

MOVING FORWARD TOGETHER:

U OF M MINNEAPOLIS AREA NEIGHBORHOOD IMPACT REPORT



To: Minnesota State Legislature
Governor Tim Pawlenty

From: University of Minnesota
City of Minneapolis
Stadium Area Advisory Group (SAAG)

MOVING FORWARD TOGETHER:

U OF M MINNEAPOLIS AREA NEIGHBORHOOD IMPACT REPORT

Primary Author: Dan Cornejo
CORNEJO CONSULTING
Community Planning + Design
dancornejo@comcast.net
651-699-1927





The destiny of the University campus is closely and inextricably linked to the destiny of the adjacent neighborhoods.

“We live in a vibrant part of the city. We like being near the university, both for the cultural programs that are offered there and for the feel of being near the campus.”

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preamble	I
Executive Summary.....	5
I. Introduction.....	7
Background	7
Purpose.....	7
Vision	7
Process for the Study	7
II. Community Context.....	9
III. Issues Analysis.....	12
Unique Asset	12
Livability and Housing.....	12
Commercial Vitality and Economic Development	14
The Campus Edges.....	14
Safety.....	14
Student/Neighborhood Relationships	15
Transportation	15
Beauty and Pride of Place in the Public Realm.....	16
Collaborative Planning and Action.....	16
IV. Best Practices	18
V. Recommendations	20
VI. U of M Stadium Area Advisory Group.....	31
VII. Acknowledgements	33

The destiny of the University campus is closely and inextricably linked to the destiny of the adjacent neighborhoods. Action is needed now to preserve the safety, health, and vitality of the campus area community.

PREAMBLE

The University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus is a unique asset to the state, to the City of Minneapolis, and to the University's 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, and hundreds of millions of dollars in employee compensation, the 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 research being carried out on campus.

Because of its size, however, the campus puts demands on the urban character, systems, and infrastructure of the communities closest to it. 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 University's campus and its adjacent neighborhoods. These issues have reached a point of crisis. The lesson from other major urban centers with large universities is that without immediate, focused action and investment, the price of addressing problems will be much higher in the future.

This report describes and analyzes some of the impacts of the University on its adjacent neighborhoods, articulates our findings, and makes recommendations for the state legislature to assist the stakeholders in charting a new course.

Articulated in many ways by all the stakeholders, including students, the message that emerges from studying the impact of the Twin Cities campus on the surrounding community is clear: The destiny of the University is inextricably linked to the destiny of the adjacent neighborhoods. These neighborhoods must have decent, safe, and affordable housing, as well as infrastructure such as schools, libraries, and parks.

The parties to this report began from the premise that many aspects of the current relationship between the University and its neighbors are working and should be strengthened. We also recognize that these kinds of issues are not unique. This led us to study responses by other educational institutions in other cities. Those responses have informed our recommendations.

How the University and its surrounding neighborhoods collaboratively examine the issues, strategically plan, and take action with the active participation of the City of Minneapolis can become a model for campuses throughout Minnesota as they address similar issues.

“Our neighborhood is being plagued by investors/developers tearing down houses and building cheap, three-unit buildings on small lots, which are essentially dormitories without adequate parking. Each unit has five bedrooms, a kitchen, and a living room. They rent each of the units to one person, who then sublets by the room. What we get is 15 adults living on a small city lot.”

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

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 assess and prepare a report of the impact of the university on the surrounding community and the relationship of the community to the university.” 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 three 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. 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 three public research universities in the world, the University must attract and retain creative, accomplished people who will come there to expand and share their knowledge and make discoveries. The University’s success in reaching its goal will be enhanced by being part of healthy, vital, and attractive neighborhoods and commercial districts. The east and west banks 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

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 they are a part. The University, the City of Minneapolis, and the community organizations will have a partnership to achieve and maintain this vision.

STUDY PROCESS

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 city planning consultant Dan Cornejo and the University of Minnesota Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA), the Impact Report Task Group conducted an Outreach Plan that consulted with stakeholder groups in five neighborhoods: S.E. 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, as well as business groups, university students, Augsburg College, Fairview-UMMC officials, City of Minneapolis elected officials and staff, senior University administration officials. Research was undertaken to gather, map, and analyze existing demographic, housing, and crime data.

A trends analysis was carried out. Investigations were made into best practices in other urban communities with large university campuses to provide an urban policy perspective.

FINDINGS

The University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus is a unique asset to the state, to the City of Minneapolis, and to the University's 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 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 research being carried out on campus.

