider formally using Racial Equity Tools where feasible.

THE LIFELONG ACTIVITY LENS
Consider use by all ages and stages of life. Recognize that older youth/teens and seniors are currently underserved. Identify other shortfalls by age range and work to rectify these.

THE DESIGN LENS
Parks must be carefully planned, organized, and detailed in order to create a pleasing and comfortable environment where all people want to gather, converse, relax, play, learn, and be active. Decisions should take design quality into account and should ensure parks are physically accessible to all people.

THE ENVIRONMENT LENS
Parks have the potential to do environmental harm, and also have the potential to improve the environment for plants, animals, and people. Decisions should consider impact on the environment and should seek ways to enhance habitat, water management, and overall environmental performance.

THE GENDER EQUITY LENS
Ensure that those who self-identify as other than male are not disproportionately and negatively affected by decision-making. Ensure that those with a sexual orientation other than heterosexual are not disproportionately and negatively affected by decision-making. Identify areas where existing conditions create a bias against these populations and work to rectify those biases to the benefit of all people.
The following actions are those that apply to the SSAMP as a whole. The individual park plans themselves are also ACTIONS—for instance: the addition of a basketball-focused multi-use court at Morris Park, as shown on that park’s plan, is an ACTION.

Actions in specific parks are shown in Chapter 4 and in Appendix A.

The following actions are grouped in categories for ease of understanding and numbered so they can be referenced in future documents and projects.

**PROCESS AND PRODUCT**

1. Ensure transparency in decision-making.
2. Follow through with implementation.
3. Undertake appropriate subsequent community engagement during capital improvement projects, per the MPRB Community Engagement Policy.
4. Ensure cohesion between SSAMP and other planning efforts, such as RecQuest.
5. Leverage lessons learned by MPRB staff and the community from the SSAMP process to improve processes for future community involvement and engagement.
PLANNING AND DESIGN

6. Create an individualized park plan for each neighborhood park property in the service area.

7. Recognize that every facility cannot be in every park.

8. Work with City of Minneapolis to implement safe, accessible connections between neighborhood parks and regional parks. Figure 3.1 depicts desired pedestrian, bicycle or other connections within the SSA.

9. Improve navigational signage to emphasize linkages between parks.

10. Support implementation of the Southside Greenway, as a means of connecting several parks. Figure 3.1 represents the Southside Greenway’s approximate planned route.

Figure 3.1 - Park Connections
11. Wherever parkland is adjacent to a Minneapolis Public School, make efforts to align with that school on the utilization of shared land. Where appropriate, a community volunteer panel could be convened to help engage with MPS.

12. Seek additional parkland or private land available for public use in the Midtown Greenway Corridor west of Hiawatha Avenue and in the Hiawatha Avenue Corridor in the vicinity of Lake Street. Figure 3.2 depicts key search areas identified for additional parkland.

13. Analyze and describe ongoing maintenance costs associated with park plans.

14. Include maintenance and storage facilities, as needed, in neighborhood park plans.

15. Manage and resolve land use, land ownership, lease agreement, and other site control issues, if applicable, prior to implementation of capital improvements.
16. Provide facilities for both programmed (sports, classes) and unprogrammed (walking, play) activity in every park.

17. Provide a walking loop with seating in most parks.

18. Increase diversity of activities available in the service area, with particular attention on skateboarding, pickleball, adult fitness, archery, climbing, bicycle polo, traditional lacrosse, and large-group picnicking.

19. Designate urban agriculture sites within the service area, as an aspect of implementation of the MPRB-adopted Urban Agriculture Plan.

---

**Figure 3.3 - Proposed Facility Changes: Other Facilities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group Shelter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage / Bandshell</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Fitness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking Loop Trail</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn/Court Games</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Park</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disc Golf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoe/Kayak Storage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restroom/Storage Building</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Oven</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.4 - Proposed Facility Changes: Landscape**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Gathering Space</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Agriculture Area</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Figures 3.3 - 3.6 and 3.10 - 3.12 appearing throughout this chapter show the total existing and the total proposed for selected SSA Facilities by category. See overall changes for all categorized facilities in figure on page 51. The total does not include regional park facilities or facilities outside the project scope.
FACILITIES (CONT.)

