Addenda #3

Request for Proposals

Planning, Design, and Construction Document & Administration Services for the East Phillips Parks and Open Spaces Plan

Addenda #1

Addenda #2

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Non-mandatory Pre-Submittal Meeting #2

December 5, 2023

List of participants who introduced themselves (may not be representative of all meeting attendees):

- Sam Olbekson – Full Circle Planning
- Craig Vaugh – TC2
- Julia Burke & Xan – TenxTen
- Matthew Tucker & Ryan Herm – Urban Ecosystems
- Scott Norton – 106 Group
- Constance Chen – Locus Architecture
- Annie Lynch
- Rob Stein – EOR
- Ben Waldo – SWA/U of MN
- Sandy Muellners – Mend Collaborative

Pre-Submittal Meeting #2 Questions and Answers

Q #1: Can you elaborate on how firms/teams will be evaluated since 40% of the score is centered around firm (20%) and team (20%)?

A #1: Qualifications for the “firm” would include sharing information about why that specific firm or company is leading the team and what qualifications they have to lead the rest of the team through the park planning process and oversight of the future park improvements. The other 20% for the Team should outline the qualifications that the full team brings to support completion of the project (both park planning and later improvements).

Q #2: Since MPRB is leading engagement, what role should the design team plan to play? Can the community collaborators be part of the team?
**A #2:** As the RFQ mentions, MPRB staff will take the lead on the engagement for the project. This is for a number of reasons: 1. MPRB recognizes that building long-term relationships with communities is important to allow ongoing collaborations throughout different projects. Since consultants are often contracted for a project or project(s) with an end timeframe, it is more sustainable for MPRB to ensure built relationships continue past the duration of the project. 2. MPRB recognizes that community engagement often needs to evolve, change pace, and adapt based on community need – MPRB doesn’t always have the budget to support a consultant to navigate all of those twists and turns, but internally, we are able to provide staff time to accomplish this as needed.

At minimum, MPRB staff anticipates the design consultant to:

- Contribute to ongoing strategic conversations regarding engagement and the park planning process/timeline
- Attend, and potentially help lead, public meetings that will include actual decision-making about park policies and design
- Attend a number of community events and conversations to share information and/or gather input about the park planning process
- Prepare materials/visuals that are easily digestible to a wide swath of the public and considers how to communicate effectively to different ages, cultures, ethnicities, languages, etc.
- Support some tabulation, written overviews, and/or visuals that depict feedback from the input received by community

**Q #3:** How will the selection team respond to Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) objectively with project teams, and how should respondents describe DEI in their responses?

**A #3:** Consideration of DEI will be incorporated throughout the different categories for submittal review, not just in one specific grading category.

**Q #4:** Can you elaborate more on the expectations around community engagement expectations and timeline? A project like this may require additional or alternate/unique engagements.

**A #4:** As noted in A #2, MPRB staff is aware that the planning process and engagement may need evolve or shift based on new information. This is also true since this park planning process is a bit of a new model because we are not just planning two parks (instead of one), but open spaces and connections within adjacent public and private properties are also included.

We anticipate that MPRB will take the lead on engagement, which allows greater flexibility to put staff time into pivoting and adapting to the community as needed. MPRB outlined, basically, a skeleton outline of the park planning process that we currently anticipate based on initial conversations internally and with community stakeholders to share a baseline of what we anticipate. Teams are invited to be creative and share ideas about what they believe may be needed based on their experience working previously with the East Phillips community and/or similar communities or projects as a complement the MPRB timeline that has been shared.
Q #5: What was the estimated costs of improvements for Cedar Avenue Field Park? Does the funding align with the proposed costs proposed in the 2017?

A #5: The estimated cost of improvements for Cedar Avenue Field Park from the 2017 plan are outlined in the South Service Area Master Plan on page 84-5. The total cost for all improvements came to $2,385,481. The current CIP funds available do not necessarily align with the 2017 improvement costs or what we anticipate as final costs for this park planning process, it is merely what is available to spend on improvements at this point in time. MPRB plans are anticipated to be 20-30 year plans, so the funding available for improvements is seen as Phase 1 of improvements for these parks.

Staff hopes that we may be able to determine general priorities during park planning engagement to help determine which improvements to move forward first.

Q #6: Are there any restriction/requirements around project funding?

A #6: No, this is local funding. Currently, we don’t have any federal funding or requirements for this work.

Q #7: Are teams required to stick to the 2017 plan for Cedar Ave Field?

A #7: There is flexibility to amend or change the 2017 Plan depending on what we hear from the public during this current park planning process. MPRB staff are being transparent with the public about the 2017 plan and are showing the 2017 plan when asking the public for feedback about Cedar Avenue Field Park. We believe it’s important to honor the previous engagement that was completed in 2017 that helped determine the improvements that are currently shown, but if there is feedback that warrants changes to the plan, we can propose them during this process.

Q #8: Please characterize any comments received to date for the 2017 plan or from the community about this project.