Because of its size, however, the campus puts demands on the urban character, systems, and infrastructure of the communities closest to it. 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 University's campus and its adjacent neighborhoods. These issues have reached a point of crisis. The lesson from other major urban centers with large universities is that without immediate, focused action and investment, the price of addressing problems will be much higher in the future. The University of Pennsylvania and Ohio State University use a variety of tools to build a stronger community for students, residents, and customers. Each institution collaborated

with its other stakeholders to create partnerships to establish ongoing revitalization programs.

The destiny of the University is inextricably linked to the destiny of the adjacent neighborhoods. They need to be of the highest quality. If these neighborhoods are weak, the University's attractiveness and vitality is weakened and its competitive advantage compromised. If the University of Minnesota is to achieve its mission, with maximum positive impact on the state, the City of Minneapolis, and the neighborhoods surrounding its campus, there is a need to create a new relationship that focuses on mutually beneficial and collaborative action.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In recognition of the positive and negative impacts of the University of Minnesota'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 of Minneapolis—the University, the City, and the neighborhood communities adjacent to campus call on the Minnesota legislature to join with us to declare a University Community Partnership District, a district of special interest that includes the neighborhoods of Cedar-Riverside, Marcy-Holmes, South East Como, Prospect Park, and the University neighborhood (including the campus), and to create an alliance (form and legal status to be determined) governed by representatives from the University, the City, the neighborhoods, and others that plans, manages programs, and initiates projects. The 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.

To further this objective, we recommend the following:

1. Continue the City and University initiatives already underway.
2. Initiate organizational steps to create a new alliance that brings together the University, the City, and the neighborhoods and empowers them to act collaboratively. Provide start-up funds (\$500,000) to begin the work immediately.
3. Take immediate action on first priority initiatives (Phase I) needed to reverse the neighborhood decline. Provide an initial capital grant (\$5 million) to begin this work in 2007.
4. Capitalize an endowment to provide sustained funding for alliance activities, including development of a long-term plan (\$20 million)
5. Provide additional endowment funds (\$5 million), to be matched by alliance fund-raising, to implement Phase II projects arising out of long-term plan.

“If someone has a place to live where they can feel proud of their home or apartment, then they are more likely to respect the surroundings in which they live.”

“The U of M should think of these neighborhoods as its backyard.... This area could be similar to Cambridge, Massachusetts (near Harvard and M.I.T.) or Hyde Park in Chicago, where diverse urban neighborhoods become neighborhoods attracting professionals, including faculty, but housing students and other University employees as well.”

I. INTRODUCTION

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 assess and prepare a report of the impact of the university on the surrounding community and the relationship of the community to the university.”

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 three 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. 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 three public research universities in the world, the University must attract and retain creative, accomplished people who will come there to expand and share their knowledge and make discoveries. The University’s success in reaching its goal will be enhanced by being part of healthy, vital, and attractive neighborhoods and commercial districts. The east and west banks 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 they are a part.
- The University, the City of Minneapolis, and the community organizations will have a partnership to achieve and maintain this vision.

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, the Impact Report Task Group initiated an outreach plan to engage stakeholders. The University of Minnesota 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: S.E. 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 officials and staff.
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, and southeast University Avenue).
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 27, Methodology.

“The City needs to do a much better job of enforcing ordinances, encouraging family ownership, solving traffic and other problems that result from over occupancy, and maintaining adequate police and inspections presence in the neighborhood. Landlords must be held accountable for the actions of the tenants and their own lack of concern and care of their property.”

II. COMMUNITY CONTEXT

The Twin Cities campus of the University of Minnesota and the five adjacent Minneapolis neighborhoods (Cedar Riverside, Marcy-Holmes, S.E. Como, Prospect Park, and the University neighborhood) include a resident population of some 35,500 people, or just under 10 percent 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. Cedar Riverside, in particular, is home to 38 percent foreign-born residents compared with 14.5 percent for the City of Minneapolis and has historically been the “point of entry” for new immigrants. Unique in Minneapolis, these neighborhoods each have a very high proportion of 18–24 year-old residents, ranging from 38 percent in Cedar Riverside to nearly 100 percent in the University neighborhood, compared with 14 percent 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 percent rental units in Marcy-Holmes to 65 percent in S.E. Como, compared with an average of 50 percent 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. Concern has been expressed regarding the vulnerability of the student population, especially to the off-campus housing marketplace. The well-being of the students is critical to their ability to function capably in the classroom and responsibly in a neighborhood. 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. *See appendices 1-5, Neighborhood Profiles.*

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 housing is available. In all, 4,026, or 24 percent, of the University’s Twin Cities campus employees live in the City of Minneapolis. Of these, 513, or 3 percent, live in the five-campus area neighborhoods included in this study. The University pays approximately \$24.7 million in total salaries each year to employees who live in these five 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 and 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 milling district on the east bank 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 a historic district that would include most of the neighborhood. S.E. Como historians are writing a history of their neighborhood, and the West Bank community celebrates their history as an immigrant community and as a center for music and theater.