20. Aquatics:

a. Transition from wading pool dominated system to a mix of wading pools, splash pads, and hybrid facilities, in order to provide facilities for a broader age range of youth.

b. Focus placement of splash pads and hybrid facilities in areas of high older youth/teen use.

c. Limit large-scale swimming opportunities in the service area to the Lake Nokomis beaches and Phillips Pool, due to high cost of implementation and operation of additional large-scale facilities.

DEFINITIONS:

Splash Pad
There are currently no splash pads in the SSA
Key Features:
• No standing water
• Size and shape can vary
• Users tend to be from multiple age groups

Wading Pool
There are 17 Wading pools in the SSA. This type of aquatics is typical for Minneapolis Parks.
Key Features:
• 0’ entry-2’ max depth
• 30’x50’ typical size
• Users tend to be younger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indoor Swimming Pool</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wading Pool</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash Pad</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interactive Water Play</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach Access</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL WATER ACCESS</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.5 - Proposed Facility Changes: Aquatics
DEFINITIONS:

Multi-use Field: open field spaces intended for use by athletics and other formal or informal gatherings/games. These are typical for most Minneapolis parks and many times overlap with multi-use diamonds.

Multi-use Diamond: the infield (dirt surface) with moderate maintenance levels and little built infrastructure. The outfield typically overlaps with multi-use fields.

Premier Field: field spaces intended for use by athletics. They require a higher level of maintenance and can include further build-out of infrastructure including enclosed fences, bleachers and benches. The surface type is not specified, however it is most likely to be artificial turf. Premier natural turf fields require periodic closure for resting.

Premier Diamond: an enclosed space intended for the use of baseball of softball. They require a higher level of maintenance and can include further build-out of infrastructure including bleachers, benches, dugouts, and scoreboards. The surface type is not specified, however it is of high quality.

Indoor Sports Dome: a bubble-like structure used to enclose a premier field space in winter. There are no sports domes within Minneapolis Parks.

FACILITIES (CONT.)

21. Athletic fields:
   a. Reduce the number of multi-use diamonds, in order to increase acreage of multi-use field areas*.
   b. Improve overall quality of multi-use fields and diamonds, through soil conditioning, irrigation, and other methods.
   c. Increase the number of premier fields (for soccer, football, lacrosse, etc), especially in areas currently underserved by this facility type.
   d. Improve availability of fields through new construction or transformation from one field type to another.
   e. Implement an indoor sports facility in the service area.
   f. Ensure that safe, non-toxic materials are used in the construction of any premier fields or play area surfacing in the parks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premier Diamond</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premier Field</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-use Diamond</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Dome</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.6 - Proposed Facility Changes: Athletics

NOTE: Multi-use fields were not quantified into the matrix because of the complexity in definition and varying size.
TYPICAL CURRENT ARRANGEMENT:
4 multi-use diamonds + multi-use field
- multi-use diamonds cannot be used concurrently with older age groups due to overlapping outfields.
- due to all the infields, limited field space is provided for other sports

COMMON PROPOSED ARRANGEMENT:
2 multi-use diamonds, + larger multi-use field
- creates more space for multi-use fields
- allows for more flexibility in field striping to meet age group demand
- still provides diamonds for youth leagues

* The Trend Analysis, Utilization Analysis and Community Engagement support the change from premier and multi-use diamonds to premier and multi-use fields. These documents can all be found within Appendices C, D and E.
Courts:

FACILITIES (CONT.)

