

THE 1996 STATE OF THE NEIGHBORHOODS ADDRESS

The Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods

Thursday, February 22, 1996
Plymouth Congregational Church
5:30 p.m.

INTRODUCTION

Our purpose today is to assess how well Minneapolis is facing the challenges and opportunities of urban life.

Last year, in the first State of the Neighborhoods Address, the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods identified lessons and insights that could be distilled from the extraordinary energy and commitment generated by Minneapolis residents in their neighborhood planning and development activities. We concluded that neighborhoods were constructing a compelling agenda for the revitalization of our community.

This year, we propose to take stock of how things have changed over the last year. We will again examine stories about tough and creative approaches to neighborhood problem-solving. We will again explore how effectively other sectors of the community have contributed to these successes.

The state of Minneapolis neighborhoods is of vital importance. It is in our neighborhoods that the daily routines of life are played out: where people live, work, and form networks of support. It is in our neighborhoods that those patterns of civic involvement so essential to the public health are formed and cultivated. And as our community wrestles with the hydra of political disillusionment, social disengagement, and economic disinvestment, we cannot be reminded too often of the values and sensitivities that neighborhoods have cultivated over time and are working continuously to preserve and enhance.

Although this Address is the product of the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods, it has been informed and inspired by the work of many others, some of whom we will mention, many of whom we will not. We hope that it will provoke reaction, discussion, and, ultimately, a heightened level of public discourse about what is needed to move Minneapolis neighborhoods forward.

The Address also reflects what the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods is. Not an expert group, but a collection of experiences and points of view. Not speaking for neighborhoods, but from a neighborhood perspective.

We have had an exciting year. We have formalized our organizational structure, been awarded tax-exempt status, received our first foundation grant, and hired our first staff person. We have hosted and facilitated more than a dozen community discussions about housing policy, social service redesign, arts and cultural initiatives, economic development issues, environmental issues, and other areas of neighborhood activity. We are delighted that you are here to share with us our accomplishments and look into the next year.

The Address will be divided into two main sections, each preceded by a report card:

- [1] The Neighborhood Perspective -- how neighborhoods are facing the challenges of five indicators of community health;
- [2] The Public Sector Response -- how public sector agencies are responding to the work of neighborhoods;

We will conclude with some brief comments about next steps -- what must be done to move the neighborhoods forward.

I. THE NEIGHBORHOOD REPORT CARD

Last year, we issued a report card that summarized how well our community is performing on five key indicators of urban health. In concluding that the neighborhoods had done their part, but that the public sector response had been sluggish, we did little to endear ourselves to large numbers of influential people.

At the core of these differences of opinion about which grades were too high, too low, or otherwise off the mark, lay the seeds of a more important discussion about what more our community could be doing to serve the larger public good. So we're back for an update.

The form is, however, different in three respects.

First, we have created two report cards: one for the neighborhoods, one for the public sector.

Second, we have also shifted our neighborhood grading categories away from traditional planning topics -- human development, public safety, infrastructure -- in favor of five revitalization principles¹:

¹ These principles are strongly influenced by the recent report, "Defining Community: A Neighborhood Perspective," published in early February by the Design Center for American Urban Landscape in the University of Minnesota's College of Architecture (hereafter "*Defining Community*"). References throughout this address to *Defining Community* are made with the authors' permission.

- Development of Revitalization Strategies Appropriate to a Neighborhood Scale
- Innovation in the Redesign of Community Services
- Promotion of Cross-Neighborhood and Multisector Collaboration
- Integration of Neighborhood Initiatives into City-Wide and Regional Activities and Systems
- Strengthening of Long-Term Civic Capacity

And third, whereas last year we treated the public sector as a single category, this year we have separated out individual public agencies so as to more fully recognize the wide discrepancies of effort that have emerged over the last year.

The grades on the two report cards suggest that the State of the Neighborhoods has three dimensions.

The first is the neighborhoods' success in strengthening community institutions, community connections, and community-based problem-solving.

The second is the growing engagement of important segments of the public sector in the neighborhood's work.

The third is, unfortunately, the lingering resistance of important public players to adapting and redirecting their work in ways that would support and enhance neighborhood initiatives.

The Neighborhood Report Card follows on the next page.

For more information about the report, call Gretchen Nicholls at the Design Center, 627-1850, extension 414.

NEIGHBORHOOD REPORT CARD for 1995

Development of Revitalization Strategies Appropriate to a Neighborhood Scale	A
Innovation in the Redesign of Community Services	B+
Promotion of Cross-Neighborhood and Multisector Collaboration	A-
Integration of Local Initiatives into Regional Activities and Systems	B
Strengthening Long-Term Civic Capacity	B-

II. THE NEIGHBORHOOD PERSPECTIVE

The activism, planning, and practical problem-solving afoot in Minneapolis neighborhoods alone cannot ensure the health of our community. But it can ignite a spark that is indispensable to a renewed sense of optimism and community ownership.²

Despite some rocky going, city residents have largely been successful in transcending the narrow, ideological struggles and trivial personal conflicts that all too often have grounded the important work at City Hall to a halt. They have sought to build consensus around long-term vision while crafting pragmatic responses to immediate needs and opportunities.

In the process, they have demonstrated a capacity not only to fashion strategies appropriate to the character and scale of their neighborhood, but to search out approaches that break new ground, that explore the potential for cross-neighborhood and cross-disciplinary cooperation, and that strengthen long-term capacity for civic involvement. We will examine each of these themes in turn.

PRINCIPLE 1: DEVELOPING STRATEGIES APPROPRIATE TO A NEIGHBORHOOD SCALE

In their analysis of the first nineteen neighborhood NRP plans, the authors of the report *Defining Community: A Neighborhood Perspective*, observe:

Whether maintenance and rehabilitation of housing stock, strengthening of small business activity, creation of small pockets of open space, development of neighborhood-specific transit strategies, or reassertion of control over the safety of public spaces, neighborhood strategies are grounded in approaches at the fine grain.³

What may seem obvious, perhaps even parochial, is in fact a powerful statement about revitalization strategies that invite community ownership and that promise long-term return.

HOUSING

² For an incisive and provocative discussion of building civic involvement through public work see Harry C. Boyte & Nancy N. Kari, *Building America: The Democratic Promise of Public Work*, forthcoming from Temple University Press.

³ *Defining Community*, note 1, at page 1. See also Steve Brandt, "Neighborhoods, city differ on priorities," *StarTribune*, February 19, 1996, page B1.

Stabilizing and improving the availability of safe and affordable housing has long been one of the cornerstones of this city's public policy and was reaffirmed through the lengthy discussion last year of the City's Four Housing Principles.⁴ Neighborhoods are providing new definition to what this means.

Neighborhood plans are looking at housing from a perspective of maintenance, management, and enhancement of existing stock.⁵ They are trying to stitch a thread of consistency through property management practices, maintenance, acquisition policies, and demolition and rehabilitation decisions -- to substitute a planned approach to revitalization for ad hoc responses.⁶ They want to know how it all adds up.

Prompted by widespread neighborhood interest in establishing revolving funds for low-interest, home improvement loans, the **Center for Urban and Regional Affairs** produced the "Neighborhood Home Improvement Loan Fund Handbook" that walks neighborhoods through the steps and issues involved in setting up such a program.⁷ Neighborhoods have transformed the importance of these small-scale loans tools.

In the **McKinley** neighborhood, one of the first neighborhoods to design its own home improvement loan program, there was not a single default in the first wave of more than 150 loans. Similarly, **Powderhorn** neighborhood has made almost

⁴ The four principles, developed by the Planning Department and Mayor and fleshed out with specific language (not included here) from the Council, are:

1. The variety of housing types throughout the city and its communities, and throughout the metropolitan area, shall be increased, giving prospective buyers and renters greater choice in where they live.
2. The management, quality, and balance of subsidized housing throughout the city and metropolitan area shall be improved.
3. Housing markets that are already strong shall be preserved and strengthened.
4. The quality of Minneapolis' housing stock shall be improved.

See Kevin Diaz, "Council approves housing principles," *StarTribune*, July 1, 1995, page 10A. See also the proceedings of the August 14, 1995 roundtable discussion sponsored by the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods and the League of Women Voters of Minneapolis, contained in *Defining Community*, at pp. 10-11.

⁵ *Defining Community*, at page 6.

⁶ See the November 27, 1995 housing roundtable discussion sponsored by the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods and the League of Women Voters of Minneapolis, contained in *Defining Community*, at pp. 12-13.

⁷ Written by Ryan Pulkrabek, graduate student in urban planning, the handbook was the product of the Neighborhood Planning for Community Revitalization program, run by Kris Nelson. For more information, call Kris Nelson at CURA, 625-1020.

150 loans, all of which have been repaid.⁸ This spring, **Marcy-Holmes** will make loans targeted at the maintenance of historic properties.

Neighborhoods have also emphasized the expansion of credit opportunities for existing or potential homeowners. **Northside Neighborhood Housing Services**, working with Jordan, Hawthorne, Near North, and other neighborhood groups, is on track to provide purchase and reconstruction assistance to almost 200 home buyers annually who would otherwise fall short of traditional lending criteria.⁹

The St. Anthony West neighborhood has launched a **Home Ownership Resource Center** that will attempt to make public and private investment available to homeowners, particularly elderly residents who may be less able or inclined to maintain or improve their homes. The neighborhood hopes ultimately to offer the program to residents in the St. Anthony East, Logan Park, and Sheridan neighborhoods.¹⁰

The challenges of rental property are increasingly working their way onto the neighborhood agenda.

Loring Park, Stevens Square, Near North, Marcy-Holmes, Whittier, Powderhorn, East Harriet, and Seward, among others, have developed loan programs to support landlord investment in multi-unit properties.¹¹

Windom Park has taken these programs a step further in an effort to get a handle on the vexing problem of property management. The neighborhood has extended maintenance funding to landlords of duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes in return for the landlord's participation in rental property management training

⁸ Interview with Bob Miller, NRP Director, February 14, 1996.

⁹ See Jim Buchta, "The Revival of a community," *StarTribune*, April 22, 1995, Home Section at pp. 4-5. For more information, call Ronnie Davis at Northside Neighborhood Housing Services, 521-3581.

¹⁰ See the discussion in the Housing Roundtable II, sponsored by the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods and the League of Women Voters of Minneapolis, contained in *Defining Community*, at pp. 12-14. The St. Anthony West Neighborhood Organization has found a strong partner in the **Greater Minneapolis Metropolitan Housing Corporation (GMMHC)**. For more information, call the St. Anthony West Neighborhood Organization at 378-8886.

Under the leadership of Carolyn Anderson, GMMHC has made its presence felt throughout the city. For example, GMMHC is moving forward with a 1994 commitment with the MCDA to build up to 100 new houses annually for five years on the north side. See Jim Buchta, "The revival of a community," *StarTribune*, April 22, 1995, Home Section, page 5. For more information, call GMMHC at 339-0602.

¹¹ *Defining Community*, at page 85.

and education courses. The neighborhood has relied heavily on management models developed by non-profit development corporations.¹²

These models are being tested daily in the properties owned or managed by community development corporations.¹³ Perhaps no organization has been more firmly on the front lines of these challenges than **Project for Pride in Living**.¹⁴ In December, PPL's founder and executive director of a quarter century, **Joe Selvaggio**, announced his intentions to turn over the reins and assume more of an adviser/master fundraiser role.¹⁵ There has been no more ardent an advocate for inner city residents. We hope he will continue to exercise the moral leadership that the city has come to take for granted.

The Powderhorn Residents Group has converted a traditional, three-story apartment complex into a center based on the needs of Southeast Asian Families. The **East Village** project includes large apartments capable of accommodating extended families, community rooms, and educational programs tailored to such resident needs as English-as-a-second-language training.

The fight for preservation of historically significant properties continues to animate neighborhood revitalization efforts. Since we visited them last year, a number of preservation stories have turned positive: mixed-use housing and commercial development has given new life to historic properties along **East Hennepin Avenue**; a new owner will soon give the **Lyon House** a welcome face lift.

A number of other housing preservation stories have joined the list as strong symbols of neighborhood regeneration. The Elliot Park Neighborhood earmarked NRP money for the renovation of the **Hinkle-Murphy Mansion**, opening the way for the expansion of an existing business and the addition of twenty new jobs. The Stevens Square Neighborhood Organization provided the seed money that will enable a family business to complete the renovation of the **Van Duesen Mansion** on 19th and Lasalle.¹⁶

One of the most creative expressions of neighborhood interest in building on the uniqueness of historic housing stock is the emergence of a small, but ardent,

¹² *Defining Community* at page 12. For more information, call Dianne Loeffler at Windom Park, .

