

# People-Centric Funding Model Workshop Background Brief

Prepared by ULI Curtis Infrastructure Initiative staff

## Introduction and Overview

This brief is intended to serve as background materials for a series workshops that are being hosted by ULI Minnesota, ReConnect Rondo, and MnDOT to identify policies, financial models, and community benefit principles through a People, Public, Private Partnership (P4) Model that would result from the development of the Rondo Community Land Bridge covering I-94. This work builds upon an [advisory services panel](#) completed in 2018 as part of ULI's involvement with the 10 Minute Walk partnership.

The ULI Curtis Infrastructure Initiative has partnered with six ULI district councils across North America to provide technical assistance as part of a cohort to help build capacity to reconnect divided communities—physically, socially, and digitally. This cohort of ULI members and staff, local leaders, and other global experts meets regularly over the course of a year to identify key issues, share best practices, and provide updates on projects to support each other in addressing complex infrastructure challenges.

Recommendations from this project are expected to be finalized in September 2021.

## Including People in Public-Private Partnerships

Public-private partnerships are a way to combine the strengths and resources of both the public and private sectors most effectively. These partnerships are legal cooperation agreements that are used in economic development, infrastructure development, social services delivery, and other applications. These partnerships are formed when a government—or other public entity—lacks capital and capabilities that business can provide and a business lacks the standing, faith of the public, and skills that a government can provide. This creates opportunities that otherwise would not be possible or likely within the near term. However, it is important to understand that public-private partnerships are not privatization but do require a partnership that pays back a private interest with steady, consistent returns on their investment.

The Urban Land Institute has done extensive research and examination of successful public-private partnerships over the years including multiple articles, books, and other publications. Some of the hallmarks of partnerships that work include:

- Clear definitions and roles.
- Robust, mutually beneficial relationships.
- Holistic, flexible planning and financing for the span of the full project.
- An integrated internal and external communication plan.

- A pervasive spirit of stewardship in partnership actions.<sup>1</sup>

Commonly, public-private partnerships are referred to as PPPs or P3s. Traditionally, these are partnerships between a private entity and a public or quasi-public entity. Though this definition of public-private partnerships is beginning to be broadened to by including non-private or government actors into the partnerships to further grow the ability to solve complex projects. This might mean more philanthropic, or community members are more engaged in the process due to a history of distrust or inaction by either the public or private partners to complete a project.

The broader definition of a people-public-private partnership or public-private-philanthropic-people partnership is sometimes referred to as a P4 or P5 model. This approach shifts the implementation and/or ownership of the project to different non-traditional partners since these groups may have more political will and trust, ability to deliver on promises, or access to financial resources. This is being used in both real estate development as well as complex infrastructure challenges.

This newer model of public-private partnerships allows for modifications to the process to decide on how investment decisions are made to be more inclusive and representative of those that are most impacted by these investments. As identified as part of the Elevated Chicago’s workplan, ownership of projects is power.<sup>2</sup> This power-dynamic was also identified as part of GBBN’s *Design Issues Series (DIS): Environmental Justice Symposium* that explored initiatives within Cincinnati, Louisville, Minneapolis, and Pittsburgh and shown graphically within the figure to the right.<sup>3</sup>



The intention behind this effort is to move from community engagement to create community empowerment to ensure that real estate—which is defined by space delineated through regulation, codes, laws and other manmade structures, natural geography, and time—better serves those people impacted by the development process.<sup>4</sup> As identified by GBBN, to move to more empowerment through community decisionmaking requires building better relationships before projects begin, better understanding local perceptions and recognizing community members as experts to develop frameworks, and putting the community at the center of those manmade real estate structures.

<sup>1</sup> <https://knowledge.uli.org/en/reading-lists/2019/public-private-partnerships/p3s-a-practical-solution-for-improving-public-infrastructure>

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.elevatedchicago.org/>

<sup>3</sup> <https://urbanland.uli.org/development-business/using-community-engagement-to-find-untapped-expertise-in-equitable-development/>

<sup>4</sup> [http://morris.marginalq.com/GREM\\_RE720\\_MoreFiles/Urban%20Econ%20Graaskamp%20ULI.PDF](http://morris.marginalq.com/GREM_RE720_MoreFiles/Urban%20Econ%20Graaskamp%20ULI.PDF)

