

Virtual Project Update/Open House

## **Cedar-Riverside Recreation Center Predesign**

June 16, 2020 from 4:00 – 5:30pm

Held Virtually through Zoom

**Members of the Public:** Approximately 20 members of the general public were present

**Staff, consultants, and speakers present:** Susan Olmsted (Perkins and Will), Daniel Elias, Siciid Ali, Abdirahman Mukhtar, Emma Pachuta, and Madeline Hudek (MPRB);

### **1. Welcome**

Daniel Elias welcomed everyone to the Virtual Project Update/Open House, thanked MPRB's project partners (Pillsbury United Communities (PUC), Augsburg University, YMCA and M Health Fairview) and provided an agenda for the session.

[A copy of the Presentation is posted on the project page]

### **2. Questions and Answers following the Presentation**

**Q: Is there a specific age group that would be allowed to use the Teaching Pool in Option 1B?**

*A: No, if a Teaching Pool were built as part of the new recreation center, use would not be limited to a specific age group. MPRB Recreation staff would offer programs intended to match the needs of the community.*

**Q: For Option 2, would the new facility fit on Lot A/A1 or Lot F?**

*A: It is unlikely at this time that a 40,000+ SF facility as depicted in Option 2 would fit into the development of Lot A/A1. It is more likely that a facility this size would fit into a Lot F redevelopment, within Currie Park, or at another undetermined location on the west side of Cedar-Riverside.*

**Q: Have the roles/plans of the original project partners evolved?**

*A: As it relates to the interest of the partners in pursuing the project, no, partner plans have not changed. However, as we continue to refine the operational model for the facility, each partner's involvement continues to shift as we better understand the planned programming for the spaces.*



**Q: Can you describe the Bonding process?**

*A: As of this meeting, the 2020 Bonding Bill is up in the air and State Legislators are still negotiating. Much of what happens in the 2021 off-year bonding cycle or 2022 bonding year will depend on the outcome of the 2020 Bonding Bill. In a normal bonding cycle, bonding for the 2021 bonding cycle would require advocacy from a legislator. When the 2022 bonding cycle begins, local agencies send a formal bond request in the fall before the bonding year (October of 2021 in this case). In all scenarios, MPRB is prepared to submit a bond request for this project to best position it for funding from the State.*

**Q: Can you comment on how you arrived at the daily usage estimates?**

*A: Data was gathered from the existing Brian Coyle Community Center (how many are served today and projected to be served in the future) as well as national and regional use trends in recreation facilities of similar size and type.*

**Q: How has the management of Riverside Plaza participated in the project?**

*A: MPRB facilitated two information sessions in the lobby of Riverside Plaza (Chase Building) with approval of management. The intent at the time was to raise awareness of the project and recruit Community Advisory Committee applicants. Riverside Plaza management has not been directly involved in reviewing the project plans. MPRB also engaged the public at National Night Out, at Currie Park and at community events.*

**Q: Would it be helpful to estimate the positive social impact this project would have on the neighborhood, including improved safety, inclusion and equity and a broader sense of community?**

*A: Yes, these descriptions will be a part of this predesign report. However, we don't yet know how to quantify this. What is more easily accomplished is to quantify factors numerically like participants served and number of guests. While factors such as safety will be part of the report, it is not a tool we will use to compare options to each other.*

**Q: Is it feasible that Option 2 and the Africa Village project on Lot A are both completed?**

*A: Given the information included in the Sherman Associates Lot A Proposal, it is unlikely that a Recreation Center of 40,000+ SF will fit into the Lot A development.*

**Q: Is there a projected timeline by which MPRB must secure/identify one of the site options?**

*A: While it would be hugely beneficial to both project planning and the bonding application, site selection should not limit MPRB's ability to request bond funds.*



**Q: Does MPRB have to identify and own a site before going for state funding?**

*A: Typically, it's preferred to demonstrate to the State that we plan to build the facility on a specific site. Since we have advocates at the State legislature interested in supporting this project, there is a possibility that we would receive funding in advance of the site location. The challenge is that the funding from the State is not reimbursable until the MPRB has an ownership stake in a specific site.*

**Q: What is the likelihood of considering Option 2 if at all, given the Park Board's hesitation? Is this actually an option?**

*A: Discussions continue between MPRB and PUC regarding the lease of the Brian Coyle Community Center. In order to move forward with Option 2, discussions would need to advance, and a new lease would need to be negotiated. MPRB remains committed to advancing all three of the options provided in the presentation.*

**Q: Does Sherman Associates own the Mixed Blood Theater? Could that site be used to make a better use of the space?**

*A: Sherman Associates does not own the Mixed Blood Theater.*

*Question Clarification: Even if Sherman does not own the Mixed Blood Theater, site could be better utilized if it were rebuilt and integrated into a new development.*

**Q: Given the tenant litigation Sherman Associates are dealing with in Riverside Plaza, does that affect the relationship MPRB would have with the developer in coordinating on this project?**

*A: MPRB is unaware of any tenant lawsuits that may be pending. MPRB will review the situation to ensure that any future MPRB partnership is advanced with a partner in good standing in the community.*

**Q: How did you end up deciding to include Lot F in the plans? Why was that chosen?**

*A: Lot F is included in the Predesign analysis as a possible location for the future recreation center due to its proximity to Currie Park and the lot owner's intent to develop the site. Lot F is owned by Sherman Associates.*



**Q: Why does there need to be a new place for the building? Why not just knock down Brian Coyle and rebuild it there?**

*A: Building a new recreation center in the current location of the Brian Coyle Community Center remains an option. There are two significant challenges to this site: the existing lease agreement between MPRB and PUC and the size of the site. MPRB and PUC continue to discuss a renegotiated lease that would allow MPRB to leverage State Bond Funds on the project as the current lease does not allow for this. The lease must be renegotiated to rebuild on the Coyle Center site. Additionally, the size of the area available within Currie Park for a new recreation center is tight and may limit the size of the building. MPRB believes that a new recreation center on an alternate site would allow for the expansion of Currie Park, which would be a major community benefit. Another concern relates to the continuity of services. In order to build within Currie Park, there will be a duration of time when community and recreation services would be interrupted. Building on another site would allow for these services to remain in place for the duration of a recreation center construction project.*

**Q: Why can't the new building have everything in it including a swimming pool? Couldn't you just make it taller, like the Y?**

*A: Each option presented represents the same capital and maintenance costs. The intent of this is to identify a project that could be reasonably accomplished with State and MPRB funding and allow for community dialogue around priorities. An option that includes everything would represent a project that is unlikely to be funded by the State, unlikely to fit on an available site, and beyond the operational capabilities of MPRB to run.*

**Q: Who will run the building?**

*A: The intent is for MPRB to operate most of the new facility.*

**Q: Who owns Lot F right now?**

*A: Currently, Lot F is owned by Sherman Associates.*

**Q: Where is everyone going to park? Where will guests park for the apartments if they can't park there?**

*A: Both the planned development of Lot A and the future development of Lot F will require parking be provided on-site for the buildings to function as required by City of Minneapolis zoning requirements. MPRB, however, operates recreation centers throughout the city and is hopeful that community members within walking and biking distance of the new recreation center are the main user group.*

### **3. Adjourn**