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ABSTRACT

This thesis studies Fair Park, a 277 acre public park located in Dallas, Texas. Fair Park represents prevalent planning challenges – the repurposing of sites that have outlived their initial uses and the reintegration of such sites into their surrounding contexts. To better understand the site, a historical overview of the development of Fair Park from inception to its current condition is provided. Fair Park is looked at within the context of South Dallas in efforts to understand the past planning efforts and why they have succeeded/failed. A new framework for thinking about future planning efforts for Fair Park is proposed so that the site can catalyze the revitalization of South Dallas at large. Two alternative land use scenarios are provided to illustrate the site’s development potential under the proposed framework. The thesis concludes with proposing a structure for moving forward with the planning and implementation of new development in Fair Park and summarizes some potential obstacles to implementation that must be carefully considered.
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INTRODUCTION

Fair Park, located in Dallas, Texas, is home to the State Fair of Texas and a variety of other cultural and entertainment uses. Fair Park has evolved since its construction in 1886; it has changed in response to the times, to what is profitable, and to what is popular. It has experienced periods of great investment and transformation, and periods of disinvestment and decline. Today, Fair Park is in one of its valleys of prosperity and is in need of another catalytic transformation that will catapult it into the 21st century. This thesis strives to establish a compelling case for investment in Fair Park today, to articulate a framework for the planning and redevelopment of the site, and to provide a blueprint for the next steps necessary to make such a plan a reality. The scenarios identified in this thesis illustrate the potential for the site both internally and in relation to its surrounding context. The scenarios aim to succeed where previous efforts have failed – mainly in providing recommendations that are feasible within the current context and that will be sustainable in the future.

This thesis is organized into four chapters. It begins by chronicling the development of Fair Park itself, from an 80 acre site dedicated to the State Fair in the 1880s, to the host site of the World’s Fair in 1936, to the 277 acre site that it is today. The park and the State Fair hold special significance to the city of Dallas, and without an in depth understanding of the evolution of this importance, any proposed plan would not adequately/sensitively respond to the complexities of that history. Chapter 1 also provides a critique of past planning efforts in order to understand where and why they have been successful, and where and why they have fallen short.

Chapter 2 begins with a detailed overview of the current context in which Fair Park exists today. There are numerous political, social, and economic forces at work in the city, and tensions between the rich and the poor, the north and the south. Fair Park, given its location, lies in the middle of many of these tensions. The chapter concludes with a description of the opportunities that can be achieved by the reinvestment in and transformation of Fair Park.

Based on a thorough understanding of the history, evolution, and current context of Fair Park, Chapter 3 delves into the question of how Fair Park could be redeveloped, and what uses could go there. This question is answered first by defining criteria for successful redevelopment. With criteria established, a case is made for the relocation of
State Fair activities, and other infrastructure/urban design interventions as preconditions for redevelopment. The chapter provides two potential use programs for Fair Park as a means to illustrate the potential ability of the site to meet a broader set of goals than have previously been set for it.

Chapter 4 describes the next steps in turning the findings of this thesis into a redevelopment project. Given the complexities of the physical, social, and political context surrounding Fair Park, a new approach to planning and development is recommended. Finally, potential obstacles to the implementation of a future plan are described.

This thesis is intended to serve as a catalyst to trigger a new conversation around the redevelopment of Fair Park, and to encourage the people of Dallas to imagine a different future for the site. This document is not intended to provide solutions – that will require more work. However, by analyzing the history of the site within the context of the political, social, and economic realities of the surrounding areas, this thesis provides a framework for thinking about ways to affect the future trajectory of Fair Park, South Dallas, and beyond.
CHAPTER 1: STATE OF FAIR PARK

Fair Park is one of the largest publicly-owned sites in Dallas, Texas. While it is located less than two miles from the downtown, it feels as if it could be miles away. Major roadway infrastructures built in the 1960s and 1970s have physically and visually isolated Fair Park from the central business district. Today, the site is surrounded by low income and minority communities and served by decaying commercial corridors. Obsolete housing stock, industrial facilities, and other infrastructures reinforce a sense of isolation of the park from its surrounding context.

Birth of the State Fair
Fair Park was originally developed as a state fairground. The idea was conceived in the 1870s by Billy Gaston and other Dallas business leaders who wanted to hold a fair of ‘unprecedented magnitude and scope.’1 While Dallas County had held fairs in the past, the group set out to find a new site to hold this ‘bigger and better’ fair they envisioned for Dallas. Ultimately, 80 acres were identified for the Dallas State Fair and Exposition, which stirred up substantial controversy. The site, located in an agricultural area on the outskirts of the city, was described as “the worst kind of hog wallow”2 and was considered by many unfit to hold an event of such prestige. Despite its poor soil conditions, the site was well served by existing railroad lines, and the land was purchased by Gaston and other businessmen who made up the board of directors of the proposed fair. These leaders provided the initial capital in exchange for stock.3

Leading up to the 1886 event, the grounds were transformed. The original site plan included a one mile long race track built for $10,0004 with an 8,000 seat grandstand, stables and other livestock-related structures, and restaurants and entertainment venues.5 Two grand buildings, the Exposition Building and Machinery Hall were built to showcase automobiles and other technologies. The multi-story Exposition Hall footprint measured 200’x300,’ and the single story Machinery Hall measured 75’x300’ and featured additional outdoor exhibition areas.

1 Wiley, p. 8
2 Wiley, p. 8
3 Wiley p. 8.
4 Wiley p. 5
5 Winters, p. 8
These impressive buildings, along with the programmed pageantry and attractions, drew thousands of people to Fair Park during the 1886 fair. Despite its success, the fair failed to turn a profit, and in fact, revenues fell approximately $100,000 short of costs. Nevertheless, the board of directors continued to invest in the fair, and by 1887 the grounds had been expanded by 37 acres paid for by Gaston and the board in exchange for a five-year note.\(^6\) New buildings were built, new attractions were added, and the fair continued to grow. Despite its success, revenues fell short of costs year after year, but this did not stop the board from continuing to invest in the fair.

Exposition Building in 1886


\(^6\) Wiley, p. 15
The State Fair Grounds Become a Public Park

In 1902 the Main Exposition Building and several of the surrounding structures burned to the ground. Given the fair's precarious financial situation, the halls were not rebuilt immediately. Their replacement was dependent on the success of the fair.\(^7\) In 1903 more trouble hit when the state placed a ban on track betting, reducing fair revenues by 50\%.\(^8\) This turn of events sparked several bids for the fairgrounds. The city became interested in taking over the land, and private developers began making offers to the fair board to acquire the land and redevelop it as suburban housing.\(^9\) Unwilling to see all of their efforts destroyed, the fair board rejected offers from private developers and struck a deal with the city which ultimately canceled the debt and insured that the fair would remain on the site into the future.

Under the terms of the deal, the city would pay the board $125,000 which it raised through a special tax in exchange for the transfer of ownership from the fair board to the city. This money would be used to retire the outstanding $80,000 of debt held by the fair. The remaining funds would be donated back to the city in order to fund the rebuilding of the Exposition Hall. In addition, $30,000 would be raised via stock issuance, which would also be donated to the city to support work on the fairgrounds.\(^10\)

---

7 Wiley, p. 49
8 Winters, p. 19
9 Wiley, p. 51
10 Wiley, p. 52
The ownership transfer was approved in 1904. Upon its execution, the site became the second public park in Dallas and was renamed Fair Park. While the city gained ownership, the fair and the city contracted that the newly incorporated State Fair of Texas would be allowed to put on the fair each year. It was further stipulated that the fair would pay all operational expenses of the fair, and would reinvest profits in the maintenance and improvement of Fair Park.\textsuperscript{11}

Fair Park underwent several transformations and expansions during the early 1900s; each year new buildings were added. In 1906 George Kessler was hired to develop a master plan that would improve the landscaping and identify sites for future buildings.\textsuperscript{12} Kessler had worked on the 1904 St. Louis World’s Fair design, and his plan “formed the basis of the layout for the Texas Centennial Exposition in 1936.”\textsuperscript{13} It seems clear that the board of directors had big plans for Fair Park, and they sought the help of experts to ensure a bright future. By 1906 the Kessler master plan was completed, and over the next several years new buildings were added and some existing ones rebuilt. Additionally, the park held year-round events, and many of the fair facilities were used in the off season.

One of the most substantial changes to the site occurred in 1930 when construction began on the Cotton Bowl. Given the low profitability of the race track (based on the city’s second ban on track betting) and the success of a recently added football stadium, the racetrack was relocated to the northeastern corner of the site, and the new 46,200 seat football stadium went under construction.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Wiley, p. 52
\item Winters, p. 21
\item Winters, p. 21
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
The World’s Fair Comes to Dallas

In 1934 Dallas won the bid to host the Texas Centennial – the celebration of the 100th anniversary of Texas independence from Mexico. Banker R.L. Thornton and architect George Dahl were instrumental in winning the bid for Dallas. In just about two years the park was replanned and rebuilt to host the second costliest World’s Fair to date in the United States. Dallas made by far the largest bid, at over $9.5M, comprised of Fair Park and additional land, $3.5M from municipal bonds, and an additional $2M provided by local businessmen. Ultimately, the Texas legislature contributed and additional $1.2M and other monies were obtained from the federal government. And still, a substantial portion of the grand total was donated by individuals and companies. More than 8,000 workers built a new park in less than one year, for a total cost of approximately $25M. The result was an incredible display of art, architecture, and entertainment with a powerful, iconic, and timeless image.

14 Winters p. 53
15 Wiley, p. 113
17 Wiley, p. 117
Texas Centennial Plot Plan


Laborers Preparing the Site for the Texas Centennial

The Texas Centennial Central Exposition Master Plot Plan shows 124 features. In the center of the trapezoidal site was the Cotton Bowl Stadium. In the northeastern corner lay the racetrack and associated grandstand and stables. The main entrance off of Parry Avenue was marked by pylons, the Grand Plaza, and the Esplanade of the State which led to the Court of Honor and the State Hall of Texas beyond that. This created a powerful axis that drew visitors into the site. The Esplanade was flanked by exhibit halls on either side, and to the north of the Cotton Bowl were located various agricultural and livestock exhibit spaces, as well as the restaurants and food vendors.

At the southern end of the Court of Honor was the Federal Concourse. This plaza marked the intersection of Grand Avenue and Constitutional Place. Constitutional Place led to The Midway, which was home to many of the fair’s attractions and entertainment venues. The southernmost portion of the site along Second Avenue was home to the cultural facilities, including the music hall, the open air amphitheater, the horticultural center, and museums and other exhibition halls.
By 1936 Fair Park was no longer on the outskirts of the city – gone were the endless fields of farmlands. Residential communities and commercial corridors had sprung up around the site, and the area was served by streetcar.