¹³ Not all of these experiences have been successful. After a long struggle, Project for Pride in Living, for example, was forced to close down an entire building that had become drug-ridden.

¹⁴ PPL owns or manages 361 units, of which 86% of the tenants are people of color and 90% are single parents.

¹⁵ See Robert Franklin, "The houses that Joe built," *StarTribune*, December 12, 1995, page B1. He will be succeeded by Steve Cramer.

¹⁶ See Linda Mack, "Abandoned mansion finds a believer to restore it," *StarTribune*, June 6, 1995, page B1.

bungalow movement.¹⁷ Prompted by a Longfellow Neighborhood NRP survey that found that bungalows account for almost sixty percent of the neighborhood's housing units, Kristi Johnson formed the **Twin Cities Bungalow Club** to educate residents about how to maintain and adapt their homes. Ms. Johnson is working on a book of remodeling plans, sending out a periodic newsletter, and convening membership meetings, all inspired by fierce loyalty to these early 20th century, low-pitched, one-and-a-half story houses sprinkled throughout the city.

STRATEGIES APPROPRIATE TO A NEIGHBORHOOD SCALE: PUBLIC SAFETY

Minneapolis neighborhoods are united in their commitment to reclaim control over the public realm through block clubs, citizen patrols, improved lighting, community safety coordinators, and a variety of other measures.¹⁸ They seek to extend that commitment to the Police Department through strategies that foster officer involvement in the community -- beat and bicycle patrols, neighborhood safety centers, storefront cop shops.¹⁹

The unequivocal statement of safety priorities emerging from neighborhoods has prompted only a slow redirection of public effort, as we will discuss below. But neighborhoods have nevertheless stitched together public and private resources to open safety centers,²⁰ purchase security equipment,²¹ and otherwise support these organizing efforts.

Walking the streets is a powerful second line of response.²²

¹⁷ See Larry Millett, "Cowabungalow," *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, November 24, 1995; Linda Mack, "Beloved Bungalows," *StarTribune*, November 24, 1995, page B1.

¹⁸ *Defining Community*, at page 26. One of the culminating events for community organizing is the annual National Night Out celebrations throughout the city. On August 1st, an estimated 35,000 residents representing 800 block clubs filled the city's streets and sidewalks to celebrate their communities. See T. Robertson & K. Dushschere, "Night Out celebrates community," *StarTribune*, August 2, 1995, page B1.

¹⁹ *Ibid.* Important as they are, requests for vehicle patrols, more rapid response to emergency calls, and retrospective investigation are not the backbone of neighborhood plans.

²⁰ See, e.g., Ingrid Middleton & Anne O'Connor, "Determined to make a neighborhood change," *StarTribune*, June 6, 1995, page B1 (describing the efforts to create a multipurpose safety center in **Powderhorn**, relying on donated time, money, and materials); Jennifer Thaney, "Safety Center Opens at Chicago-Crossings," *The Alley*, January 1996 (describing the opening of a cop shop and meeting space in **Phillips**).

²¹ The Longfellow Neighborhood, for example, was able to convince a local retailer to sell motion detectors to neighborhood residents for half-price; almost 500 were sold under the arrangement. See T. Robertson & Kevin Dushschere, "Night Out celebrates community," *StarTribune*, August 2, 1995, page B1.

²² *Ibid.*

The **Lyndale Walkers** have organized Unity Walks among adjacent neighborhoods. Last fall, Joe Selvaggio from Project for Pride in Living organized an remarkable coalition of neighborhood organizations to march for safety and unity in the **Walk for One Community**.²³

The extraordinary efforts we noted last year of neighborhoods combating prostitution and the attendant drug dealing and harassment from Johns have paid dividends. Although the activities are still with us, neighbors and businesses in **Hawthorne, Prospect Park, the Warehouse District, and on Lake Street** have closed saunas and pushed the prostitution industry elsewhere.

Residents know that intensified community organizing and surveillance is only one piece of a more comprehensive strategy for building healthy, crime-resistant communities. They are weaving crime prevention strategies into every aspect of their planning efforts: reclamation of vacant lots, strengthened housing inspection, enhanced leisure time and employment opportunities for young people, improved pedestrian environments. They proceed in the hope that these multiple fine-grain strategies will add up to a measurable impact on resident safety.

Led by the example of St. Joseph's House, a shelter for women and children, the residents of the 2100 block of Portland Avenue South have systematically set about ridding their block of drug dealers through an organization called **Homes on Portland Enterprises (HOPE)**. HOPE has bought, razed, and rehabilitated problem properties, picketed, and organized community suppers, offered tenant education programs, and otherwise given birth to a new sense of community ownership.²⁴

STRATEGIES APPROPRIATE TO A NEIGHBORHOOD SCALE: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Whether reflected in small business development and retention, job creation, or light industrial strategies, neighborhoods are developing approaches to economic development that emphasize the compatibility of business enterprises to neighborhood life:

Neighborhood economic development strategies grow from an interest in control over their environment, in building neighborhood economic and social capital, in creating appropriate zones among potentially incompatible uses, and in marketing small business areas as a hallmark of neighborhood identity.

Neighborhoods decline to draw a bright line between job-building and community-building, grounding their plans in the immediate day-to-day effects

²³ See Heron Marquez Estrada, "Community Walk is a step to curb violence," *StarTribune*, October 2, 1995, page B1.

²⁴ See Allen Short, "Residents reclaiming block from drugs, crime," *StarTribune*, December 13, 1995, page B1.

economic activity has on the social, political, and physical make-up of the neighborhood.²⁵

Neighborhood emphasis on small business exemplifies these themes. And it is not simply that the increased frequency of Caribou sightings suggests the revitalization of particular urban life forms.

From **Near North's** Small Business Investment Company to the **Marcy-Holmes Home-Based Business Association**, and from the continuing successes of the **American Indian Business Development Corporation** in seeding minority entrepreneurialism to the proliferation of **micro loan programs** throughout the city, neighborhoods are looking to leverage greater capital from existing sources, create new instruments of lending, and strengthen business development assistance.

Generating new economic capital is only part of the response, however. Neighborhoods are increasingly looking within their boundaries to tap and circulate their own community's wealth.²⁶

The **Crossroads Resource Center** has completed studies in Phillips, Powderhorn, and Camden that identify and quantify the forms of neighborhood wealth, its movements, and final destinations.²⁷ Using a community Income Statement and Balance Sheet, Ken Meter has sought to demonstrate that neighborhoods can exercise greater control over their economic future by understanding how money circulates within the community.²⁸

²⁵*Defining Community*, at page 36.

²⁶ The Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods and the Minnesota Alliance for Progressive Action sponsored a roundtable discussion on the Sears property last summer to explore whether concepts of community wealth had any place in the broader deliberations about the Daley Group proposal. Planning Director Paul Farmer proposed at the end of the roundtable that the conversation be continued through a design charette. That charette was convened a number of weeks later, generating constructive ideas. There have been a number of conversations at all levels since then. It is not yet clear where Mr. Farmer's excellent work will lead.

For more information about MAPA's Community Wealth Creation Project, call Dave Mann at MAPA, 641-4050.

²⁷ The Phillips study was commissioned by Phillips Community Initiatives for Children; the Powderhorn study by Healthy Powderhorn; the Camden study by a consortium of the Joint Ministry Project, St. Bridget's Church, Luther Memorial Church, and Camden Area Community Concerns Council. *See also* Edwin Felien, "We're richer than we think!" *Southside Pride*, February 1996, page 1; Alicia Scott, "Camden starts focus on community assets," *Northnews*, October 30, 1995, page 5.

For more information, call Ken Meter at Crossroads Resource Center, 869-8664.

²⁸ In a related application of this principle, the **Elliot Park Neighborhood Organization**, concerned about the lack of access of neighborhood residents to groceries, commissioned Project for Pride in Living to do a study about the

Meter's findings about the siphoning of resources represented by mortgage and rental payments to non-resident lenders and owners were instrumental in establishing the case for a **Phillips Neighborhood Credit Union**. His work has also prompted **Abbott-Northwestern Hospital** to undertake an internal study of the impact the hospital has on the surrounding community: how many employees live in adjacent neighborhoods, how much money is spent on local vendors and contractors, how many of its clients come from the immediate community.²⁹

The Central Neighborhood Improvement Association has similarly moved forward aggressively in strengthening neighborhood-based businesses at 4th Avenue and Lake Street. Combining federal, state, city, NRP, and private funding, CNIA has assembled a stabilization and development package that has rooted out an enclave of pornography stores, strengthened existing businesses, encouraged the emergence of an Hispanic business hub, and created optimism that new investments will flow into the node.³⁰

STRATEGIES APPROPRIATE TO A NEIGHBORHOOD SCALE: PARKS, OPEN SPACE, AND THE ENVIRONMENT

Neighborhoods speak with unmistakable clarity about the importance of parks, open space, and the natural environment to their identity and livability. They are moving on three related, but separate fronts.

The first is a commitment to maintaining, upgrading, and expanding the basic civic structure of the existing park system.³¹

Citizens for a Loring Park Community, working through a master planning process, has dedicated a substantial portion of its NRP energy to the redesign and revitalization of the park. The plan not only focuses internally -- improving the pond's water quality, moving the athletic facilities to the perimeter, renovating the buildings, fountain, and paths, creating a new formal garden, and planting more trees -- but looks to create stronger connections to the broader community through bike and pedestrian paths.³²

possibility of attracting a grocery store to the neighborhood. *See* James Walsh, "When groceries aren't next store," *Star Tribune*, March 31, 1995, page B1.

²⁹ Interview with Ken Meter, February 15, 1996.

³⁰ CNIA, led by an indefatigable executive director, Jana Metge, has also been instrumental in the development of the Lake Street Commercial Corridor Plan, described more fully below.

For more information, call Jana Metge at the Central Neighborhood Improvement Association, 822-3302.

³¹ *Defining Community*, at page 62.

³² The two-year master planning effort was supported by Diana Balmori, a landscape architect from New Haven. *See* Linda Mack, "Restoring Loring Park," *Star Tribune*, April 9, 1995, page B1.

With capital construction complete, the Marcy-Holmes neighborhood has begun intensive planning to connect the **Stone Arch Bridge** more fully into the neighborhood.³³ The Powderhorn Park Neighborhood Association has invested more than \$1 million in the stabilization and reinvigoration of the vegetation, wildlife, and shoreline of **Powderhorn Lake**. **Stevens Square, Seward, Hale/Page/Diamond Lake**, and others are working with the Park Board to upgrade buildings and equipment, expand plantings, and improve lighting.

The second front of neighborhood activity is the development of smaller open spaces that fall outside of traditional models of parks.

Neighborhoods are testing new approaches to creating and maintaining community gardens, pocket parks, and other small open spaces. There are now more than sixty community gardens in Minneapolis.³⁴ The **Knox Garden** at 1211 Knox Avenue North, one of seven pilot projects developed in conjunction the Minneapolis Park Board and the Sustainable Resources Center, uses recycled fences to create outdoor "rooms" planted with flowers, vegetables, and fruit.³⁵ The **Youth Farm and Market Project** in the Lyndale Neighborhood uses 38 vegetable plots on a once-abandoned lot to teach young people about food, health, and farming.³⁶

The third front is the exploration of ways in which neighborhoods can have an impact on, and bring into neighborhood focus, broad issues of environmental protection and enhancement.³⁷ The environment is a powerful organizing tool -- witness the Cedar Lake Park coalition, river and creek clean-up initiatives, and anything to do with airport noise, freeway expansion, or closing streets around the lakes. Neighborhoods are trying to take the next step and understand how broad issues of water, air, and soil quality, natural habitat, and land use can be affected at the neighborhood level.³⁸

The **Bottineau Neighborhood**, with others, has joined in partnership with Citizens for a Better Environment to hammer out good neighborhood agreements with businesses whose activities could harm the river. The **Marcy-Holmes Neighborhood Association** last summer distributed hundreds of trees to residents to replenish, diversify, and expand the urban forest. The **Urban**

³³ The neighborhood's plan to make the Bridge more of a gateway into the community is contained in *The Stone Arch Bridge Continued: a Plan for Sixth Avenue*. Copies are available by sending your name and address to Marcy-Holmes NRP, 1313 Fifth Street S.E., Minneapolis, MN 55414.

³⁴ See Steve Brandt, "A growing interest in community gardens," *StarTribune*, August 3, 1995, page B1.

³⁵ *Ibid.* For more information call the Sustainable Resources Center at 870-0720.

³⁶ See Steve Brandt, "Harvest of Pride," *StarTribune*, August 3, 1995, page B1.

³⁷ *Defining Community*, at page 70.

³⁸ The Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods sponsored a roundtable discussion on May 11th to explore some of these issues. See *Defining Community*, at pp. 75-76.

