

Draft Report

(graphics and appendices to follow)

*Dan Cornejo
01-03-07*

Moving Forward Together: U of M Area Neighborhood Impact Report

University of Minnesota, City of Minneapolis, Stadium Area Advisory Group

Preamble

The University of Minnesota is a very significant asset to the State, the City of Minneapolis, and its adjacent neighborhoods. With its extensive array of undergraduate, graduate, and professional degree programs, venues for arts and sports programs, 50,000 students, 16,300 employees, hundreds of millions of dollars in employee compensation, the University's Twin Cities Campus provides innumerable educational, cultural, and economic benefits. In fiscal year 2006, the University attracted \$576 million for research sponsored by the federal government and private sector sources, most of that carried out on the Twin Cities Campus.

However, because of its size and scale, the University also puts demands on the urban systems and infrastructure of the communities closest to its campus. There are pressures on the housing market, a growing imbalance in neighborhood demographics, and transportation/traffic/parking issues associated with having 80,000 people converge daily to use University facilities.

Today, homeowner flight, blighted rental properties, and rising rates of violent crime threaten the campus and the community environment. The continued viability of the University, the well-being of the students and their educational endeavors, and the health and sustainability of the neighborhoods are all threatened. These issues have reached a crisis stage, with trends in a downward spiral. The current trajectory of deterioration in the neighborhoods is of grave concern. Without focused action and investment now, the price of addressing problems will be much greater in the future.

Immediate attention and increased resources are needed to reverse these trends and chart a new, more positive future for the neighborhoods and the campus environment. We believe that timely investments now represent, to a large degree, the savings in likely greater expenditures needed for more drastic corrective measures in the future. .

How this Twin Cities Campus and its surrounding neighborhoods, with the active participation of the City of Minneapolis, examine the issues of common concern, organize stakeholders to strategize, make plans, and take action, all in a collaborative manner, could be a model for the other campuses throughout Minnesota as they address similar issues.

Articulated in many different ways by all the stakeholders, including the students, the overriding message that has emerged from the process of studying the direct and indirect impacts of the University of Minnesota

Twin Cities Campus on the surrounding community is that the destiny of the University is closely and inextricably linked to the destiny of the neighborhoods.

The parties to this report began from the premise that many aspects of their current relationship are working, and should be strengthened. We also examined the very real concerns and negative aspects arising from the presence of a large institution in the center of older, largely single-family neighborhoods. We recognized that these phenomena were not unique, which led us to learn from other responses by other educational institutions in other cities. These insights informed our study.

This report describes and analyzes some of the positive and negative impacts of the University of Minnesota on its adjacent neighborhoods, articulates our findings and conclusions, and makes recommendations for the State Legislature to assist the stakeholders in addressing them.

I. INTRODUCTION

Executive Summary

(a brief statement of the most important things we want the reader to get from the report)
This needs to be articulated as “The Ask.”

Background

The financing bill passed by the Minnesota Legislature in May, 2006 and signed into law by the Governor in support of an on-campus University of Minnesota Gopher football stadium included a directive to prepare a report on the neighborhood impacts of the University of Minnesota and the relationship among the neighborhoods, the University of Minnesota, and the City of Minneapolis.

This report responds to that directive, and includes the consensus recommendations from the University, the City of Minneapolis, and the Stadium Area Advisory Group.

Purpose

The University of Minnesota aims to be among the top public research universities in the world. The University of Minnesota’s Twin Cities campus is a major economic and cultural asset to the metropolitan area, and the University in turn benefits from its flagship campus’ location in the center of a vibrant Minneapolis-St. Paul metro area.

To achieve its goal of being among the top public research universities in the world, the University of Minnesota must attract and retain creative, accomplished people who will come here to expand and share their knowledge, and to make discoveries. The University’s success in reaching this goal will be enhanced by being a part of healthy, vital, and attractive neighborhoods and commercial districts. The East and West Bank areas of the Twin Cities Campus and the adjacent communities form an important economic and cultural anchor in the City of Minneapolis. The success of each reinforces the success of the other.

Vision

It is the vision of the parties involved in the process that led up to this report that:

- the communities adjacent to campus will be vital, safe, and attractive places where current and future residents will want to invest their time, talents, and resources for the long term. Together, the campus and neighboring communities will be an environment rich in culture,

creativity, community, and human capital, and will be a premier asset to the cities and the region of which it is a part; and that

- the University, the City, and the community organizations will have a partnership to achieve and maintain this vision in the long run.