Some developers and investors are taking this approach such as Chicago TREND that is providing ownership opportunities for tenants and community members<sup>5</sup> Beyond the individual investors focused on building community-wealth more financial entities such as CDFIs that provide non-traditional or harder to underwrite loans like SPARCC (Strong, Prosperous, And Resilient Communities Challenge) are working to change this though empowering communities by creating community ownership opportunities.<sup>6</sup> These efforts are paying off by convincing the larger financial institutions and developers to rethink their models for partnering with community to create returns on investment that address racial disparities and other inequities.<sup>7,8</sup>

But, ultimately, real estate development and subsequently, infrastructure investment, is about people and their experience within the built environment. So, the implementation of that vision through public-private partnerships should be about collaboration, listening, convincing, and alleviating fears to enable a people-centric vision. This will result in a more collaborative model that truly is a partnership focused on improving people's lives that is able to address complex problems by solving them together instead of one acting as a contractor to the other.

## Case Studies and Examples

The following projects are examples of public-private partnerships that have established an effective process for ensuring the successful delivery of the project. Note that not all the case studies have been fully completed nor are any one perfect. Lessons can be learned from each of the cited examples and improved in subsequent partnerships. This section is divided into three sections including case studies and examples that will be used as part of the ongoing workshops, directly infrastructure related examples, and other examples that highlight the real estate development process or broader equitable development themes.

### Key Case Studies and Examples

This section includes four case studies and examples that are a mix of a park space built over a river, two capping projects, and a real estate development project. These four projects were determined to be key examples to be examined as part of community-centered information exchange on developing a public-led funding model for the Rondo neighborhood.

#### 11<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge Park: Washington, D.C.

The 11th Street Bridge Park is a proposed 1,200 foot-bridge that would span the east and west banks of Washington, D.C.'s Anacostia River. The community-led public-private partnership is seeking to implement not only the 132,000 square-foot park but also act as a resource. The project delivery is expected to be in 2023.

---

<sup>5</sup> <https://www.forbes.com/sites/annefield/2021/04/29/addressing-the-racial-wealth-gap-through-community-ownership-of-shopping-centers/?sh=466786d71fc8>

<sup>6</sup> <https://www.sparcchub.org/>

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.jpmmorganchase.com/ir/news/2020/jpmc-commits-30-billion-to-advance-racial-equity>

<sup>8</sup> <https://www.washingtonhousingconservancy.org/the-model>

**Total (Proposed) Cost:** \$139 million (estimation includes both physical construction and equitable investment)

**Funding Partners:** Private contributions, District of Columbia

**Ownership:** District of Columbia, Building Bridges Across the River

**Project Manager:** Building Bridges Across the River, OMA, OLIN<sup>9</sup>

**Implementation:** From the earliest days of the proposal in 2013, mitigating displacement from park investments was a central for its implementation plan.<sup>10</sup> To combat fears of displacement the District and Building Bridges Across the River launched an effort to develop an equitable development plan for the one-mile area surrounding the park. This plan identified key strategies around workforce development, small business enterprises, housing, and arts and culture.<sup>11</sup> Thousands of community members have engaged with the design process. Due to COVID-19, the District of Columbia has delayed approximately \$34.9 million in proposed bond funding but approximately \$111.5 million has been raised by the nonprofit for design, construction, operations and maintenance, and community benefits.<sup>12</sup>

**Community-Value Add:** Since 2016, more than \$60 million has been invested in building human capital around the project.<sup>13</sup> The early success of this investment was captured in a 2019 Urban Institute evaluation of the first two years of the implementation of the Equitable Development Plan finding that 70 homes have been purchased by participants in the Ward 8 homebuyers club, 31 construction trainees have full-time jobs, and 104 small businesses east of the Anacostia River have received loans and technical assistance through partner Washington Area Community Investment Fund.<sup>14</sup> This plan also helped launch the Douglass Community Land Trust,<sup>15</sup> community gardens and community-supported agriculture, connecting community members with the Anacostia River, and many other community events.<sup>16</sup>

### The Cap at Union Station: Columbus, Ohio

**Project Overview (completion/expected delivery date; project type; strategy used):** The Cap at Union Station is a 25,500 square-foot retail development (1.12 acres) built over I-670 that stitches together downtown Columbus with the Short North neighborhood.<sup>17</sup> This was one of the first speculative retail projects built over a highway within the United States. The project opened in October 2004 and employed a Right-of-Way Use agreement.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> <https://oma.eu/projects/11th-street-bridge-park>