**Historic Street Car Serving Fair Park**


Post Texas Centennial: The Ups and Downs of Fair Park
Since the Texas Centennial in 1936, Fair Park has continued to evolve, but not at the same magnitude as it did in preparation for the World’s Fair. The racetrack and grandstand were razed in the 1950s, and various other buildings were torn down to be replaced with new structures, or very often, with more parking. In the 1960s and 1970s the Fair began to struggle. Controversy ensued over the direction of future development of Fair Park.\footnote{Wiley, p. 192} Museums considered relocating outside of Fair Park, and the city continued to pressure the Park Board to increase year-round activity in the park. Despite their many efforts, the State Fair was unsuccessful in creating a vibrant year-round atmosphere in Fair Park.\footnote{Wiley, p. 192}

In the 1960s and 1970s, Dallas underwent substantial changes. Numerous highway infrastructures were built which had both positive and negative effects on Fair Park.

South Dallas Highway Network

\footnote{18 Wiley, p. 192}
\footnote{19 Wiley, p. 192}
In 1967 the Park Board approached the city of Dallas with a request to acquire a substantial piece of land along the eastern edge of Fair Park (the area which today holds parking lots and the Gexa Center). This land was needed to provide parking during the State Fair in order to improve the experience for fairgoers. Over the next several years the city acquired parcels of land. Some parcels were sold voluntarily; others were taken by eminent domain actions. Concerned for the longevity of their neighborhood, residents attempted to thwart the city’s efforts by challenging the eminent domain actions in court, but they were unsuccessful. Ultimately, Fair Park was expanded eastward in another example of how South Dallas communities were forced to bear the brunt of ‘improvements’ for others. This expansion created deep-rooted tensions between the community members who felt they were being robbed, and the city. This tension still exists, and has made it difficult for community outsiders to work with South Dallas communities.

Figure 1: Historic Expansion of Fair Park

In 1986 the Fair Park Centennial Buildings were designated a National Historic Landmark, a prestigious honor designated by the Secretary of Interior and the National Park Service to exceptional places that illustrate American heritage. In its application for this designation, it was noted that the Centennial Buildings at Fair Park were not just architecturally

---

21 www.nps.org/nhl
significant, but that they were “one of the largest intact groupings of exposition buildings remaining in the United States.” In addition to the architecture, the urban design of the space and the substantial collection of public artwork were noteworthy attributes of the site.

Map of Historic Buildings

Source: National Register of Historic Places Nomination Form; viewed at: http://pdfhost.focus.nps.gov/docs/NHLS/Text/86003488.pdf

Despite its designation as a National Historic Landmark, Fair Park and the 30 Centennial Buildings decayed over the following years. In 1994 and 1995 the Centennial Buildings were actually listed on the National Trust for Historic Places “America’s Most Endangered Places” list. In efforts to maintain these historic treasures, more than $260M dollars has been spent since the early 1990s on capital improvements, most of which included restoration and renovation to buildings and artwork. The investments did not go unnoticed, and in 2011 Fair Park was named one of the American Planning Associations’ Great Places.

22 FP National Register of Historic Places nomination form
Planning a Future for Fair Park

In addition to the substantial spending on capital improvements in Fair Park, significant money has been spent on planning for the site. Since the 1980s more than 40 plans have been prepared for Fair Park, and many were completed before (note for example, the 1969 Master Plan for Year Round Uses). This number does not include all of the studies and plans conducted on and for the surrounding neighborhoods, such as master plans for Frazier Courts, Forest Heights, or Jubilee. Nor does this number include plans prepared for the city at large. For example, The Dallas Plan, completed in 1993, included the revitalization of Fair Park as a key component of the improvement of the city of Dallas at large.

Figure 2: Current Context of Fair Park

Fair Park plans include economic impact studies, architectural building studies, and comprehensive master plans. The most recent comprehensive plan was completed in 2003 by Hargreaves Associates and their team of consultants. The Hargreaves plan was a thorough, well researched plan that provided a wealth of information on the state of Fair Park and many of its individual components. It catalogued the historic buildings, analyzed the context of Fair Park in relation to the city at large and the major transportation routes, and identified many of the challenges facing Fair Park, including those of management and the need to look at the surrounding areas. Ultimately, the plan articulated the following five objectives for Fair Park:
1. Create a signature public park.
2. Uphold the park’s historic legacy.
3. Support the museums and the State Fair of Texas while activating the park with new programs and uses.
4. Encourage economic vitality.
5. Enhance connectivity with the community and greater Dallas metroplex.

From these objectives, the team generated a vision of Fair Park as a place for education, culture, and year-round activity. Renderings showed people lying on great lawns, parking hidden underground, and visitors celebrating all of the history the site had to offer. The plan broke the site down into four areas and described each ‘project’ area in detail. The final plan presented an attractive, green, urbanistically pleasing vision for what Fair Park could be if certain actions were taken (and based of course, on many assumptions).

Ten years later the majority of the plan recommendations remain unrealized. Museums have not expanded, rather, many have left the site all together. The Midway is not operating year-round. While much of the historic core has been renovated, it still remains largely empty. The decommissioned rail line along the northern edge of the site has not been transformed into a green boulevard that connects Fair Park to its northern neighbors. Parking has not been placed underground, a sufficient number of trees have not been
planted in surface lots, and new green open space has not been created. While the Fair Park Comprehensive Development Plan presented a compelling vision, it did not address the needs of the South Dallas and Fair Park areas as a whole. In fact, all five objectives were inward looking – they focused on the park itself, and not on its context. The Hargreaves plan did address the edges of the site, and proposed development at key intersections such as Parry Ave and Haskell Ave, and Parry Ave and Robert B. Cullum Blvd, as well as public realm improvements at major northern and southern street connections. But ultimately the plan focused on drawing people to Fair Park by making it a center for activity, entertainment, and events.

**Fair Park Today**

Today Fair Park covers 277 acres within the city of Dallas. Despite the many changes that have occurred, the site still resembles its 1936 design. When the park applied for landmark status it listed 32 historically significant structures and 13 plazas/landscape features. Today, over 40 structures exist on the site, 30 of which date back to the Texas Centennial.

Many of these buildings have been impeccably restored over the past two decades, and aside from the many museums within the site, the park itself is a museum of sorts.

Main access to the site continues to be provided off of Parry Avenue, with another primary entrance located still on Grand Avenue. Secondary Entrances exist at MLK Blvd, First Avenue, Exposition Blvd, Lagow Street, and Gaisford Street.
The site can still be described based on the following uses/areas:

- Esplanade and historic Centennial Buildings
- Music Hall, museums, and parkland
- The Midway and the Cotton Bowl
- Agricultural buildings/livestock
- Gexa Center and parking lots

Visitors enter through the gates across Exposition Plaza, and continue along the Esplanade towards the Court of Honor. This central axis ends at the Texas Hall of State. The esplanade reflecting pool is newly restored, as are Centennial Hall and the Automobile Building which flank the axis to the north and the south.

Along the southern edge of the site are the Musical Hall and numerous museums and other cultural facilities. The Leonhardt Lagoon is well maintained and beautifully landscaped. It provides one of the few pockets of lush greenery.
At the center of the park is the recently expanded and updated Cotton Bowl, south of which lies the Midway. This area is cordoned off when the fair is not in session, in contrast to the rest of the site, which while often empty, is still open to the public.

The food pavilion, exhibition halls, and livestock buildings are still located along the northern edge of the site, as is the Mounted Patrol Headquarters.

The eastern edge of the site between Pennsylvania Avenue and Fitzhugh is comprised entirely of parking lots with the exception of the Gexa Center located between First Ave and Exposition Ave.

**Parking Lots Along the Eastern Edge of Fair Park**

![Parking Lots Along the Eastern Edge of Fair Park](http://www.dmagazine.com/Home/D_Magazine/2012/June/How_the_State_Fair_of_Texas_Kills.aspx, viewed 5/19/13)

In addition to these buildings, approximately 65% of the site is paved, and the majority of the impervious surfaces are used for parking. Over 15,000 spaces are provided within the site, and 3,500 are provided in the overflow lots in Frazier Courts. The majority of the spaces are located along Fitzhugh Avenue and close to 1,000 are located along Robert B. Cullum.

Today the site is still visually appealing, and one feels a sense of excitement when entering the park through the main gates. The entry axes align with visual monuments – from Exposition Avenue one sees statues and the Hall of the State; from Grand Avenue, the clock tower; and from MLK Blvd, the Ferris wheel. However, the excitement is tempered by the fact that the area feels like a vacant movie set with perfectly manicured buildings and grounds, but no people. The grassy banks along the reflecting pool, and the shaded
porticos of the Automobile Building and Centennial Hall seem to beg for people to be interacting, reading a book, or enjoying a cup of coffee. The fair area along the Midway is fenced off, though one can see components of temporary structures and amusement rides through the barricades. The vast swaths of parking lots along Fitzhugh are eerie. Walking there on a summer day it is easy to understand why the area has the perception of being unsafe. This is how one views Fair Park for the majority of the year.

Fair Park has varying and inconsistent patterns of use throughout the year. On any given weekday, the park appears largely empty and abandoned; even though the museums and music hall are open for business.

The park comes to life when it hosts festivals – and it hosts many of them. From the North Texas Irish Festival which attracts 73,000 people, to the Texas Mardi Gras which attracts over 12,000 people, Fair Park draws people from Dallas and beyond to come enjoy live entertainment and cultural events. In addition to festivals, there are concerts at
the Gexa Center and the Music Hall, and numerous marathons and runs that start in, and sometimes stay entirely within Fair Park. According to the Dallas Department of Parks and recreation the site hosts 800-1,200 large-scale events per year. Such events bring people to the site for a few hours or a few days. These events are substantial and take time to set up and take down. As a result, festivals and runs, and other sporting events bring people to the site for short bursts, but much of the time the park is empty.

Table 2: Representative Events at Fair Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Number of Attendees</th>
<th>Economic Impact (If Estimate Provided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heart of Dallas Bowl</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>$10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Texas Irish Festival</td>
<td>73,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Day Dallas</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Park Fourth</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taste of Dallas</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fair of Texas</td>
<td>3,000,000</td>
<td>$300,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diwali Mela Festival</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwanza Fest</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Lantern Festival</td>
<td>163,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mardi Gras Texas Style</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Arts Festival</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinco de Mayo</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sporting Events
- Dallas Cup
- Hot Chocolate Run
- AC Roller Derby
- Soccer Games
- Susan G. Komens 3-Day Walk
- Kart Racing

Sources: City of Dallas. “Fair Park - A Great Public Space for Special Events and Programs.” PowerPoint Presentation.