Process for the Study

The University of Minnesota, the City of Minneapolis, and the Stadium Area Advisory Group appointed an Impact Report Task Group to oversee the consultation process and the development of the report.

With the assistance of lead consultant Dan Cornejo of CORNEJO CONSULTING – Community Planning + Design, the Impact Report Task Group initiated an Outreach Plan to engage stakeholders. The Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA) was engaged to undertake research on existing data, mapping, trends analysis, best practices and strategies for building partnerships among the stakeholders, and to provide an urban policy perspective to inform the report recommendations. Mr. Cornejo also coordinated the distillation of the key findings and recommendations and authored the final draft report.

The Outreach Plan included:

1. Consultation (meetings, surveys, and e-mail communications) with stakeholder groups in five neighborhoods: SE Como, Marcy-Holmes, Prospect Park, Cedar-Riverside/West Bank, as well as the University neighborhood, an area adjacent to campus not defined as part of other neighborhoods.
2. Meetings with key City of Minneapolis elected and appointed officials.
3. Meetings with key senior administration officials at the University of Minnesota.
4. Meetings with University of Minnesota student organizations, including the Minnesota Student Association (MSA), the Graduate and Professional Student Assembly (GAPSA), and the Minnesota Greek Alumni Partnership.
5. Meeting with students as part of a November 29 Minneapolis Campus Safety Walk.
6. Meetings with Augsburg College and Fairview-UMMC officials.
7. Meetings with the business associations to gather data on economic vitality of the business districts (Dinkytown, Stadium Village, Cedar-Riverside).
8. Articles about the study in *The Minnesota Daily* and *The Bridge* and an invitation to respond to survey questions via e-mail or web.

See *Appendix XXX* for full listing of stakeholder meetings.

II. COMMUNITY CONTEXT

The Twin Cities Campus of the University of Minnesota and the five adjacent Minneapolis neighborhoods (Cedar Riverside, Marcy Holmes, South East Como, Prospect Park, and the University neighborhood) include a resident population of some 35,500 people, or just under 10% of the population of the City of Minneapolis.

There is great variety among and within neighborhoods, but in general these are densely settled urban places with great cultural and ethnic diversity. Unique in Minneapolis, these neighborhoods are comprised of a very high proportion of 18-24 year-old residents, ranging from 38% in Cedar Riverside to nearly 100% in the University neighborhood, compared with 14% for the City as a whole. These neighborhoods are much

higher in their proportion of rental housing than the average for the rest of Minneapolis, ranging from 85% rental units in Marcy Holmes, to 65% in South East Como, compared to an average of 50% for Minneapolis as a whole. The large numbers of college-age and other young adults gives these neighborhoods a special energy and vibrancy, but also brings a more transient spirit. The culture of the young adults and that of the long-term residents sometimes conflict, mostly related to noise, hours, civility, and the mundane responsibilities of living in a community.

The neighborhoods have in common an outstanding resource of human capital, residents who are highly educated, culturally adept, and well organized on behalf of their communities. All the neighborhoods have a strong heritage of citizen involvement and political activism.

The major employers in the district--the University of Minnesota, Augsburg College, and the University of Minnesota Medical Center Fairview, bring upwards of 18,000 employees to the area each day.

The commuting employees of these institutions represent a potential market for quality housing in the district, when it is available. In all, 4,026 or 24%, of Twin Cities Campus University employees live in the City of Minneapolis. Of these, 513, or 3%, live in the five campus area neighborhoods included in this study. The University pays approximately \$24,700,000 in total salaries each year to employees who live in these five campus area neighborhoods.

Income levels in the five neighborhoods are on average less than for Minneapolis as a whole.

This situation is partly attributable to the large number of student and young adult residents. The exception is in the Cedar Riverside neighborhood, where three times as many families have poverty-level incomes as in the City as a whole. The Prospect Park neighborhood is also home to 200+ very low income families who live in the Glendale public housing development.

The five neighborhoods are rich in historic character and tradition, have a diverse mix of single-family homes, townhomes, and apartments both older and more recently-constructed.

A point of pride in these neighborhoods is the history and character of the housing and commercial areas. The Marcy-Holmes neighborhood grew up with the 19th Century east bank milling district, and has three designated historic districts within its boundaries. The Prospect Park neighborhood, with its topography, winding streets, and homes of great architectural character, is in the process of defining an historic district that would include most of the neighborhood.

