MEETING #1
Design Advisory Committee
October 25, 2011
5:30-7:30pm
Saint Paul Parks and Recreation
Agenda

Welcome & Introductions
Project Overview
Design Advisory Committee/Design Process
Project Schedule/Funding
Project Background
Current Site Conditions & Land Ownership
Pedro Park Boundary Discussion
Moving Forward
Project Overview:

Project Goal: This project will develop a master plan and cost estimate for the phased development of critical parcels for a new downtown park within the block bounded by 10th, Robert, 9th and Minnesota Streets.

Meeting Goal: Review up-to-date project background information and discuss preliminary community ideas.
Design Advisory Committee and Design Process
Design Advisory Committee guidelines:

Who is the Design Advisory Committee?
- A diverse mix of community representatives including property owners, adjacent residents, stakeholders and representatives from business, finance, institution, and real estate.

Charge of the Design Advisory Committee:
- Advise the design team composed of city staff in the concept development and refinement for Pedro Park.

Role of the Design Advisory Committee:
- Define the community and neighborhood needs of the park site
- Define design and development approach as it relates to land ownership
- Review plan concepts and provide input on major design elements and park themes
- Bring suggestions from area residents to the attention of the project team
- Help communicate project progress to community members
- Provide guidance to the Parks and Recreation design staff on the final design recommendations for this project
- Ensure that the full range of local issues are addressed during this design process
Design Advisory Committee guidelines:

Design Advisory Committee process determines the direction of development and refinement of concept designs

How does the Design Advisory Committee process work?

- Staff recommendation of Design Advisory Committee Chairperson: To be determined… any volunteers?

- Role of the chairperson is to be a liaison to Parks staff, facilitate meeting, move process as it moves forward

- Decisions for moving forward will be made by consensus.

- Project information will be available to the public on the city website: www.stpaul.gov/pedropark

- Meetings are open to the public. Comments from public outside design advisory committee can be sent through email, telephone or by comment card.

- Design Advisory Committee meetings end after design development is complete and consensus has been reached for major project elements
Design Advisory Committee Guidelines:

Rules and Expectations for the Design Advisory Committee

- Respect for different perspectives
- Courtesy of one another
- Contribute in a positive way
- Attend every meeting, or let chairperson know you will be absent
- Other?
Project Schedule and Funding
Project Schedule and Funding:

**Preliminary Schedule:**
- Community Involvement and Concept Design
- Land Acquisition and Relocation
- Design Development and Construction Documents
- Demolition and Construction

**Funding:**
- CIB 2009- $100,000
- CIB 2012- (pending) $117,000
- Funding to be determined
- Funding to be determined
- Funding to be determined
**Project Schedule and Funding:**

**Project: Fitzgerald Park**

**Location:** Block bounded by Minnesota, 9th, 10th and Robert Streets

**Description:**
The CapitolRiver District Council anticipates the creation of a new 1 block-square park on the north end of downtown to serve as a hub for community life in the new Fitzgerald Park neighborhood and to serve as an active recreation space for residents and workers in the heart of St. Paul. The Park, as specified in the City-adopted Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan, is to be located on the block bounded by 9th, 10th, Minnesota and Robert Streets.

Currently, the community looks to develop a specific site design for the park. We seek funding in the amount of $180,000 to allow the Parks Department to engage the district council and community at large in drafting a formal park design that is in keeping with the Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan and the concerns of local stakeholders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Description</th>
<th>Financing Source</th>
<th>Priors</th>
<th>2008 Adopted</th>
<th>2009 Proposed</th>
<th>2010 Tentative</th>
<th>2011 Tentative</th>
<th>2012 Tentative</th>
<th>Total (not including priors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design</td>
<td>Capital Imp. Bonds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Justification:**
The Fitzgerald Park neighborhood has grown notably in size through residential construction and conversion, starting from 2,407 residents in 2000 to becoming one of the fastest growing residential areas of the city today. Yet the neighborhood has no city park facilities. The majority of residents do not have a car, making the quality of local amenities particularly important.

We know that places like Mears Park in Lowertown have provided a focus for building the community life that attracts people to urban neighborhoods. Neighbors casually meet while enjoying the park or volunteering to perform upkeep. Additionally, there is much local and national evidence that parks also act as an economic development engine to better support further residential and business growth in the neighborhoods surrounding the park.

Looking across the City core, District 17 has roughly 8,500 residents (and 45,000 workers) within the district. Yet unlike similarly-sized neighborhoods, there are no city facilities designed for adult active recreation uses in district 17. And because downtown residents don’t have private yards, additional park space has become a key community priority.