Only the State Fair takes up almost the entire site for 24 days each fall, bringing in over 3 million people. During the fair, the site feels alive, full of people and entertainment. The Midway, which is usually closed off, is opened up and flooded with people. The Hargreaves report notes, however, that the visitor experience during the fair is limited to certain sections of the park, and that many of the parking lots are used for support activities rather than visitor activities. Additionally, during the fair, the museums do not get much traffic. Nevertheless, when looking at the use pattern maps, the fair is the only time when the majority of the site is activated.
Part of the reason the site feels so empty when the fair is not in session is because it is so big. The distance between museums is substantial, as is the area along the Esplanade and the lagoon. These stretches are lined with buildings other than museums that are vacant except during festivals and special events. The combination of distance between uses and the low number of visitors creates a lonely, isolated feeling in the park.

It is not that Fair Park does not attract visitors – more than 6 million people enter the site every year. It is not that events and entertainment are not held on the site – they are. But the types of uses that Fair Park draws, and the types of uses it is currently set up to support will never create the density and vibrancy that people envision for a signature park.

Part of the reason that a signature park use has not worked is that there is not enough density to support such a use in the areas surrounding the park. To illustrate the point, consider Central Park in New York City, a highly trafficked and utilized public park. It also holds festivals, contains permanent venues such as a zoo, restaurants and the like, and it is bordered by cultural institutions like museums. Unlike Fair Park, however, Central Park is bordered on all sides by some of the densest residential and commercial real estate in the country. People walk blocks to lay out in the Sheep’s Meadow on a nice day because it provides a change of scenery and rare open space. Events certainly draw big crowds, but the park itself is the main attraction on any given day. And it is in the center of a vibrant community that provides people to traverse the park on their way to work, or escape to the park during lunch. This population density does not exist around Fair Park, and adding more festivals will not change that.

Sheeps Meadow in Central Park: New York, Ny

Looking back through history, Fair Park has always been a place of learning, gathering, and entertainment. Throughout its history, Fair Park has struggled with profitability and year-round activity, and today is no different. While Fair Park has many wonderful assets and amenities, it lacks the vibrancy and population that a site of its size requires to feel like a well utilized place. There is a mismatch between the size of the site and the types of uses it houses. As evidenced by the relocation and closures of many venues, the park does not attract sufficient levels of visitors to support the year-round activity that the community desires and that past plans have sought to provide. Fair Park has struggled to maintain its tenants, and the new ones it attracts are of temporary nature. Without a different vision for the use of Fair Park, it will be difficult for the site to achieve its highest and best use.
CHAPTER 2: SOUTH DALLAS – THE CURRENT CONTEXT OF FAIR PARK

As history shows, Fair Park has maintained several characteristics over its life and it has also undergone numerous and drastic transformations. Many of these changes have been in response to context and the realities of the time. That context today consists of the communities surrounding Fair Park which have fallen into a blighted state. Without substantial interventions, it will be difficult to change the trajectories of these neighborhoods. Fair Park presents a unique redevelopment opportunity to serve as a catalyst that can spur the revitalization and transformation of South Dallas. The park itself is ready for another wave of transformation that will catapult it into the 21st century and allow it to become the self-sustaining center of education, innovation, and community that it was envisioned to be, while simultaneously serving as the new engine of South Dallas.

As detailed in Chapter 1, recent efforts to revitalize Fair Park have not yielded the hoped for results. There has been a disconnect between the planned uses and expectations. To understand what is needed for Fair Park to thrive, and for expectations to match outcomes, it is imperative to understand not only the challenges and opportunities facing Fair Park, but the context in which the site itself exists.

South Dallas Context

Fair Park is located less than two miles from the central business district in the westernmost part of the South Dallas/Fair Park neighborhood. It is northeast of the intersection of Interstate 30 and Interstate 45, and the S.M. Wright Freeway. Despite its excellent access to regional roadways, Fair Park is nestled among several blighted communities whose populations continue to decline.

Fair Park is bordered by three well-established neighborhoods: Jubilee to the north, Frazier to the east, and Grand Park South to the south.
Physical Context  
North of Fair Park

The northern edge of Fair Park is bordered by the Jubilee neighborhood. This community, like all of those in South Dallas, has experienced a dramatic decline in population since the 1960s. The closing of the Ford Factory in 1970 and the construction of I-30 have provided negative impacts on both sides of the community; the former, by the loss of jobs, and the latter by its physically imposing presence. While Fair Park received millions of dollars in preservation and maintenance, Jubilee has not been so lucky, and the majority of buildings are in either fair or poor condition. Some are obsolete, and some structures have been completely abandoned.

Looking at the area closest to Fair Park south of Haskell Avenue, close to 50% of the land is completely vacant. Housing pockets in the eastern edge are in poor condition, and the middle of the area is characterized by vacant lots. The Fannie C. Harris Elementary School is located south of Haskell between Grand and Gurley. The corner of Haskell and Parry is marked by vacant areas and parking lots, as well as a large tract of paved
land that was slated for the Railroad museum (which has since left Dallas and moved to Frisco). The decommissioned rail line and its right of way create a barrier between Fair Park and Jubilee.

In 2004 the Jubilee Park and Community Center Corporation commissioned a plan to address its state of decay and decline and to prepare a redevelopment strategy. This
plan focused on physical stabilization and redevelopment as a way to catalyze a more comprehensive transformation. While much of that physical transformation has occurred, or is in the process of occurring, the comprehensive transformation has yet to emerge.

The former Ford Assembly Plant, which in its prime employed 2,000 people, stood vacant for years before a developer purchased the site. Today, it houses a variety of uses including warehousing, industrial/commercial space, and an indoor soccer megaplex. Despite its new users, the site still looks like a former factory/industrial space, covered with impervious surfaces and isolated from its surrounding context.

**East of Fair Park**
To the east of Fair Park is the Frazier Courts neighborhood. This neighborhood was the victim of the eminent domain actions of the late 1960s in Dallas, and today abuts the parking lots along the eastern edge of Fair Park. Covering over 1,000 acres, this neighborhood is symbolic of the decay and blight prevalent throughout South Dallas. Characterized by buildings in poor or obsolete condition, numerous vacant lots, minimal commercial and industrial uses, a poor public realm, and extreme poverty, the Dallas Housing Authority commissioned a master plan that was delivered in 2004. This study provided a thorough analysis of the entire area and recommended stabilization and redevelopment strategies. The plan specifically addresses the opportunities for the overflow parking lots of the State Fair, which are technically outside of the 277 acre park site. Today, elements of the plan have been implemented, and others are underway. Yet, without jobs and other meaningful ways to boost resident incomes and the tax base, the area continues to struggle.

**Parking Lots East of Fair Park**
South of Fair Park
The southern edge of Fair Park abuts approximately 87 acres of land in need of redevelopment and revitalization. This area, bound by Parry Avenue, Robert B. Cullum Blvd, South Trunk Avenue, and Fitzhugh, has been the subject of previous studies and redevelopment plans. The majority of the area is vacant, scattered with poor quality housing, decaying commercial uses, parking lots, and a few churches. The western portion of this area is slightly more developed, but includes low density retail and substantial parking lots. Minyard Food Store, for example, at the intersection of MLK Blvd and South Trunk, has an expansive parking lot along the main corridor, creating an unfriendly pedestrian environment.

Further South, between Robert B. Cullum Blvd and I-45, the area is characterized again by vacancy and low quality single family homes. In this area, there are pockets of newer housing and other development, but these patches are few and far between. West of Grand Avenue lies just over 60 acres wedged between the I-30 and I-45 interchange. This area is home to recycling businesses and other industrial/commercial facilities. The few dilapidated residential structures located here look more like junk yards than homes. Given its condition and location with excellent rail and highway access, this area is prime for consolidation and redevelopment with industrial and manufacturing facilities. These are likely the only suitable uses for the space given the noise and air quality due to its proximity to highways.

I-30 and I-45 Highway Interchange

Sources: Google Earth
New Transportation Infrastructure Investments

The newly added DART Green Line, which opened in 2010, has two stops serving Fair Park, one at the entrance on Parry Ave, and another just south of the entrance on MLK Blvd. This light rail, along with the numerous buses that serve Fair Park and the immediately adjacent areas, provide excellent access to the site and its surrounding areas.

Despite the substantial work done on stabilizing and improving the housing stock and physical environment around Fair Park, the absence of jobs and education has stifled the next level of revitalization. While the high levels of vacancy present opportunities for development, they also make any new development riskier. Without substantial and simultaneous investments in the area, it is difficult to convince the private sector to assume the risk of investing in South Dallas.

Social Context

Many studies have detailed the population of South Dallas. It is characterized as mainly African American, impoverished, and uneducated. Employment is low, jobs are scarce, and the number of undesirable uses such as liquor stores, pawn shops, and night clubs is high. The following graphs and tables provide a snapshot of the social context surrounding Fair Park.

Figure 9: South Dallas Population by Race

Sources: Data from http://projects.nytimes.com/census/2010/map for census tracts comprising South Dallas
Moreover, the population in South Dallas is continuing to decline. In 1970 over 62,000 people lived in South Dallas; by 2000 that number had dropped to just over 28,000, representing a 54% change. As of 2010, just 22,138 people lived in South Dallas; the area saw a decline in its population while the rest of the city saw an increase. More than 2,000 of the 10,395 housing units are vacant, contributing to the feeling of decay and disinvestment.

Education levels in South Dallas are extremely low – almost 50% of the residents have less than a GED or high school diploma. With the lack of education and employment opportunities it is not surprising that per capita income is only $10,446, compared to $24,837 in the city at large.

Low education, employment, and income are often associated with high levels or poverty and crime – South Dallas is no different.

Figure 10: Crime Rate per 1,000 People

Sources: The Institute for Urban Policy Research at The University of Texas in Dallas based on 2008 US Census Data
Undesirable uses are concentrated in South Dallas, and contribute to the negative image of the place.

**Figure 11: Liquor Stores per 1,000 People**

Sources: The Institute for Urban Policy Research at The University of Texas in Dallas based on 2008 US Census Data

**Economic Context**

South Dallas is struggling economically. While downtown, North Dallas, and Uptown in particular have seen a growing population, new retail and restaurants, and thriving commercial districts, the opposite has occurred in South Dallas. Despite numerous economic development studies and plans, the area has not begun to change for the better. The public realm along commercial corridors such as MLK Blvd is as dismal as the retail options located there. In such a state, attracting new businesses will continue to be difficult. Major investments will be needed to bring vitality to South Dallas – and these will be required via a multi-pronged approach to provide education, employment, and ultimately an increase in disposable income. More plans on how to go about bringing changes that will result in concrete outcomes are required.