Ecology Coalition brought together almost 200 people in early June to discuss a wide variety of neighborhood-based environment strategies.³⁹

³⁹ This is discussed further at page 21 below.

STRATEGIES APPROPRIATE TO A NEIGHBORHOOD SCALE: TRANSPORTATION

The pursuit of revitalization strategies appropriate to a neighborhood scale is nowhere more evident than in transportation. Neighborhoods have identified the missing link in city and regional transportation planning: a focus on the particularized transportation needs of neighborhood residents, institutions, and businesses.⁴⁰ The street is the basic structure of a community, not an engineer's toy.

Traffic speed, management, and volume. Lighting not just for the automobile but for pedestrians and bicycles. Developing mass transit options that enable residents to get to the local health clinic, grocery store, or child care center, not just to downtown or the Megamall. Rethinking land-use policies to reflect changing residential and commercial needs. Neighborhoods want to know how the interior systems work, how to connect the essential points of destination.

Neighborhoods are starting with the basics. They have called for, and are slowly receiving help with, **neighborhood transportation studies**.⁴¹ The questions these are likely to address are at once basic and far-reaching:

- how are the neighborhood's transportation needs met? how are they changing? what needs do special populations have -- seniors, people with disabilities, single mothers?
- how do transportation practices and policies reflect neighborhood concerns about safety? about connecting residents to jobs?
- how are the transportation needs of multiple neighborhoods integrated?

A powerful model for how these questions can be approached is being tested in our northern suburbs. Northwest Hennepin Human Services Council, a consortium of fifteen northwest Hennepin County municipalities, has joined with the United Way Success by Six program to create the **Success by Six Northwest Transportation** initiative.

The initiative has enlisted the Metropolitan Council Transit Organization in creating a demonstration bus route that more effectively connects low-income residents of Brooklyn Center to essential health, commercial, and public service destinations. It convened a transit summit in early October that produced working groups on consolidation of transit services, transportation funding, and

⁴⁰ *Defining Community*, at page 48.

⁴¹ Almost sixty percent of the nineteen neighborhood NRP plans to be approved called for the preparation of a transportation management study and circulation plan for the neighborhood. *Ibid.* at page 50. Jim Daire of the Minneapolis Planning Department has been detailed to help develop these; one suspects that he is overworked.

land-use. It was instrumental in convincing the United Way to recognize transportation as a priority in the funding of community services.⁴²

PRINCIPLE 2: INNOVATION IN THE REDESIGN OF COMMUNITY SERVICES

Adapting our civic institutions to the complex forces of change that are shaping Minneapolis is not reasonable to ask of our elected leadership and public bureaucracies. It lies beyond their institutional capacity to take on such a task alone. It is ultimately a task for residents well-organized around the tasks of revitalizing their physical environment, their social relationships, and their civic institutions.

The opportunity to take a fresh cut at problem-solving -- to test old approaches against new needs, to tap civic energy in the redesign of community services -- is reflected in the effort described in the previous section to develop strategies appropriate to a neighborhood scale.

Neighborhoods have recognized a great many things of value in the existing toolbox of public services. They rely heavily on the competence, good will, and political sensibilities of our city's elected officials and employees.

But they have also begun to carve out areas in which they propose to expand the envelope of established practices or, in some cases, to develop a new envelope altogether. In the process, they are establishing a new vocabulary with which to describe a neighborhood perspective on community revitalization.⁴³

Housing demolition strategies that provide greater neighborhood control over the acquisition and disposition of problem properties.⁴⁴ Small business strategies that become the linchpin of neighborhood economic development efforts. Strategies for connecting the schools more fully into the community through changes in

⁴² Northwest Hennepin Human Services Council is equally active in housing, social service, and other community issues. For more information, call its Executive Director, Patty Wilder, at 493-2802. For more information about the transportation initiative, call Elizabeth Wilder, also at 493-2802.

⁴³ See *Defining Community*, at page 1.

⁴⁴ The **Lyndale Neighborhood**, for example, challenged the MCDA's acquisition and demolition policies in a dispute over the future of a row house at 3100 Harriet Avenue South. See Cynthia Scott, "What's it worth?" *Southwest Journal*, June 14-28, 1995, page 1. The **Central Neighborhood** similarly called those policies into question when it sought to rehabilitate, rather than demolish, some of the older homes in the neighborhood. See Steve Brandt, "Central neighborhood wants homes rehabbed, not razed," *StarTribune*, November 14, 1995, page B1.

programming and improved access to facilities.⁴⁵ Open space strategies that not only expand the horizons of the existing park system, but suggest the contours of a new system of small-scale, neighborhood-based open spaces. Environmental strategies that draw the City into fuller partnership in addressing regional air, water, soil, land-use, and energy policies. Arts and cultural strategies that underscore the need for a meaningful city arts and cultural policy.⁴⁶

One additional area of activity is illustrative.

REDESIGN OF COMMUNITY SERVICES: HUMAN DEVELOPMENT

A small number of neighborhoods have taken the lead in expanding traditional definitions of human development to include not only the formal social service network, but the networks of community support that undergird community health.

These two strains of human development were the subject of a two **human development roundtable discussions** sponsored by the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods and the Lyndale Neighborhood Association.⁴⁷ The participants

⁴⁵ With the breaking of ground for the Whittier School in the next year, the **Whittier Neighborhood** will see realized a plank of its NRP plan that many dismissed as utopic when it was adopted years ago: the establishment of a community school. It can be argued that the Whittier NRP process was a major impetus for the Minneapolis Public Schools to begin considering in a concerted way the community schools agenda.

⁴⁶ This theme was underscored in a roundtable discussion on April 18, 1995 cosponsored by the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods, Intermedia Arts, and United Arts, contained in *Defining Community*, at pp. 81-82.

The **CultureTalks** report, completed in 1993 under the direction of 24 community residents, remains the clearest blueprint for City action. Despite strong efforts from **Council Member Jim Niland** to breathe life into the report's recommendations, City Hall has permitted it to languish. See Editorial, "Arts in the City," *StarTribune*, July 23, 1993, page 18A.

⁴⁷ In the first roundtable, the **Phillips Neighborhood** described its Lifespan project, an attempt to influence the provision of social services in the neighborhood from birth to death. The **Stevens Square** neighborhood sketched both their social services inventory and the resulting decision to form a job training and placement partnership with the Loring Nicollet Bethlehem Community Centers. The **Lyndale Neighborhood** discussed its attempts to form alliances with community-based organizations already involved in building the capacity of neighborhood residents to meet their human development needs.

In the second roundtable, **Healthy Powderhorn** described the process by which neighborhood residents are invited to identify issues important to their health, to become involved in Community Health Action Teams, and to develop strategies for action based on the wisdom and traditions of the multiple cultures present in the eight neighborhoods involved. Pillsbury United Neighborhood Services called attention to its **New Unity** project, which will provide family loans, housing assistance, job training, and credit counseling. **Phyllis Wheatley** characterized their work as providing support needed by people in the community, particularly the African American and Southeast Asian communities, to realize their goals and to enrich their lives. The Minneapolis Foundation detailed its **Building**

agreed that a distinction should be drawn between social services -- the province of institutional providers -- and human development -- the responsibility of cultures, informal social networks, and individuals.

These are tricky, elusive conversations, difficult to translate into pragmatic suggestions for neighborhood activity. But they opened exactly that issue: what roles neighborhoods can play both in working more closely with social service providers and in helping residents gain access to the support they need to meet their needs and realize their goals. At least three tangible results emerged from the roundtables:

1. Hennepin County and Lyndale are discussing with the NRP staff and others the possibility of making neighborhood organizations eligible for money earmarked for social services;
2. Hennepin County has offered to assume the role of contract managers for neighborhoods interested in pursuing human development strategies; and
3. The participants agreed to discuss further the implications the social service-human development distinction holds for funders, neighborhood groups, and providers.⁴⁸

The Stevens Square neighborhood has begun this kind of conversation in another form. Having called in its NRP plan for a social services inventory to determine the spectrum of resident needs and potential responses, Stevens Square contracted with Loring Nicollet Bethlehem Community Centers to develop the **Stevens Square-Loring Heights Common Social Services Plan**. It was released last month.⁴⁹

The plan concluded that the neighborhood could most effectively address human development issues by creating a job training and placement program targeted on the least well-off residents of the community. It will seek to make placements both outside and inside the city. At the regional level, the report targets three manufacturing sectors that are experiencing growth, pay a decent wage, and have a need for low-skill labor: printing and publishing; machining and metalworking; and medical device-making. Locally, the report identifies health care providers as

Better Futures initiative, focusing on children and families in the seven most impoverished Minneapolis neighborhoods.

The proceedings of the first Human Development Roundtable, held on July 11, 1995 are reproduced in *Defining Community*, at pp. 21-22; the proceedings of the second, held on September 20th, are found at pp. 23-24.

⁴⁸ That roundtable is scheduled for February 27th.

⁴⁹ *The Stevens Square-Loring Heights Common Social Services Plan: A Report by Loring Nicollet Bethlehem for the Stevens Square Organization*, Bart Putney, Project Coordinator. For more information, call Bart Putney at the Stevens Square Neighborhood Organization, 871-7307, or Bill Allexaht at Loring Nicollet Bethlehem, 871-2031.

a market in which the program could both support the local economy and provide employment opportunities free from transportation obstacles.

The Stevens Square Plan seeks to be comprehensive and multidisciplinary. As well as undertaking job skills training, it will offer child care counseling, provide youth apprenticeships opportunities, seek out mentors. It envisions close cooperation among a wide variety of service providers.

Healthy Powderhorn, as we noted last year, is exploring an approach to human development and health that is rooted in community organizing, planning, and learning. Through Citizen Health Action Teams (CHAT teams), residents of eight neighborhoods are identifying and examining solutions to health conditions that undermine the community's quality of life. One CHAT team is identifying ways to connect young people to health care. Another is seeking to improve transportation access to grocery stores. Yet another, focusing on strengthening connections among residents, has given rise to "talking circles," in which people meet just to talk.⁵⁰

Healthy Powderhorn hopes to open a holistic lifestyle center this year in the Bloomington-Lake area that will offer exercise facilities, nutrition education, ethnic dance classes, and in western and alternative medicine.

Healthy Powderhorn's emphasis on building community as a human development strategy is echoed in neighborhoods throughout the city.⁵¹ Some of the most powerful examples are focused on arts and cultural activities.

The **Phillips Gateway Project** was dedicated this fall after more than three years of community planning, design, and construction.⁵² Born of the neighborhood's efforts to raze a liquor store from the corner of Chicago and Franklin, the project has not only reclaimed a public gathering space, but enlisted hundreds of residents in a community organizing process.

Children from Four Winds School created drawings that were displayed on the site and incorporated into the rock mosaic pathways. Students from Anderson School created murals. Sixty teenagers were hired to create the mosaics. Young people were trained in the skills the project's construction would require. As

⁵⁰ See Leonard Inskip, "Pursuing new health strategies in Powderhorn," *StarTribune*, December 19, 1995, page A17. Another of the CHAT Teams "joins health-care practitioners and community residents and links traditional medicine with alternative practices, often with an African, Asian, or Native American approach." *Ibid.*

⁵¹ An interesting example is the intergenerational day care center recently opened by **Mount Olivet Church's Day Services Program**. Located at 56th and Lyndale, the centers provides activities throughout the day in which seniors and children share. See Paul Levy, "Young, old share time together," *StarTribune*, October 12, 1995, page B1.

⁵² See Steve Brandt, "Gateway of Hope," *StarTribune*, October 6, 1995, page B1.

Betsy Sohn, the Project Manager noted, "My hope for the gateway is that it has provided a means for a lot of people in the neighborhood to build a sense of ownership for that corner."⁵³

Having completed its move into the Bee Line Building on Lyndale and 26th, **Intermedia Arts** provides space and programming that invite neighborhood residents to gather and celebrate the multi-culturalism of the surrounding CARAG, Lowry East, Lyndale, and Whittier neighborhoods. Its second annual Day of the Dead festival, for example, drew neighbors, members of the Chicano-Latino community, and Mexican artists together to participate in the Halloween-like celebration from Mexican culture.

PRINCIPLE 3: PROMOTION OF CROSS-NEIGHBORHOOD AND MULTI-SECTOR COLLABORATION

A neighborhood-based planning approach can foster parochialism and balkanization. On the other hand, it can be the essential point of departure for residents who want first to determine what it is about their neighborhood they value and want to strengthen before turning to the larger context into which neighborhood activity must necessarily fit.