22. Courts:
   a. Continue commitment to basketball, especially full-court, throughout the service area.
   b. Decommission single and double banks of tennis courts, in favor of other amenities.
   c. Implement multi-use courts with striping for tennis, pickleball, and volleyball where appropriate (see figure 3.9)
DEFINITIONS:

Traditional Playground
Typical for Minneapolis Parks
Key Features:
- Manufactured and built to meet commercial standards
- Separate designs for two age groups (2-5 and 5-12)
- Recent designs focus on sensory stimulation for ages 2-5 and physical challenges for ages 5-12.

Adventure Play
None in the SSA
Key Features:
- Areas that offer challenges such as vertical climbing/bouldering walls, obstacle courses or zip lines
- Usually targeted for older children and teens

Nature Play
None in the SSA
Key Features:
- Provides a creative and sensory rich experience in a setting with natural materials.
- Designs are intended to change throughout the season and over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Play Structure</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Play</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adventure/Climbing Play</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PLAY AREAS</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.11 - Proposed Facility Changes: Play

FACILITIES (CONT.)

23. Play:
   a. Increase diversity of play opportunities to include adventure and nature play.
   b. Provide play opportunities at every park, though not necessarily with traditional manufactured play structures.
   c. Seek partnership to provide indoor play.
   d. Ensure that play equipment is chosen with a consideration for user safety and equipment longevity.
Increase winter recreation opportunities in areas currently underserved, namely the northern portion of the service area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACILITIES</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Designated Sledding Hill</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skating Rink</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hockey Rink</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broomball Rink</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year-Round Rink</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warming House</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.12 - Proposed Facility Changes: Winter Recreation
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

25. Protect and enhance existing natural areas.
26. Provide some natural areas (pollinator gardens, rain gardens, forested areas) in most parks.
27. Explore use of sustainable construction methods and materials, even if initial and ongoing cost may be higher, in order to improve environmental performance in the long run.
28. Consider the construction of sustainable parking lots: those that manage their own storm water.
29. Reduce overall acreage of mown turfgrass.
A PARK PLAN DOES DETERMINE

- The types and locations of facilities
- The general areas of mown and naturalized landscapes and the general location of trees
- The extent and general location of pathways

A PARK PLAN DOES NOT DETERMINE

- The specific design of facilities
- The location of minor amenities such as benches, drinking fountains, and signs

EXAMPLE:

A park plan DOES determine:
- That there will be a traditional play area in a certain location in the park (as opposed to a nature play area in a different location)

A park plan DOES NOT determine:
- The exact equipment, layout, color, surfacing

*Future capital projects will have their own community engagement processes at the time of implementation.*
### KEY/LEGEND

#### AQUATICS
- Wading Pool *(small, shallow pool for children)*
- Indoor Swimming Pool
- Beach Access
- Splash Pad *(water play area with sprayers and fountains, with no standing water)*
- Interactive Water Play *(small stream/fountains for kids to play in)*

#### PLAY
- Traditional Play Structure *(swings, slides, climbers)*
- Adventure Play *(place for challenging play for older youth and teens including climbing walls, zip line, obstacle course)*
- Nature play area *(play area for children that encourages creative play with natural materials)*

#### ATHLETICS
- Multi-use Field *(open turf that may be used for soccer or other sports)*
- Multi-use Diamond *(field for baseball or softball but the outfield may be used for soccer or other sports)*
- Premier Field *(High quality field for soccer or other sports, often with permanent stripes)*
- Premier Diamond *(High quality field for baseball or softball, usually with a fence around the outfield)*
- Sports Dome *(may be put up in winter to allow sports to be played year round)*

#### COURTS
- Tennis Court
- Basketball Court
- Volleyball Court
- Multi-sport Court *(court striped to allow many different sports such as pickleball, bike polo)*

---

For more detailed definitions and pictures of plan elements, see Chapter 3.
**WINTER USE**
*Places to play in winter (ice skating, sledding)*

- Designated Sledding Hill
- Skating Rink
- Broomball Rink
- Hockey Rink
- Year-round Rink (Hard-surface rink for hockey all year or bike polo in summer)
- Warming House

