



Date of Board P+C: Sept 7, 2022

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

Staff Lead: Tyler Pederson

Department or Division: Planning Division

Project Name: Riverside Park and Bohemian Flats Improvements

Engagement Level: Consult

This plan serves as a guide for the community engagement process for Riverside Park Playground and Wading Pool Improvements and a Savanna Restoration. 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 consult category of community engagement for which MPRB is required to obtain stakeholder feedback on project, initiative, or program analysis, alternatives, or decisions. This CE Plan was used with a GARE Racial Equity Tool Kit framework.

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

MPRB staff and the local neighborhood organizations, Seward Neighborhood Association and Riverside Neighborhood Association were provided the opportunity to comment on the Draft CE Plan prior to and concurrent with the plan's submittal to the Board of Commissioners, and prior to initiation of community engagement activities.

1. Project Description

1a. Project Overview:

Riverside Park is one of the oldest parks in Minneapolis and was designed by HWS Cleveland and built in 1885. It now sits within the Mississippi Gorge Regional Park, another of Cleveland's legacy achievements, and acts as a kind of neighborhood park to the Cedar-Riverside Neighborhood and a portion of the Seward Neighborhood. The neighborhood focused portion of the park is approximately 25 acres in size and abuts West River Parkway and technically includes Annie Young Meadow (improvements completed in 2019).

Much of the park is currently open lawn with about 50% tree canopy cover. There is a play area (2001), wading pool (1932), a plumbed restroom facility (1933), an irrigated multi-use field (mainly for soccer), and a small basketball court plus a full-size basketball court. A single main asphalt trail runs through the park from the wading pool to the parks northwest corner.

The Riverside Park improvements will be an implementation of the Mississippi Gorge Regional Park Master Plan. This project will design and construct a playground, wading pool, a restored historic staircase to Annie Young Meadow, a savanna restoration and a second full basketball court.

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

Goal 2: Steward a continuum of nature and recreation

Goal 6: Strengthen ecological connections

1c. Project Timeline:

August-November 2022, Community Engagement and Concept Design

November 2022, Concept Approval by Board of Commissioners

December-February 2022/23, Construction Documentation

March 2023, Project Bidding for Construction

May 2023, Construction Start

December 2023, Construction Concludes

1d. Project Funding:

<u>Capital Sources</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
2022 NPP20 (Riverside Park)	\$1,124,000.00	
NPP20 Play Area Rehab (Riverside Park)	\$338,000.00	
2020/2021 Parks and Trails, Regional	1,061,843.00	Not all funds from this

(Mississippi Gorge Regional Park)		category are available for this project
-----------------------------------	--	---

<u>Supplemental Sources</u>	<u>Amount</u>	<u>Expiration</u>
River Access Grant (Mississippi Gorge Regional Park)	\$ 20,000.00	
2022 Grant for Bohemian Flats Savanna (Bohemian Flats Park)	\$286,000.00	
Total:	\$2,829,843.00	

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.)*

For this project the Cedar Riverside and Seward neighborhoods are the boundaries for community engagement.

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

Data comes from MN Compass Neighborhood Profiles (2016-2020)

Total Population

Cedar Riverside Neighborhood	9,000
Seward	7,516
City of Minneapolis	429,954

Data from 2020 Decennial Census

Age by Percentage of the Population

Age	Cedar Riverside	Seward	City of Minneapolis
Under 5 years	10.1%	6.9%	6.4%
5-9 years	10.9%	4.3%	5.7%
10-14 years	4.4%	3.1%	5.0%
15-17 years	NO DATA	1.6%	2.7%
18-24 years	33.8%	7.6%	13.5%
25-34 years	14.6%	29.7%	22.3%
35-44 years	7.5%	10.3%	14.0%
45-54 years	5.2%	9.0%	10.5%
55-64 years	3.9%	10.8%	10.1%
65-74 years	4.4%	10.7%	6.3%
75-84 years	2.9%	3.5%	2.4%
85 years and older	NO DATA	NO DATA	1.2%

Race by Percentage of the Population

Race & Ethnicity	Cedar Riverside	Seward	City of Minneapolis
White	28.1%	55.5%	59.7%
Black or African American alone	54.6%	33.8%	18.6%
American Indian and Alaskan Native alone	NO DATA	NO DATA	1.1%
Asian or Pacific Islander alone	10.9%	3.1%	5.9%
Prefer to answer another way	NO DATA	NO DATA	NO DATA
Two or more races alone	3.7%	3.9%	4.5%
Hispanic or Latinx	1.8%	3.2%	9.6%

Median Household Income

Cedar Riverside Neighborhood	\$27,789
Seward Neighborhood	NO DATA
City of Minneapolis	\$66,068