Despite the difficulties of thinking beyond boundaries, of mobilizing multiple neighborhoods in pursuit of a shared agenda, and of hammering out complex understandings about shared decision-making and governance, Minneapolis neighborhoods are making progress in promoting cross-neighborhood and multi-sector collaboration.⁵⁴ Two areas are illustrative: commercial corridor planning and the environment.

CROSS-NEIGHBORHOOD AND -SECTOR COLLABORATION: COMMERCIAL CORRIDORS

⁵³ *Ibid.*

⁵⁴ Arthur Himmelman makes the distinction among four levels of joint effort:

1. **Networking** -- *exchanging information for mutual benefit;*
2. **Coordination** -- *exchanging information and altering activities for mutual benefit and to achieve a common purpose;*
3. **Cooperation** -- *exchanging information, altering activities, and sharing resources for mutual benefit and to achieve a common purpose;*
4. **Collaboration** -- *exchanging information, altering activities, sharing resources, and enhancing the capacity of another for mutual benefit and to achieve a common purpose.*

Arthur Himmelman, *On the Theory and Practice of Transformational Collaboration: Collaboration as a Bridge from Social Service to Social Justice*, working paper, June 1995. Neighborhood efforts fall into each of these.

The emerging interest in commercial corridors that we noted last year has grown into one of the dominant areas of neighborhood planning energy.⁵⁵ Some corridors are still defining the scope of their work.⁵⁶ Others have completed a plan and have moved into implementation.⁵⁷ Others still are somewhere in-between.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ Following the Commercial Corridor roundtable discussion the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods convened in August of 1994, a second roundtable discussion was held in February of last year. See *Defining Community*, at pp. 44-46. Eight corridor task forces provided an update on their progress: Central, Chicago, Franklin, Hennepin, Lake Street, Lyndale, Nicollet, and West Broadway. Planning Director Paul Farmer, after describing the Pittsburgh Neighborhood Commercial Improvement Program he helped develop, made a commitment to work with the MCDA to construct a commercial investment program that would bring coherence to the multiple planning and implementation initiatives the corridor work had started in motion. *Ibid.*, at page 46.

⁵⁶ The **Central Avenue Task Force** has concentrated its attention on a stretch of the avenue between 22nd and 27nd. Working with consultant Kim Havey, the group has inventoried the residential and commercial properties along the corridor, conducted a photo documentation of the corridor, and identified investment strategies. They are now considering investment priorities, the possibility of an interlink cable installation, and the effects of Dziedzicdale.

The **Lyndale Avenue Task Force**, which emerged from the Minneapolis Livability Project's concern about the proposed expansion of Lyndale Avenue, met throughout the year to develop recommendations for changes in the avenue that would reduce vehicular speed and its affect on neighborhoods. They have forwarded to the Public Works Department recommendations that parking bays or medians and left-turn lanes be added. They expect to hear back from Public Works this month and to discuss options this spring. See "Lyndale Avenue group meets again Feb. 22," *Southwest Journal*, February 14-27, 1996, page 3.

⁵⁷ The **Franklin Avenue Task Force** used NRP Early Access funds to study the feasibility of a trolley, to undertake a marketing study, to strengthen the business association, and to begin a variety of streetscape improvements. They continue to explore the development of a cultural corridor and the expansion of programming geared toward young people.

⁵⁸ The **Chicago Avenue Task Force**, consisting of eight neighborhoods and assisted by consultant Scott Wende, has identified five specific strategies within its plan for which it has sought funding. Over the last year, much of its energy has been focused on the Chicago-Lake intersection and the future of the Sears site.

The **Hennepin Avenue Task Force**, chaired by Suzanne Zorn, is poised to move into an implementation phase that will emphasize four strategies, among others:

- [1] making the avenue more pedestrian- and mass-transit- friendly;
- [2] creating a Hennepin Avenue Service and Parking Management District;
- [3] reconciling the existing and proposed zoning code to the plan's proposed uses, densities and strategies; and
- [4] creating a commercial overlay district.

The efforts are, however, unified by an understanding of the need to think about the corridors as places in which multiple systems and forces interact and intensify: public safety, relationships among residential, commercial, and industrial activities, transit access, job training, mixed-use development densities, infrastructure deterioration, traffic management, management of public spaces, and many others.

Each corridor, moreover, has the potential to unify and better define neighborhoods, to provide the public space in which residents can gather, and to strengthen the network of goods and services that stabilizes the neighborhood's economy.⁵⁹ Three of these efforts are illustrative.

The **West Broadway Business Association** has begun a five-year workplan that will focus on improving the physical structure of the avenue, enhancing safety, strengthening recreational and employment opportunities for youth, and encouraging the health of small businesses.⁶⁰ The Association has already secured a storefront office for the police department, introduced streetscape improvements, and begun publishing a newsletter to improve communications with the surrounding neighborhoods.

The Association has also developed a working relationship with the Design Center for American Urban Landscape's Community Connections Project. The Design Center has done an extensive survey of the history of the avenue, its current characteristics, and its emerging challenges. The Association and the Design Center are exploring ways in which to use this work both to place the Minneapolis segment of West Broadway in the broader context of the transit, commercial, and residential corridor that extends through Robinsdale, Crystal, New Hope, and Brooklyn Park and to open conversations with the surrounding neighborhoods about connections between the residential and commercial districts.⁶¹

The **Nicollet Avenue Task Force** has moved forward with a \$1.2 million street and streetscape improvement plan funded by the Stevens Square, Whittier, and Loring Park neighborhoods. In part because of this investment in the sidewalks, lighting, plantings, and facades along the avenue, in part because of the Task

⁵⁹ See the working paper circulated by the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods following the first commercial corridor roundtable discussion, contained in *Defining Community*, pp. 42-43.

⁶⁰ See Mark Brunswick, "West Broadway renewal challenges years of decline," *StarTribune*, January 30, 1995, page B1. The membership of the West Broadway Business Association draws from a mix of small business owners, large institutional presences (Target, for example), banks, health care facilities, churches, and social service organizations. It is chaired by Linda White-Anderson of First Bank and is staffed by Rodney Wooten. For more information, call Rod Wooten at the WBBA, 521-0716.

⁶¹ For more information about the Design Center's work with West Broadway, call Carol Swenson at the Design Center, 627-1850 extension 213.

Force's Masterplan for the avenue, the Ackerberg Group has agreed to develop a business intervention strategy and generate proposals for mixed housing-commercial development.⁶²

The Lake Street Corridor Study has moved into overdrive over the last year. Initiated by the Powderhorn Neighborhood Group, but quickly expanded to include neighborhoods the full length of the street, the Lake Street Task Force selected a project team led by the Ackerberg Group to develop a masterplan from the lakes to the river. The result is a blend of the visionary,⁶³ the immediate,⁶⁴ the practical,⁶⁵ and the politically-acute.⁶⁶

Where other plans for Lake have quietly receded from memory, the current effort promises to activate a broad array of participants in its implementation. A number of reasons suggest themselves:

1. The plan emerged after extensive community-based discussions, generating considerable neighborhood ownership of the overall framework and particular strategies;
2. Bundles of activity along the corridor are gathering momentum -- the birth of the Green Institute at Hiawatha and Lake, the revitalization of Bloomington and Lake, the interest in the Sears property, and investments in the Mid-Town Greenway along the 29th Street corridor;

⁶² The improvements will also use state and city capital funds. The Ackerberg fee will come from matching funds from Loring Park and the business association.

⁶³ At least in part attributable to the skill of **Ken Greenberg**, a member of the project team who served as Toronto's Director of Urban Design for more than a decade in Toronto and who has been deeply involved in the University of Minnesota's Masterplan and the Masterplan for the St. Paul Riverfront. See Linda Mack, "Envisioning Place," *StarTribune*, January 14, 1996, page B1.

The importance of **Scott Wende** should also be noted. Wende has worked in a consulting capacity on three of the Lake Street intersections; not only his skill, but his knowledge of the street and his credibility with businesses and residents are invaluable assets to the effort. See also Steve Brandt, "Breathing life into Lake," *StarTribune*, March 22, 1995, page B1.

⁶⁴ At least in part attributable to the commitment and skill of the **Urban Ventures** group, which has worked boldly and aggressively with neighborhood groups to advance proposals for property acquisition, job training, and recreational space in the node at 4th and Lake. Urban Ventures has also worked with Project for Pride in Living to develop proposals for the re-use of the warehouse portion of the Sears property.

⁶⁵ At least in part attributable to the pragmatism of the Ackerberg Group, led by **Caren Dewar**.

⁶⁶ In large part attributable to the strong leadership the neighborhoods along the corridor have provided, including among many others F. Scott Hawkins of Powderhorn.

3. The Ackerberg Group has made a strong commitment, beyond their contractual obligations, to guide the plan into an implementation phase; and

4. The node at 4th and Lake has emerged as a potential demonstration project under the Metropolitan Council's Metropolitan Livable Communities Act program, which would provide seed capital for a half dozen projects in a concentrated area.⁶⁷

CROSS-NEIGHBORHOOD AND -SECTOR COLLABORATION: THE ENVIRONMENT AND OPEN SPACE

Neighborhood residents are eager to work across geographic lines to protect and enhance the environment. They are similarly interested in exploring how environmental issues can bridge the divide among land-use, housing, health, safety, and economic development issues.

The **Environmental Summit** organized by the **Urban Ecology Coalition** last June displayed the keen interest among neighborhoods to share information, seek out technical assistance, and identify implementation partners in their efforts to pursue strategies of environmental sustainability.⁶⁸ Ranging from residential lead abatement to boulevard plantings, and from water quality education to contaminated soil remediation, more than a dozen workshops sought to connect neighborhood residents to other organizations and technical specialists working in the field.⁶⁹

In addition to the connections made at the Summit, the event has produced at least three outcomes that enhance collaboration among neighborhoods.

First, a **working group** was formed to meet periodically to discuss how information and resources about environmental strategies can be shared.

Second, the Urban Ecology Coalition has published an **Environmental Resource Guide** that identifies organizations working on a broad array of environmentally-related projects, provides tips about how to begin neighborhood-based environmental projects, describes energy practices applicable to businesses

⁶⁷ See The Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods, "Demonstrating New Approaches to Development: The Metropolitan Livable Communities Act," *Neighborhood Connections* Winter 1996, at page 4.

⁶⁸ "Creating a Sustainable City: Strategies for Neighborhood Environmental Action," June 10, 1995. For more information, call Jeff Roy at the Urban Ecology Coalition, 721-1681.

⁶⁹ In preparation for the Summit, the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods sponsored a roundtable discussion among two dozen neighborhood environmental activists to discuss how environmental agendas have been, and could be, included in the NRP process. See *Defining Community*, at pp. 75-76.

and homes, and suggests benchmarks to identify neighborhood progress in taking on environmental challenges.⁷⁰

Third, on Saturday, March 2nd, the Urban Ecology Coalition, the NRP, and the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods will sponsor the **Sustainable Communities Resource Fair and Workshop** to provide information about neighborhood, public sector, and non-profit activities related to sustainability.

The **Midtown Greenway Coalition**, drawing on neighborhood groups, private businesses, city and county agencies, and the federal government (through ISTEA alternative transportation funds) has taken the lead in creating a vision for the transformation of the 29th Street Corridor into a reclaimed bicycle pathway linking the river with the Chain of Lakes.

They have been joined in their effort by a task force that will develop a masterplan for the area bounded by 28th to 31st Streets and from Hennepin to Lyndale. Established at the suggestion of Council Member Lisa McDonald, the **28/31/Hennepin/Lyndale Task Force** has been asked to examine the feasibility of using the Greenway as the spine of an urban village that would introduce a variety of housing styles and higher densities to the corridor.⁷¹ The project also has the potential to link with the Hennepin Community Works project and the Lake Street Corridor project.

Through its comprehensive redevelopment plan linking eleven neighborhoods along the northern reach of the river, the **Mississippi Corridor Neighborhood Coalition** opened a far-reaching and provocative discussion about the co-existence of recreational, conservation, residential, commercial, and light industrial uses along the river.⁷² That conversation has touched on the Kondirator, the ambiguities of MCDA industrial policy, the conversion of the Grain Belt Brewery into a theater/marina/housing/park complex, and the establishment of greenways throughout the residential areas.

The **Phelps Park Collaborative** has used the park at 39th and Columbus as a magnet to draw four surrounding neighborhoods, the Boys and Girls Club, and other community-based organizations into the facilities improvements and the social programming of the park.

⁷⁰ The Guide has been sent to each Minneapolis neighborhood group. It is also available on the Freenet computer network or can be ordered from the UEC. For more information call Jeff Roy at the Urban Environmental Coalition, 721-1681.