<sup>10</sup> <https://nextcity.org/daily/entry/can-a-park-prevent-gentrification>

<sup>11</sup> <https://bbardc.org/equity/>

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.bizjournals.com/washington/news/2020/05/19/dc-mayor-delays-11th-street-bridge-park-funds.html>

<sup>13</sup> [https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/local-opinions/11th-street-bridge-park-southeast-dc-anacostia/2021/04/22/7984c300-a1e6-11eb-85fc-06664ff4489d\\_story.html](https://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/local-opinions/11th-street-bridge-park-southeast-dc-anacostia/2021/04/22/7984c300-a1e6-11eb-85fc-06664ff4489d_story.html)

<sup>14</sup> <https://www.urban.org/research/publication/equitable-development-and-urban-park-space-results-and-insights-first-two-years-implementation-equitable-development-plan-dcs-11th-street-bridge-park-project>

<sup>15</sup> <https://douglassclt.org/>

<sup>16</sup> <https://bbardc.org/>

<sup>17</sup> <https://casestudies.uli.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/C035010.pdf>

<sup>18</sup> [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project\\_profiles/oh\\_cap\\_union\\_station.aspx](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project_profiles/oh_cap_union_station.aspx)

**Total (Proposed) Cost:** \$9.5 million; \$7.8 million in private funds (\$7M conventional loan, \$300K mezzanine debt, \$500K in equity), \$1.3M for platforms, \$415K for title searches, architectural design, and utility connections

**Funding Partners:** Private funds, state, and city

**Ownership:** Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT), City of Columbus, and Continental Real Estate Companies

**Project Manager:** Continental Real Estate Companies, Columbus City Attorney, Jezerinac Geers & Associates, David B. Meleca Architects, Continental Building Company<sup>19</sup>

**Implementation:** The idea for the project was initially conceived as part of the 1989 North Market Plan but did not become more real until 1996 when ODOT and the city met with neighborhood groups about a proposed widening of I-670 from four to eight lanes. The state proposed the construction of a 60-foot plates on either side of High Street to create a hard space with brick fences, park benches, and improved lighting along ethe 200-foot-long space. This proposal was met with skepticism from the neighboring residents and businesses who were divided when the interstate was first constructed in the 1950s. The neighborhood groups countered with a more ambitious 1,000-foot cap that would stretch from High Street to neighboring Park Street and feature retail and residential. ODOT determined this option—proposed at \$15 million—was too expensive and would require the construction of a tunnel. But, in 1999, the Continental Real Estate Companies was able to sign a memorandum of understanding with the city that if they were able to obtain clear air rights above the highway, they would develop retail on the site. An agreement was made with the FHWA that the city leased the platform for \$1 per year and the developer paid the city 10 percent of ongoing profits as part of a 20-year lease agreement that included eight 5-year renewal options. In the event that the developer sells the retail development, the city will receive 10 percent of the sale amount.

**Community-Value Add:** The project was a result of neighborhood engagement and creative problem solving to reconnect the divided community and help spur revitalization within the Short North neighborhood. The project also helped to heal scars from the initial highway project that removed a vibrant retail corridor.

**EastPoint:** Oklahoma City, Oklahoma

**Project Overview (completion/expected delivery date; project type; strategy used):** The EastPoint Project, when complete, will have 41,202 square feet of renovated single-story retail and office space along a commercial corridor in northeast Oklahoma City. The 18,000 square foot first phase includes 10,000 square feet of medical space and complementary retail. Planning for the project began in Fall of 2016, and the first phase opened in Summer of 2019.<sup>20</sup>

**Total (Proposed) Cost:** \$8.7 Million

**Funding Partners:** Citizen’s Bank, City TIF: \$1.3 million (\$600,000 soft loan, \$700,000 predevelopment grant)

<sup>19</sup> <https://www.continental-realestate.com/projects/retail/cap-at-union-station/>

<sup>20</sup> <https://casestudies.uli.org/deal-profile-eastpoint/>

**Ownership: Private:** 85% Pivot Project (developer) and 15% tenants

**Project Manager:** Pivot Project

**Implementation:** The Eastpoint Project lies in a historical black, disinvested community in Northeast OKC. After the creation of a TIF, the Alliance for Economic Development of Oklahoma City, which manages the city’s economic development programs, reached out to Pivot about the largely vacant EastPoint site, then partially under the urban renewal authority’s ownership. Pivot Project recruited a healthcare provider to come on as the anchor tenant, but even with an anchor tenant pre-leased to the building and a quarter of the project funded by the advance money from the TIF, he found difficulty securing a construction loan due to the economic stagnation of the historically disinvested neighborhood it was located in. They eventually found a lender who was willing to finance the project, but needed significant community support to keep the anchor tenant, Centennial Health, on board throughout the project.