Most of the owner-occupied housing in these neighborhoods has traditionally been single family houses, but in the last few years a variety of new condo, loft and townhome developments have been built along the significant corridors of the riverfront, East Hennepin, University Avenue, and 8th Street SE. New mixed-use developments are being built in the Old Saint Anthony area along E. Hennepin, and on the St. Paul edge of Prospect Park.

Estimated market values for single family properties in the district range from lower than Minneapolis' average in the Cedar Riverside neighborhood, to significantly higher than average in the Prospect Park neighborhood. Housing conditions in the Cedar Riverside neighborhood are relatively stable, thanks to most rental properties being in large, stable holdings, and to the high number of community-managed cooperative housing units.

Recent trends in single-family conversion to rental use/over-occupancy are causing a negative spiral downward in the Southeast neighborhoods.

Housing type and conditions in the South East Minneapolis neighborhoods, however, are quite volatile, with one of the highest rates of single family home conversion to rental in the city. From 2000 to 2006, 17% of the single family homes in the SE Como neighborhood were converted to rental use. This neighborhood has a uniquely high proportion of its residents who have been in their homes for many years, which suggests that the wave of turnover in single family properties may continue. The SE Como neighborhood is presently the most vulnerable to the negative housing trends described elsewhere in this report.

There are three retail/commercial business districts within the campus area neighborhoods, all of which are at least in part identified with a University and young adult clientele: Stadium Village, Dinkytown, and Cedar Riverside.

Profiles of these three commercial districts are included in *Appendix X*. The University Research Park (formerly known as South East Minneapolis Industrial area or SEMI), just northeast of campus, was, in the last century, a railroad commodity transfer and manufacturing district. The City of Minneapolis has developed a plan to transform this district with new infrastructure and to make it available for biotechnical and other higher technology business growth. On the University campus adjacent to the University Research Park is an evolving district of biomedical research facilities, which should be an excellent fit with the private-sector research park aspirations for the University Research Park area. The University’s McGuire Translational Research facility was completed here in early 2006, and nearby, a new biomedical research facility will be under construction in 2007. The new football stadium is now under construction just to the south of the research district.

The University Research Park is connected on the east to the City of Saint Paul’s biotechnology corridor.

The two cities are increasingly working together to coordinate their planning and development efforts. The University-affiliated University Enterprise Labs, a wetlab business incubator, is located on the biotech corridor where the two cities meet.

The campus area district, perhaps second only to downtown Minneapolis, draws a large number of visitors each year from around the state and region. University athletic venues, cultural and arts events at the University and Augsburg, patient visits to the Fairview/University hospitals on both sides of the river, the theatres and music venues in Cedar Riverside and Dinkytown, conferences and special events at the University bring in millions of visitors to the city. The Fairview/University outpatient clinics alone generate 400,000 patient visits each year.

Use of current transit options is high. There is strong support for new Central Corridor LRT line.

With over 60% of commutes using a non-single-occupancy vehicle option, the Twin Cities campus population is already relatively reliant on Metro Transit, the intercampus bus shuttle, and other alternative forms of transportation. It’s anticipated that the Central Corridor light rail line will eventually be built through the campus area neighborhoods, linking on the eastern end with downtown Saint Paul, and on the west, with downtown Minneapolis and the North Star commuter rail line. More transit-oriented development is in the planning stages along University Avenue, in anticipation of light rail.

Please refer to *Appendix X* for a matrix of neighborhood data, and profiles of each of the five neighborhoods and three retail/commercial districts.

III. ISSUES ANALYSIS: THEMES AND MAIN MESSAGES

The Impact Report Task Group, through its Outreach Plan, heard from hundreds of stakeholders, including students, long-term neighborhoods residents, business operators and owners, elected and appointed City officials, senior officials from Augsburg College and Fairview-UMMC, and University of Minnesota administrators. These consultations were extremely candid, rich with insights, and characterized, at times, with frustration as well as a sense of optimism. Great hope was expressed by all parties that with the attention and support of the State legislature, this collaborative assessment would lead to a new commitment, a new partnership, and a new moving forward together with resources sufficient to enhance the competitive advantage of a great educational institution and significantly improve the prospects for neighborhoods adjacent to the campus.

The following themes and main messages emerged from these consultations:

1. Together, the University of Minnesota Twin Cities Campus and its surrounding neighborhoods are a unique asset, an educational, cultural, and economic powerhouse for not only the City of Minneapolis, but for the whole State of Minnesota.

Creative people are drawn to communities that have a strong and growing mix of learning, cultural, employment, and living options. We want people with choices to find every reason to choose the University of Minnesota. We want them to choose to live and raise their families in the neighborhoods adjacent to campus.