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 S.E. New mixed-use developments are being built in the Old Saint Anthony area along E. Hennepin, on the St. Paul edge of Prospect Park, and near Van Cleve Park in S.E. Como.

Estimated market values for single-family properties in the district range from lower than Minneapolis's 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 southeast 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 percent of the single-family homes in the S.E. Como neighborhood were converted to rental use. The 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 S.E. Como neighborhood is presently the most vulnerable to the negative housing trends described elsewhere in this report.

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

Profiles of these three commercial districts are included in *Appendices 7-9*. The University Research Park (formerly known as South East Minneapolis Industrial area or SEMI), just northeast of campus and north of the S.E. University Avenue commercial area, was in the last century a railroad commodity transfer and manufacturing district. The City of Minneapolis has developed a plan to transform the district with new infrastructure and 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 there in early 2006. 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 St. 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 theaters 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 the new Central Corridor LRT line.

With over 60 percent 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. Preliminary engineering is underway for the Central Corridor light rail line to be built through the campus area neighborhoods, linking on the east end with downtown St. 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.

“We have learned a lot from the experience of creating this report. There is momentum here to begin to tackle some things that are important to us all.”

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 neighborhood 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 candid, rich with insights, and, at times, characterized by frustration as well as optimism. Hope was expressed by all parties that with the attention and support of the state legislature the collaborative assessment would lead to a new commitment, a new partnership, and a moving forward together with resources sufficient to enhance the competitive advantage of a great educational institution and improve the prospects for neighborhoods adjacent to the campus.

The following themes and messages emerged from the consultations.

I. UNIQUE ASSET

Together, the University of Minnesota Twin Cities campus and its surrounding neighborhoods are a unique educational, cultural, and economic asset for the Twin Cities and the whole state.

Creative people are drawn to communities that have a strong mix of options for learning, culture, employment, and living. We want people to find every reason 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 and its competitive advantage compromised. Its ability to attract high-quality students and faculty and to garner research funds may be harmed.

If the University of Minnesota is to achieve its mission, with maximum positive impact on the state, the City of Minneapolis, and the neighborhoods surrounding its campus, there is a need to create a new relationship that focuses on mutually beneficial and collaborative action.

2. LIVABILITY AND HOUSING

Livability and housing vitality are central vibrant, 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 (Marcy-Holmes, S.E. Como, Cedar-Riverside, Prospect Park, and the University neighborhood) need to be attractive and welcoming. They also need infrastructure such as schools, libraries, and parks. These neighborhoods must be the first choice for U of M, Augsburg College, and Fairview-UMMC faculty and administrative staff, as well as for graduate student families and undergraduate students when they seek a place to live.

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. Over the last 10 years, the University has added 1,756 beds of on-campus student housing and now provides housing for 80+ percent 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 reflecting a general desire for a campus experience, there has been an increase in student demand for rental housing near campus.

This demand, coupled with an aggressive financial lending and investment environment in the last decade, has fueled in near-campus neighborhoods the development of 1,183 units of privately developed and managed rental housing marketed to students. Many of the units are in multi-family complexes with professional property managers. Some have 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 to convert single-family homes to rental use, with much greater negative impacts. The S.E. 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 housing into income-producing “rooming houses.” A relatively new phenomenon is the demolition of existing single-family housing and rebuilding with poor quality multi-bedroom

units. Poor tenant selection and negligent maintenance often characterize the management of these properties, which result 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.

The housing conditions have worsened to the point that there are now many rental properties that students refuse to live in. Owners of these buildings lower their tenant standards in order to fill the units. At least one apartment building was shut down in 2006 for multiple offences, including drug dealing.

Since 2000, 224 single-family homes (that we can document) in S.E. Minneapolis have been converted to rental, 156 of these in the S.E. Como neighborhood alone. New infill development of low-quality is characterized by over-occupancy. The change to the homestead property-tax provisions that permit “relative homesteading” has led to 60 single-family homes being used for student housing. In many cases, this has had the unintended result of a family member student acting as de facto landlord of a “rooming house.” This kind of rental housing is unlicensed and unregulated. Students and other tenants, especially those new to the Twin Cities, are being exploited by these practices.

These practices have produced a demographic mix different from anywhere else in Minneapolis. Adults 18-24 years of age make up over 45 percent of the population of the University’s surrounding neighborhoods. This is compared with only 14.3 percent for the same age group throughout Minneapolis as a whole.

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

These neighborhoods have reached the tipping point. These trends must be stopped now, or we run the risk of grave conditions. Other university cities have reached a point where they find it necessary to clear and rebuild neighborhoods, an action that none of the U of M stakeholders support.