**Community-Value Add:** The Eastpoint project provides significant community value from a variety of perspectives. It is the first new development in a historically redlined community and demonstrated a financial viability for the neighborhood. The project also, significantly, offered 15% equity to the project's tenants. “I couldn’t imagine developing this, and not having tenants share in the upside,” said Jonathan Dodson, co-founder of Pivot Project. The ownership stake provides additional cashflow to these businesses, which are primarily entrepreneurs recruited from the surrounding neighborhood, and after the city’s 10-year lock-up period, the stake may also be sold. Finally, the anchor tenant being a health care provider provides a significant value to the members of the community as previously health services in the area were significantly lacking.

#### Klyde Warren Park: Dallas, Texas

**Project Overview (completion/expected delivery date; project type; strategy used):** Klyde Warren park is a 5.2 acre highway cap over the Woodall Rodgers Freeway, Texas Highway 366, in Dallas. The park, which was completed in 2012, connects Dallas’ historic downtown area to the uptown. The project was funded by a combination of Public and Philanthropic sources, including \$20 Million in transportation funds from TxDOT, and \$50 Million in private donations, and a city bond issue.

**Total (Proposed) Cost:** \$110M

**Funding Partners:** Private Philanthropy, City of Dallas bonds, Texas Department of Transportation, American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, contributions to Woodall Rodgers Park Foundation, Real Estate Council<sup>21</sup>

**Ownership:** Owned by City of Dallas, privately managed by Woodall Rodgers Park Foundation

**Project Manager:** Bjerke Management Solutions

**Implementation:** A significant community movement for the highway cap began in the early 2000s, with planning beginning in 2004. With significant contributions from private donors, the local regional transit authority and state DOT contributed around 40% of the construction cost, with the rest being funded by

---

<sup>21</sup> [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project\\_profiles/tx\\_klyde\\_warren\\_park.aspx](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project_profiles/tx_klyde_warren_park.aspx)

a city bond issue. The park quickly evolved into a significant community asset and now plans for expansion are being examined.

**Community-Value Add:** Klyde Warren Park is one of the most utilized public spaces in the city, with 100,000 yearly visitors and 1,300 public events and programs a year. In 2018, 6 years after opening, a \$76M expansion to the park was announced which will increase the size of the park by 1.2 acres, add parking facilities for the nearby office buildings, and create a 16-20k sf pavilion which is planned to be used as a visitors center for the city.

## Infrastructure Projects

This section includes several infrastructure specific projects.

### Capitol Crossing/Third Street Tunnel: Washington, D.C.

**Project Overview (completion/expected delivery date; project type; strategy used):** Capitol Crossing is a privately funded 7-acre highway cap which was completed in 2021 that has a Right-of-Way Use Agreement.<sup>22</sup> The real estate development project, when complete, in December 2022, will include 5 buildings which are expected to be LEED Platinum certified, with 2.2 Million square feet of space and at least half a million square feet of office space, 70,000 sf of retail space, and 150 residential units. The project will also include a 4-level parking garage.

**Total (Proposed) Cost:** \$1.2 Billion (Est. \$270M for cap, \$1B for building construction)<sup>23</sup>

**Funding Partners:** Privately funded (included Norwegian Pension Fund)

**Project Manager:** Property Group Partners (developer), SOM, Balfour Beatty Construction DC<sup>24</sup>

**Ownership:** Property Group Partners (developer)

**Implementation:** This project is relatively distinctive in that it is a highway capping project which was entirely privately funded by a developer, with the intent to develop commercial properties on the newly created “land,” rather than primarily being used as a park, community hub, or other amenity. The initial concept was conceived in 1989 but the NEPA environmental assessment of the project began in 2001 which found no significant impact, so zoning was approved for development. The Property Group Partners were awarded the project and paid the District of Columbia \$11 million at the time of closing with the agreement to make up to \$109 million in additional payments as the development proceeds.<sup>25</sup> This structure exists because there is patient-capital that has been willing to use this as an opportunity build and create new land in a constrained area. The building construction has been structured to enable the developer to wait for appropriate market conditions to build new buildings while implementing the infrastructure improvements at the outset.