The neighborhoods surrounding the University of Minnesota need to be of the highest quality. If these neighborhoods are weak, the University’s attractiveness and vitality is weakened. Its competitive advantage will be severely compromised: its enrollment of high quality students will likely drop, its lure for the most talented faculty will be lessened, and its ability to garner research funds may be harmed.. As first stated above in the preamble, the destiny of the University is closely and inextricably linked to the destiny of the surrounding neighborhoods.

If the University of Minnesota is to achieve its mission, with maximum positive impact on the whole State, the City of Minneapolis, and the neighborhoods surrounding campus, there is a need to stop “business as usual.” There is a need to create and embrace a new and different relationship that focuses on mutually beneficial and collaborative action.

2. Livability and housing vitality are central to vibrant and sustainable neighborhoods. Long-term residents and students deserve safe, affordable, and decent housing. These qualities are closely linked to the University’s attractiveness. However, conversions of single-family homes to *de facto* rooming houses, over-occupancy, and poor management by some landlords are negatively impacting affordability and neighborhood livability.

The neighborhoods adjacent to the University campus (Mary-Holmes, SE Como, Cedar-Riverside, and Prospect Park), with their commercial districts, parks, schools, and libraries, are the very places that need to be attractive and welcoming. These neighborhoods must be the first choice for U of M, as well as Augsburg College and Fairview-UMMC, faculty, administrative staff, and grad student families as well as undergraduate students when they seek decent, safe, and affordable housing, in attractive sustainable neighborhoods of enduring quality and character.

Research has shown that students who live on campus and take part in the campus experience have a higher graduation and success rate in their college career. The University, like many of its peer institutions, has continued to enrich its extracurricular on-campus programming, to provide a higher quality college experience. Over the last 15 years, the University has added XXX beds of on-campus student housing, and now provides housing for 80+% of the Twin Cities freshman class each year. Partly due to a higher number of students living on campus and “graduating” from the residence halls, and partly because of a general desire for the campus experience, there has been an increase in demand among students to live in rental housing near the campus.

This demand for student rentals, coupled with an aggressive financial lending and investment environment in the last decade, has fueled, in near-campus neighborhoods, the development of XXXX units of privately developed and managed rental housing marketed to students. Many of these units are in multi-family complexes, with professional property managers and some with student development staff on site, similar to the staffing provided in the University’s residence halls. Although the designs of some of these developments have been of concern, they are for the most part well maintained and well managed properties that provide safe, if expensive, housing for students.

Another way that the private market has responded has been in the conversion of previously single family homes to rental use, with much greater negative impacts. The SE Como, Marcy-Holmes, and Prospect Park neighborhoods are being transformed from primarily single-family communities with homesteaded properties to an unstable investor/speculator haven. The limited City of Minneapolis staff resources for housing inspections/enforcement have difficulty keeping up with investor-landlords who are converting many older single-family-triplex housing into income-producing “rooming houses.” Poor tenant selection and negligent maintenance often characterize the management of these properties, which resulting in disinvestment and loss of livability for family households nearby. This phenomenon is based on an economic model of legal and illegal conversions, with profits driven by minimal investment and illegal levels of over-occupancy.

In the past year, many of the properties exhibiting the most disinvestment appear to be occupied by non-student tenants, some of whom are engaged in illegal activities including drug-dealing and robberies.

Since 2000, 224 single family homes (that we can document) in SE Minneapolis have been converted to rental, 156 of these in the SE Como neighborhood alone. In addition, new infill development of low-quality is also characterized by over-occupancy. The change to the homestead property-tax provisions that permit “relative homesteading” has led, in many cases, to the unintended result of a family member student acting as *de facto* landlord of a “rooming house.”

Students and other tenants, especially those that are new to the Twin Cities area, are being exploited by these practices. These practices must be stopped. Students and other tenants deserve decent, safe, and affordable housing.

These practices have produced a demographic mix that is different from anywhere else in Minneapolis. Adults who are 18-24 years old comprise over 45 percent of the population of the surrounding neighborhoods, compared to only 14.3 percent for this same age group throughout the City of Minneapolis as a whole.

Also, this onslaught on neighborhood real estate/market forces dynamics, unique to neighborhoods near an educational institution, has produced an alarming artificial rise in property values, driven partly by high expectations for return-on-investment profits driven by rents from over-occupancy.