⁷¹ See Mark Engebretson, "29th Street neighborhood?" *The Southwest Journal*, February 14-27, 1996, at page 1. The Task Force will almost certainly start with the masterplan and move from there to a more detailed consideration of the urban village concept.

⁷² See Steve Brandt, "Future Murky for upper riverfront," *StarTribune*, November 6, 1995, page B1. The Coalition has also worked closely with **Citizens for a Better Environment** to develop "Good Neighbor" agreements with riparian businesses.

PRINCIPLE 4: INTEGRATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD INITIATIVES INTO CITY-WIDE AND REGIONAL ACTIVITIES AND SYSTEMS

As difficult as it is for neighborhoods to act in concert where they have identified shared interests, it is an altogether different task to link those activities into city-wide and regional systems and activities. Indeed, this must necessarily be the province of the public sector: to bridge between the neighborhood perspective and the city-wide and regional perspective.⁷³

Southeast Minneapolis neighborhoods can develop a masterplan for an industrial land parcel, but they will require a coherent set of light industrial policies from the MCDA in order to make progress.

Central-city neighborhoods can explore options to rationalize and coordinate community-oriented policing among three precincts, but they need clear direction from the Police Department for practices to change.

Commercial corridor task forces can continue to position themselves for the revitalization of their avenues, but they will ultimately founder absent clear direction about which of the economic development, land-use, transportation, and housing strategies will be given priority within the city and region.

And so on.

Neighborhoods have nevertheless sought to understand how their activities can influence city-wide and regional policies. They have pushed the envelope of innovation to test the limits of city policy. They have acted jointly to draw in ever-larger cross-neighborhood systems. A few additional examples suggest the breadth of this effort.

⁷³ In last year's State of the Neighborhoods Address, we made specific recommendations about how the City might get a start in doing this:

- developing comprehensive housing, economic development, environmental, and land-use strategies;
- creating a neighborhood-based transportation plan;
- supporting clearly and forcefully the objectives of Representative Myron Orfield's legislative package;
- searching out areas of constructive collaboration with our suburban neighbors such as river reclamation, joint school attendance zones, urban-suburban transit routes that open access to jobs, pathways and trails connecting natural systems.

Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods, *State of the Neighborhoods Address*, January 5, 1995, at pp. 22-30. As will be discussed in Section III below, there has been progress on some of these fronts.

INTEGRATION INTO CITY-WIDE & REGIONAL SYSTEMS: PUBLIC SAFETY

The **Central City Neighborhood Partnership**, a consortium of a half-dozen inner-city neighborhoods, recently completed a year-long, six-part dialogue with the Police Chief, three precinct commanders, Community Crime Prevention/SAFE, the City Attorney, the County Attorney, the Chief Judge of Hennepin County Court, the Head of County Community Corrections, and others involved in the criminal justice system.⁷⁴ The meetings sought to explore in depth what role neighborhood organizations can play in increasing the effectiveness of different facets of the criminal justice system.

The first meeting of the Partnership was instructive. The Commanders of each of the three precincts covering the neighborhoods of the Partnership discussed specific proposals to facilitate communications among the precincts and to improve precinct responsiveness to neighborhood priorities.⁷⁵ The discussion in turn generated additional ideas more appropriately taken up in subsequent conversations with the scheduled participants. With each meeting, the ideas and proposals were refined to become more practical and specific.

The Partnership will release a set of recommendations within the next number of weeks. It had hoped that some of these would be picked up by the Police Department in particular even before the formal report was released. They have not.

The thoroughness with which the Partnership has conducted its work assures that the group's findings will be an important resource for the Police Department and others. The findings are likely to emphasize ways in which the Department can

⁷⁴ The dialogue was cosponsored by the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods. For more information, call Bart Putney at the Stevens Square Neighborhood Organization, 871-7307.

The effort was supported by the work of Stuart Alger, a graduate intern funded through the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs's **Neighborhood Planning for Community Revitalization program**.

⁷⁵ A summary of the memorandum prepared before this meeting is contained in *Defining Community*, at pp. 32-33. Some of the issues discussed in this and subsequent meetings included:

- in addition to beat officers, how can police resources be directed to ensure responsiveness to neighborhood concerns?
- when a neighborhood organization does set safety priorities, how can these best be communicated to precinct officers? how are these reconciled with the precinct's own priorities?
- what mechanisms can be put in place to ensure that officer performance is measured in part by responsiveness to neighborhood-identified problems?
- how can the precincts prevent pushing the problems of one precinct into the next precinct?

Ibid., at page 32.

improve its responsiveness to neighborhoods concerns, breathing life into its community-oriented policing strategies.

INTEGRATION INTO CITY-WIDE & REGIONAL SYSTEMS: THE ENVIRONMENT

The Mississippi Corridor Neighborhood Coalition has pushed open the door of the City's long-term vision for the future of the upper river. One of the Coalition's partners, **Citizens for a Better Environment (CBE)**, is similarly helping organize neighborhoods on projects that open possibilities for new forms of cooperation along the watersheds of two creeks: Bridal Veil Creek and Bassett Creek.

The CBE effort, supported by a grant from the McKnight Foundation, is rooted in providing technical assistance to neighborhood consortiums working to "daylight" (*i.e.*, bring out of the pipe) the two creeks.

In Southeast Minneapolis, the Prospect Park and East River Road Improvement Association and Como neighborhoods have established a steering committee to work with CBE and a consultant, Peggy Sand, to evaluate the feasibility and desirability of reclaiming **Bridal Veil Creek**, which flows into the river through a culvert just north of Franklin Avenue.

In north Minneapolis, CBE is serving as a resource to the Bryn Mawr and the Harrison neighborhoods, and working in concert with the parties involved in planning for the future of the Sumner-Olson public housing site, to examine how and under what circumstances **Bassett Creek** might be uncovered.⁷⁶ The creek runs from Medicine Lake through Wirth Park, Bryn Mawr and Harrison, then under the Glenwood-Lyndale and Sumner-Olson public housing sites, emptying into the river through a culvert on the other side of the Itasca Building/Star Tribune Paper Plant site.

The interest in Bassett Creek's future has been heightened by the likelihood that the Sumner-Olson site will be dramatically reconfigured following the removal of the existing housing units as part of the settlement of the Public Housing Authority/Legal Aid lawsuit over concentrations of low-income public housing. The possibility of introducing an amenity such as a reclaimed creek has worked its way into many of the conversations about Sumner-Olson.

The Bridal Veil and Bassett Creek discussions have pushed Minneapolis neighborhoods to lift their horizon lines in imagining the transforming effects the presence of a "new" amenity could have in connecting neighborhoods more

⁷⁶ In early October, the Harrison Neighborhood, the Urban Ecology Coalition, and the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods sponsored a roundtable discussion about Bassett Creek. See Steve Brandt, "The tide may be turning for neglected waterway," *StarTribune*, October 4, 1995, page B1. The Bryn Mawr neighborhood has set aside \$77,500 of its NRP fund to help create a two-mile bicycle trail between Wirth Park and the Cedar Lake Trail.

firmly to the river and in redefining the edge between the residential and industrial segments of these communities.

INTEGRATION INTO CITY-WIDE & REGIONAL SYSTEMS: ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Defining the city's place in the regional economy of the 21st century has proved an elusive task for everyone from the MCDA to the Greater Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce and Metropolitan Council. A number of neighborhood initiatives have furnished a glimpse into approaches that bring with them such a far-sighted perspective.

The **Green Institute**, by testing a variety of models for sustainable economic development, seeks a foothold in the 21st century economy for the Phillips Neighborhood and the City as a whole. Its vision for a new industrial sector that will marry economic revitalization and environmental stewardship is founded upon the development of an eco-industrial park that would house and incubate companies working at the cutting edge of environmental and energy technology.

Over the last year, the Green Institute has brought on an Executive Director, George Garnett, solidified its support within the foundation community, and begun an environmental studies community education course. Perhaps most significantly, it has opened the **Re-Use Center**, a store for salvaged building parts.⁷⁷ The Re-Use Center is the embodiment of the Green Institute's working philosophy of combining conservation practices, environmental education, and neighborhood-based economic development.⁷⁸

The **Lake Street and West Broadway corridor initiatives** hold considerable potential to explore the connective network between the city and regional economies. Together with the other six corridors in the midst of planning processes, these corridors represent the other group of "brownfields": land that is underutilized, filled with architectural waste, but otherwise not polluted. They are possible locations for higher-density, mixed-use, transit-oriented development. They can be broken into nodes in which adjacent neighborhoods concentrate resources in stabilizing and maintaining small business.

The **Southeast Economic Development Committee (SEED)** is a consortium of the Southeast Business Association, the Prospect Park, Como, and Marcy Holmes neighborhoods, and others that is working closely with the MCDA to apply unconventional and innovative concepts to the future development of a 300 acre underutilized industrial area east of University Avenue. SEED has pursued development guidelines that confront the limitations of traditional "big-box"

⁷⁷ See Steve Brandt, "Turning trash into treasure," *StarTribune*, April 12, 1995, page B1.

⁷⁸ Spearheaded by Susan Gust, the Re-Use Center is committed to being staffed by Phillips Neighborhood residents -- from the salvagers to business managers and from the architectural cleaners to the floor sales personnel. For more information, call the Re-Use Center at 724-2608.

development formulas by emphasizing neighborhood-compatible, urban-style development: smaller set-backs to make buildings more pedestrian and transit-friendly; high floor-area ratios to encourage both concentration of development in multi-story buildings and preservation of open space; minimization of paved areas; and landscaping and lighting details.⁷⁹

PRINCIPLE 5: STRENGTHENING OF LONG-TERM CIVIC CAPACITY

The neighborhood-based planning process, both inside and outside of the NRP, is ultimately about more than producing a plan. It is about developing forms of civic involvement and problem-solving capacity that can be sustained over time. It is about cultivating people's connection with the life of their neighborhood. And it is about defining institutional roles and responsibilities among all sectors that will contribute to the building of community on an ongoing basis.

DEFINING THE ROLE OF NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS

Neighborhood organizations have been around for a long time. Prodded by the NRP, however, they have been strengthened in some neighborhoods, weakened in others, and born in yet others. The flap a number of months ago about whether neighborhood organizations are emerging as a "shadow government," unaccountable to the public,⁸⁰ largely misses the point.⁸¹

Minneapolis neighborhood organizations have emerged as key facilitators of the resident planning processes. They will play a pivotal role in coordinating the implementation of neighborhood strategies. They are essential bridges between residents and the public service delivery system. They are important cultivators of the next generation of civic leadership. As two writers recently observed:

Think about it: If an organization came to you with an offer to plot out a blueprint for a neighborhood's future, to coordinate the volunteers and marshal the resources necessary to implement that blueprint, and to undertake all of this through public forums that invited civic involvement, wouldn't you want to try to make that process work?⁸²

⁷⁹ In its Winter 1996 edition of *Neighborhood Connections*, the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods printed an article about the Southeast Minneapolis Industrial Area that mischaracterized the views of the author of an earlier draft, Cordelia Pierson. This has caused Ms. Pierson, the SEED Committee on which she serves, and the MCDA considerable embarrassment. The Center deeply regrets its actions and has apologized to the parties affected.

⁸⁰ See Kevin Diaz, "\$30 million for neighborhoods approved," *StarTribune*, October 28, 1995, page B1.

⁸¹ See Gretchen Nicholls & Rip Rapson, "City Hall gets in habit of bashing neighborhood program," *StarTribune*, December 5, 1995, page A15.

⁸² *Ibid.*

If neighborhood organizations are to play these roles and become stable, well-managed entities operating at a significant scale, a number of issues will need to be resolved.

First, the City will have to come to terms with whether it will support ongoing neighborhood staffing.

Financial support from the NRP for neighborhood staff salaries is sunsetted; there is deafening silence about whether additional funding will be available and, if so, from what sources.⁸³

Second, the neighborhoods will need to develop tools to overcome some of the burnout, frustration, and factionalism that so often accompanies volunteer leadership.

The **Lyndale Neighborhood Association**, for example, has floated proposals that would strengthen the organizational development, board training, managerial systems, and professional services available to neighborhood organizations. These proposals envision standards of certification for neighborhood staff and clear measurement and evaluation criteria for both staff and the Board.⁸⁴

Third, neighborhood organizations will need the continued technical support they have recently received.

The **Neighborhood Planning for Community Revitalization Program**, run by Kris Nelson at CURA, has provided assistance for such applied research projects as environmental inventories, home-based business surveys, commercial corridor business inventories, residential revolving loan fund analyses, and the Central City Neighborhood Partnership's public safety initiative. The **Neighborhood Organizing Project**, offered by Jay Clark at CURA, has furnished highly pragmatic training sessions for people entering the exhausting world of community organizing. The **NRP staff**, under the direction of Hillary Freeman, is in the middle of a series of class offerings on such topics as working with non-profit organizations, writing neighborhood newsletters and brochures, managing personnel, and understanding the legal restrictions on spending NRP money.⁸⁵

Fourth, neighborhoods will need to institutionalize cooperative working relationships with other neighborhoods.