A #8: Staff have completed initial engagement within the community since September 2023 but have not completed any sort of formal tabulation for the engagement to date. Qualitatively, some themes that come to mind include: strong support for the splash pad (or a water feature in general) especially among young people, strong support for changing the half court to a full court, and support for the linear skatepark.

One piece of feedback we have heard that is not currently represented in the 2017 plan is a need for additional indoor programming space – specifically for older Native youth (16-25). We’ve heard that East Phillips Rec Center is currently not an option for them for a number of reasons.
So, during this planning process, in reviewing how to meet the need of additional indoor programming space, we could potentially look at making changes to the rec center, we could consider adding indoor space at Cedar Avenue Field, or, through our partnership with Little Earth, we could potentially look at adding indoor programming space on their property, as well. This is one example of why we believe it is a benefit to increase our project area to include adjacent private and public parcels, increasing our ability to meet the needs of residents in addition to what the park spaces can provide.

Q #9: Can you provide detailed community engagement to date, partners, and any documentation (2017 master plan and current).

A #9: A high level overview of the 2017 Cedar Avenue Field Park planning process is outlined, beginning on page 83 of the South Service Area Master Plan. Staff have looked in the archives and have also included the presentation from 2017 that presented the design of the plan to amend into the SSAMP to the Board of Commissioners. Staff was not able to track down the raw data from the 2017 Cedar Avenue Field Park process within the timeframe available.

Since the East Phillips Open Spaces Planning project officially launched in September 2023, staff have attended/joined 12 events to gather feedback from the community, which have included large community events like the Clean Sweep or back-to-school events, MPRB-led pop-up engagement in the parks, and/or smaller conversations with community partners. Staff have also attended a number of organizational board meetings and networking events to share information about the upcoming park process and make connections with community partners. Staff have included an overview of the themes that have been heard to date from the engagement in the addenda. A few things to note about the write-up:

- Initial engagement has included high-level questions like “What is your vision for the park? Do you have any concerns about the park?”
- To date, more engagement has been completed about Cedar Avenue Field Park than for East Phillips Park
- Not all park users have been engaged through our engagement yet, especially noting teams or community members who use the fields and courts at East Phillips Park
- MPRB is three months in to a 12-month initial engagement process, so there is a lot more engagement that will be completed to reach a broader community audience

Additional Questions Submitted

Q #10: For the "experience of team" and "key personnel" sections -- are these limits (5 and 4, respectively) per firm, or for the team as a whole?

A #10: Both sections are for the team as a whole.

Q #11: What does the RFQ mean when it says that the objective is to have a “board adoptable plan”?

A #11: This is a term that is regularly used in MPRB staff vernacular. Staff on this project interprets this language to mean that when staff bring the final plan to the Board of Commissioners for approval, they should feel confident that the designs and policies that are included in the final plan have been thoroughly vetted with the public in a public setting and that the decisions do, in fact, thoughtfully respond to the vision, needs, and challenges that were discussed with the public together during the process.
Q #12: Can you better explain the role that the Indigenous Parks Liaison, who was introduced at the Pre-Submittal meeting, will play in this park planning process? This role was not mentioned in the original RFQ.

A #12: Carrie Day Aspinwall was recently hired as the MPRB Indigenous Parks Liaison to help lead organizational Reconciliation work with the Native community. Her role was introduced during the Pre-Submittal Meeting #1 in November and she also attended and participated in the Pre-Submittal Meeting #2 in December. At a high level, we anticipate that her role on the project will include:

- relationship-building within the Native and East Phillips communities
- playing an advisory role on process, procedures, and community engagement for the project
- connecting any MPRB organizational reconciliation work that may overlap with the East Phillips planning process
SOUTH SERVICE AREA MASTER PLAN

MINNEAPOLIS PARK & RECREATION BOARD

Public Hearing and Consideration of Amendment
July 12, 2017
Presentation Overview

• Background of SSAMP/Cedar Avenue Field
• Community Engagement
• Cedar Avenue Field Plan
• Public Hearing
The South Service Area Master Plan

*Introduction and Planning Framework*

A Service Area Master Plan is a project to create new park plans for all outdoor facilities in neighborhood parks in a certain part of town.

The South Service Area is south of downtown and east of I-35W.

There are 32 neighborhood park properties in the South Service Area.

The SSAMP will guide capital investment, operations, and maintenance for the next 20-30 years. It will guide how the funds from the 20-year Neighborhood Park Plan will be spent.
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. Soloman 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 information on these special considerations parks can be found in chapter 4.
The South Service Area Master Plan

Approval

On May 5, 2016, the 19-member CAC recommended the South Service Area Master Plan be brought forward to the Board of Commissioners for adoption.

On September 28, 2016, the Board of Commissioners formally approved the plan.