See Appendix 10, Residential Property Characteristics of University Neighborhoods.

3. COMMERCIAL VITALITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

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

The commercial and service districts of Dinkytown, Stadium Village, and Cedar-Riverside, to varying degrees, benefit from their proximity to the University of Minnesota campus. Stakeholders want to explore connections between the community's business district objectives and the University's educational mission, to enhance the potential of these districts to offer a 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

biotechnical 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 the potential for business development, employment opportunities, and tax base.

4. THE CAMPUS EDGES

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

Campus master planning and city and neighborhood long-range planning need to be mutually informed. 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, and can remove properties from the tax base. Speculation about potential University campus growth influences decisions of 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.

5. SAFETY

Safety and law enforcement are critical to livability.

The S.E. Minneapolis neighborhoods saw a 28 percent increase in violent crimes in 2006, compared with a 17 percent increase for the City of Minneapolis as a whole (*See Appendix 19*). 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 often get around on foot or by bicycle, sometimes late into the evening, are even more at risk.

More crime prevention is needed, through redesign of neighborhood public spaces (especially on major corridors connecting these neighborhoods to campus), through lighting enhancements, and through measures that draw on cooperation and collaboration among the stakeholders. The many ways the City of Minneapolis Police Department and the University of Minnesota Police Department are collaborating need to be supported and expanded.

6. STUDENT/NEIGHBORHOOD RELATIONSHIPS

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 neighborhood activities. This is a challenge to sustain. Students often work at least one job in addition to their college work and most expect to live in the neighborhood only short-term. The time horizon, expectations, and culture of long-term residents differ from those of their student neighbors.

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

However, the life-styles of some students and their visitors create

real problems. Many participants in our outreach process say that uncivil and destructive behavior by some students, often associated with under-age and excessive drinking, has serious negative impacts on neighborhood livability. 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 percent of students aged 18 to 24 self-reported that they engage in high-risk drinking. (Note: 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 is a need for more venues and activities on campus and in the neighborhoods where students and other young adults can socialize in ways that have a positive effect. Service learning and volunteer initiatives can provide bridges between students and neighborhoods.

There is a need for sustained education and training of students in the skills for living-on-your-own in a community. Because students make up such a large percentage of these neighborhoods' populations, the neighborhoods and the University must 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 the revision to the code is lauded by all the stakeholders, there is no consensus on how the revised code should be interpreted.

7. TRANSPORTATION

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 the image of the University and to its relative attractiveness 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 campus locations and VanGo, a van pool option. Campus neighbors and University employees may register for and use Zipcars. Facilities for bicyclists are well incorporated into the campus environment. The University's free intercampus bus shuttle provides over 3.8 million trips each year, reducing the need for automobile trips between ends of the campus. For commuting to classes and work, over 60 percent of the trips to the Twin Cities campus each day are by something other than a single-occupancy vehicle.

Nevertheless, there is a need to address the traffic and parking pressures brought onto the 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 connections (both existing and proposed), need to function more effectively as 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. Increased numbers of students, faculty, residents, and others walking, biking, and using transit contributes to public safety.

8. BEAUTY AND PRIDE OF PLACE IN THE PUBLIC REALM

Beauty and pride of place are key ingredients for the University and its adjacent neighborhoods. The surrounding communities are what visitors, as well as prospective students and faculty, see first.

Over the last decade, the University's campus grounds have been dramatically improved, with a green walking/biking environment and with high-quality buildings and public spaces. The beauty falls off considerably when one walks from campus out into the neighborhoods. There is a need for public realm improvements at the campus edges, seams, and corridors and at the gateways to and from campus. Enhanced aesthetics of the surrounding neighborhoods will contribute to the area's competitive advantage.

9. COLLABORATIVE PLANNING AND ACTION

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 to better collaborate with the University and the City of Minneapolis

to comprehensively plan for the district that encompasses the University campus and the four surrounding neighborhoods. There is a need for a strategy that defines actions, timing, responsible parties, costs, and funding for initiatives and improvements.

The four surrounding neighborhoods are each unique in their problems and opportunities, but their destinies are linked to the changes that take place on the University campus, the campus of Augsburg College, and the Fairview-UMMC complex.

All the parties to this report believe that a new convening organization with the authority to plan and act in partnership will greatly facilitate work that needs to be done. The new organization needs resources to augment the member neighborhoods and business associations' capacity to remedy existing problems and capitalize on opportunities to improve the attractiveness and economic impact of the University's 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. (See Appendix 21)

“If the U of M wants to be a first-class research university, its faculty will want good choices for living close to campus. Still, the university will need affordable housing for its graduate students and younger faculty. These people will also be concerned about public schools. The U should think of the neighborhood schools as laboratory schools.”