South Dallas needs a catalyst to spur development and reverse current trends. The reality is, that **without massive investments in jobs and education** (and this does not mean capacity building and fostering linkages – but rather putting serious capital to work to
create actual jobs), **the neighborhood will not turn around.** Important work has been
done to stop the downward spiral of South Dallas, but the population is still on the decline.
Fair Park is the real opportunity to provide such a catalyst, but **bringing people to the site is not enough – people need to be brought to the area, people need to stay in the area, people need to work in the site, learn in the site, innovate in the site, and live, shop, and socialize in the surrounding areas.**

But what does this really mean? What does it take to create a catalyst for meaningful, tangible change? To answer that question it is important to first look at the park through and operational/financial lens.

**Economic Context of Fair Park**

Equally important to understanding the context around Fair Park is understanding the current operations and funding of the site and the activities within the park. It is important to understand the costs of running the park today in order to have a baseline in which to compare alternatives.

The current reality is that the city of Dallas pays for the majority of the operations and upkeep at Fair Park. With an annual operating budget of over $8M per year, the city is responsible for the landscaping, building maintenance, security, facility rental, and programming within the park. While permanent organizations, such as the museums, contract with the Office of Cultural Affairs, the Department of Parks and Recreation is still responsible for landscaping these non-city entity sites.

In the last two decades, over $260M\(^1\) has been spent on capital improvements in Fair Park, more than half of which was funded by the city bond programs. This money has gone to the restoration and preservation of buildings and public art, and was supplemented by the State Fair, government grants, and philanthropic donations.

Revenues are generated within the park by leasing buildings and hosting events. Additionally, the Department of Parks and Recreation collects a percentage fee from their vendors who provide catering, parking, and security services to events. These revenues, however, do not cover the total cost of the park, nor do they allow for the accumulation of a reserve fund to pay for the inevitable future costs of maintaining old buildings.

---

The State Fair reinvests its net revenues into Fair Park per its contract with the city, but this is a relatively small amount. According to the Ernst & Young financial statement notes\(^2\), these amounts were $2.9 Million and $1.9 Million in 2010 and 2009 respectively. In 2007 and 2008 these contributions were on the order of $16.5 Million and $3.2 Million respectively. It is likely that the substantially higher amount in 2007 is related to the contract amendment with the city described below. Additionally, the State Fair makes other investments in site in conjunction with the State Fair or its other activities. While some, such as the recent resurfacing of the Grand Plaza Parking Lot, have benefits for the city as well, they are not revenue generating benefits. The State Fair is a profitable non-profit (i.e. its revenues exceed its cost), but this is because the vast majority of the site's maintenance is paid for by entities other than itself. And it is currently not paying rent. In 2006 the city struck a deal with the State Fair in which it would receive a rent abatement of $13.9M from 2007 through the first quarter of 2018 in exchange for making a $19.5M investment in the Cotton Bowl renovations\(^3\). As the Fair has ramped up its use of the park, for example, with its planned Summer Adventures program\(^4\), it is not compensating the city for its increased usage. Contractually this is the State Fair’s right, but the additional wear and tear on the park is potentially unfunded.

### Making the Case for Redevelopment in Fair Park

The need to revitalize South Dallas is well known throughout the city. It has been the subject of many plans including the current Mayor’s Grow South Initiative, and a strong component of comprehensive plans such as The Dallas Plan and Forward Dallas! The


\(^3\) State Fair of Texas Financial Statements; and “First Amendment to the Lease Agreement between the State Fair of Texas and the City of Dallas (062070).”

\(^4\) City of Dallas. “Fair Park – A Great Public Space for Special Events and Programs.” PowerPoint Presentation.
current physical, social, and economic state of South Dallas mars the otherwise thriving image of the city of Dallas. And moreover, by allowing South Dallas to exist in its current state, the city and its private sector are foregoing vast opportunities.

Fair Park is a key component of unlocking latent potential in South Dallas and for the city as a whole.

Looking at the current state of operations at Fair Park, it can be described as an import site. It brings people to it for events it holds there. People come for a short period of entertainment and then leave. But Fair Park should not just be an ‘import site’ that people go to for events. Like any large space with historic infrastructure such events could be part of its use program, but it should not be the only use program. Rather, Fair Park should be reimaged as the catalyst for the revitalization of South Dallas. Fair Park could become the place where investments are made, where jobs are created, where people are educated. It could become an ‘export site’ that produces trained people, ideas, goods, services and the like.

Efforts to fix the areas around Fair Park have stalled – South Dallas cannot continue to move forward unless it is repopulated and its residents have access to education and employment opportunities. Stabilization can only go so far, and for revitalization to happen, businesses must be drawn to the area. New housing and public realm improvements have been, and continue to be necessary, but more importantly, residents must have the ability to maintain a basic quality of life. Providing one without the other has, in numerous other cases, ultimately been unsuccessful.

Fair Park provides the opportunity to create a magnet that draws people and investments down to South Dallas – it can provide the basis for the comprehensive redevelopment that physical transformation of neighborhoods alone has not been able to deliver.

For Fair Park to be such a catalyst, it must be redeveloped to deliver concrete outcomes, not such a process. The outcomes of the site itself should include:

- Jobs
- Financial self sufficiency
- Education, innovation, and job training
These outcomes will provide the necessary means for the people of South Dallas to become gainfully employed, and for the future generations to become educated and have increased opportunities to provide for themselves and their families. These outcomes have not been yet achieved in South Dallas, and they have not been contributed to by Fair Park. With the number of attempts to affect change in the past, it is clear that ‘business as usual’ will not get the job done.

Redeveloping Fair Park in a meaningful way will require thinking about redevelopment in a new way. Fair Park is big, empty, and expensive to maintain. Currently, Fair Park needs to be this way because for 4 weeks every year, almost the entire site is used by the State Fair; in just 4 weeks 3.5M people come to Fair Park; and for these 4 weeks the park needs to be in tip top shape.

Recently Fair Park has received a lot of press – people have called for a reimagining of site. This is not the first time people have called for new ideas – Dallasites have been talking about revitalizing Fair Park for decades. Undoubtedly, the State Fair of Texas holds a special meaning to the city of Dallas. For many, it is impossible to imagine Fair Park without the State Fair. Yet the fair and its programmatic requirements have, in many ways, limited the potential of the site. While the fair itself operates autonomously from the city and the tax payer dollar, Fair Park as a site does not. Without relocating the State Fair, attracting year-round uses that bring more life to the park will be nearly impossible. The city will need to find tenants willing to invest and locate in Fair Park, but vacate for approximately seven weeks a year to accommodate the State Fair.

People want something new and vibrant and exciting in Fair Park, but most cannot fathom the idea of relocating the State Fair. To really re-envision Fair Park in a way that is meaningful, and in a way that catalyzes development in the surrounding areas, it is important to envision and test scenarios in which the State Fair is relocated to a more appropriate site. Considering this bold move does not require executing it, but understanding the physical, social, and economic realities of the current situation in comparison to what could be if the Fair were relocated is an important first step. Few could seriously argue that the State Fair is not a fun, successful event rich with Dallas culture and tradition. This event has historically taken place in Fair Park – since 1886. But today, the consequences of its existence in Fair Park is in direct conflict with what is needed by the surrounding communities.
If Fair Park can be redeveloped successfully and achieve the repopulation and employment of its surrounding areas, it will show the public and private sector that what has been done in areas like Uptown in North Dallas, can succeed in South Dallas as well.
CHAPTER 3: REIMAGINING FAIR PARK

Based on the history of the site, the context, and the need for redevelopment, this chapter looks at potential development scenarios for Fair Park. To use the redevelopment of Fair Park as a catalyst for rebuilding the surrounding communities and rebalancing the disparities across the city, any plan should define the specific outcomes it seeks to achieve, not merely goals or objectives. This chapter establishes a set of criteria in order to guide the development of new use programs and to evaluate potential development scenarios. It also describes preconditions for development that will be necessary for any redevelopment to achieve its goals and ultimately allow the site to better interact with South Dallas as a whole. The chapter concludes with the proposal and evaluation of two scenarios that illustrate the potential for Fair Park and demonstrate how a redevelopment can unlock potential within the greater South Dallas area.

Criteria
Developing a set of criteria for a plan is a critical input that will shape the results and ultimate outcomes. Based on the current operations of Fair Park, and the needs of its surrounding communities, this section articulates a set of criteria that can guide the development and evaluation of alternative use scenarios.

1. **Financial Self-Sufficiency:** Rather than having the city of Dallas fund landscaping, historic building preservation, full time police detail and the like, the new users of Fair Park could absorb most if not all of these costs. For example, private companies can be held accountable for landscaping the property that they either own or rent; new uses could be carefully selected such that they can run without a subsidy; and even basic infrastructure maintenance costs can be shifted to private users. The ultimate goal is to free up city capital so that it can be deployed to areas and activities where it can generate a more suitable return on taxpayer dollars. It should be noted that financial self-sufficiency does not necessarily equate to a lack of control for the city. Via landlord covenants or zoning requirements the city can still maintain control of certain aspects of the look and feel of Fair Park, should it so choose.

2. **Maximization of Site Beneficiaries:** Redevelopment scenarios should be thoughtful to who exactly is benefiting from redevelopment, and to what extent. As it stands today, beneficiaries of Fair Park are mainly the visitors who come for short periods of time. Fair Park is used by festival goers and visitors who come to the site for the antique fairs and other events that are held there. Additional beneficiaries include the State
Fair board, some of whom earn significant salaries and other benefits from overseeing Fair operations; the football teams and fans that play at the Cotton Bowl each year, and fairgoers, many who come from out of town and enjoy the fair for just a day or two each year.

3. **Creation/Provision of Jobs:** Job creation is an imperative of any redevelopment in Fair Park. Fair Park is adjacent to communities with some of the highest levels of unemployment in Dallas. Redevelopment should strive to create numerous year-round jobs (as opposed to temporary ones for state fair workers or event support staff) for a variety of skill levels. A job center at Fair Park could accomplish multiple goals including bringing diverse populations to the area to work, providing low skill jobs for many of the nearby residents, and creating opportunity for future generations to have better, higher skilled jobs. Providing jobs to local populations will support area revitalization by providing both income and potentially services to surrounding neighborhoods.

4. **Year-Round Activity and Intensity of Use:** Year-round activity and intensity of use is critical not only for the image of the place, but for the revitalization of surrounding areas and for expanding the city’s economic base. One of the main differentiators of Fair Park and other successful state fairgrounds is its lack of a vibrant year-round activity calendar. While in the past, uses outside of State Fair season were more active, many have moved to downtown or elsewhere, or have closed for financial reasons. Outside of the State Fair, millions of visitors come to the park each year, but they come for short periods of time – for example, for an early morning half marathon or 5K run, or for a day-long festival or evening concert. Redevelopment of Fair Park should bring a higher density of people to the area year-round, and attract people to the site for more than just one or two events per year. Mixing housing, jobs sites, services, and other uses will bring a diverse group of people and activities to the park and increase the intensity of uses.