⁸³ The Citizen Participation Program within the MCDA has been superseded by a seven-person NRP/Citizen Participation division. Although the new division, under the direction of **Bob Cooper**, has been instrumental in guiding the Agency's assistance to neighborhood groups, it is highly unlikely that it will emerge as a funder of neighborhood staffing needs.

⁸⁴ For more information, call Joe Barisonzi at the Lyndale Neighborhood Association, 824-9402.

⁸⁵ For more information, call Hillary Freeman at the NRP, 348-3082.

Neighborhoods can share staff, information, and technical assistance. They can rely on mediating institutions within the community to connect them to essential resources. They can partner with the public sector and community-based organizations. All of this is being done to a degree as neighborhoods enter the implementation phase of their plans. But the impending erosion of funding makes the urgency of their task daunting.

BUILDING CIVIC CAPACITY: STRENGTHENING NETWORKS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT

Last spring, the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods hosted a series of community conversations with **Robert Putnam**, the author of *Bowling Alone: The Decline of American Social Capital*.⁸⁶ *Bowling Alone* had created quite a stir on the national scene with a simple thesis that the informal networks of social connection that have long characterized American society are in substantial decline. Putnam condensed the argument into a single statistic: more people than ever are bowling, but fewer are bowling in leagues, where people gather, spend money, and share their lives.

Putnam was intrigued with Minneapolis -- its traditions of political activism, corporate responsibility, and civic involvement. He was stunned at the levels of citizen participation in the NRP, neighborhood organizations, and initiatives such as Healthy Powderhorn. He is anxious to return to observe more closely.

But he asked a question that will be a key to the viability of all of these traditions and activities: whether our community is building on those features of social life -- the networks, values, and trust -- that will enable Minneapolis residents to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives.⁸⁷

Minneapolis neighborhoods are struggling with this issue. They have united around a planning process, around a project, or around a threat to community health. It is not clear, however, whether these activities are building a set of relationships among individuals, families, and organizations that will provide the attitudinal and behavioral glue sufficient to hold together substantial sectors of our community and span underlying social cleavages.⁸⁸

Many of the examples this Address has cited give us reason to be optimistic. Putnam was. We are too.

BUILDING CIVIC CAPACITY: FORMING PARTNERSHIPS WITH MEDIATING INSTITUTIONS

Minneapolis enjoys a wealth of organizations and institutions that make connections among citizens, the government, and the private sector. Religious organizations. Volunteer associations. Educational and research institutions.

⁸⁶ Robert Putnam, "Bowling Alone: The Decline of American Social Capital," *Journal of Democracy*, January 1995, pp. 1-28; "Bowling Alone: Democracy in America at the End of the Twentieth Century," forthcoming in a collective volume edited by Axel Hadenius, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

⁸⁷ See "Tuning In, Tuning Out: The Strange Disappearance of Social Capital in America," The 1995 Ithiel de Sola Pool Lecture, American Political Science Association, October 1995.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, at page 2.

Business enterprises. Social service agencies. Community-based development corporations. Neighborhood life is inextricably intertwined with their activities.

Neighborhoods have, however, yet to capture fully in their revitalization planning the rich potential partnerships of these and other community institutions. And without a well-defined network of those partnerships, it is difficult to imagine the emergence of true long-term civic capacity. A few examples.

Community development corporations (CDC's). There has been a tentative quality about the relationship between NRP neighborhoods and the CDC's. Despite a significant number of strong, well-defined working partnerships, it is not clear on the whole what roles neighborhoods would like the CDC's to play in planning and implementing housing, social service, and small business strategies.⁸⁹ When the implementation responsibilities of the MCDA are thrown into the mix, the picture is murky at best.⁹⁰

Religious institutions. Churches, synagogues, mosques, and other places of worship not only share the neighborhoods' concern about community stability and security, but are important sources of social and economic support, leadership development, and community discussion. Rarely, however, have religious institutions been tied meaningfully into the neighborhood planning process.

Financial institutions. Partnerships with lending institutions are being formed in conjunction with the evolution of neighborhood home ownership and small business initiatives. What is less clear is the extent to which banks, mortgage companies, and venture capitalists, among others, will adapt their products to the emerging neighborhood markets.⁹¹

⁸⁹ The Minneapolis Consortium of Non-Profit Developers has opened a series of conversations with neighborhoods about these issues. They are planning a series of meetings in March in which neighborhood organizations and selected CDC's can exchange ideas. They have also facilitated a dialogue between commercial corridor task forces and representatives from the banking community, with another session scheduled next month.

The Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods and the League of Women Voters of Minneapolis have scheduled a third housing roundtable discussion for March 21st from 7 to 8:30 p.m. at Hennepin United Methodist Church in which some of these issues will be explored.

⁹⁰ The **Twin City Family Housing Fund** has sought to bring some clarity to the situation. It has hired the firm of Gavzy, Gavzy, and Owens to design a computer program that will track neighborhood expenditures for housing activities. It hopes better to understand where its own programs can strengthen and supplement the work being done by neighborhoods.

⁹¹ The Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods is planning a series of roundtable discussions about neighborhood economic development strategies. It intends to draw in financial institutions as the issues are crystallized from the discussions.

III. THE PUBLIC SECTOR RESPONSE

Neighborhoods do not work in a vacuum. They are buffeted by complex forces of social, economic, and political change. They share with the public sector intertwined destinies and purposes: the stability and health of the city's commonwealth.

The bulk of this Address focuses on the neighborhood perspective: how community is being defined, what revitalization strategies hold particular promise. But part of the Address must necessarily be an assessment of how our units of government are responding to and supporting that perspective. That assessment follows.

The assessment is not one of the overall performance of public agencies.⁹² It is instead one of whether and to what extent public agencies are supporting the neighborhoods' work:

- are they recognizing the importance of revitalization strategies appropriate to a neighborhood scale?
- are they supporting innovative approaches to redesigning community services?
- are they facilitating cross-neighborhood and interdisciplinary collaboration?
- are they integrating neighborhood initiatives into city-wide and regional systems?
- are they fostering the development of long-term civic capacity?

As the Public Sector Report Card on the next page suggests, almost all of our public agencies have made progress over the last year -- some of it dramatic, some of it steady, and some of it barely detectable. The wide divergence of effort has led us to break out grades individually rather than to collect them into a single public grade.

It is not reasonable to expect turn-around in a single year. These are complex systems of human beings, political pressures, received practices, and inflexible rules and regulations. But from the depths of last year's situation -- no department heads, no strategic direction, no institutional acknowledgment of the neighborhood planning process -- we do expect progress. It is there. From C's

⁹² That is better left to the Mayor's State of the City Address. *See* "State of the City Address," Mayor Sharon Sayles Belton, February 7, 1996.

and D's on the report card, we have moved to B's and C's, with even an A thrown in for good measure.

It is important, moreover, to recognize the role of political leadership. We have chosen to grade departments, knowing full well the political constraints that having fourteen bosses can impose. Ultimately, our elected officials are accountable. But this is not an election, simply a parent-teacher conference, so we proceed.

PUBLIC SECTOR REPORT CARD for 1995

Responding to and Supporting Neighborhood Efforts

CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS	C
Inspections	A-
Police Department	C-
Public Works	C
MCDA	C-
Planning	B
HENNEPIN COUNTY	B
MPLS. PUBLIC SCHOOLS	B+
PARK & RECREATION BOARD	B

INSPECTIONS

If a department of city government exemplifies a redirection of attitude toward neighborhood work, it is Inspections.

Like most departments, Inspections is hopelessly stretched.⁹³ But Inspections has not only begun to chip away at the huge backlog created by the emerging priority of rental property licensing, but has worked creatively with neighborhoods and the NRP staff to do more with less. Two examples are illustrative.

First, it was instrumental in helping design, support, and implement the Citizens Inspectors program, which permits neighborhoods to make initial reviews of problem properties.

Second, it has taken the lead in forging an agreement with twenty neighborhoods and the NRP in which more than \$3.5 million of NRP money will be placed on the table as a matching grant for every dollar the city spends on boarded properties. This will not only increase the pool of money the city would otherwise spend on these properties, but will lead to fundamental operational changes in how priorities are set for dealing with the so-called "Section 249" cases -- including giving neighborhoods a far more expansive role in determining the future of those properties.

THE POLICE

Chief Robert Olson has brought a remarkable freshness and candor to his department. He has championed changes in overtime policy, the toughening of internal disciplinary policies, the move to permanent shifts, the creation of a youth/police athletic league, and the expansion of the CCP/SAFE program. His officers daily confront the complex pathologies and problems of our community. Our city owes them a great debt.

But neither the Chief nor the precinct command has been able to reform the department's institutional machinery to respond to neighborhood priorities at their most fundamental level.⁹⁴

In overwhelming numbers, neighborhoods want to strengthen block clubs, enlist neighborhood beat cops, create substations, and otherwise connect officers to

⁹³ See, e.g., Steve Brandt, "City's housing inspectors are picking up pace," *StarTribune*, January 16, 1996, page B1.

⁹⁴ After intensive conversations with the precinct commanders, the Central City Neighborhood Partnership has emerged frustrated with the lack of progress. Although the Precinct Commanders have been generous with their time, there has been little movement to work with the series of ideas generated by the Partnership to improve the ways in which neighborhood and precinct priorities are integrated. The Partnership will release a report summarizing its recommendations in a number of weeks. See note 75 above.

neighborhood life. In a word, they have asked for community-oriented policing in fact, not in theory.

A number of examples demonstrate this lack of real commitment to the structural changes necessary to make community policing more than a mere tweaking of the status quo.

A SAFE Streets program may reduce the number of gunshots in particular troublespots, but it also closes the door on the downtown Queer Patrol and pulls cops off the beat.

An expansion in CCP/Safe is welcomed by all, but begs the question of why more than eighty percent of our neighborhoods are looking for help in creating, expanding, or extending the reach of block clubs and more than a third are calling for the creation of a neighborhood safety coordinator and the expansion of safety education.

The expenditure of millions to purchase ninety more patrol cars may be necessary to transport the city's new "Clinton Cops," but trivializes neighborhood requests for small grant programs that would purchase equipment for citizens patrols, put more lights in chronic problem areas, or provide support for block clubs.

Using NRP dollars to secure police buy-back hours may provide a short-term fix, but has little impact on the long-term willingness of the precincts to allocate officers to regular office hours in a cop shop, a bicycle patrol, or foot patrol.⁹⁵

There appears to be a genuine desire by the Department's Administration to reconcile some of these tensions. But the old-line, paramilitary trappings of the force produce tremendous internal divisions and a powerful organizational inertia. The Department will have to move off its half-efforts and take a leap of faith if there is to be real change. It hasn't happened yet.

PUBLIC WORKS

The project manager of the Phillips Gateway Project recently wrote us a note describing her experience with Public Works employees:

One of the most difficult tasks in the construction of the Gateway was having to lift four twenty-ton concrete sculptures and set them in place in Peavey Park. It was made all the worse by being scheduled on a very cold, rainy, muddy day. But the Public Works Bridge Division didn't tell us it couldn't be done; they instead brought out their best people and acted as hired contractors with a public servant attitude. We all joked about the mess, but they just dug in and did their job. They kept asking us whether we were satisfied. They let us pin carnations on their jackets. They all

⁹⁵ And establishing a cop shop is not the end of the matter. Phillips, for example, has had a tortuous time getting an officer assigned to theirs.

hugged the artist when it was finished. It seemed like they cared as much about the project as we did.⁹⁶

A wonderful example of what is possible when the can-do attitude of Public Works engineers, laborers, and managers is tied to the energies of neighborhood residents. Nor is it an isolated one.

Mike Monahan has become an encyclopedia of traffic calming techniques. The Department has lent strong support to the Nicollet Avenue Corridor Task Force in its streetscape improvements, has provided technical assistance to the bikeway planning of the Midtown Greenway Coalition and the Marcy Holmes neighborhood, and has enlisted the Planning Department's Jim Daire in neighborhood transportation studies. The Department has even shown some flexibility in its lighting standards.⁹⁷

But this is still a Department enmeshed in traffic engineering and mega-project management. It is interested in talking traffic calming theory, but incapable of genuinely pursuing a neighborhood-based transportation policy at the levels requested by neighborhoods. It will direct millions into an over-engineered Hiawatha Overpass that destroys any hope of integrating pedestrian movement into the Hiawatha/Lake commercial node.