This situation is fast eroding the affordability of all types of housing, and making it nearly impossible for new families to buy into the neighborhood, further eroding the public investment in local public schools. Currently, there are very real concerns regarding the possible closing of one elementary school and the viability of others.

These neighborhoods have reached the tipping point, and these trends must be stopped. By not acting now, and charting a new course, we run the risk of having much more grave conditions, in which the only viable solution entails clearance and redevelopment, a scenario none of the stakeholders views as desirable.

3. Commercial vitality and jobs-based economic development is critical to the long-term sustainability of the University, the City, and the neighborhoods.

The commercial retail and services districts of Dinkytown, Stadium Village, and Cedar-Riverside, to varying degrees, benefit from their proximity to the University of Minnesota campus. The stakeholders want to explore connections between the community business district vitality objectives and the educational mission of the University, to enhance the potential for these districts to have the broader range of goods and services essential to strong, “full service” neighborhoods.

There are investment opportunities for the University, the City of Minneapolis, and the private sector to link the University’s bio-technical research activities to commercial applications taking advantage of the proximity of the industrially-zoned lands in the University Research Park (formerly known as South East Minneapolis Industrial area, or SEMI) and the Mid-City Business Park. We need to maximize this potential for increased business development and employment opportunities.

4. Plans for University growth, especially at the campus edges, need more transparency and links to neighborhoods plans for shaping the changes in their future.

Growth at the campus edges, or significant new University facilities built at the edge of residential or commercial areas, can have unintended effects on campus neighbors. Land use changes undertaken by the University can have positive or negative synergies with neighborhood and city plans. Speculation about potential University campus growth influences decisions made by private property owners, sometimes to the detriment of the community. Neighbors and private property owners near campus need more predictability about where the campus boundaries will be in the coming years. There is a need for campus master planning and city and neighborhood long-range planning to be mutually informed and better connected.

5. Safety and sustained law enforcement are critical to livability.

The SE Minneapolis neighborhoods have seen a 28% increase in violent crimes in 2006 over last year, compared with a 17% increase for the City of Minneapolis as a whole. Some of the increase in the campus neighborhoods may be attributable to more rigorous police enforcement in other neighborhoods, pushing crime to new areas of the city. The dramatic increase in crimes against persons has contributed to the feeling of a lack of safety on and off campus. Long-term residents are feeling more vulnerable. Students, who are often getting around on foot or by bicycle, often late into the evening, are even more at risk.

More crime prevention is needed, through re-design of neighborhood public spaces, especially on major corridors connecting these neighborhoods to campus, lighting enhancements, and other measures that draw from the cooperation and collaboration among the stakeholders.

There are many ways the City of Minneapolis Police Department and the University of Minnesota Police Department are collaborating, and these efforts need to be supported and expanded.

6. More positive connections need to be made between University students and the neighborhoods in which they live.

For many of the students who live in the neighborhoods, this is their first experience living on their own. The neighborhood organizations and the University's Office of Student Affairs are working together to encourage more student engagement in community activities in the neighborhood, though this is a real challenge to sustain. The students are often working at least one job in addition to their college work, and most expect to live in the neighborhood only short-term, which doesn't provide much incentive to commit time and energy to get to know one's neighbors. The time horizon, expectations, and "culture" of the long-term residents are different from that of their student neighbors.

Many long-term residents indicated that having students living in their neighborhood had many positive effects, including their energy, idealism, creativity and positive outlook.

However, the life-styles of some of the students, and their visitors, create some very real problems. Many participants in our outreach process said that uncivil and destructive behavior by some students, often associated with under-age and excessive drinking, was having serious negative impacts on neighborhood livability. In fact, high-risk drinking is a serious public health problem nationwide among college age adults. In a survey conducted by the University's Boynton Health Services, 45.6% of students aged 18 to 24 self-reported that they engage in high-risk drinking. This behavior puts the neighborhood at risk, as well as the student who is drinking excessively. (*Footnote: High risk drinking is defined as five or more servings at one sitting, within the last two weeks of the survey, "University of Minnesota Tobacco, Alcohol, and Other Drug Use", Boynton Health Service, November, 2006.*)

There needs to be different ways for students to gather and meet. Clearly, there is a need for more, different, and exciting venues, on campus and in the neighborhoods, where students and other young adults can meet and socialize in ways that have a positive effect on these neighborhoods. These alternative venues and activities can help foster better neighborhood relations. Service learning and volunteer initiatives provide bridges between students and neighborhoods. Students need to be linked to their neighbors through mutual accountability.