5. **Positive Reintegration with Surrounding Neighborhoods:** Successful redevelopment of the park should strive to reintegrate the fairgrounds with its surroundings. Today Fair Park is isolated between East Dallas and South Dallas. Bounded by gates, endless parking lots, and old railroad tracks, the park that once drew so many people in now, both physically and by its perception, keeps them out; except of course, during the State Fair. From creating more inviting edges to replacing parking lots with extensions of the neighborhood fabric, a successful Fair Park would become a seamless part of its surrounding communities that benefits those communities in addition to the city at

---

large. It will be critical to develop the surrounding areas in conjunction with Fair Park so as not to perpetuate the sites current isolation/detachment from its surroundings.

6. **Retention, Reuse, and Enhancement of Historic Structures:** The Texas Centennial Buildings located in Fair Park are historically important buildings. They are used during the fair, and occasionally throughout the year for exhibitions and the like. These buildings, while historic, should be utilized on a permanent basis. Leaving them vacant not only requires upkeep that does not generate much of a return, but it does not allow the buildings to be used and enjoyed as they were designed to be.

**Preconditions for Redevelopment**

As noted in previous chapters, the State Fair limits the development opportunities for Fair Park because of its space requirements for the limited periods of the year during which it operates. As a result, the first precondition of development is the relocation of the State Fair.

The second precondition for redevelopment is the implementation of a new urban design/infrastructure framework. As detailed in Chapter 2, when Fair Park was initially built, it was located on the outskirts of town amidst rural fields. Over time, as it grew, so did the area around it. Today, the site remains, in many ways, as if it was still located along the outskirts of urban development. It is gated, inward looking, and isolated from its context. An important first step in the redevelopment of Fair Park, and in the revitalization of South Dallas, will be the reorganization/reintegration of the site, including substantial infrastructure investments.

To reweave Fair Park into its urban fabric, a new urban design framework must be introduced in order to reintegrate Fair Park with the surrounding neighborhoods, breakdown the site and create a sense of porosity and permeability. The proposed urban design framework has three elements:

1. Establishment of a roadway network within and through the site
2. Creation of a strong open space system
3. Leveraging of DART investments to trigger transit oriented development around the Fair Park and MLK Blvd DART Green Line stations

Additionally, the site cannot be used or redeveloped in isolation, and thus the proposed urban design framework expands the development boundaries and identifies additional
zones to the north, south, and west of the site. To the north, Haskell Street becomes the new edge of the Fair Park development, while to the south the DART line provides a lower boundary. Interstate 30 marks the new boundary to the west. To the east of the site, Fitzhugh provides a useful boundary because the adjacent Frazier neighborhood has approved a redevelopment plan that improves the area. The 15 acre overflow parking lot to the east of Fitzhugh on the northern corner of the site, for example, is slated for redevelopment with 360 apartment units.

**Roadway Network**

In an effort to reconnect Fair Park with the surrounding South Dallas communities, Grand Avenue, MLK Blvd, and Pennsylvania Avenue should be extended through the site in order to increase permeability and connectivity. These extended streets reconnect the neighborhoods to the north and to the south of Fair Park, and help to reknit the site back into the community fabric. Some east-west roads, such as 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue are reestablished within the site as well, and in combination with the green boulevard that connects to the central open space, both visual and vehicular/pedestrian connections are created. The new blocks are created which allow for the introduction of new land uses to the site.

**Figure 12: Extending the Street Grid**
Figure 13: Creating Permeability Along Site Edges

Figure 14: Breaking Down the Site
Open Space

Three key open space elements are proposed within the site. First, the historic Leonhardt Lagoon Nature Walk and parkland, and the adjacent Dallas Discovery Gardens have been retained. These sites have regional significance and are in excellent condition. They are accessible by the communities to the south, and are close to the DART station on MLK Blvd that provides access to the region. The second open space calls for the creation of a green open space in the center of the site where the Cotton Bowl currently sits. Removing the Cotton Bowl will present political challenges, and other alternatives such as its reprogramming or repurposing can be explored at a later date. Extending from this green open space, the establishment of a green boulevard connects the park to Fitzhugh Ave. and the community beyond. This axis will serve to draw people into the site and create a central gathering space/park amenity. Third, the railroad track to the north, which is no longer active, is repurposed as a linear park, providing a shared asset and unifying element between the community to the north and the site itself. This idea was proposed in the 2003 Fair Park Comprehensive Master Plan, but has not yet been implemented.

Figure 15: New Green Space Network
Transit Oriented Development

Fair Park is well served by the new DART Green Line, which has a stop at the entrance of Fair Park on Parry Street, and two blocks to the south of Fair Park on MLK Blvd. These stations, along with the redevelopment of Fair Park, can trigger much needed commercial, retail, service, and other development around the transit sites. Transit oriented developments will help to strengthen the overall area, which will benefit new developments both inside and outside of the park. These areas are already slated for transit-oriented development, and making that plan a reality will be critical in establishing Fair Park as a catalyst for change.

With the site reintegrated into its context it is possible to envision a new parcelization that will facilitate the changing of the land use program.

Figure 16: Proposed Parcelization

Note: F Parcels denote parcels within Fair Park; C Parcels denote community parcels outside of the site.
Scenarios
The goals for the outcomes of redevelopment, along with the criteria defined above, inform a vision of the characteristics of what the future of Fair Park could be. While the ultimate program of the site will need to be developed through a more in depth planning process which is described in Chapter 4, this section articulates and illustrates three scenarios for the future of Fair Park. The first scenario is the continuation of the status quo. It describes what will happen if things continue as they have been and provides cursory cost estimates. The following two scenarios provide something that has been missing from the civic discussion – alternatives for Fair Park that do not include the State Fair.

Scenario 1: Maintain the Status Quo
This scenario assumes that no major improvements are made to the site plan and/or activity mix, and that the State Fair continues to operate in Fair Park. Under this scenario, park activities will continue to be festivals, athletic events, and concerts that attract large crowds for short periods of time. The State Fair will operate its Summer Adventures program from May through August, and the city will continue to rent out historic exposition halls. Planning efforts for the surrounding areas will continue to be of the same ilk – aiming to ‘foster participation,’ ‘facilitate and promote economic development opportunities,’ and ‘strengthen linkages.’ These sound more like goals of a process, not aspirations or outcomes resulting from the implementation of a plan. These plans, like many others, also lack accountability, responsibility, and authority. Maintaining the status quo in Fair Park likely means maintaining the status quo in South Dallas, and that paints a bleak picture for the future of the city as a whole.

Financially, this means that the city will continue the majority of operations and maintenance in Fair Park. The State Fair has made contributions to Fair Park between $1.9M and $3.2M between 2008 and 2010. Even if the State Fair could grow net revenue contributions to $5M per year, its contributions are substantially less than the city will spend on operating costs alone. While much historic restoration has been performed in the past two decades, Fair Park will continue to need capital improvements.

The annual revenues from venue rentals have ranged between $1.5M and $2.4M over

---

2 South Dallas/Greater Fair Park Community Revitalization Plan; Adopted by the Dallas City Council December 12, 2012
3 These are net revenue figures and do not account for the investments in State Fair specific infrastructure/buildings/equipment.
the past five years. Many of these events have estimated contributions to the local economy. These estimates, however, are based on assumptions. Careful review of these assumptions should be executed to check their validity. For example, in the Revitalization of Fair Park: Economic Impacts and Development Issues study conducted in 1991 for the Friends of Fair Park, it was projected that by 2010 output from Fair Park would be in excess of $300M. However, this figure is based on the number of visitors increasing from 5.5M per year to over 11M per year – a target that was clearly not hit.

**Current State of Fair Park**

![Source: Google Earth](image_url)

**Alternative Scenarios**

The following two scenarios describe what could be located in Fair Park were the State Fair to relocate. These scenarios illustrate the latent potential in Fair Park for the purpose of comparison to Scenario 1.

**Scenario 2: The Mixed Income Residential Neighborhood**

One of the most powerful feelings one gets when visiting Fair Park when the State Fair is not in session, is the overwhelming lack of people. Areas like the lagoon or the Centennial Court seem to beg for visitors other than maintenance workers. Wide roads and expansive parking lots devoid of all but a few cars create an eerie contrast between a feeling of upkeep and investment and the missing feeling of a bustling population and all that it brings (safety, security, activity, etc.).
This scenario re-envisions Fair Park as a vibrant residential neighborhood that serves its own residents and attracts visitors from the surrounding communities and beyond. Rather than competing with the Arts District or other more developed areas of the city, this scenario focuses on augmenting existing uses such as the Dallas Summer Musicals venue, and attracting others that would provide services and amenities to the newly envisioned community. This scenario brings new life and diversity to South Dallas/Fair Park, and integrates the site with existing neighborhoods by extending development along its edges.

To achieve this vision, Scenario 2 proposes the introduction of several new land uses within new and existing structures, and the retention of some existing facilities. As shown in the diagram below, and corresponding to parcels in Figure 16:

- The structures in parcel F1 are repurposed for retail, entertainment, and service uses. These could include coffee shops, restaurants, boutique shopping, or personal service centers.
- Parcel F2 is also repurposed. The Cotton Bowl is demolished and replaced with...
a public open space. The surrounding buildings are repurposed, and potentially expanded, to house a community college facility that will serve the surrounding areas by providing education and skills training.

- Parcels F3 – F10 are cleared and redeveloped as a residential community. Parcel F5 could follow the development plan articulated in 2004 Frazier Courts Neighborhood Development Strategy. Parcels F4, F6, F8 and F10 will be developed at an FAR between 1.0 and 1.5. These parcels are closest to the existing community and will need to relate to the existing scale. Parcels F3, F7, and F9, on the other hand, can be developed at a higher FAR of 2.

- Parcels F14 and F18 are redeveloped to consolidate and expand community services.

- Parcels F11, F12, F13, and F17 are retained in their current form. Vacated buildings should be reprogrammed with new attractions, and if necessary, additional building space could be added to house uses demanded in the future by the new and existing residential communities.

- Parcels F15 and F16 are developed as higher density housing with an FAR of 1.5. This housing is provided atop parking podiums to accommodate parking for residents and site visitors.

Descriptions of Proposed Land Uses

Residential Communities

Adding residential areas within Fair Park will bring the critical mass of people that will provide the life and vibrancy currently lacking. Along the eastern edge of the site the residential areas step down in density form west to east in order to integrate more smoothly with the existing neighborhoods. A variety of housing typologies, ranging from single family homes to multifamily housing can provide residences for people of varying incomes and family sizes. In addition to contributing to the repopulation of South Dallas, this new community can contribute to the diversification of the area.