---

<sup>22</sup>[https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/value\\_capture/defined/row\\_use\\_agreements.aspx#:~:text=Right%2Dof%2Dway%20\(ROW,transportation%20ROW%20or%20real%20properties.&text=In%20active%20real%20estate%20markets,historic%20properties%20to%20nearby%20properties](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/value_capture/defined/row_use_agreements.aspx#:~:text=Right%2Dof%2Dway%20(ROW,transportation%20ROW%20or%20real%20properties.&text=In%20active%20real%20estate%20markets,historic%20properties%20to%20nearby%20properties)

<sup>23</sup> [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project\\_profiles/dc\\_capitol\\_crossing.aspx](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project_profiles/dc_capitol_crossing.aspx)

<sup>24</sup> [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project\\_profiles/dc\\_capitol\\_crossing.aspx](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project_profiles/dc_capitol_crossing.aspx)

<sup>25</sup> [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/fact\\_sheets/value\\_cap\\_row\\_use\\_agreements.aspx](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/fact_sheets/value_cap_row_use_agreements.aspx)

**Community-Value Add:** The property does create community value, despite being a wholly-private project. The Capitol Crossing land bridge reconnected the East End and Judiciary Square neighborhoods. Additionally, 50 of the planned 150 residential units are committed to be affordable housing, and the developer took additional measures to create what has been called Washington D.C.’s first “eco-district.” These steps include pollutant filtering chimneys to reduce air pollution from the parking garage and I-395 below, and water cisterns to capture, filter, and re-purpose stormwater which would otherwise runoff into the Chesapeake Bay.

**METRO Green Line-Metro Transit: Minneapolis and St. Paul, Minnesota**

**Project Overview (completion/expected delivery date; project type; strategy used):** The Metro Green Line is an 11-mile light rail line that connects the central business districts of Minneapolis and St Paul in Minnesota. Revenue operations began in June 2014. The project leveraged a partnership between the public sector and philanthropic organizations to rethink how large-scale public-transportation investments occur due to the legacy of the construction of I-94 that runs parallel to the transit corridor. This model has been incorporated in other large-scale complex infrastructure projects across the United States.

**Total (Proposed) Cost:** \$957 million

**Funding Partners:** Federal Transit Administration, Counties Transit Improvement Board, state of Minnesota, Ramsey County, Hennepin County, Metropolitan Council, city of St. Paul, and the Central Corridor Funders Collaborative (Annie E. Casey Foundation, Bush Foundation, Ford Foundation, F.R. Bigelow Foundation, Jay and Rose Phillips Family Foundation of Minnesota, John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, Living Cities, Inc., McKnight Foundation, The Minneapolis Foundation, Northwest Area Foundation, Otto Bremer Foundation, The Saint Paul Foundation, Surdna Foundation)<sup>26,27</sup>

**Ownership:** Metropolitan Council

**Project Manager:** Metropolitan Council, AECOM, Walsh Construction, Ames Construction, and C.S. McCrossan<sup>28</sup>

**Implementation:** Beginning in September 2006, the Metropolitan Council began community engagement that resulted in hearing from more than 25,000 people at more than 1,100 public meetings. However, the initial concept dates to at least 1981, and planning officially began in 2001 with the Ramsey County Regional Railroad Authority preparing an environmental impact statement that was completed in 2006.<sup>29</sup> In 2008, the Collaborative was formed with the goal to invest \$20 million to support their efforts to reduce displacement within the corridor that was home to approximately 120,000 residents, 23 percent of whom live below the poverty line and 44 percent were people of color. Following additional design, engineering, analysis, utility relocation, and federal funding approval,

---

<sup>26</sup> <https://finance-commerce.com/2015/04/progress-mn-metro-green-line/>

<sup>27</sup> <https://www.spmcf.org/what-we-do/invest-in-community-led-solutions/community-initiatives/central-corridor-funders-collaborative>

<sup>28</sup> <https://aecom.com/projects/green-line-light-rail/>

<sup>29</sup> <https://metrocouncil.org/Transportation/Projects/Light-Rail-Projects/Central-Corridor/Project-Facts/History.aspx>



construction began 2011 with completion in 2012 with several years of testing before revenue operation.