The SSAMP document included a “place-holder” for Cedar Avenue Field... and instructions for amending the SSAMP once a plan for Cedar Avenue could be completed.
Cedar Avenue Field

Community Engagement

- August 2, 2016: Little Earth National Night Out event
- November 10, 2016: East Phillips (EPIC) community meeting
- MUID public safety and leadership teams
- November 14, 2016: open house at Little Earth (60 attendees)
- Three-week pop-up open house at Little Earth and East Phillips Center

- February 8: community open house to discuss initial concept designs (20 attendees)

- April 22: release of preferred concept for comment, beginning of pop-up open house at Little Earth and East Phillips
- On-line and in-person survey (60+ responses) (significant response from youth and Native Americans)
Cedar Avenue Field

Existing Conditions
Cedar Avenue Field

Park Plan

UPDATE EXISTING
- Traditional Play Structure
- Basketball Court
- Multi-use Diamond

NEW/ADDED
- Outdoor Gathering Space
- Interactive Water Play
- Group Shelter
- Linear Skate Park
- Volleyball Court
Cedar Avenue Field

Idea Images

Outdoor Gathering Space
Aire abierto para la reunión de la comunidad / a péritos
Meaaha diiwaad ee taqu kulmu

Interactive Water Play
Juegos de agua interactivos
Ciyaaraha leeka dheegay ee biyaha dhihxoodka

Traditional Play Structure
Zona de juegos
Gudhaaha ciyaaraha

Basketball Court
Cancha de baloncesto
Garoonka kubadda kaleegyaa

Volleyball Court
Arena de Voleibol
Kubadda laliska

Linear Skate Park
Parque de skate
Beerta leenaa
### Cedar Avenue Field

**Estimate and Allocations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Type</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>2017 ESTIMATED COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatics</td>
<td>Water Plaza including pavement and programmable jets</td>
<td>$328,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play</td>
<td>Traditional Play Structure in same general location, all resilient surfacing</td>
<td>$872,698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics</td>
<td>Athletic field renovation including turf renovation and backstop</td>
<td>$386,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>Basketball Court: full court</td>
<td>$106,777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts</td>
<td>Volleyball Court: paved</td>
<td>$65,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landscape</td>
<td>Naturalized areas within park</td>
<td>$6,571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Outdoor gathering space: plaza with tables and activities</td>
<td>$249,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Skate Trail: linear skate park</td>
<td>$246,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Group picnic shelter</td>
<td>$90,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Renovate walking paths</td>
<td>$82,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Misc. signs, trees, furniture</td>
<td>$15,604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** | $2,385,481

- **2016 park equity rank #25**
- **$600,000 in NPP20 funds in 2022**
- **Commitment of rehabilitation funds in short term:**
  - Rubber playground surfacing
  - Repair and relocation of picnic area
Cedar Avenue Field

Next Steps

• July 12: Public Hearing and Planning Committee consideration

• July 19: Consideration by full Board

• July/August: modification of SSAMP document

• Implementation over time
Public Hearing
Themes from initial MPRB engagement completed for East Phillips Opens Spaces Plan
September – November 2023

Park Engagement – General (includes both parks)

Interest in having (from image board):

- Water feature (Wading pool, splash pad, water slide, etc.)
- Climbing Wall
- Performance Stage of Amphitheatre
- Urban Agriculture or Medicine/Herb Garden
- More swings
  - For younger and older youth
- Keep/improve the basketball courts
- More trees
- Outdoor fitness area

Concerns

- Both parks aren’t welcoming to all residents
- Safety concerns, both traffic and crime-related
  - Drug-use/needles in park – need to keep youth safe
  - Intersections are dangerous, cars don’t follow lights or yield to kids
- Current maintenance needed at both parks
  - Pool unsanitary
  - Playground breaks
- Little Earth and East Phillips (neighborhood) feels separate

Would like to see:

- More park space
- Winter amenities (cross country skiing, ice skating, snow shoeing, fire pits)
- Improved maintenance and safety

Cedar Avenue Field Park

What works here?

- Like the playground
- Basketball court – needs to be bigger, make rim adjustable
  - The field works well for events and Powwows

What doesn’t work here?

- Need for indoor space for youth sports
- Unsafe intersections on Cedar Avenue side of street
- Not enough seating for elders near playground or near field space for events
- No bathrooms

What do you want to see?

- Water feature (splash pad, pool, slide, etc.)
- Indigenizing the park
  - Space for cultural activities and ceremonial practices
  - Firepit for ceremonial purposes
  - Tobacco use for ceremonial purposes
- Support for design elements in 2017 plan, specially:
  - Full basketball court
  - Splash pad
  - Grills/covered picnic area
  - Like that it gives park users more options
- More swings (for all ages)
- More lighting, cameras, or other safety features

East Phillips Park

What works here?

- Basketball courts
- Enjoy the playground
- Soccer field
- Events in the rec center

What doesn’t work here?

- Pool is unsanitary
- Needles in some areas of the park, parents can’t let their kids play in some areas
- No room for youth from Little Earth to play basketball

What do you want to see?

- Better bathrooms
- Sports improvements
  - Adjustable basketball rims
  - Indoor soccer dome
  - Nets behind goals
  - Light soccer field for evening games
  - Artificial turf field
  - Multi-sport court
- Improved swimming pool/slash pad
- Address safety
  - Lighting