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

The University impact on neighboring communities may be compared to the impact of federal government facilities like military bases on areas surrounding them. The Community Impact Assistance Program compensates local school districts for lost tax base revenue or increased burdens resulting from federal activities. The program is often used, along with other methods, to reduce the negative impacts and improve the relationship between the federal institution and the local community. (See *Appendix 18*)

At the state level, public universities and colleges have similar impacts. These institutions can choose from an array of techniques to increase positive interactions between themselves and the neighborhoods and 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)

The University of Pennsylvania stands out as a model to emulate. It uses a variety of tools to build a stronger community for students, residents, and customers. U of Penn 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. UC Green is U of Penn's collaborative program to help "green" the campus and surrounding areas.

Another good example is the collaboration between the City of Columbus and the Ohio State University to address decades of neighborhood deterioration around the campus. The city adopted a University district overlay zone to reduce density and improve compatibility of new development. The city and university developed an action plan that led to the creation of Campus Partners, an organization that is making \$28 million in program-related investments in the campus area neighborhoods.

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

- Increase home ownership through acquisition, renovation, and resale of houses by providing incentives for faculty and

staff (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)

- Engage with the community in long-range planning (U of Penn, U of Southern California, Ohio State U)
- Create an organization that involves all stakeholders in collaborative planning and action (U of Penn, Ohio State U)
- Provide a special fund to purchase and operate affordable rental housing (U of Penn, Marquette U)
- Create a landlord network that convenes landlords, University housing staff, and property managers to discuss rental housing issues (U of Penn)

Financial and Marketing Support

- Create an identity or brand for surrounding neighborhoods (U of Penn)
- Allow businesses/community members to use institutional space (Augsburg College)
- Increase activities during summer (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 continuing through college-age years (U of Southern California)
- Create scholarships to help community youth earn 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)
- (See Appendix 20, Best Practices)*

“A lovely goal would be making the student body more a part of the city, not just as students, but as citizens who have something to give and something to gain from the city and neighborhood in which they live.”

V. RECOMMENDATIONS

In recognition of the positive and negative impacts of the University of Minnesota'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 of Minneapolis—the University, the City, and the neighborhood communities adjacent to campus call on the Minnesota legislature to join with us to declare a University Community Partnership District, a district of special interest that includes the neighborhoods of Cedar-Riverside, Marcy-Holmes, South East Como, Prospect Park, and the University neighborhood (including the campus), and to create an alliance (form and legal status to be determined) governed by representatives from the University, the City, the neighborhoods, and others that plans, manages programs, and initiates projects. The 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 adjacent to the University is of grave concern. As we have learned through our best practices research of other urban communities with large university campuses, without immediate focused action and investment, the price of addressing problems later will be much higher.

To further this objective, we recommend the following:

1. Continue the City and University initiatives already underway.
2. Initiate organizational steps to create a new alliance that brings together the University, the City, and the neighborhoods and empowers them to act collaboratively. Provide start-up funds (\$500,000) to begin the work immediately.
3. Take immediate action on first priority initiatives (Phase I) needed to reverse the neighborhood decline. Provide an initial capital grant (\$5 million) to begin this work in 2007.
4. Capitalize an endowment to provide sustained funding for alliance activities, including development of a long-term plan (\$20 million)
5. Provide additional endowment funds (\$5 million), to be matched by alliance fund-raising, to implement Phase II projects arising out of long-term plan.

The following chart outlines the specifics of the recommendations.

PHASE I RECOMMENDATIONS: FOR IMMEDIATE ACTION IN 2007

<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>OUTCOMES</i>	<i>PARTY(IES) RESPONSIBLE TO IMPLEMENT</i>	<i>REQUEST FOR STATE FUNDING</i>
I. (a) Formalize an alliance to plan and implement actions in a University Community Partnership District; provide staff and resources to coordinate and direct the activities of the alliance.	<p>Alliance to be a representative body of the constituencies: the University of Minnesota, the City of Minneapolis, the recognized neighborhood organizations and business associations; other alliance partners to be determined and invited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Functions of the alliance to include: communications among alliance members and with the public; facilitate, initiate, and manage joint projects, including, potentially, real estate development; oversee collaborative planning; evaluate and recommend collaborative action; identify and enlist other partners and stakeholders. • Develop interim governance structure and operating principles for the University Community Development District. • Develop additional organizational structure as needed, for example, evaluating need for incorporation, ability to facilitate or undertake real estate development. • Organize actions on first priority initiatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholders are organized for collaboration. • Volunteer-led organizations have enhanced capacity to participate as equal partners. • Additional partners are recruited. • Management is provided to carry out the recommendations. • Development of a broad but clear mission statement, strategic short-term action plan, and specific, outcome-based objectives. 	Alliance partners	\$500,000 funding to establish alliance and carry out a comprehensive plan