**Community-Value Add:** Extensive community engagement led by the public-sector and a partnership with national and local philanthropies resulted in significant design changes such as three additional stations (Hamline, Victoria, and Western), improved station design and access, noise reduction, and improved operation.<sup>30</sup> The Collaborative partnered with the Local Initiatives Support Coalition preserve and build new affordable housing to reduce displacement as part of a process for the 2012 Central Corridor Affordable Housing Coordinated Plan as well as created the Business Resources Collaborative to help businesses during the construction, longer-term economic development, and to boost woman and minority workforce involvement. Between 2011 and 2016, 3,573 subsidized affordable units were built or preserved, 968 households received funds to stay in their homes, and 20 percent (1,269) of the 6,388 new housing units built were designated affordable.<sup>31</sup>

### The Park at Penn Landing: Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

**Project Overview (completion/expected delivery date; project type; strategy used):** The Park at Penn Landing is a 12-acre civic space that that extends the Interstate 95 Park over the Delaware Expressway further reconnecting downtown Philadelphia and the waterfront. The project leveraged a public-private partnership between a redevelopment authority, the city, and a private developer. The park is expected to be complete in 2024.

**Total (Proposed) Cost:** \$225 Million

**Funding Partners:** Pennsylvania Department of Transportation (\$100M), City of Philadelphia (\$90M), William Penn Foundation (\$15M), Federal Highway Administration, and John S. and James L. Knight Foundation<sup>32</sup>

**Ownership:** Delaware River Waterfront Corporation (DRWC)

**Project Manager:** DRWC

**Implementation:** First envisioned in 2011, the Parks at Penn Landing was developed as part of the Master Plan for the Central Delaware that began in 2009. The goal of this master plan was to create a roadmap and implementation plan to improve approximately 6-miles of waterfront disconnected by the construction of I-95. This built on a previous effort led by Penn Praxis between 2006-2007 that engaged more than 4,000 residents to identify opportunities to reconnect the city to its waterfront cut off by I-95.<sup>33</sup> In September 2020, the DWRC selected the Durst Organization to invest more than \$2.2 billion to

---

<sup>30</sup> <https://metro council.org/Transportation/Projects/Light-Rail-Projects/Central-Corridor/Public-Involvement.aspx>

<sup>31</sup> <https://www.huduser.gov/portal/casestudies/study-09082016-1.html>

<sup>32</sup> [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project\\_profiles/pa\\_the\\_park\\_at\\_penns\\_landing.aspx](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/project_profiles/pa_the_park_at_penns_landing.aspx)

<sup>33</sup> <https://www.delawareriverwaterfront.com/planning/masterplan-for-the-central-delaware>

leverage the \$225 million public and philanthropic investment to fully implement the original master plan.<sup>34</sup>

**Community-Value Add:** The development surrounding the Parks at Penn Landing is expected to generate more than \$62 million in new annual tax revenues for the city that includes \$9 million for the school district and \$21 million for the commonwealth of Pennsylvania. This project also includes parks and other public spaces, and mixed-income housing. The project also reconnects the Old City neighborhood and the Delaware River waterfront as well as increases mobility opportunities for non-motorists.

#### The Ringland Project: Antwerp, Belgium

**Project Overview (completion/expected delivery date; project type; strategy used):** The Ringland project is a 12.4-mile highway capping (land bridge) project within Antwerp, Belgium.<sup>35</sup> The community-led public-private partnership was created to enhance citywide green space and mobility, improve air quality, health, and living conditions, and to build more housing. The project is expected to be built in phases with an undetermined completion date.

**Total (Proposed) Cost:** \$7.3 billion (estimated)

**Funding Partners:** The Department of Mobility of Flanders, City of Antwerp, Organization for Permanent Modernity, private contributions

**Ownership:** City of Antwerp

**Project Manager:** Organization for Permanent Modernity, ARUP

**Implementation:** In 2013, a community group made up of residents, supported by in-kind professional services, proposed the project and refined the vision and concepts to convince local and regional elected officials to support the project. During this period, the community group (Organization for Permanent Modernity) crowdfunded more than \$120,000 from 4,500 Antwerp residents and raised an additional \$120,000 from a musical festival that attracted more than 15,000 people. These funds were used for further technical assistance focused on infrastructure planning and technical feasibility, mobility impact, environmental impact, and the financial feasibility and housing development. By 2017, a formal agreement was made between the Flemish government, the city of Antwerp, and the community group to further feasibility studies and begin to implement the project. This included regular workshops, facilitated conversations led by ARUP, and community meetings called “Ring Days” to ensure co-creation of the project.<sup>36</sup> Additional working groups made up of government officials and transportation stakeholders have been established to integrate all the plans. Approximately \$1.51 billion in public funds have been committed to this project to date.<sup>37</sup>