There is a need for sustained and effective education and training of students in the skills for living-on-your-own in a community, to enable them to be better residents and neighbors, as well as better students. Because the student population is such a large component of these neighborhoods' populations (45 percent, as indicated above), there is a need for students, the neighborhoods, and the University administration to work together more closely to address issues of student conduct. In December, 2006, the University's student conduct code was revised to apply to conduct off-campus when the conduct adversely affects a substantial University interest, and either constitutes a criminal offense or indicates that a student may be a danger to self or others. While this revision to the conduct code is lauded by all the stakeholders, there is not agreement on how it should be interpreted.

7. Transportation alternatives and improved traffic management practices are needed.

Expanded and well-connected transit, especially light rail, is critical to the overall attractiveness and economic vitality of the University and its nearby neighborhoods, providing access to the two downtowns, University and Hiawatha Avenues commercial and institutional corridors, the State Capitol, the Northstar commuter line, major sports and entertainment venues, and the airport. These connections are critical to overall image of the University, and to its relative attractiveness when compared with other universities in major urban centers.

The Twin Cities Campus population is already relatively reliant on transit and alternative modes of transportation. A major marketing push on the use of U-Pass and Metro Pass transit deals has resulted in over 18,000 University students and employees regularly using Metro Transit to get around. The University has recently added Zipcar, a car sharing service, at three locations around campus, and VanGo, a van pool option, providing further options for those who qualify to use them. Campus neighbors, as well as University employees, may register and use Zipcars. Facilities for bicyclists are well incorporated into the campus environment. The University's free intercampus bus shuttle provides over 3,800,000 trips each year, reducing the need for automobile trips between ends of the campus. For commuting to classes and work, over 60% of the trips to the Twin Cities Campus each day are by something other than the single-occupancy vehicle.

Nevertheless, there is a need to address the traffic and parking pressures brought onto this area by faculty, staff, visitors, students, and long-term residents who live near campus, and by the many visitors/customers who use the University, Augsburg College and Fairview-UMMC, and the commercial districts.

The walking and biking environment, as well as bus and light rail (both existing and proposed) connections, need to function much more effectively as true alternatives to car usage. The new LRT investments must be designed so that they are attractive and convenient to the neighborhood residents, business, as well as the University. Streetscapes need to be improved, gateways need to be created, and wayfinding measures need to be established. These measures will foster alternative movement patterns. Increased numbers of students, faculty, residents, and others walking, biking, and using transit also contributes to the overall safety of the public realm. The availability and attractiveness of all of these alternatives to the car can result in reduced car usage, thereby reducing the parking problem as well.

8. Aesthetics, beauty, and pride of place are key ingredients for the attractiveness of both the University and the adjacent neighborhoods.

Over the last decade, the campus environment has been dramatically improved, with an attractive and green walking/biking environment with high-quality buildings and public spaces. This beauty falls off considerably when one walks from the campus out into the neighborhoods. There is a need for public realm improvements at the campus edges, on the seams and corridors, and at the gateways to and from the campus. Dramatically-enhanced positive aesthetic qualities of the campus and surrounding neighborhoods will contribute to competitive advantage.

9. An effective and sustainable program of University, City, and neighborhood improvements requires a new method of collaborative planning and action.

Existing neighborhood and business organizations seek a more collaborative partnership with the University and the City of Minneapolis to better plan on a more comprehensive basis the larger district

that encompasses the University of Minnesota campus and the four surrounding neighborhoods. There is a need for a strategy that defines specific actions, timing, responsible parties, and estimated costs for initiatives and improvements.

There is a recognition that the four surrounding neighborhoods, and the University campus, are unique and distinct in their problems and opportunities, but that their destiny is closely linked to the changes that take place on the University campus, the campus of Augsburg College, and the properties that make up the Fairview-UMMC complex. All the parties to this report believe that a new convening organization with powers to plan and take action in partnership would greatly facilitate the work that needs to be done.

This new organization needs the authority to plan comprehensively, strategically, boldly and with confidence. It needs the resources for the organization itself and for augmenting the capacity of the member neighborhoods and business associations, to take sustained action to remedy the very real problems that exist. It needs the resources to capitalize on the opportunities to improve the attractiveness and economic impact of the University and its neighboring areas.

This collaborative alliance, and the plans, programs, and activities it undertakes to improve the socio-economic and physical environment it shares, will greatly enhance the competitive position of the University of Minnesota.