<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>OUTCOMES</i>	<i>PARTY(IES) RESPONSIBLE TO IMPLEMENT</i>	<i>REQUEST FOR STATE FUNDING</i>
I. (b) Initiate immediate action on critical problem areas.	<p><i>Early start initiatives:</i></p> <p>(1) City of Minneapolis Department of Regulatory Services has launched an initiative to inspect rental and boarding and lodging facilities in the University Community Partnership District in 2007–08.</p> <p>(2) U of M Office of Student Affairs, University Student Legal Services, and Office of Housing and Residential Life will conduct seminars in the residence halls for students preparing to move off campus: tenant rights and responsibilities; neighborhood orientation; civic engagement.</p> <p>(3) The University will launch an exploratory process to develop a partnership with one or more of the University Community Partnership District schools to create school-wide programs and a culture that prepares every student for postsecondary education success.</p>	<p>(b) (1) All rental properties will be reviewed for compliance, and cited deficiencies will be corrected.</p> <p>(b) (2) At least 500 students will receive training on tenant rights, responsibilities, and living in the community.</p> <p>(b) (3) A successful partnership of this kind, where every student has the ability to aspire to, and has a path to reach post-secondary education, would enhance the attractiveness of the neighborhood school and distinguish it as a premier choice for parents.</p>	<p>City of Minneapolis</p> <p>University of Minnesota</p> <p>University of Minnesota, partnership with one or more public schools.</p>	State funding is not requested for early start initiatives.

RECOMMENDATION	DESCRIPTION	OUTCOMES	PARTY(IES) RESPONSIBLE TO IMPLEMENT	REQUEST FOR STATE FUNDING
	<p><i>First priority initiatives (these initiatives require new funding):</i></p> <p>a) Improve the condition of rental housing, increase compliance, and maintain homeownership opportunities</p> <p>(1) Accelerate initiative to address serious noncompliance with health and safety codes; provide increased staff and resources for sustained action.</p> <p>(2) Develop long-term approach based on best practices and expert advice.</p> <p>(3) Reclaim/rehab/redevelop blighted properties.</p> <p>(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 de facto rental use of these properties.</p>	<p>(a) (1) Safe, legal rental properties for students and others.</p> <p>(a) (2) Systemic improvements in regulatory actions to ensure safe and decent housing.</p> <p>(a) (3) Remove blight.</p> <p>(a) (4) Ensure responsible rental practices.</p>	<p>City of Minneapolis</p> <p>City of Minneapolis</p> <p>Alliance members and partners</p> <p>Alliance members</p>	<p>\$5 million seed funding for first priority initiatives</p>

<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>OUTCOMES</i>	<i>PARTY(IES) RESPONSIBLE TO IMPLEMENT</i>	<i>REQUEST FOR STATE FUNDING</i>
	<p>b) Educate tenants and prospective tenants</p> <p>(1) Develop a Web -based curriculum for students on renting and living in the community.</p> <p>(2) Increase student civic engagement in the off-campus neighborhoods where they live through the creation of student councils/ block clubs.</p> <p>(3) Research models of “quality tenant”/”quality rental” programs and determine cost/feasibility for implementation.</p>	<p>(b) (1) Student tenants live in safer conditions.</p> <p>(b) (2) Student leaders are developed to help with crime prevention and peer education.</p> <p>(b) (3) Tenants have incentive to become well-informed consumers; landlords have incentive to seek out the best tenants.</p>	<p>University of Minnesota</p> <p>University of Minnesota; neighborhood and business organizations</p> <p>University of Minnesota</p>	
	<p>c) Raise quality of recent in-fill housing and raise standard where necessary; review zoning, housing, and site review standards in the district, related to the pattern of high density, low quality infill housing.</p>	<p>(c) Improve quality of new, in-fill housing; avoid future blight.</p>	<p>City of Minneapolis</p>	

<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>OUTCOMES</i>	<i>PARTY(IES) RESPONSIBLE TO IMPLEMENT</i>	<i>REQUEST FOR STATE FUNDING</i>
	<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 and alumni/ retirees seeking life-cycle housing.</p> <p>e) Create homebuyer incentives: develop program for implementation that is responsive to the marketplace, based on best practices and expert advice; determine appropriate targets for participation.</p> <p>f) Investigate and develop best practices to address safety and crime issues that are challenging residents and businesses throughout the proposed University Community Partnership District.</p>	<p>(d) Provide more options for graduate student housing close to campus; attract more long-term and age-diverse tenants, including alumni and retirees.</p> <p>(e) Develop market responsive model, ready to implement. More homeowners in neighborhoods and more employees living close to work.</p> <p>(f) Safer environment for students, other residents, and businesses along commercial corridors.; more police presence; improved capability for enforcement.</p>	<p>University of Minnesota, with alliance members and other partners</p> <p>Alliance members and other partners</p> <p>Minneapolis Police Department and University of Minnesota Police Department</p>	