**Community-Value Add:** The project has established a model for Belgian communities to have community-led infrastructure proposals that can lead to support from the elected leaders and the public

---

<sup>34</sup> <https://drwcsite.s3.amazonaws.com/files/283435941521129689-drwc-announces-selection-of-developer-for-penns-landing-press-release.pdf>

<sup>35</sup> <https://www.arup.com/projects/antwerp-ring-road>

<sup>36</sup> <https://www.uantwerpen.be/en/research-groups/research-group-for-urban-development/research/infrastructure-mobilities/roofing-the-antwerp-ring/>

<sup>37</sup> <http://urbanism.orgpermod.com/projects/curatorship-for-covering-of-the-antwerp-ring-road/>

sector which traditionally leads investment decisions. This is enabling community members to be more a part of a transparent process for decision-making.

### Target Field: Minneapolis, Minnesota

**Project Overview (completion/expected delivery date; project type; strategy used):** Target Field is home to the Minnesota Twins professional baseball team in Minneapolis since 2010. In 2006 the Minnesota legislature passed legislation supporting the development of the baseball stadium; the Minnesota Ballpark Authority was established to own and manage the site. A portion of the ballpark and Target Plaza are built in I394 airspace.

Including post opening infrastructure and amenity additions total amended cost of Target Field and associated supporting infrastructure is \$555 million. Most of the \$350 million public funding for the ballpark and supporting infrastructure was financed by a Hennepin County sales tax. The Minnesota Twins contributed \$175 million to the ballpark and other infrastructure and amenities. Additional small contributions were made by Target Corporation, Minnesota Department of Transportation, and Minnesota Ballpark Authority.<sup>38,2</sup>

**Total Cost:** \$555 million<sup>39</sup>

**Funding Partners:** Hennepin County, Minnesota Twins, Target Corporation, Minnesota Department of Transportation, Minnesota Ballpark Authority.<sup>ibid</sup>

**Ownership:** Minnesota Ballpark Authority

**Project Manager:** Minnesota Ballpark Authority, Minnesota Twins, Hennepin County, Mortenson Construction.

**Implementation:** Target Field serves mainly as example of the creation of a public entity, Minnesota Ballpark Authority, to plan, acquire property and construct a building for use by others, in this case a private business. Implementation in cases such as this typically require enabling legislation, often specific to the purpose for a project the scale and expense of Target Field's magnitude. The critical legislative action enabled Hennepin County to raise public funding from county bonds financed by a sales tax, as well as establishing the ballpark authority.<sup>40</sup> Several legal documents provide the including lease, public grant, and use agreements provide the details of the legal and financial arrangements.<sup>41</sup>

Target Plaza was an addition to the stadium site after Target field opened and required an airspace lease with Minnesota Department of Transportation and approved by Federal Highway Administration. In both cases protracted negotiations between government agencies and private sector partners were necessary to implement the projects.

---

<sup>38</sup> [Legislation - Minnesota Ballpark Authority](#) Retrieved June 7, 2021.

<sup>39</sup> [Target Field Construction Budget - Minnesota Ballpark Authority](#) Retrieved June 7, 2021.

<sup>40</sup> <https://www.revisor.mn.gov/laws/2006/0/Session+Law/Chapter/257/>

<sup>41</sup> [Legal Documents - Minnesota Ballpark Authority](#) Retrieved June 7, 2021.

**Community-Value Add:** Construction of the ballpark included a community participation program that established and exceeded goals for hiring historically underrepresented people and business among the labor force, subcontractors, and construction materials and support suppliers.<sup>42</sup>

Target Plaza, built mainly over 1394, is a primary entrance to Target Field. The plaza is a popular destination for Twins baseball fans to take photographs sitting on the sculpture of a baseball glove and with statues of famous iconic Twins players. Target Field Station is a major transit hub, served by light rail transit, is near the NorthStar commuter rail station, and abuts Cedar Lake Bike Trail.

## Real Estate Development

This section includes examples of projects that have a community or tenant ownership model as part of the real estate development component.