**LANDSCAPE**

- Outdoor Gathering Space *(Open area for community gathering/picnics)*
- Designated Urban Agriculture Area
- Mown Turf Grass
- Naturalized Area *(native vegetation areas)*

**OTHER**
*Other types of recreation in outdoor parks*

- Group Shelter
- Stage / Bandshell *(for outdoor plays, music, or classes)*
- Adult Fitness *(area with machines to work out in)*
- Walking Loop Trail *(walking path that loops around the park, includes signs and seating)*
- Lawn/Court Games *(small open lawn or court for games)*
- Dog Park
- Disc Golf
- Archery *(archery course)*
- Skate Park
- Canoe/Kayak Launch
- Community Oven
- Restroom/Storage Building
LOCATION AND HISTORY
Currie Park occupies a trapezoid of land sandwiched between two light rail lines, I-35W, and 15th Avenue. The park is one of the very few green spaces in the highest density neighborhood in Minneapolis outside of downtown.

The idea of a playground in the Cedar-Riverside neighborhood is far older than the playground itself. In 1919 the park board considered purchasing two lots for playgrounds in the area, but the neighborhood was evenly divided for and against acquiring the land and charging the cost to area property owners through assessments. A mention of the park in 1932 included renewal of a lease of land by MPRB, a lease that was renewed again in 1939. Due to the economic realities of the Great Depression, the only improvements in the park system at that time were being made with the help of federal work relief programs (even recreation supervisors were paid by federal programs).

In 1939 Park Board president Francis Gross mentioned the Sixth Ward playground issue specifically. He was concerned that area residents had been denied a park for so long, but also worried that MPRB would not be able to maintain what it built. Nevertheless, in the next year the park board equipped the park with a small skating rink, a softball field, a few swings, a sandbox, and a small tool and office building. All the work was done by federal work relief crews. The success of the new playground led the park board to purchase the 1.2-acre lot in 1941. It was one of the few land purchases by the park board in the 1930s. Other than some additional grading and fencing for the park in 1946, the park board spent no additional money on improving the park.

The construction of freeways beside the park in the 1960s did not require land to be taken from the park, but those freeways effectively severed the park from neighborhoods to the west. The next major development at the little park was the explosion of population in the area with the construction of Cedar Square, a high-rise apartment complex across the street from the park in the 1970s. In 1975, the Minneapolis housing authority sought the park board’s help in expanding and improving what was then referred to as Cedar Square West Neighborhood Park and offered to use redevelopment funds to expand the park. The housing authority gave the park board an additional 1.5 acres of land to expand the park in 1976. Under that agreement a shelter was built in the park and playground and athletic facilities were improved. The park was named for Edward A. Currie in 1977. Currie was the director of the Pillsbury Settlement House that had existed next to the new park land for many years.

In 1992 the park expanded again when Pillsbury United Communities, the social service agency that grew out of the Pillsbury Settlement House, built a community center adjacent to the park. The agency deeded the building and the land it occupied to the park board, but retained operating control of the facility. It named the center for Brian Coyle who had been a city council member from 1983 until his death in 1991.

The playground at the park was updated, along with other improvements, in 2003-2004. In 2011, artificial turf was installed on the soccer fields, making them playable and maintainable for much more of the year.

EXISTING CONDITIONS AND CHARACTER
Today Currie Park includes the land acquired over the years plus a piece of Minnesota department of Transportation right-of-way that is home to a tennis court perched atop a wall beside I-35W. The Brian Coyle Center occupies the eastern portion of the park. The area fronting 15th Avenue is home to play areas, a wading pool, a restroom building, and some open picnic areas. Between the play area and the tennis court is a youth-sized artificial turf soccer field. Paths wind through the green spaces between the other amenities.