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

	English Only	Language other than English	Speaks English less than “very well”
Cedar Riverside Neighborhood	45.2%	54.8%	27.3%
Seward Neighborhood	65.7%	34.3%	16.5%
City of Minneapolis	78.4%	21.6%	8.5%

Percentage of the Population with a Disability

Cedar Riverside Neighborhood	17.4%
Seward Neighborhood	13.2%
City of Minneapolis	10.9%

Renter v. Home Ownership

	Owner-occupied housing	Renter-occupied housing
Cedar Riverside Neighborhood	11.2%	83.9%
Seward Neighborhood	32.4%	62.5%
City of Minneapolis	44.6%	49.5%

Analysis:

The Cedar Riverside and Seward neighborhoods are generally more diverse in race and languages spoken than the City of Minneapolis. In particular, the Cedar Riverside neighborhood has a larger percentage Black and Asian population than the city. It should be noted that the median household income is less than half that of the City’s in Cedar Riverside. Additionally, both neighborhoods have a higher percentage of renters, fewer homeowners, as well as a higher likelihood of people with a disability than the city.

2c. List any key findings or excerpts from relevant plans or policies that are informing this project, program or initiative, especially if community was engaged in the policy or plan: *The purpose of community research is to collect data that will best inform specific project decisions or strategic direction and support the policy goals of effective community engagement. Research completed in advance of and during project development may include review of previously completed directives or mandates, activity plans, master plans, community studies, industry trends and historical and demographic data. MPRB staff is responsible for determining the research data necessary to support and document decision-making for a project and building off prior community engaged planning, policy, and design.*

This project’s main guide is the Mississippi Gorge Regional Park Master Plan, completed in the summer of 2019. The community was engaged through a Community Advisory Committee, Project Advisory Committee, online surveys, and public open houses in 2018 and 2019. The Master Plan identified a need for several recreation amenity improvements, and more importantly a stronger, more transparent,

connection between the upper portion of Riverside Park to the lower portion of the park and the Mississippi River.

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

The median household income for the Seward neighborhood is suppressed from our main data source, this additional information could help us better understand the difference between our two guiding neighborhoods. Additionally, we are assuming that the primary users of the park are the two nearby neighborhoods, but there is no way to verify this. Given its easy access from the Grand Rounds National Scenic Byway and proximity to the University of Minnesota (a neighboring property to the northwest) there are likely many park users who don't come from the Cedar Riverside and Seward neighborhoods.

3. Community Engagement:

3a. Identify Project Stakeholders

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

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

Project Stakeholder <i>(students, ethnic communities, neighborhood groups, community leaders)</i>	Outreach: How will you reach out to the stakeholder? <i>(i.e. go to parks, neighborhood listserv, engage with cultural media)</i>	Engagement: How will they participate? <i>(i. e. online survey, focus group, community open house, intercept survey)</i>	Reflecting Back: How will stakeholder groups be reflected back to about the project progress or outcomes? <i>(Posted on project website, ribbon cutting, e-blast, site visit, celebration)</i>
Seward Neighborhood Association	Attend neighborhood association meeting(s), project website, email	Provide feedback via open house, focus group (if a need arises), and online surveys.	E-blast, MPRB project website, and grand opening celebration.

Riverside Neighborhood Association			
West Bank Parks Committee (verify name)			
Nearby Residents and General Park Users	Attend virtual meeting(s) and/or in person pop-up events, project website, email	Provide feedback via open house, focus group (if a need arises), intercept survey, and/or online survey.	E-blast, MPRB project website, and grand opening celebration.

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

3a. Advisory Committees:

Project Advisory Committee: This roster is a list of MPRB departments and divisions that are on the PAC
Planning Division
Asset Management Department
Community Connections and Violence Prevention Department
Youth and Recreation Centers Department
Communications Department
Park Police Department
Forestry Department
Environmental Management Department
MPRB Trades

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

NO

4. Analysis:

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

- Any additional ideas for how or who to engage with about this project?
- We likely will not be able to afford everything we wish to build. How might we best prioritize the projects we've noted in the project description and in the bullets below to fit our budget?
- What types of play structures and pool features are the most desired?

- How can the new playground and pool enhance users' experience in the park?
- Given the newly resurfaced basketball court, is there a desire to expand basketball according to the Master Plan's direction?
- How can we best connect Upper Riverside Park to the lower area at Annie Young Meadow and enhance accessibility within the park?

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

We'll be seeking voices that are often lost amongst louder voices. We'll also be relying on the priorities set within the Master Plan and not reversing course or modifying those priorities which were developed with great effort.

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

30% Design Review

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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