<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>OUTCOMES</i>	<i>PARTY(IES) RESPONSIBLE TO IMPLEMENT</i>	<i>REQUEST FOR STATE FUNDING</i>
2. Provide sustained funding for alliance activities.	Capitalize an endowment sufficient for the investment income to be used as a permanent source of funds for alliance operational expenses and to seed new initiatives.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funds for alliance operations (staff, board support, expenses, etc.) for the alliance • Funds for long-term planning • Funds to augment operational funding for neighborhood and business organizations and City of Minneapolis • Funds for continued Phase I projects and programs. 		\$20 million
3. Develop a long-term plan for the alliance and the district.	<p>(a) Develop a comprehensive vision; develop revitalization plan; 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, including economic development that serves the University, the City, and the adjacent neighborhoods in complementary ways. 	Alliance partners, with extensive community consultation	(funding from item 1(a) above.)

<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>OUTCOMES</i>	<i>PARTY(IES) RESPONSIBLE TO IMPLEMENT</i>	<i>REQUEST FOR STATE FUNDING</i>
4.(a) Report back with a Phase II Implementation Program.	Alliance reports back to the legislature with a comprehensive plan, progress to date, and recommendations for continuing to move forward.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive Plan, with Implementation Program; report results of early initiatives. 	Alliance partners	\$5 million
4. (b) Provide additional funding to endowment to support Phase II Implementation Program.	Add up to \$5 million to the initial endowment, to be matched 1:1 by other public or private sources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity for legislature to further facilitate efforts. 	State of Minnesota; other funders	
5. Advocate for full funding for development of Central Corridor Light Rail Transit (LRT).	While we recognize the University community can be successful without LRT, we should be proactive. Timely funding decisions are needed now by the legislature. 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.	<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. • 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. 	Alliance partners; State of Minnesota	

PHASE II RECOMMENDATIONS: FOR ACTION IN 2009 AND BEYOND

In Phase II the University Community Partnership District Plan will continue to advance the Phase I first priority initiatives, and will include at least the following additional initiatives. Funding for Phase II is described in Recommendation 4. (b) above.

<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>OUTCOMES</i>	<i>PARTY(IES) RESPONSIBLE TO IMPLEMENT</i>	<i>REQUEST FOR STATE FUNDING</i>
1. Implement Homebuyer incentives.	<p>(a) Promote through the University and other employers in the district; implement program.</p> <p>(b) Provide and promote purchase/ rehab options for older homes needing significant improvements.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More ownership in the neighborhoods • More employees living close to work. • More upgraded homes that stabilize the neighborhood. 	Alliance and other partners	
2. Redevelop strategic sites.	<p>(a) Identify priority sites and potential partners; evaluate feasibility and market.</p> <p>(b) Enter into partnerships with private developers and other stakeholders to secure sites for redevelopment as quality, appropriately dense, ownership or co-op housing.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove blight and replace with high quality development. • Attract investment and a diverse mix of residents. 	Alliance and other partners	
3. Implement partnerships with public K-12 schools in the district.	Builds on, and is contingent on, the outcomes at 1 (b) (3).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve and preserve neighborhood schools. • Connect students and faculty with scholarship/engagement in the schools. 	University of Minnesota, with school partners	

<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>OUTCOMES</i>	<i>PARTY(IES) RESPONSIBLE TO IMPLEMENT</i>	<i>REQUEST FOR STATE FUNDING</i>
4. Develop programs and initiatives focused on international student population and new immigrant community needs.	Develop programs that create educational, cultural, and other types of links between students from other countries and local immigrant communities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased awareness of the opportunities for cross-cultural community development. 	Alliance partners	
5. Promote life-long learning opportunities focused on residents of adjacent neighborhoods.	Develop programs that instill a stronger connection between long-term residents and the University. Create an incentive for alumni to relocate to adjacent neighborhoods in their retirement years.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased campus connections between nearby residents and the University. 	Alliance partners	
6. Develop programs and tools to promote small business development in the proposed University Community Partnership District.	<p>Develop programs that assist existing small businesses and attract new businesses that serve the needs of local residents, providing goods and services that contribute to vital, safe, and attractive neighborhoods.</p> <p>Develop programs to promote healthy business environment, including marketing and promotion, property maintenance, and business recruitment and retention.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased support for existing businesses and business organizations. Increased opportunities for new business ventures. Enhancement of long-term viability of business districts that serve both the University community and the neighborhoods. 	Alliance partners	