IV. BEST PRACTICES AND STRATEGIES FOR BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS AMONG UNIVERSITY, CITY, AND NEIGHBORHOODS

The University impact on neighboring communities may be compared in many ways to the impact of federal government facilities like military bases on areas surrounding them. For example, the Federal Impact Aid Program compensates local school districts for lost tax base revenue or increased burdens resulting from federal activities. That program is often used in conjunction with other methods for reducing the negative impacts and improving the relationship between the federal institution and the local community.

At the state level, public universities and colleges have similar impacts. These institutions can also choose from a wide array of techniques to increase positive interactions between themselves and the neighborhoods/commercial districts adjacent to their campuses.

We examined initiatives and programs at the following universities and colleges:

- University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, PA)
- The Ohio State University (Columbus, OH)
- University of Iowa (Iowa City, IA)
- University of Texas (Austin, TX)
- Augsburg College (Minneapolis, MN)
- Macalester College (St. Paul, MN)
- St. Cloud State University (St. Cloud, MN)
- University of St. Thomas (St. Paul, MN)
- Marquette University (Milwaukee, WI)
- University of Missouri – Kansas City
- University of Southern California (Los Angeles, CA)

- University of Washington (Seattle, WA)
- Yale University (New Haven, CT)

Of all the academic institutions researched in this report, the University of Pennsylvania stands out as a model for others to emulate. The University of Pennsylvania uses a variety of tools to build a stronger community for students, residents, and customers. This academic institution played a leading role in the creation of the University City District, an independent, not-for-profit organization that manages University City (UC), a 2.2 square mile area of West Philadelphia. In addition, UC Green is Penn’s collaborative program to help “green” the campus and surrounding areas.

SUMMARY OF CAMPUS-BASED INITIATIVES

Collaborative Institutional Structure

- Independent non-profit organization, with representatives from University, City, neighborhoods, and others, that plans, manages programs and initiates projects (U of Penn, Ohio State U)

Housing and Neighborhoods Initiatives

- Landlord Network that convenes landlords, University housing staff, and property managers to discuss rental housing issues (U of Penn)
- Create new organization to involve all stakeholders in collaborative planning and action (U of Penn, Ohio State U)
- Engage with the community in long- range planning and visioning (U of Penn, U of Southern California, and Ohio State U)
- Establish special fund to purchase and operate affordable rental housing (U of Penn, Marquette U)
- Acquire, renovate, and resell houses, and/or provide incentives for faculty and staff, to increase homeownership (U of Penn, Ohio State U, U of Washington, U of Southern California, Marquette U, St. Thomas U, Macalester College, Yale U, U of Minn – University Grove)

Financial and Marketing Support

- Create an identity or brand for surrounding neighborhoods (U of Penn)
- Allow businesses/community members to utilize institutional space (Augsburg College)
- Increase activities during the summer months (U of Iowa)

Education and Outreach

- Conduct community-driven research projects that produce information for the neighborhoods (Ohio State U, Macalester College, University of Missouri-Kansas City, U of Minn)
- Establish youth programs that work with neighborhood students starting at early childhood and continue through to college-age years (U of Southern California)
- Create scholarships to assist community youth in gaining a college degree (Augsburg College, U of Minn)

Infrastructure Development

- Establish a University District to develop and maintain property near the campus (U of Penn)
- Cooperatively fund new infrastructure projects in the adjacent neighborhoods (U of Iowa)
- Construct campus buildings that integrate into the architectural fabric of the community (Macalester College)

Increased Connections

- Promote volunteer and internship opportunities in the local community (U of Penn, University of Missouri-Kansas City, Augsburg College, U of Minn)
- Engage local community members and keep them up-to-date on University happenings (U of Penn, Augsburg College)
- Encourage staff and faculty to live on-campus through low-interest mortgages (U of Southern California)

Safety and District Beautification

- Increase foot patrols through a Campus Ambassadors Program (U of Penn)
- Ensure litter free commercial districts and neighborhoods (U of Texas, U of Penn, Ohio State U)

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

In recognition of the positive and negative impacts of the University's Twin Cities Campus on the nearby neighborhoods, and of the unique opportunities before us to preserve and improve the campus and area neighborhoods as a premier asset for the state, the region, and the city; the University of Minnesota, the City of Minneapolis, and the neighborhood communities adjacent to campus call on the Minnesota legislature to join with us to declare a University Development District, a district of special interest, to include the neighborhoods of Cedar Riverside, Marcy-Holmes, South East Como, Prospect Park, and the University neighborhood (including the campus); this district to be the subject of joint efforts to preserve and maintain a vital, safe, and attractive community that will be a premier destination and choice of a place to live, learn, and work. The current trajectory of deterioration in the neighborhoods is of grave concern. Without focused action and investment now, the price of addressing the problems will be much greater in the future.