**Project: Pedro Park**

**Location:** 10th and Robert Streets

**Description:**
This project will develop a master plan and cost estimate for the phased development of critical parcels for a new downtown park within the block bounded by 10th, Robert, 9th and Minnesota Streets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase Description</th>
<th>Financing Source</th>
<th>Priors</th>
<th>2012 Proposed</th>
<th>2013 Tentative</th>
<th>2014 Tentative</th>
<th>2015 Tentative</th>
<th>2016 Tentative</th>
<th>Total (not including priors)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design</td>
<td>Capital Imp. Bonds</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Capital Imp. Bonds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Project Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>187</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Project Schedule:

**October 2011**
- Project Background

**November 29, 2011**
- Brainstorming: Needs/Wants, Goals/Objectives

**January 2012**
- Present 2-3 Concept Plans

**April 2012**
- Preliminary Plan
- General Public Open House

**June 2012**
- Final Plan & Estimate
Saint Paul Parks and Recreation Systems Plan:

System-wide Needs
- Destination Play Areas
- Splashpads
- Off-Leash and Formalized Dog Use Areas
- Sand Volleyball Courts
- High Quality Athletic Fields (Synthetic Turf)
- Walking and Biking Trails
- Access to Nature
- Family, Adult, and Senior Recreation

Downtown Park Needs:
- Inviting trail connection from downtown to Bruce Vento and Swede Hollow Park
- Enhance Pedestrian Connections across I-94 to extensive open space
- Enhance connections to River Parks
- Off-leash Dog Areas
- Children’s Play Areas
- Public Art
- Amenities: Outdoor Exercise Stations and Shaded Seating Areas
Project Background
Project Background:

Project Origin:
-A park is called for at this location in the Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan, adopted by the Saint Paul City Council as part of the Comprehensive Plan in 2006.

-Redevelopment of the area surrounding this park includes The Pointe condominium (290 units) on the west, Rossmor (129 unit) building on the east, and City Walk (228 units) on the south.

-Penfield and Lunds construction are scheduled to begin on the north side of the park in the Spring of 2012.

-The Pedro family donated the property in the northeast corner of the park site, for use as a portion of this park. Demolition of the Pedro building occurred in 2011.
Project Background:
PLANNING: Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan

Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan

CITY OF SAINT PAUL
August 2010
Project Background:

PLANNING: Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan

... the community's vision of a diverse, mixed-use sustainable, human-scaled neighborhood that is pedestrian-friendly, transit-oriented, safe, beautiful and well-maintained. Historic buildings are maintained, and new buildings are designed to be compatible with them. The needs of pedestrians, bikes, cars, transit and those of limited physical mobility are balanced and met. A central green provides residents and visitors with a place to gather. The neighborhood has a strong sense of place and identity.
Project Background:

PLANNING: Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan
Project Background:

PLANNING: Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan

The pedestrian loop connecting downtown's parks comes through the Fitzgerald Park neighborhood on 9th and Exchange streets.
Project Background:

Construction: Central Corridor LRT
Project Background:

PLANNING: Central Corridor LRT: 10th and Cedar Station

Fitzgerald Park Public Realm Development Strategy #5:
“A full-block park should be built on the block bounded by 10th, Robert, 9th, and Minnesota streets. The park should be designed in park to provide for the active recreation needs of the burgeoning residential population in the neighborhood...”
Project Background: Future Construction: Penfield Development
Project Background: Future Construction: Penfield Development
Current Site Conditions and Land Ownership
Current Site Conditions: Land Ownership

- THE BLOCK IS DIVIDED INTO SEVEN PARCELS OWNED BY THREE DIFFERENT ENTITIES IN ADDITION TO THE CITY.

- THE PEDRO FAMILY DONATED THE PARCEL IN THE NORTHERN CORNER OF THE SITE.
Current Site Conditions: Analysis

- CURRENT USE IS PREDOMINANTLY FOR SURFACE PARKING, CHILDCARE CENTER, AND POLICE OPERATIONS

- SIXTEEN FEET OF GRADE CHANGE FROM NORTH TO SOUTH OF BLOCK

- EXISTING FENCES AND SIGNIFICANT GRADE CHANGE CREATES A BARRIER TO THE SITE

- ALLEY R.O.W. INCLUDES OVERHEAD LINES (6 POLES) AND CATCHBASINS

- LIMITED GREENSPACE ONSITE

- PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS TO THE WEST ARE IMPORTANT FOR ACCESS TO THE LIGHT RAIL STATION AT 10TH STREET
Current Site Conditions:

View of North corner - Pedro site
Current Site Conditions: View of existing Police Annex structure
Current Site Conditions:

View of new development along Robert Street
Current Site Conditions:

View of Existing Alley - looking west
Current Site Conditions: View of Southeast corner- Union Gospel Childcare Center
Current Site Conditions:

View of southern corner parking lots
Current Site Conditions:

View of Western corner- and the sunken parking lot approximately 8’ below the sidewalk
Current Site Conditions:

Utility Easements in the existing alley R.O.W.
Current Land Ownership:

Legend
Fitzgerald Park, RC 2010 Parcel Point Data
PIN, Owner
- 312922431540, City Of St Paul
- 312922430033, Beneficial Properties Llc
- 312922430034, Beneficial Properties Llc
- 312922430037, Beneficial Properties Llc
- 312922430030, City Of St Paul Public Safety
- 312922430031, Donerly Inc
- 312922430032, Donerly Inc
- 312922431536, Union Gospel Mission
- 312922430041, Union Gospel Mission (Naomi FC)
Pedro Park Boundary Discussion
Pedro Park Boundary Discussion:
Study Area- The block bordered by Minnesota Street, Robert Street, 10th Street and 9th Street
Description: 9th Street is realigned as suggested by the Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan

Pros:
- A more direct pedestrian way to Cedar
- Becomes a part of the downtown parks loop
- Creates a development parcel at the corner of 9th street and Minnesota

Cons:
- Costly approach that Public Works does not favor
- Requires demolition and relocation of Union Gospel childcare and Naomi Center
- Realigning the street makes the park size smaller

Description: The current configuration of 9th Street is at an angle and terminates in the MPR parking area

Pros:
- The potential park size is maximized
- Does not require costly acquisition or relocation of the Union Gospel childcare and Naomi Center
- Does not incur costs for new infrastructure

Cons:
- Does not carry through the vision from the Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan regarding the street alignment
- Pedestrian connection from the park site to Cedar is less direct
Size and Scale of Pedro Park:

Option A: City Parcels
Option B: Half Block
Option C: L-Shaped
Option D: Full Block
Option A: City Parcels

Details: .85 acres
Estimated Site Prep/Acquisition: $0.5 million*

Considerations for Park Development:
- Demolition of building
- Site improvements
- Utilities

Pros:
- Does not require acquisition of additional parcels
- Park development process shortened

Cons:
- Is not in keeping with the Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan to have a full block park
- Grading and retaining walls will be more costly to make a transition to the western and southern part of the block
- Below grade adjacent property

*Relocation of Police Operations not included
Option B: Half Block

Details: 1.1 acres
Estimated Site Prep/Acquisition: $1 million*

Consideration for Park Development:
- Demolition of Building
- Site Improvements
- Utilities

Pros:
- Site can be filled so that it is at grade with sidewalk
- Size of Park is similar to Wacouta Commons which includes open lawn, play area and other urban park features
- Potential for redevelopment of southwest corner with direct access to the park.

Cons:
- Is not in keeping with the Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan to have a full block park
- Grading and retaining walls will be more costly to make a transition to the southern part of the block

*Relocation of Police Operations and private parking not included
Size and Scale of Pedro Park:

Option C: L-Shape
Details: 1.82 acres
Estimated Site Prep/Acquisition: $2.5 million*

Considerations for Park Development
- Demolition of building
- Site Improvements
- Utilities

Pros:
- Site can be filled so that it is at grade with sidewalk
- Shape creates two distinct zones for the park
- Significant area is gained for a relatively low cost
- Provides open space for Childcare Center

Cons:
- Is not in keeping with the Fitzgerald Park Precinct Plan
- Interface between childcare center and park presents a challenge

*Relocation of Police Operation and private parking not included
Option D: Full-Block

Details: 2.5 acres
Estimated Site Prep/Acquisition: $11 million*

Considerations for Park Development:
- Demolition of building
- Site improvements
- Utilities

Pros:
- Full block offers significant green space for the neighborhood
- Large area creates many options for how it is programmed and designed

Cons:
- Most costly option requiring the greatest amount of land acquisition
- Requires acquisition of Naomi Family Center which adds significant cost and time to the project
- Maintenance requirements will be high for such a large park

*Relocation of Police operations, private parking, and Union Gospel Childcare and Naomi Family Center not included
Context - Downtown Saint Paul Parks:

- Wacouta Commons - 1.07 acres
- Pedro Park Site Study - 2.5 acres
- Mears Park – 2.1 acres
- Downtown Children’s Play Area – .18 acres
- Hamm Plaza - .13 acres
- Ecolab Plaza - .45 acres
- Landmark Plaza - .61 acres
- Rice Park – 1.62 acres
Context - Downtown Saint Paul Parks:

Study Area - Comparison with Wacouta Park
Context - Downtown Saint Paul Parks:

Study Area - Comparison with Mears Park
Discussion

1. Thoughts on Park Size
2. Ideas/Desires for Pedro Park
3. Priorities for Pedro Park
4. Interim plan for Pedro Park site
Moving Forward....

Next Meeting: November 29, 2011 (tentative)

Brainstorming:
Needed/Wants
Goals/Objectives