<i>RECOMMENDATION</i>	<i>DESCRIPTION</i>	<i>OUTCOMES</i>	<i>PARTY(IES) RESPONSIBLE TO IMPLEMENT</i>	<i>REQUEST FOR STATE FUNDING</i>
7. Support economic development in adjacent neighborhoods.	Facilitate the commercial application of University research activities, taking advantage of the proximity of industrially-zoned land in University Research Park and the Mid-City Business Park near the campus.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased local job opportunities. • Increased tax base. 	Alliance partners	
8. Improve “gateways” into the district.	(a) 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. 	Alliance partners	

VI. UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA STADIUM AREA ADVISORY GROUP

HISTORY AND DESCRIPTION

The Stadium Area Advisory Group (SAAG) was created in late 2004 by the University of Minnesota to advise the University's leadership on issues and concerns of nearby neighborhoods and communities related to the planning, construction, and operation of a new on-campus stadium. Its first year of formal meetings, from February 2005 to March 2006, were concerned with the development of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the stadium. Comments from and discussions with SAAG members and the organizations that they represent substantially helped to shape the impact mitigation strategies that were included in the EIS.

SAAG began its second phase of work in June 2006 to advise the University during the current phase of stadium development: design and construction. SAAG is also charged with advising the University on the development of the neighborhood impact report and with recommending operating guidelines for the Stadium Good Neighbor Mitigation Fund. Members of SAAG have also served on two smaller task forces, one overseeing the development of the neighborhood impact report and one that is developing the draft guidelines for allocation of proceeds from Stadium Good Neighbor Mitigation Fund. The Mitigation Fund task force will make its recommendations to SAAG and the University in March 2007. The Mitigation Fund is anticipated to be in operation by the last quarter of 2007.

After construction is complete and the stadium operations begin in fall 2009, it is expected that SAAG will continue to serve its

multiple roles of advising the University regarding community impacts of stadium operations and regarding allocations from the mitigation fund.

SAAG is made up of representatives designated by local governments and communities that are adjacent to or encompass the University's Twin Cities campus. Representation includes each of the following:

- Six neighborhood organizations: Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association, Prospect Park East River Road Improvement Association, Saint Anthony Park Community Council, S.E. Como Improvement Association, University District Improvement Association, and the West Bank Community Coalition.
- Four neighborhood business associations: South East Business Association, Stadium Village Commercial Association, Dinkytown Business Association, and Cedar Riverside Business Association.
- Five local governments: Hennepin County, City of Minneapolis, Ramsey County, City of St. Paul, and City of Falcon Heights.
- One state-related enterprise: the Minnesota State Fair.
- One student representative, appointed by the Residence Halls Association.

SAAG is advisory to the cochairs of the University leadership team charged with development and operation of the stadium: the vice president for University Services and the athletics director. SAAG is staffed by the University's Offices of University Relations, University Services, Budget and Finance, and the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics.

MOVING FORWARD TOGETHER:

U OF M MINNEAPOLIS AREA NEIGHBORHOOD IMPACT REPORT

Acknowledgements

IMPACT REPORT TASK GROUP

Lois Eberhart, *City of Minneapolis Dept. of Public Works*

Jennifer Jordan, *City of Minneapolis Dept. of Community Planning
and Economic Development*

Florence Littman, *Prospect Park East River Road Improvement Association*

Joan Menken, *S.E. Como Improvement Association*

Wendy Menken, *S.E. Como Improvement Association*

Jan Morlock, *Office of University Relations, University of Minnesota*

Richard Poppele, *Prospect Park East River Road Improvement Association*

Catherine Vennewitz, *Cedar-Riverside Business Association*

Doris Wickstrom, *West Bank Community Coalition*

CONSULTANTS

Dan Cornejo, *Cornejo Consulting*

Community Planning + Design

1657 Saunders Avenue

Saint Paul, MN 55116

Barbara Lukermann, *University of Minnesota Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA)*

The students of the Hubert Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs fall semester 2006 course PA 8203—Neighborhood Revitalization

OTHERS

All of the members of the Stadium Area Advisory Group who supported the work of the Task Group.

City and University leaders, who provided comments, encouragement, and guidance.

The hundreds of campus neighbors, students, and business owners who have shown their interest and commitment by commenting, participating in the dialog, and responding to surveys.









UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA

Published by Office of University Relations.

This publication can be made available in alternate formats for people with disabilities. Please contact University Relations, 612-624-6868.

8/2008 —300