Currie Park is both isolated and well connected. A light rail station is just a block away, and the Hiawatha Trail passes along the western boundary of the park. The neighborhood to the south and east of the park has a very high population density, and a high population of recent immigrants, most notably from eastern Africa. The park is therefore heavily used, despite its relatively small size.
Proposed Plan: Currie
CONNECTIONS BETWEEN PARKS
Wayfinding and connections from Currie Park should focus on:

- The existing Hiawatha Trail, which is the easiest non-motorized way to travel downtown and to East Phillips Park.
- The existing City of Minneapolis pedestrian/bicycle route on 15th Avenue and Riverside Avenue, which is a spine through the neighborhood.

THE PROPOSED DESIGN
Currie Park will see significant changes as a result of the SSAMP. As is fitting for a park in a dense urban environment, Currie will maximize recreational space year-round. The major change that drives the redesign of the rest of the park is the construction of side-by-side youth soccer fields that can be enclosed in the winter under an inflatable dome. This will allow for year-round play in an area with few indoor opportunities (and no MPRB recreation center). A tennis court and half-court basketball court would also be able to be enclosed under the dome, and another full-court basketball court in the vicinity will allow for summer play.

All these sports facilities are relocated to the western edge of the park, away from the Brian Coyle Center. Nearer the center are new play areas and a splash pad to replace the existing wading pool. Instead of the existing restroom building, a new building will be constructed that can serve both as a restroom and a vestibule for the sports dome in winter. Just north of this is a picnic area with a group shelter. This area will allow for prime sports viewing in summer and will allow families to gather for picnics with easy access to all park amenities.

New trails connect to the Hiawatha Trail and through the park. An urban agriculture area is designated behind the Brian Coyle Center, which has interest in programming that space. The new Currie Park recognizes the unique place of this small piece of land in an extremely dense neighborhood. The park will become a year-round destination for children and families to play and gather.

KNOWN LAND USE AND COORDINATION ITEMS
The northernmost section of the park is owned by the Minnesota Department of Transportation. MPRB currently operates the tennis court under a lease with the state agency. Any further improvements would have to be approved by MnDOT, or the land would have to be acquired by MPRB. The latter should be considered, to ensure stability of the MPRB investment in the sports dome, because it will be large. Discussions with MnDOT should commence as soon as possible.

The Brian Coyle Center is owned by MPRB but operated by Pillsbury United Communities. PUC has been instrumental in helping engage with the community around the SSAMP, and discussions about the lease of the building are ongoing. MPRB should continue to work closely with PUC on building and park improvements.

UPDATE EXISTING
- Traditional Play Structure
- Basketball Court
- Premier Field
- Tennis Court
- Walking Loop Trail

NEW/ADDED
- Restroom/Storage Building
- Outdoor Gathering Space
- Sports Dome
- Urban Agriculture Area
- Splash Pad
- Group Shelter
### Processes

#### 1: General Input
- **Spring-Fall 2015**
  - Input themes prior to initial concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aquatics</th>
<th>Play</th>
<th>Athletics</th>
<th>Courts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pool could be larger and more exciting</td>
<td>no comments</td>
<td>Lots of people play soccer, both on the field and in the tennis court area</td>
<td>Improve condition of tennis court; court used heavily by elderly Asian population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like splash pad instead of pool</td>
<td>no comments</td>
<td>Support for larger soccer field and indoor sports dome</td>
<td>Tennis court is needed, but only one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash pad instead of wading pool; location changed to allow for other amenities</td>
<td>no comments</td>
<td>Several references to track and field</td>
<td>Improve basketball court, possibly add another</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash pad instead of wading pool; location changed to allow for other amenities</td>
<td>no comments</td>
<td>Addition of one youth-sized premier field for a total of two youth fields (or one larger field); location changed to fit within park. NOTE: a portion of these fields would be on land owned by MnDOT--coordination necessary</td>
<td>Addition of full-court basketball court near the sports dome; and half-court basketball court in area that can be enclosed in the dome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional play area located near splash pad</td>
<td>no comments</td>
<td>Possible addition of winter sports dome over premier fields and multi-use court. Group shelter/restroom building serves as entrance to dome.</td>
<td>Addition of tennis court within dome area, to replace existing tennis court on MnDOT land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No formal winter facilities planned for this park (except possible sports dome).</td>
<td>no comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2: Initial / Preferred Concepts
- **Fall-Winter 2015/2016**
  - Input themes on initial concepts