The entrepreneurialism of certain of its divisions has yet to reach into the ranks of the engineers. Its mission is unclear, its procedures and policies a mystery. It remains a black box, impossible to penetrate without a code supplied by BRW, the engineering firm that sometimes seems wedded to the Department .

With its new head and skillful, committed employees all up and down the line, Public Works has an opportunity to remake itself. The neighborhoods don't have all the answers, but their focus on the fine grain, on a pedestrian-friendly scale, and on the long-term view could help get the Department started in a new direction.

THE MCDA

You could feel the fresh air blow in when Becky Yanisch arrived to head the MCDA. Bursting with passion about the agency and solidly trained in the complexities of development financing, Yanisch has moved firmly to put her imprint on the agency's policies, structure, and operations.

- She took the MCDA Blue Ribbon Task Force Report seriously, guiding a reorganization plan that creates closer institutional ties to the Planning Department, streamlines internal procedures, and concentrates greater

⁹⁶ Letter from Betsy Sohn to the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods, February 19, 1996.

⁹⁷ See Steve Brandt, "Neighborhoods want new streetlights," *StarTribune*, February 19, 1996, page B3.

authority in the Executive Director over such matters as determining the amount offered for property acquisition.⁹⁸

- She convened focus groups of Minneapolis residents, businesses, and community organizations to help shape Focus MCDA, the agency's business plan.
- She has developed a close working relationship with Paul Farmer, drawing the Planning Department into what had formerly been a closed loop of project planning and working with the Department on such crucial tasks as the development of the Four Housing Principles.
- She has concentrated considerable energy on the reclamation of contaminated sites,⁹⁹ including representing the City's perspective at the Legislature and encouraging the interdepartmental Environmental Coordinating Team to focus on this issue.¹⁰⁰
- She has formed a seven-member NRP/Citizen Participation group within the agency to coordinate the implementation of NRP projects.
- And the Agency has overcome some bumps in the road to forge a cooperative working relationship with the Southeast Economic Development Committee in the site planning and development of an industrial park in southeast Minneapolis.¹⁰¹

These are powerful and important steps. But the deeper institutional questions about the agency's relationship with neighborhoods have been left largely at the doorstep. These are not new to the current Executive Director. But that is part and parcel of the problem -- they have plagued the agency for too long. Three particular problems are illustrative.

First is the problem of old models and the attendant discomfort with neighborhood-based innovation and problem-solving.

The words are there: the motto "Progress through Partnership" suggests an openness to neighborhood-based problem-solving.

But in the face of neighborhood emphasis on the fine grain of housing maintenance, small business development, or resident job training, the agency has adjusted only imperceptibly, falling back on rules, regulations, guidelines, and

⁹⁸ See Mark Engebretson, "The fix for MCDA?" *Southwest Journal*, January 24-February 13, 1996, page 14.

⁹⁹ See, e.g., Jim Buchta, "Honing in on industrial sites," *StarTribune*, July 7, 1995, Home Section.

¹⁰⁰ See Environmental Coordinating Team, *1995 Annual Report*, Environmental Section, Inspections Division, Department of Operations and Regulatory Services, Office of the City Coordinator.

¹⁰¹ See note 79 above.

best practice arguments as a barrier to redesign. Often agency staff members are encouraging early on in the planning process, only to have the good will dissipated in a protracted process of contracting and implementation.¹⁰²

It is not simply the public skirmishes. The Lyndale Neighborhood challenging the agency's acquisition and demolition practices or the Central Neighborhood expressing concern that the agency was moving forward with the demolition of eight boarded properties that the neighborhood had targeted for rehabilitation.¹⁰³

It is instead the recurring patterns of neighborhood interest in the practical tools they can have a hand in controlling -- revolving small business loans, commercial corridor investment strategies, or housing fix-up funds -- that seem incapable of shaking traditional priorities out of their mold.

And it is also the mundane details of implementation over which the agency seems loathe to negotiate or even to discuss. Contracting that takes long months. Ambiguities in policy that often surface only late in the game, undoing considerable neighborhood effort. Legal interpretations of permitted expenditures that severely constrain neighborhood options.

The MCDA is in a controlling position as the designated implementation arm for the NRP process. Neighborhoods are beginning to get the feeling that this will be played out in a do-it-our-way-or-go-somewhere-else approach that serves nobody's interests. If the agency is not best equipped to form implementation partnerships with the neighborhoods, it should not obstruct, but instead guide neighborhoods to those partners.

Second is the "it's really our money" syndrome.

The agency, understandably frustrated by its shrinking pool of money for city-wide priorities and the draw-down on city resources by the NRP, gives the impression that it considers NRP money its money.

Probably the most unfortunate example was the agency's attempt to divert \$5 million annually for light industrial projects from NRP's \$20 million account, a move that prompted the Chair of the Hennepin County Board to state: "This [program] is not about the care and feeding of the MCDA."¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² For example, the East Harriet-Farmstead Neighborhood enjoyed working with the MCDA's small business group, particularly **Eric Nathanson** and **Susan Thompson**, in developing a matching grant program for small business facade improvements, but has grown increasingly concerned that some of the innovative qualities are being lost as the program moves into the realm of legalities and implementation restrictions.

¹⁰³ See note 44 above.

¹⁰⁴ Steve Brandt, "Breaking faith?" *StarTribune*, January 31, 1995, page 1B, quoting Commissioner Peter McLaughlin. Commissioner Sandra Hilary, then-Chair of the NRP Policy Board stated, "I'm just outraged. I'm just fit to be tied. It's absolutely breaking faith with the neighborhoods." *Ibid.* See also John

It has been repeated in other ways.

The agency's request for a half-million dollar administrative fee to cover the time of staff already on payroll did not strike many as the approach of an agency retooling its internal machinery to meet emerging neighborhood priorities. Added to this sum is the 7% contract management fee for which the agency bills the NRP on selected projects. And recently added to that -- inadvertently one hopes -- was an 8% fee to the neighborhoods for that same contract management.

The agency has every right to get creative in how it will finance its operations. But NRP dollars were always conceived as providing support for activities above and beyond established government activities -- they were not intended to fill budget gaps. We have yet to see the fruits of this philosophy take hold at the MCDA.

Third is the absence of a clear vision for neighborhood-based economic development strategy.

As we noted earlier, at every level of development activity, neighborhoods articulate the need to integrate economic enterprises into neighborhood life. Community-building is not a fuzzy, feel-good sidebar to economic development, but its essence.

The MCDA must approach the cultivation of the city's tax and employment base from a city-wide perspective. But neither can it dismiss the growing neighborhood consensus that such a perspective needs to be accompanied by policies, investment strategies, and practices that strengthen the social, political, and physical character of the neighborhood.

Neighborhoods use the agency's 2% small business loan program as a starting point for their small business strategies, but quickly realize that they need more. Some look to create their own, others founder from a lack of technical sophistication. If the agency is to be a real partner, it must not only increase the funding and staffing for its existing loan programs, but dramatically expand its capacity to provide information about existing business assistance programs,¹⁰⁵ develop a technical assistance package that educates neighborhoods about how commercial lending is done,¹⁰⁶ and aggressively draw neighborhoods together in partnerships with lenders.¹⁰⁷

Yewell, "Struggle over neighborhood program reflects larger issues," *St. Paul Pioneer Press*, February 21, 1995.

¹⁰⁵ The Business Link would seem to fit this bill, but needs to be connected more firmly to neighborhood strategic planning.

¹⁰⁶ This kind of education is being provided on a piecemeal basis by lending institutions, but is largely hit and miss.

¹⁰⁷ See *Defining Community*, at pp. 36-41.

Neighborhoods scatter references to jobs and job training throughout their NRP and commercial corridor plans. They are met with supportive political statements, but little else.

After participating in the Chamber of Commerce's Economic Development Task Force, forming the Twin City Economic Development Task Force, promulgating the Focus MCDA document, evaluating the Job Link program, and attending countless meetings about the future of the regional economy, the agency still has not set out a vision of what the City's economic base will be in the 21st century and how to get there. It is hard under such circumstances to lay claim to a jobs and training strategy.

Step one: get serious about those industry groups where new economic opportunities will lie -- determine what it would take to meet their existing employment needs and what will be necessary to assure their growth and profitability into the next century.¹⁰⁸ If the Stevens Square Neighborhood Organization beats you to the punch -- see page 16 -- and develops a blueprint for placing residents in key industries, see what you can do to support and replicate the model.

Step two: stop trying to reinvent the wheel when we already have in place the **Neighborhood Employment Training** network (NET), an underutilized, world-class training and placement model.¹⁰⁹ Not only has NET developed models that could be adapted and expanded in the service of city residents, but it has brought private and philanthropic employment dollars to the table. It is about time that they, together with other community-based non-profits, be given an invitation to serious conversations about the city's jobs and training policies.

The Agency is on far more solid ground than it was a year ago. Its leadership and its rank and file are deeply committed to building the economic base of both downtown and the neighborhoods. But the time has come to discard policy by press release. Thoroughgoing institutional change will be necessary if the agency is to make even greater strides in the next year. We all look forward to seeing "progress through partnership" ringing true in the neighborhoods.

PLANNING

Paul Farmer has had a busy year.

- He has breathed life into a moribund Comprehensive Plan revision process, putting that horse before the cart of a careening, soul-less zoning code revision.

¹⁰⁸ The Mayor called these industries "Horizon Industries" in her State of the City speech.

¹⁰⁹ See, e.g., Genevieve Lecamp, "Minneapolis: The NET Links Employers and the Unemployed," *The OECD Observer*, December 1995/January 1996, page 27.

- He has, in close cooperation with MCDA Director Becky Yanisch, extracted Planning from its status as the stepchild of MCDA project development.
- He has introduced fresh ideas to address shortcomings in the city's preservation ordinance and to create a new Neighborhood Business Assistance initiative.
- He crafted the Four Housing Principles, then worked closely with the Council to put some meat on the bones.
- He has worked creatively and intensively with neighborhoods along Lake Street to shape development principles for the Sears property.
- He has projected the only coherent City policy on mass transit, the location of the airport, and freeway expansion.

As welcome and important as it has been for Farmer to reassert the planning function into the deliberations of City Hall, the Department has foundered in support of the day-to-day work of the neighborhoods. At least at the level of recognizing the planning needs being generated by NRP neighborhoods, the Department needs to regroup and recommit itself to meeting the expectations its rhetoric has created.

First, Paul Farmer cannot be everywhere. His agenda is admirably ambitious, but he needs to cultivate in his young planners the art of the follow-through.¹¹⁰

Second, the Department and the Planning Commission have to take seriously their commitment to integrate the results of neighborhood planning into the Comprehensive Plan. Their working session on February 24th is a welcome attempt to address this question, but it comes late in the game. There was little assessment of neighborhood plans in the formative stages of the Comp Plan process. The working groups that will move forward after the 24th are likely to strike many as a duplication of the NRP process itself. And by the time the Plan is adopted, sixty percent of the neighborhoods will be in the *implementation* phase of their work.

Third, the Comp Plan will fall flat unless the Department figures out a better way to inject neighborhood priorities into the budgeting, policy-making, and performance review apparatus of City government.¹¹¹

¹¹⁰ It does not help that the Department has lost more than a half-dozen bright, young planners in the last year.

¹¹¹ **Laura Lambert**, working with former Planner **Julia Paulson** of the Coordinator's staff, have taken a good first step by identifying by neighborhood and planning category the strategies adopted by the first twenty neighborhood NRP plans. Together with the Design Center's *Defining Community* document and an analysis prepared by **Bob Cooper** of the MCDA of how NRP dollars have been allocated and spent, this inventory should become an indispensable tool

Fourth, the Department cannot get by with the assignment of one or two planners to the NRP. The MCDA has allocated money for the time of four planners to work with NRP staff. Even if that were happening, and it is not, it is too meager. There is too much work to be done with the neighborhoods that NRP community organizers, MCDA project staff, or Public Works engineers simply are not equipped to do.

THE COUNTY

Once it moved beyond the early political antipathies some of its Board members expressed toward the NRP, the County struggled with how to define a visible, legitimate connection to neighborhood-based planning.

- Whereas the neighborhoods were looking at discrete, geographically-specific revitalization strategies, the County bore responsibility for a far-flung web of regional services.
- Whereas the neighborhoods were searching for flexible, targeted responses, the County was wedded to a dizzying set of inflexible rules and regulations.
- And whereas the neighborhoods were exploring the possibilities of expanded youth programming and community-building activities, the County was largely locked into a single-purpose, crisis-intervention model of social services.

It was hard to know where to begin.

But they *have* begun, and in a way that holds enormous potential for innovation over the next number of years. Led by a strong core of Commissioners and critically-positioned staff,¹¹² the County has signaled its intent to redirect effort, change attitudes, and hold itself accountable to its residents.