Cultural and Entertainment Amenities/Attractions

In addition to the new residents that would locate in Fair Park, this scenario redevelops other parts of the site with cultural attractions and other services and amenities that would make Fair Park a wonderful place to visit for an entire day. The Dallas Summer Musicals, as well as the museums and parkland along the southern portion of the site are retained. While some of the building uses in the parkland have been recently vacated, the buildings can be repurposed with other appropriate activities. The exposition halls around the esplanade are repurposed for retail and restaurant activities that provide places for
visitors to eat, and for residents living within and outside of Fair Park to come and shop. Faneuil Hall in Boston provides a precedent for reuse of this type. The addition of a variety of uses creates a synergy within Fair Park. Residents of the new community have much of what they need/want within walking distance, and visitors who come to Fair Park for a show or to see a museum can stay for a meal or another activity.

_Institutional_

The final component of the redevelopment within the site is educational facilities. With the influx of residents, as well as the educational challenges facing the residents of the surrounding neighborhoods, creating educational opportunities will be key in ensuring the success of the redevelopment.

The buildings to the north of the Cotton Bowl, between the proposed residential community and the cultural/attraction area could be transformed to house a community college branch. This would provide excellent educational opportunities for a variety of users ranging from high school students looking to get a head start on a four year degree, to South Dallas residents looking to obtain an employable skill set.

The Irma Lerma Rangel Young Women’s Leadership School (located in the south eastern corner of Fair Park) is retained, and additional community facilities could be located in the southeast corner of the site to serve the influx of schoolage children in the proposed residential community. Next to this school, a park or athletic facility could be created by connecting the triangular lots across the train tracks. This intervention would not only create a more developable parcel, but it would explicitly connect the site to its neighbors. Alternatively, the school located just outside the site on East Grand Ave could be expanded to accommodate the increase in school-age children.

**Redevelopment of Community Edges**

Edge development around Fair Park will be vital to the success of the efforts made within the park. The “soft” areas along the edges of the park and the neighboring residential communities should be thought of as extensions of the park and should be densified accordingly.

The following land use plan is proposed for the edge zones:

- Parcels C1 and C2 are redeveloped with high density housing with an FAR of 2.5
- Parcels C3 – C11 are redeveloped with residential housing at a scale similar to that
along the easternmost edge of the site.
- Parcels C12 – C18 are developed with mixed use facilities and FAR ranging between 1.5 and 2.0.
- Additionally, the two TOD zones should leverage recent investments made by DART, which provides two stops at Fair Park, one at the main entrance off of Parry St, and the other just two blocks South on MLK Blvd. This new infrastructure can trigger the redevelopment in the form of transit oriented development zones with higher density mixed use development that included housing, commercial, and service oriented uses. These TOD zones could provide essential services and additional entertainment amenities for the new residents of Fair Park and for the existing residents of the surrounding communities.

**Development Summary of Scenario 2**

The tables below summarizes the proposed development by parcel and use type.

**Table 4: Scenario 2 Development Summary Within Fair Park**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Suggested Land Uses Within Fair Park</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Total Development S.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1,023,660</td>
<td>Retail/Entertainment Cultural</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>511,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>2,644,092</td>
<td>Community College and Open</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>793,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>444,312</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>888,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>535,788</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>803,682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>527,076</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>527,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>514,008</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>771,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>574,992</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,149,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>692,604</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>692,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>588,060</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,176,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>714,384</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>714,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>466,092</td>
<td>Cultural / Parkland</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>46,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>614,196</td>
<td>Cultural / Parkland</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>61,420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>309,276</td>
<td>Cultural / Parkland</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>92,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>387,684</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>387,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>278,784</td>
<td>Parkland / Housing</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>418,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>270,072</td>
<td>Parkland / Housing</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>405,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>178,596</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>53,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>252,648</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>25,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL ACRES 252.9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Land Uses</th>
<th>Total Development S.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Entertainment Cultural</td>
<td>5.38% 511,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College and Open</td>
<td>8.33% 793,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>74.70% 7,111,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural / Parkland</td>
<td>2.11% 200,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkland / Housing</td>
<td>8.65% 823,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>0.83% 78,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total 9,519,167**
Scenario 3: The Educational Consortia and Innovation/Manufacturing District

Scenario 3 takes a different approach, and focuses on creating educational and employment opportunities, as well as spurring economic development through innovation and manufacturing centers.

In this scenario the site is repurposed and redeveloped in the following way:

- Parcels F1 and F2 are repurposed with educational facilities including a major university and a community college. As well, the Cotton Bowl is replaced by public open space.
- Parcels F3, F4, F6, F7, F8, F9 and F10 are redeveloped innovation, R&D, and manufacturing centers. As with the residential development in Scenario 2, the FAR increased from east to west from 1.0 to 2.0 in order to ease the transition with the adjacent community.

Table 5: Scenario 2 Development Summary Outside of Fair Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Area Square Feet</th>
<th>Suggested Land Uses Surrounding Fair Park</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Total Development S.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>771,012</td>
<td>High Density Housing</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1,927,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>574,992</td>
<td>High Density Housing</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1,437,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>261,360</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>392,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>243,936</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>365,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>287,496</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>431,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>265,716</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>398,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>274,428</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>411,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>304,920</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>457,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>331,056</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>496,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>405,108</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>607,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>500,940</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>751,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>810,216</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1,215,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>888,624</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,777,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>1,367,784</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2,051,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>278,784</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>418,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>270,072</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>540,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>230,868</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>461,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>365,904</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>731,808</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL ACRES 193.6 Total Development S.F. 14,873,562

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Total Development S.F.</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Density Housing</td>
<td>3,365,010</td>
<td>22.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>4,312,440</td>
<td>28.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>7,196,112</td>
<td>48.38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 14,873,562
- Parcel F5 is developed with residential uses.
- Parcels F14 and F18 are redeveloped with expanded community facilities.
- Museum, cultural, and parkland facilities are located in Parcels F11, F12, F13, and F17.
- Parcels F15 and F16 are redeveloped with high density housing as in the previous scenario.

Figure 18: The Educational Consortia and Innovation/Manufacturing District

**Descriptions of Proposed Land Uses**

**Innovation/R&D/Manufacturing**

The rationale behind the introduction of this type of use is multi-fold: 1) jobs that were shipped overseas are likely not returning, thus it is imperative to train today's labor force for jobs of the future; 2) with Baylor close by, and a new university being introduced on the site, Fair Park becomes an ideal area to locate an innovation/R&D cluster that can collaborate with the proposed and existing educational institutions. Light manufacturing industries exist within Dallas and could be expanded – for example, the scrap metal facilities that currently ship the scrap to China to be recycled, could begin to process
material in Dallas. Other labor intensive industries could be created in Dallas to employ its workforce and the ideas for these industries could be conceived in Fair Park. Additionally, this use type could synergize with educational facilities to train people for numerous new jobs.

Educational Uses and Job Training Uses
Adding a major university, in conjunction with a community college, aims to accomplish several goals. Firstly, educational institutions typically bring people, jobs, and investments to an area. Additionally, with education levels so low in South Dallas, providing accessible, nearby educational institutions will provide additional opportunities for existing and future residents. This new institution continues across the new Green Spine along the northern edge of the site, and west of Parry Avenue. By combining these soft edges with the historic core of the site, the university can create a substantial, vibrant campus that includes the repurposing of historic buildings, and the addition of new ones including student housing. This scenario also calls for a community college as in Scenario 2. The Cotton Bowl, in this scenario, could easily be retained instead of demolishing it for open space. It could be knitted into the university facilities, and could serve, for example, both the El Centro and Fair Park branches of the Dallas County Community College. Key to this scenario is the job training capacity created by the interplay of educational institutions with the Innovation/R&D/Manufacturing cluster. The community college can work with these uses to train future workforces, and both the community college and major university can collaborate on research and innovation around manufacturing and new technologies.

Redevelopment of Community Edges
As with Scenario 2, the soft areas to the north and south of the site should be included in the redevelopment planning process. The only difference in land use programs for the areas outside the site between the scenarios occurs in Parcels C1 and C2. In Scenario 3, these parcels are developed as part of the university. They may well be developed as student housing, but they could accommodate other uses as well.
### Development Summary of Scenario 3
The following tables summarizes the proposed development by parcel and use type.

#### Table 6: Scenario 3 Development Summary Within Fair Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Suggested Land Uses Within Fair Park</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Total Development S.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>1,023,660</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>511,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>2,644,092</td>
<td>Community College, University / Innovation Center</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1,322,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>444,312</td>
<td>Innovation Center</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>888,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>535,788</td>
<td>Innovation Center</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>535,788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>527,076</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>527,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>514,008</td>
<td>Innovation Center</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>514,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>574,992</td>
<td>Innovation Center</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,149,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>692,604</td>
<td>Innovation Center</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>692,604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>588,060</td>
<td>Innovation Center</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,176,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>714,384</td>
<td>Innovation Center</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>714,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>466,092</td>
<td>Cultural / Parkland</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>46,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F12</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>614,196</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>122,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F13</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>309,276</td>
<td>Innovation Center</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>309,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F14</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>387,684</td>
<td>Innovation Center</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>387,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F15</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>278,784</td>
<td>Parkland / Housing</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>557,568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F16</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>270,072</td>
<td>Parkland / Housing</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>540,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F17</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>178,596</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>53,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F18</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>252,648</td>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>25,265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL**

**ACRES** 252.9

**Total Development S.F.** 10,075,428

- University 6.30% 634,669
- Community College, University / Innovation Center 13.12% 1,322,046
- Cultural / Parkland 63.21% 6,368,472
- Parkland / Housing 0.46% 46,609
- Community Facilities 10.89% 1,097,712
- Residential 0.78% 78,844

**Total** 10,075,428
Evaluation of Scenarios
Comparing these scenarios against the established criteria confirms that the status quo will not achieve the desired outcomes. It shows that Scenarios 2 and 3, while different do achieve the goals in various ways.

Table 7: Scenario 3 Development Summary Outside of Fair Park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel #</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Area Square Feet</th>
<th>Suggested Land Uses Outside of Fair Park</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Total Development S.F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>771,012</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1,927,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>574,992</td>
<td>University</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1,437,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>261,360</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>522,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>243,936</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>487,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>287,496</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>574,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>265,716</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>531,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>274,428</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>548,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>304,920</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>457,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>331,056</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>496,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C10</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>405,108</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>607,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>500,940</td>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>751,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C12</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>810,216</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>810,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>888,624</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1,777,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>1,367,784</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2,051,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>278,784</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>418,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>270,072</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>540,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>230,868</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>461,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>365,904</td>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>731,808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>193.6</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>15,134,922</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Acres</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Residential</th>
<th>Mixed Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>193.6</td>
<td>15,134,922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluation of Scenarios
Comparing these scenarios against the established criteria confirms that the status quo will not achieve the desired outcomes. It shows that Scenarios 2 and 3, while different do achieve the goals in various ways.