To further this objective, we recommend the following:

	<p>health and safety (add 2 FTE staff resources for inspections coordination and focus on over-occupancy enforcement)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (2) develop long-term approach based on best practices and expert advice (3) reclaim/rehab/redevelop blighted properties (4) review the record of “relative homesteaded” properties in the district, review best practices in other states, develop recommendations for modifying the State statute and/or zoning ordinances to eliminate <i>de facto</i> rental use of these properties <p>b) educate tenants and prospective tenants</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) continue the in-person course in residence halls and develop a web-based curriculum for students on renting and living in the community (2) increase student civic engagement in the off-campus neighborhoods where they live through the creation of student councils/block clubs (3) create models of “quality tenant”/“quality rental” programs and determine cost/feasibility <p>c) raise quality of recent in-fill housing and raise standard where necessary</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (1) review zoning, housing, and site review standards in the district, related to the pattern of high density, low quality infill housing (2) declare a focused moratorium on teardowns/infill constructions pending results of the evaluation. <p>d) create potential partnerships with existing rental property owners to provide more graduate and professional student housing options, and to promote district housing opportunities to graduate and professional students</p> <p>e) create homebuyer incentives: develop program for implementation that is responsive to the marketplace, based on best practices and expert advice;</p>	<p>homeownership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Student tenants live in safer conditions. • Student leaders are developed to help with crime prevention and peer education. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve quality of new, in-fill housing; avoid future blight. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide more options for graduate student housing close to campus. • Attract more long-term and age-diverse tenants. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop market-responsive model, ready to implement. • More homeowners in the neighborhoods and more
--	--	---

	<p>determine appropriate targets for participation.</p> <p>f) initiate a Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) program, and increase police patrols; add __ FTE positions for Second Precinct, Mpls Police Department.</p>	<p>employees living close to work.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safer environment for both students and residents
<p>3. Develop a long-term plan for the district.</p>	<p>a) develop a comprehensive vision; build from existing, underlying plans; confirm strategies.</p> <p>b) sustain the citizen engagement and planning activities of the neighborhood organizations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shared vision and priorities. • Build commitment for future action. • Identification of other (in addition to those described above) needed initiatives and programs, esp. economic development that serves the University, the City, and the adjacent neighborhoods in complementary ways.
<p>4. Report back with a Phase II Implementation Program.</p>	<p>Alliance reports back to the Legislature with a comprehensive plan, progress to date, and recommendations for continuing to move forward.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Plan, report on results of early initiatives, and opportunity for Legislature to further facilitate efforts.
<p>5. Fund the development of Central Corridor Light Rail Transit.</p>	<p>While we recognize the University community can be successful without LRT, we should be proactive. New, improved transit in the Central Corridor will contribute to vital, safe, and attractive neighborhoods, and connect the University more closely to the whole region.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Decisions of station design, location, and wayfinding that serve the interests of the city, the university, and the neighborhoods. • Promote business development in the Dinkytown, Stadium Village, Cedar-Riverside, and SE University Avenue. • Leverage further private investment in high quality housing and mixed-use development.

PHASE II RECOMMENDATIONS: FOR ACTION IN 2009 AND BEYOND

In Phase II the University Community Development District Plan prepared in Phase I will be carried out. We expect it to include at least the following initiatives.

Recommendation	Description	Outcomes
1. Homebuyer incentives-- implementation	Promote through the University and other employers in the district; implement program.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More ownership in the neighborhoods • More employees living close to work.
2. Redevelopment of strategic sites	a) identify priority sites and potential partners; evaluate feasibility and market. b) enter into partnerships with private developers and other stakeholders to secure sites for redevelopment as quality, appropriately dense, ownership or co-op housing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove blight and replace with high quality development. • Attract investment and a diverse mix of residents.
3. Partnerships with pre- K-12 schools in the district	Develop a plan to provide engagement grants to seed faculty and student collaborations with neighborhood schools; implement grant program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve and preserve neighborhood schools • Connect students and faculty with scholarship/engagement opportunities.
4. Improve “gateways” into the district	Develop a plan and design guidelines for signage, lighting, improving the pedestrian environment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better wayfinding and pedestrian environment. • Project welcome and pride.