#### 3: The Preferred Concept
- **Now**
  - Key elements of the concept
**PROCESSES CONT.**

1: General Input  
**Spring-Fall 2015**  
*Input themes prior to initial concepts*

2: Initial / Preferred Concepts  
**Fall-Winter 2015/2016**  
*Input themes on initial concepts*

3: The Preferred Concept  
**Now**  
*Key elements of the concept*

| Landscape | 1. Urban agriculture desired | 2. Like urban agriculture | 3. Addition of urban agriculture area on the northern side of the building.  
Addition of outdoor gathering spaces throughout park  
Naturalized landscape along Hiawatha Bicycle Trail on western edge of park |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Space desired for outdoor prayer</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Other | 1. More restroom space | 2. Need a wide walking track, so youth and elders can both use it | 3. Addition of more pathways to create walking loops through park and improved connection to the Hiawatha Bicycle Trail  
Addition of group shelter / restroom buildings near the play areas and soccer field; can be used as the entrance to a possible winter sports dome |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2. Walking trails are important, with seating, especially useful for elders | 2. Adult fitness area is important  
Put a skate park on MnDOT land near the park  
Restroom and shelter buildings are important |

**OPERATIONS ESTIMATE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>Total Per Unit Operations Cost</th>
<th>( \triangle ) Qty</th>
<th>( \triangle ) Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wading Pool</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>$(15,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splash Pad</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports Dome</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Half Court Basketball</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor Gathering Space</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Shelter</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Difference</strong></td>
<td><strong>$115,000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## COST ESTIMATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>2017 ESTIMATED COST/PROJECT</th>
<th>Implementation Sequence</th>
<th>Prioritization Category</th>
<th>Applicable SSAMP Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>Splash Pad in new location</td>
<td>$ 1,314,180</td>
<td>before/with playgrounds (note: will be extremely close to existing building)</td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
<td>16, 20a, 20b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>Traditional Play Structures (2) in new containers</td>
<td>$ 698,158</td>
<td>after/with splash pad (note: will be extremely close to existing building)</td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
<td>16, 23b, 23d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Athletic field renovation, incl. demolition of 1 artificial turf field and tennis court, new premier fields</td>
<td>$ 1,642,725</td>
<td>full court stand-alone, half-court after/with playgrounds</td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
<td>16, 21c, 21d, 21f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>Basketball Court (1 full, 1 half)</td>
<td>$ 172,486</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
<td>16, 22a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>Tennis Court</td>
<td>$ 106,777</td>
<td>before/with sports dome</td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Urban Agriculture Area</td>
<td>$ -</td>
<td>stand-alone</td>
<td>CONDITIONAL</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Naturalized areas</td>
<td>$ 23,146</td>
<td>stand alone or with other projects, as appropriate</td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
<td>26, 29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Parking Lot Renovation</td>
<td>$ 209,014</td>
<td></td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Gathering Plaza near building</td>
<td>$ 177,414</td>
<td>with splash pad and/or playground</td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Group picnic shelter</td>
<td>$ 90,350</td>
<td>after fields</td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
<td>16, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Sports Dome, incl. new restroom/storage building and demolition of existing building</td>
<td>$ 2,234,106</td>
<td>after/with fields, tennis, half-court basketball</td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
<td>14, 21e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Renovate walking paths</td>
<td>$ 266,857</td>
<td>with other projects, as appropriate</td>
<td>PLANNED</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 7,002,499</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Urban Agriculture Areas will be implemented in partnership with specific programs or community members.