Table 8: Scenario Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Financial Self Sufficiency</th>
<th>Maximization of Site Beneficiaries</th>
<th>Job Creation</th>
<th>Year Round Activity</th>
<th>Reintegration with Context</th>
<th>Reuse/Preservation of Historic Structures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes +</td>
<td>Yes +</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes +</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table provides a qualitative evaluation, especially for financial self-sufficiency. Further testing is required to conduct a rigorous evaluation, but this chart provides a logical evaluation of the scenarios against the criteria.
Scenario 1
As shown in Table 8, Scenario 1 meets only the last criteria, that of reusing and preserving historic structures. While events do occur on the site throughout the year, this scenario has not met the fourth criteria because it does not provide a sufficient intensity of use throughout the year.

Scenario 2
Testing Scenario 2 against the criteria yields the following:

1. **Financial Self-Sufficiency:** New residences would dramatically increase the tax base. Rough estimates on the residential development within the site show a potential increase in revenue to the city based on real estate taxes ranging from $18M to $38M.\(^4\) Increased tax revenues would fund city investments in infrastructure, rather than require that funds essentially be 'donated' without any sort of return. Additionally, homeowners, condo associations, and local service providers could contribute to the upkeep, landscaping, and programming of the area.

2. **Maximize the Beneficiaries of the Redevelopment:** Scenario 2 makes Fair Park a home and destination to its residents, the citizens of South Dallas, the citizens of the entire city of Dallas, and visitors. It becomes a place where people come to school, to shop, and to live. The museums and cultural facilities continue to attract visitors, while new residents can utilize the landscaped parkland.

3. **Creation/Provision of Jobs:** While the residential portion of this scenario does not contribute much in the way of new jobs, aside from custodial, landscaping, and perhaps security jobs, the other uses of the site would bring new employment opportunities to the site. Based on estimated employment densities, this scenario could potentially bring over 3,800 new permanent jobs to Fair Park.

4. **Increase Year-Round Activity/Intensity of Use:** With a new population living in the park, year-round activity would be achieved. It would be a different sort of activity than what other state fair sites have programmed. Instead of frequent conferences, horse shows, or performances, activity would occur in the form of residents going about their daily lives. Given the size of Fair Park, the

\(^4\) Total number of units is calculated by multiplying Total Development SF by 0.85 (for efficiency) and by dividing the resulting number by 1,100 (average unit size). Based in the estimated number of units I calculate a range of total housing values. On the low end, I estimate the average assessed value at $125,000, and on the high end, at $255,000. The gross assessed value is then multiplied by the Dallas Real Estate Tax rate of 2.73% to arrive at the estimates, which have been rounded.
establishment of such a residential community would certainly support existing venues and create a demand for new ones. While unnecessary to compete with the arts district downtown, Fair Park, over time, could build an identity as both a residential area with strong entertainment and service amenities such as the Dallas Summer Musicals, and perhaps a cluster of restaurants and other entertainment uses.

5. **Fair Park Positively Reintegrates with Surrounding Neighborhoods:** This scenario proposes that the redevelopment of the surrounding edges occur simultaneously with development within the site. Along with the described preconditions of development, this scenario reknits Fair Park back into the urban fabric of the area. Additionally, the site becomes a place that serves and benefits the neighborhood, making it a purposefully integrated part of the community fabric.

6. **Retention/Reuse and Enhancement of Historic Structures:** By repurposing the historic buildings for higher intensity uses, this scenario accomplishes the goal of reusing and enhancing the historic structures. This scenario ensures that these iconic buildings are enjoyed year-round by numerous populations that either live at or visit the park.

### Table 9: Employment Density Figures Used for Estimation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Type</th>
<th>Employees per 1,000 sf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate/Mgmt</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bar/Restaurant</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel/Lodging</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Commercial</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Service</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Service</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial/Insurance</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Retail</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery/Liquor/Convenience</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: These figures are not derived from Dallas, but are used as conservative estimates of potential employment density by use type.

**Source:** “Employment Generation Rates: A Background on Survey Research Conducted in Telluride, San Miguel County and Other Resort Communities”

### Table 10: Scenario 2 Estimated Permanent Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (sf)</th>
<th>Net Area (sf)</th>
<th>Total # of Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Retail/Entertainment Cultural Services</td>
<td>511,830</td>
<td>435,056</td>
<td>1,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College and Open Space</td>
<td>793,228</td>
<td>674,243</td>
<td>1,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural / Parkland</td>
<td>200,812</td>
<td>170,690</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>78,844</td>
<td>67,017</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Potential Jobs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,814</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scenario 3

Testing Scenario 3 against the criteria yields the following:

1. **Financial Self-Sufficiency:** Scenario 3 achieves financial self-sufficiency in a different way than Scenario 2. In this scenario, major institutions take over the operation and maintenance of this historic core of the site. Additionally, it is likely that the city could receive additional benefits from the addition of a university to the site via sale or lease of land. Similarly, the community college would provide the same benefits. The Innovation/R&D/Manufacturing cluster would not only provide its own operation and maintenance, but would contribute commercial taxes to the city. The residential component under this scheme, though much smaller than in Scenario 2, could contribute between $1.3M and $2.8M.\(^5\)

2. **Maximize the Beneficiaries of the Redevelopment:** Scenario 3 reaches a potentially wider group of beneficiaries than Scenario 2. In this scenario, students from across the world could come and study at the anchor university that locates in Fair Park. Numerous local students and those from elsewhere could come and study at the community college branch. The Innovation/R&D/Manufacturing cluster could provide thousands of jobs. These jobs could provide employment for the current residents of South Dallas, and to those new populations who may locate in the area in order to be close to the new education and innovation center.

3. **Creation/Provision of Jobs:** Of the three scenarios described in this thesis, Scenario 3 provides the greatest number of permanent jobs, at over 22,000 (see table below). These jobs are created through the educational institutions ranging from professors to custodial workers. And these jobs are created by the Innovation/R&D/Manufacturing facilities.

4. **Increase Year-Round Activity/Intensity of Use:** This scenario dramatically increased the intensity of use of Fair Park by bringing tens of thousands of people to the site each and every day. The mix between educational facilities, which has a potentially high number of students and even faculty living on site, and employment centers creates a vibrant mix of high intensity, high density uses. This scenario also provides a critical mass of people that can support the development of services and retail along the edges of Fair Park, and drive the long planned economic development/entertainment zone to the south of the site.

\(^5\) Same assumptions as used in Scenario 2 estimation.
5. **Fair Park Positively Reintegrates with Surrounding Neighborhoods:**
As with Scenario 2, this scenario also proposes that redevelopment of the surrounding edges occurs simultaneously with the development within the site. Along with the described preconditions of development, this scenario reknits Fair Park back into the urban fabric of the area. Additionally, the site becomes a place that serves and benefits the neighborhood, making it a purposefully integrated part of the community fabric.

6. **Retention/Reuse and Enhancement of Historic Structures:** By repurposing the historic buildings with a university, this scenario accomplishes the goal of reusing and enhancing the historic structures. The building maintains its historic purpose as a place to share innovations. This scenario ensures that these iconic buildings are enjoyed year-round by numerous populations that study there.

### Table 11: Scenario 3 Estimated Permanent Jobs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Area (sf)</th>
<th>Net Area (sf)</th>
<th>Total # of Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University/Community College/Open Space</td>
<td>1,956,715</td>
<td>1,663,208</td>
<td>4,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation Center</td>
<td>6,368,472</td>
<td>5,413,201</td>
<td>17,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural / Parkland</td>
<td>46,609</td>
<td>39,618</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>78,844</td>
<td>67,017</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Potential Jobs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>22,242</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 4: NEXT STEPS AND CONSIDERATIONS

The previous chapter presented two alternative land use programs that could align outcomes with the needs of the areas surrounding Fair Park. Those ideas, however, are not a solution, but rather scenarios that should spark a broader conversation about the redevelopment of Fair Park. This chapter discusses potential next steps in the process of redeveloping Fair Park, and makes several recommendations for avoiding past mistakes and inefficiencies. The chapter concludes with both the identification of several potential obstacles to implementation and potential solutions to managing those challenges.

Redevelopment of a site with the complexities of Fair Park will require a comprehensive planning process that builds upon all of the previous work that has been completed. However, such a process should aim not to reinvent the wheel, but to develop a solution that responds to the immediate needs of today while incorporating the flexibility to adapt to the needs of tomorrow.

Despite its history of successful neighborhood planning initiatives, past large-scale planning efforts in South Dallas have faced many challenges, including:

1. Lack of funds to begin implementation promptly
2. Insufficient funds to implement at a large enough scale to drive catalytic change
3. Misalignment between planning power and executive power
4. Lack of accountability, responsibility, and authority at the city level

Promoting constructive change in Fair Park requires that a new process and framework be developed for planning and implementation. Redevelopment will need to occur at such a scale that it will drive change, attract new investment, and have in place an infrastructure to perpetuate future change and growth.

Next Steps

Create an Advisory Committee
Given the complexities surrounding Fair Park, substantial work will be required before even developing a plan or beginning implementation. Additionally, given the tensions around the site and its uses, there is much ground work to be done to bring the city and the community on board to consider dramatic change. Such an undertaking will require a dedicated group of individuals to pull together the necessary materials and make a strong
case. This group could comprise an advisory committee that shepherds the process along, articulates a vision, makes a strong case, and ultimately sees through the implementation.

**Conduct Feasibility Studies**
For the advisory committee to be successful, it must not only make a strong case for redevelopment, but it must possess concrete evidence to support the notion that such redevelopment would accomplish the desired goals. Feasibility studies need to be conducted to provide such evidence and ultimately strengthen any redevelopment campaign. Issues that must be addressed include:

1. Legal issues pertaining to Fair Park, its existing contracts, and changes of use
2. Market studies for new housing and/or other potential uses
3. Financial feasibility of investment and requirements of potential funding sources
4. Institutional frameworks that could be implemented during development and for the continued operation and maintenance of the site
5. The necessary infrastructure investments required to make future development successful

**Secure Commitments for Funding**
Given the historic challenges in raising adequate funds for redevelopment projects in South Dallas, securing funding early on will give this effort a new level of credibility – it will show stakeholders and the city that this effort can and will be realized. Armed with the feasibility studies and a strong vision of desired outcomes, the advisory committee can approach a variety of funding sources to raise capital for this effort. Highlighting the need for education and new century jobs may help attract the interest of national philanthropic organizations such as the Ford Foundation or the Gates Foundation. The advisory committee can also reach out to the local and regional civic activists, institutions, and private companies for funds. Additionally, given that Fair Park is so well served by new public transportation, federal funds may be available for development of the site and its surrounding areas. Redevelopment of Fair Park will have to be phased over many years. As such, while substantial funds will need to be raised at the onset, others could be committed in a matching capacity over time.