The umbrella over much of this effort is the redesign of health, social service, and public systems being shepherded by Associate County Administrator **Carol Ogren**.¹¹³ Despite being saddled with a deadly name, "Hennepin County

in fine-tuning the Comprehensive Plan, the City Priorities policy document, and department workplans. It should also be integrated with the City's new Financial/Accounting system developed under the leadership of City Finance Director **John Moir**.

¹¹² In his recent State of the County Address, County Board Chair **Peter McLaughlin** laid out the broad principles that he hopes will re-energize the bureaucracy and present a new face to County residents. His work builds on many of the themes articulated by his predecessor, **Mark Andrew**.

¹¹³ Ms. Ogren has also been keenly interested in the human development discussion emerging from the human development roundtables sponsored by the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods and the Lyndale Neighborhood Association. See note 47 above.

Results and Community-Oriented System (RCS)," the effort is expressly a response to the perceived remove and rigidity of current County practices:

RCS is . . . consistent with the County's emphasis on community building and NRP's commitment to informing and involving neighborhoods in major policy deliberations that affect them . . .¹¹⁴

It proposes to broaden funding categories, reduce rules and regulations, create state-wide eligibility standards and funding, and increase the flexibility of benefit packages.¹¹⁵

It is far too early to gauge the long-term impact of the effort. A number of specific County actions suggest, however, that change has already taken hold.

In response to concerns raised at a **Human Development Roundtable** sponsored by the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods and the Lyndale Neighborhood Association, the County entered into discussions with neighborhood representatives and the NRP about overcoming statutory limitations about how NRP dollars can be spent for neighborhood social service programming. The County has is also examining how it can best make its staff available as contract managers for neighborhoods interested in building social networks and programming.

The County has also thrown its support behind an number of innovative neighborhood health and human development initiatives. It has become an active partner in **Healthy Powderhorn**, taken a lead role in co-locating and integrating previously uncoordinated health services at the **Glenwood Health Clinic**, and has provided funding to help launch implementation of the job training and placement program emerging from the **Stevens Square Common Social Services Plan**.

Moving beyond human services to the environment, the County continues to push forward with the **Hennepin Community Works** project. Concentrating on the 29th Street Corridor and Humboldt Avenue from north Minneapolis to Brooklyn Center, Hennepin Community Works remains an ambitious attempt to combine community development, infrastructure improvement, enhancement of natural amenities, and job training.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ Letter from Robert Miller and Carol Ogren to Neighborhood Leaders, January 29, 1996.

¹¹⁵ See Hennepin County, *Results and Community Oriented System*, January 5, 1996 (42 pages). For more information, call Carol Ogren at Hennepin County, 348-4806.

¹¹⁶ Although Hennepin Community Works seems to have lost some of the innovation and boldness envisioned at its conception by Commissioner **Mark Andrew**, it continues to hold considerable potential. In the 29th Street corridor, it could serve as a catalyst to the ultimate success of the Midtown Greenway Coalition. In the Humboldt Avenue corridor, it has led to the formation of an citizen advisory group and the hiring of a Master Plan team of architects, landscape architects, economists, and others.

The County has also shed its cloak as the evil demon in the Southside Garbage Transfer Station dispute to emerge as a constructive partner in the emergence of the **Green Institute**.¹¹⁷ It has intensified its efforts to contribute to the clean-up of **contaminated tax-forfeit lands** within the city.¹¹⁸ And it has completed the draft stage of an ambitious plan to integrate **bike planning** into road design on county highways.¹¹⁹

Plans, whether social service redesign or infrastructure improvements, do not necessarily translate into change on the ground. The County machinery is still cumbersome,¹²⁰ trained in traditional models of service delivery, and highly sensitive to political winds. The jury will be out for a while. In the meantime, however, we all have reason to be optimistic.

MINNEAPOLIS PARK SYSTEM

In the early stages of the NRP, a common complaint was that the Parks were taking their agenda on the road, unduly influencing the thinking of neighborhood groups. They probably did. But the concern was unfounded: neighborhoods could make up their own minds about the importance of park facilities, programming, and open space to the vitality of their communities.

We now have a situation in which the Parks cannot keep up through their traditional capital planning process.¹²¹ Nor can they afford to build or upgrade

¹¹⁷ See Steve Brandt, "Turning trash into treasure," *StarTribune*, April 12, 1995, page B1.

¹¹⁸ See Mark Brunswick, "Hennepin County trying to fix clean-up problem," *StarTribune*, March 7, 1995, page B1.

¹¹⁹ See Mark Brunswick, "Making more room for bikes," *StarTribune*, December 1, 1995,

B Section. The County intends to open discussions this year with municipal leaders to obtain rights of way for bicyclists. Although geared largely to suburban communities, the plan is grounded in three principles that will benefit city and suburban residents alike:

1. Expand bicycle accessibility to, and connections to, local bicycle systems and to county roads;
2. Encourage other units of government to create bike lockers and safety programs; and
3. Create a system that allows cyclists to travel at high speeds with minimal disruption.

Ibid.

¹²⁰ Despite providing information and some technical assistance to the Stevens Square Social Services Plan, for example, the County took almost nine months to process the contract between the neighborhood organization and its contractor, Loring Nicollet Bethlehem.

¹²¹ See, e.g., Steve Brandt, "Minneapolis parks: who will fund them? Higher costs have officials weighing priorities," *StarTribune*, June 30, 1995, page B1;

existing facilities without an assurance of ongoing operating support. But the requests keep rolling in.

It is difficult to hold the Park Board and its staff strictly accountable for this. Two-thirds of its operating budget comes from property taxes, which are not growing commensurate with demand for services. Regional monies available for operating expenses are meager. City Hall has high expectations about sustained social programming out of park facilities. Cost-cutting measures -- such as the "No-Mow" or ice-rink closing options -- are met with predictable citizen resistance.

The Parks will ultimately have to find a permanent way out of this box. In the meantime, they have put their toe in the water of innovation, with some surprisingly good results.

Using an \$8.5 million fund from the Minnehaha Creek Watershed District, they have skillfully steered the effort of the multi-agency **Chain of Lakes Clean Water Partnership** to improve the water quality in Lake of the Isles and Cedar, Calhoun, Harriet, and Brownie Lakes.

They have, albeit reluctantly, forged closer working relationships with neighborhoods such as Loring Park and Powderhorn interested in developing **Master Plans** for their parks.¹²²

They have formed a partnership with the Sustainable Resources Center to encourage the emergence of new neighborhood models of designing and managing small **community gardens and pocket parks**.¹²³

They have shown new interest in using the NRP staff as a resource. The Parks Recreation Division recently asked the NRP to conduct an orientation for all 120 park center directors and to provide ongoing training sessions. Superintendent **Dave Fisher** has formed an interdepartmental team within his administration to explore how the Parks and NRP can cooperate in making connections with and providing information to neighborhoods.

These and other initiatives -- bikeways, water quality education, urban reforestation -- are calling into question traditional approaches to park planning and management. But the challenges facing the park system are immense. Without a clearer Park and Recreation Board blueprint for the future, the cracks that are now emerging in this jewel of a system may jeopardize its long-term viability.

Steve Brandt, "'96 brings new challenges to Park Board," *StarTribune*, January 3, 1996, B Section.

¹²² This has been a rocky road. There is still considerable tension in a process in which neighborhoods look outside the Park Board's professional expertise and field experience for planning and design consultation.

¹²³ See note 35 and accompanying text above.

MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A year and a half ago, a report on the status of the NRP expressed concern that the schools were relatively absent from the neighborhood planning agenda.¹²⁴ Whittier had raised the issue of community schools. East Harriet had provided for facilities improvements at Clara Barton School. Other neighborhoods had raised ideas about expanding community education programming. But Superintendent Hutchinson's administration was largely missing from the table.¹²⁵

Things have changed.

- Some **forty school projects** in the neighborhoods are in the pipeline, ranging from facility expansions and playground upgrades to modified procedures for the purchase of equipment.¹²⁶
- The Superintendent has drawn together a **management team** to monitor and guide the relationship between the District and the neighborhood planning process.
- The sixty-five **school principals**, the District's primary liaison with the community, recently spent two days in an orientation and training with the NRP staff.
- The NRP and Schools Administration are exploring ways to continue **exchanges of staff and technical assistance**.

And then there is the **community schools initiative**. Despite continuing heated controversy over the extent to which the initiative will re-segregate school populations and affect student achievement,¹²⁷ the District has taken a position and sought to spell out the mechanics. In doing so, it has demonstrated a responsiveness to strongly-felt impulses among large numbers of neighborhoods.¹²⁸

¹²⁴ Rip Rapson et. al., *The Neighborhood Connections Project: Building a Community Agenda from the Bottom-Up*, The Design Center for American Urban Landscape, June 1994.

¹²⁵ The Schools were, for example, frustrated in their inability to figure out how to tap into the \$1.5 million annual funding earmarked by state statute for school activities identified in neighborhood action plans. *Ibid.* pp. 61-62.

¹²⁶ Interview with Bob Miller, NRP Director, February 14, 1996.

¹²⁷ See, e.g., Wayne Washington, "Minneapolis school enrollment proposal flawed, NAACP says," *StarTribune*, February 21, 1996, page B5.

¹²⁸ Mirroring the public discussion, there are passionate views within the Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods about whether this responsiveness is premature -- whether a community schools agenda needs to await the further integration of residential neighborhoods -- or whether it represents a timely and healthy recognition of the importance of strengthening neighborhoods by reconnecting families to schools close to where they live. The Center has gone on

The School Board adopted the policy, the Mayor provided the political cover, and the Administration supplied the road map. But it was ultimately the neighborhoods who got the ball rolling.

Almost four years ago, the **Whittier Alliance** refused to back off its NRP plan's insistence that a neighborhood school be constructed. In the face of heated resistance from then-Superintendent Ferrara, the neighborhood meticulously presented its case: neighborhood children attended more than fifty schools throughout the city, the neighborhood was among the most integrated in the city, and the Schools were out in the community doing a Quality Schools Study intended to raise the issue of community schools.

Whittier was patient. The next new school to be built in Minneapolis will be Whittier School.

Our community has only begun to tap the potential connections between neighborhoods and schools. The forty pending projects are a good start. But the breadth of ideas about how schools can be integrated into neighborhood life beyond the traditional K-12 educational function suggests that the time is right for a fresh look at how schools work within community.¹²⁹

IV. NEXT STEPS

After close to fifty pages and one hundred and twenty-nine footnotes, one might asked whether there could possibly be any next steps. We leave that largely for you to decide.

We have tried throughout this Address to underscore those areas in which the community must improve if we are to move our neighborhoods forward.

On the neighborhood side, these tend to fall into the realm of strengthening long-term capacity:

- more clearly defining the role of neighborhood organizations, both by way of the public sector, but also in relationship to other community-based organizations and to the private sector;
- strengthening networks of community support within neighborhoods;

record urging that the trade-offs involved in a return to community schools be more fully identified and analyzed. See Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods, *Community Schools: What Do We Have to Give Up to Get Them?* Neighborhood Connections, Fall 1995, page 4.

¹²⁹ The Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods is planning a community roundtable discussion on this topic this spring.

- creating partnerships that will help neighborhoods meet their long-term goals.

The Minneapolis Center for Neighborhoods intends to explore these issues over the next year through community discussions, forums, and other means. We invite your participation and your ideas.

On the public sector side, we have been a little shy in offering our opinions. But we are interested in finding ways to help our public agencies take on the very difficult institutional challenges they face. We are planning a series of community roundtables that will touch on some of these:

- identifying roles among various partners in implementing neighborhood housing strategies (on March 21st, with the League of Women Voters);
- repositioning neighborhoods in the delivery of human development strategies (on February 27th, with the Lyndale Neighborhood Association);
- updating progress on commercial corridor implementation efforts;
- creating viable neighborhood economic development strategies;
- integrating the schools more fully into their communities.

Beyond these lie the pivotal issues of regional housing, economic development, land-use, transportation, and environmental policy. We have dealt with these only obliquely today. That is a reflection about the constraints of time, not about the seriousness of the challenges. We all need to make time to become involved in these issues, whether through the Alliance for Metropolitan Stability, the Metropolitan Interfaith Council on Affordable Housing, the Citizens League's Metropolitan Livability Task Force, the Metropolitan Council's Transit Redesign initiative, or any number of other efforts.

Our community has a full agenda. It will take the neighborhoods and the public sector working together and with a broader community of interests to bring about the kind of revitalization of place, community, and spirit that makes us all want to live in Minneapolis.

Thank you for joining us today. We look forward to working with you.