### Market Creek: San Diego, California

**Project Overview (completion/expected delivery date; project type; strategy used):** Market Creek was first conceptualized in the mid-1990s as a development to lure a grocery store to a neighborhood which had not had one for over 30 years. The project was led by the Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation (JCNI), a small nonprofit organization. The project found success in significant public outreach, described by then-CEO Jennifer Vanica as “asking residents what they want before you know what you want.”

**Total Cost:** \$23.6 million

**Funding Partners:** JCNI, Private loan, community financing

**Ownership:** Market Creek Partners LLC, a for-profit subsidiary of JCNI<sup>43</sup>

**Project Manager:** JCNI

**Implementation:** The Market Creek development engaged with residents significantly before conceptualizing the project, including over 600 surveys in 4 languages and hosting community cultural events to bring the community together. These efforts ended up involving over 2,000 residents in the planning process for the project. JCNI also used an unusual model of funding the project, offering members of the community to buy-in to the project through a version of an IPO. Members of the community provided about 20% of the capitalization for the project, with over 400 individuals purchasing shares ranging from \$500 to \$10,000. However, there are two potential downsides to this approach. First, because of the public nature of the offering, the state required a lengthy “mandatory silent period” before the offering, which hampered community engagement.<sup>44</sup> Second, while this action provided an opportunity of reward for members of a disinvested community, it also introduced risk to

---

<sup>42</sup> [Community Participation Program - Minnesota Ballpark Authority](#) Retrieved June 7, 2021.

<sup>43</sup> <https://www.voiceofsandiego.org/neighborhoods/the-dream-of-local-fades-at-market-creek-plaza/>

<sup>44</sup> <https://community-wealth.org/content/market-creek-plaza>

the community, as exemplified by the 2010 closure of multiple small businesses in the center due to the Great Recession.

**Community-Value Add:** Possibly the most significant community-value add of Market Creek was the introduction of Food 4 Less, the first grocery store in the neighborhood in over 30 years, which also employed 91% local staff at its opening. It also created significant local entrepreneurial opportunities by providing \$1M to the California Southern Small Business Development Corp to facilitate the creation of loans for community members to open businesses in the center. Unfortunately, these businesses were hard hit by the Great Recession and were mostly replaced by national chains. One unexpected community benefit was derived from JCNi’s continual community meetings, which spurred “spillover” community-led efforts in other areas, such as organizing to push for streetlight repair.

## Additional Resources

- 10 Principles for Enhancing Equitable Access to Parks. ULI. 2021: <https://knowledge.uli.org/en/reports/research-reports/2021/10-principles-for-enhancing-equitable-access-to-parks>.
- 11<sup>th</sup> Street Bridge Parks Equity Toolkit. Building Bridges Across the River. <https://bbardc.org/equitytools/>
- The Elevated Chicago Workplan. Elevated Chicago. 2018. <http://www.elevatedchicago.org/our-work-plan/>
- Pavement to Parks: Transforming Spaces for Cars into Places for People. ULI. 2020: <https://knowledge.uli.org/en/reports/research-reports/2020/pavement-to-parks>.
- Rondo, St. Paul, Minnesota Advisory Services Panel Report. ULI. 2018: <https://knowledge.uli.org/en/reports/aspr/2018/st-paul-minnesota>.
- Successful Partnerships for Parks: Collaborative Approaches to Advance Equitable Space. ULI. 2020: <https://knowledge.uli.org/en/reports/research-reports/2020/successful-partnerships-for-parks>.
- Successful Public/Private Partnerships from Principles to Practice. ULI. 2016: <https://2os2f877tnl1dvtmc3wy0aq1-wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/ULI-Documents/Successful-Public-Private-Partnerships.pdf>.
- Promoting Cross-Sector Partnerships for Equitable Transit-Oriented Development. ULI. April 2011: <https://knowledge.uli.org/-/media/files/research-reports/2011/promotingcrosssectorpartnershipsforequitabletransitorienteddevelopment.pdf?v=aa08a287b6e6427093371921f56e9a38&hash=84780F6A76ADA8AE2E6D0E216074EC5C>.
- Center for Innovative Finance Support Project Profiles. U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration’s Office of Innovative Program Delivery. [https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/jpd/project\\_profiles/](https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/jpd/project_profiles/)
- The High Line Network Research and Resources. <https://network.thehighline.org/resources/>