Having funds committed will also facilitate the recruitment of anchor institutions. For example, should the advisory group decide that a university should be located within Fair Park, having funds to implement the complementary developments already committed will make it that much easier to bring serious players to the table. Convincing a school to
invest heavily in the area will no doubt require substantial investments in the surrounding area, and a reputable group with committed funds will be in a better position to strike a deal than city agents working from a master plan document.

**Attract Partner Institutions and Local Developers**

Bringing institutions to Fair Park will require that they make commitments and key investments in the site and in the vision for its future. For example, in bringing a large university to Fair Park, that institution could be charged by the advisory committee with the responsibility of redeveloping parts of the site with a campus, and making certain necessary infrastructure improvements to the site at large. Moreover, terms can be negotiated requiring the creation/provision of a certain number of full time jobs to local residents. Local real estate developers with expertise in educational facilities, housing, manufacturing, or whatever uses are ultimately decided for the site, could take the lead in initiating the redevelopment and attracting larger institutions. Ultimately, the advisory committee may want to delegate as much of the development/implementation as possible to institutions or developers that are willing to fund such improvements (with or without the help of matching funds) while abiding by key requirements of the vision and desired outcomes.

**Engage Community in a Planning Process**

With sufficient funding, and institutional partners in place, the advisory committee should then engage stakeholders in a well-planned and efficient planning process. So much work has been done on Fair Park and its surrounding communities that much of the planning analysis will require only updating. The real challenge that will need to be addressed by the planning process is building consensus around the new vision for the park. Given the complex history and numerous stakeholder groups involved, having the resources in place and the authority to execute a plan are critical first steps. With these tasks accomplished, the advisory committee and its consultants will be in a new position when working with stakeholders. They will not merely be people planning for change that will never actually happen; rather they will be credible facilitators of change with whom residents can engage around shared goals and objectives.

**Obtain the Authority to Execute Future Planning Efforts**

With a plan, funding institutional partners, and community support, the advisory committee should consider approaching the city and obtaining authority to implement the plan. This will align planning power with executive power for this project, and will provide continuity in
the implementation, and protection from changing political leadership. Additionally, such an authority will help avoid past challenges faced by redevelopment in South Dallas.

Dallas is governed by a weak mayor system. As a result, even great leadership may fall short in convincing city council members to vote for and approve a specific initiative. Given the long history of distrust between the city and South Dallas, any changes to Fair Park will likely present several political challenges. Moreover, much of this distrust is warranted. In their 2004 report titled “Dallas at the Tipping Point”, Booze Allen concluded, among other things, that the city of Dallas suffers from issues relating to the misalignment of accountability, responsibility, and authority\(^1\). While the city is not a corporation, it suffers from many issues that may drive one out of business. For example, when a plan is completed in Dallas, very often there is no particular agency or person at the city with the authority to execute the recommendations, there is not a particular person or agency that claims responsibility for doing so, nor is any particular person or agency held accountable. Sometimes recommendations are followed, other times, they are not.\(^2\) As a result, aligning authority, accountability, and responsibility within the organization charged with redeveloping Fair Park will be critical.

**Establish a Framework for Continued Implementation Over Time**

The redevelopment of Fair Park will not happen overnight – it will not happen in 5, 10, or perhaps even 15 years. It will take time, patience, and flexibility. The initial advisory committee may move on over the course of implementation, and therefore it will be essential that a detailed implementation plan be created as well a framework for who will see it through and how. This could involve transferring of authority/responsibility to anchor institutions, or keeping it with an autonomous group. This idea will require more research, but is critical to the ultimate success of any redevelopment.

**Obstacles to Implementation**

Implementing a project of the scale described in this thesis will not be without its challenges. This section highlights several obstacles likely to arise during a planning/redevelopment process. These challenges should not limit creative thinking, but rather should be viewed as another constraint in a larger system of equations that needs to be anticipated.

\(^1\) Booze Allen Hamilton. April 2004. “Dallas at a Tipping Point,” p. 3
1. **Fair Park is a Public Park**

Fair Park is a public park owned by the city of Dallas. To sell any part of the site, or to change its status as a publicly owned piece of land would require a referendum. As a result, selling the site to a private developer or institution would be quite difficult.

The advisory committee will need to analyze this issue and ascertain if there is any way around the issue. Potentially, the city may be able to execute long term leases with institutions/universities that may want to locate in Fair Park. Such a solution may be more difficult for residential uses or innovation/research uses. Nevertheless, the city could potentially negotiate a long term lease with a variety of uses that could increase city revenues and decrease the outlays by the Department of Parks and Recreation by transferring maintenance of the site (subject to city imposed guidelines) to the tenants.

On the other hand, selling the land may pose a way for the city to earn money and permanently reduce its maintenance responsibilities at Fair Park. This potential income/savings may provide an incentive for taxpayers to vote favorably in a referendum.

2. **Relocating the State Fair**

As illustrated in previous chapters, relocating the State Fair is a critical first step in realizing the full potential of Fair Park. However, the State Fair is deeply rooted in Fair Park, and its image is in many ways tied to the site. Moreover, the State Fair renegotiated a long-term lease with the city in 2007, and relocating the fair would require the breaking or renegotiation of this lease.

In addition to the legal issues at play, there are several issues of perception that will have to be addressed. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been invested in Fair Park over the past two decades. Battling the sunk cost fallacy will require effective messaging and a compelling presentation of the facts. Additionally, there is a nostalgic significance to the State Fair and its location in Fair Park. Many people remember vividly their trips to the fair as a child. Relocating a deep-rooted piece of history will likely be met with substantial resistance that should be anticipated.

Lastly, the State Fair, though a non-profit, has been able to provide generous employment and consulting opportunities to many people. Any discussion of relocating the fair may be viewed as a threat to jobs, as opposed to an opportunity to expand jobs to a new location.
To address this issue, considerations should be given to finding an attractive alternative site where the State Fair could relocate. Other state fairs can be looked to for precedents, as can other events that include livestock, such as horse shows and 4H competitions. These events require substantial infrastructures but are located in more rural areas.

Additionally, the State Fair prides itself on being financially self-sufficient. It should be able to function without depending on the city to maintain its site throughout the year.

3. Catalyzing Future Investment
It is hard to spur change with many small interventions. Over time, piecemeal efforts will likely have some effect, but not the desired dramatic turnaround that is needed in South Dallas. As is often the case when redeveloping blighted areas, there is the temptation to move cautiously, not to throw good money after bad. However, such an approach can cause the exact outcome it is trying to avoid – the expenditure of resources without results deemed sufficient.

The redevelopment of South Dallas has shown there are limits to the efficacy of small to midscale interventions. Creating serious change in the area will require serious investment. Given the risk and likely unattractive returns provided by investments in the area, the private sector cannot be relied upon initially. Given the historic performance of the city, it is likely they may not provide adequate funding as well.

There are several ways that this project could be funded, all of which involve layering of different sources of capital. Two key avenues to explore are reaching out to national philanthropic groups such as the Ford Foundation or the Gates Foundation and asking for the commitment of substantial funding. These funds could be matched by locally raised philanthropic money.

Alternatively, anchor institutions could be approached to make substantial initial investments in the area provided they receive some financial and policy incentives from the city. For example, the University of Texas could be approached to establish a South Dallas campus. Attracting these investments will not be easy, but developers and leaders will need to think outside the box in order to catalyze the scale of investment that is demanded by the site and its context.
4. Oversight and Follow Through
One of the common problems with implementing large-scale development projects that require city funding and oversight is that politicians come and go, and what was popular under one government is not under the next. As was discussed in the Booze Allen report – three issues plaguing the city of Dallas when it comes to accomplishing goals are: accountability, responsibility, authority.

As a result, redeveloping Fair Park will require more permanent oversight, and thus the advisory committee was recommended above. Additionally, while redevelopment as proposed in this thesis is in many ways a philanthropic project, but it must be viewed as a business proposition – and should be executed as if it were an initiative being carried out by a Fortune 500 company.

By obtaining authority, the advisory committee will be in a better position to hold people accountable for actions and commitments. For example, roles can be defined and city officials and other participants can publicly take responsibility, thereby increasing their accountability and commitment to the project.

5. Community Buy-in
Engaging the community residents and building with them a shared vision will be difficult. South Dallas communities are not trusting of outsiders, and often not even of well-intentioned philanthropists and/or politicians. Parts of the community are heavily influenced by council persons or other community leaders that have their own interests to protect.

The planning process undertaken as part of this redevelopment will need to anticipate significant resistance. Care should be given to the messaging and execution of the planning process.

Additionally, it is important that the opportunities that exist in the redevelopment of the site not be confused with opportunism. It is important to stress that the goals of this redevelopment have emerged from the needs of the surrounding communities, as opposed to being imposed upon the communities based on what makes sense for others. The conversation can then shift to how to best deliver to the community what it needs. Wherever possible, efforts should be made to provide equity building opportunities to residents.
6. Overcoming Inertia of Prior Investment
Overcoming investment inertia will present a substantial public relations challenge to the advisory committee. There has been tremendous investment in Fair Park, and debunking the sunk cost fallacy is difficult with any audience. Not all of the prior investment in Fair Park will be lost in redevelopment. However, some likely would be, specifically those related to the State Fair, and potentially the Cotton Bowl.

The advisory committee must anticipate this type of opposition, especially from proponents of the State Fair and the Cotton Bowl in the business community. The redevelopment team must find ways of creating a vision that incorporates components of numerous stakeholder’s visions, and this includes members of the opposition to redevelopment. Constructing a compelling storyline that acknowledges the negative aspects of the past and current state of the site and its context, but focuses on the opportunities of the future, may help in this regard.

Conclusion
Though redeveloping Fair Park will present many challenges, and will ultimately require many compromises, the benefits make it a worthwhile effort. Fair Park has the potential to not only be a dynamic site in its own right, but it could spark the rebirth and growth of an entire segment of the city that is currently impoverished. By using Fair Park as a catalytic project, the untapped redevelopment potential of South Dallas can be unlocked for future generations.

This paper has attempted to provide a new way of thinking about the redevelopment of Fair Park and encourages its use to transform the larger context in which it exists. The state of fairness is off balance in Dallas. Redeveloping Fair Park is a first step in restoring equilibrium.
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