

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	3
Executive Summary	5
Introduction	9
Planning Methodology	11
Community History	13
Findings.....	15
Support for Artists.....	17
Community Development	37
Leadership	53
Programming	57
Urban Design	63
Funding.....	69
Planning, Zoning and Regulatory Issues.....	77
Recommendations.....	81
Summary Timeline, Budget and Responsible Parties.....	103
Appendices	107
A: Structure Survey (provided by ArtSpace Projects, Inc.)	109
B: Survey Results.....	139
C: Sample Survey.....	145
D: Comparison of National Arts Districts.....	153
E: Reference Materials	155
F: Planning Participants.....	159

FOREWORD

The creation of the Arts Action Plan for Northeast Minneapolis has been many years in the making, and is the immediate result of seven months of careful and intense thought and research into how to sustain and support Northeast Minneapolis – the artists’ community as well as the history and unique flavor of the entire area – as the 21st century progresses.

The Northeast Minneapolis Arts Association, known as NEMAA, is a non-profit arts agency with the mission of promoting and supporting the quality and diversity of artistic resources based in Northeast Minneapolis, to benefit the greater community. NEMAA has been behind the inception and realization of this plan, and this first step could not have been undertaken without that agency’s dedication to its core constituency – the artists, businesses and organizations that call Northeast Minneapolis their home.

The agency’s role in this process is all the more impressive given its youth. The organization was founded in 1995, with the sole purpose of presenting and managing the annual “Art-A-Whirl” studio tour event. Since that time, the organization has rapidly advanced, expanding its programs to additional studio tours, and ultimately assuming a much more active and comprehensive role as advocates for individual artists.

The Arts Action Plan would never have come to fruition without the support of a few regional agencies, and a host of individuals who share and support NEMAA’s vision. The planning process was funded by the McKnight Foundation, Shamrock Properties, Hillcrest Development, Wells Fargo Bank and General Mills. The process was steered by a 49 member Technical Advisory Committee and a 27 member Steering Committee, each of which met throughout the seven-month planning period. The Minneapolis City Council must also be thanked for its willingness to participate in such a project, and for its vision and support.

The consultants would like to especially thank two individuals who have led this process from its inception up until this point: Heidi Andermack, the Project Coordinator, and Catherine Geisen-Kisch, former Aide to Minneapolis Council President Paul Ostrow. They have both brought

energy and drive to this process, and have been critical in bringing a wide variety of stakeholders to the table. Without them, this project could not have happened.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

What is the Northeast Minneapolis Arts Action Plan?

Northeast Minneapolis has become the working home to hundreds of local Minneapolis artists over the last ten years. They have located in the district due to its empty warehouse and factory spaces (ideal for artists' studios), the low rents and the area's flexibility and accessibility.

As the economy changes, however, and the local land becomes more valuable for commercial, retail and mixed-use development, artists' spaces may be threatened. This has happened in communities across America: Soho, New York and San Francisco, California are notable, among many others. Previously known as artistic enclaves, they are now predominantly populated with high-end retail and office space and upscale residences.

Looking into the future, the community and artists' population of Northeast decided to attempt to forestall what many consider an inevitable social change, and try to keep the area as an artists' community for the long-term. Initiated and managed by NEMAA, the Northeast Minneapolis Arts Association, with financial support from the McKnight Foundation, Shamrock Properties, Hillcrest Development, Wells Fargo Bank and General Mills, the Arts Action Plan is the first phase of an at least fifteen-year process to maintain and strengthen the artists' presence in Northeast Minneapolis.

Why is it important now?

Scores of communities across the United States have established artists' communities,

or cultural districts. Providence, Rhode Island has made a concerted effort to attract artists by making all artistic income and product tax-exempt. Paducah, Kentucky offers low-interest, long-term loans to artists who will relocate there. Jersey City, New Jersey is trying to capture overflow artists from New York City by creating a district in which only artists can live or work.

Why have these cities, and others like them, initiated these programs? Because the economic figures indicate that the arts are a sound investment for a city. They support tourism efforts. They promote quality of life, thus attracting more business relocation. They increase economic activity. They make the community a better place to live, and in times of both economic boom and fiscal hardship, they are supported and championed by the people.

The unusual thing about Northeast Minneapolis is that it has not undertaken the daunting task of providing long-term stable spaces for artists in order to boost the local economy. The Arts Action Plan has been undertaken in order to support the artists. However, substantial economic benefit will be an inevitable by-product.

It is the consultants' hope that the Northeast Minneapolis Arts Action Plan may be used as a model for other communities in Minneapolis and throughout the nation that are grappling with these issues. The Plan's central aim is to support both artists and economic strength, without exploiting or sacrificing one in favor of the other. The recommendations, summarized below, all have been crafted with this balance as their goal.

What are some of the most important points of the Arts Action Plan?

Perhaps the most unique strategy in the plan is number 2.3, “Pursue the purchase of development rights for selected properties.” This is a tool that has been used by conservation and historic programs (notably the Nature Conservancy) but never, as of yet, for cultural or arts-related programs.

The strategy proposes that a non-profit organization be formed to purchase and hold development rights for buildings currently being used for arts purposes in Northeast Minneapolis. This strategy would create a “win/win” situation: property owners would receive an immediate infusion of cash, to be used for whatever they wish; and buildings would be subject to deed restrictions that would limit all or a portion of properties to artist-related uses.

This is only one of the 30 strategies, and eight recommendations contained within the plan. Each one is a significant brick to be laid in the foundation of the thriving, active arts community that Northeast Minneapolis is now, and should remain to be.

When will the Arts Action Plan be complete?

One of the wisest decisions made by NEMAA in the beginning of the planning process was to plan for the *long term*. The Arts Action Plan is step one in a fifteen year framework. The recommendations made within this plan have a five year timeframe; however, these recommendations will spur on further action that will provide for an at least fifteen year span to allow for strategies to reap fruit.

*What are the recommendations and strategies?***Recommendation 1**

Establish the Northeast Arts District from Central to Marshall Avenues, and from 26th to Broadway, with Arts Zones of highest artist concentration and cultural activity; allow for other locations that encompass important concentrations of artists

Strategies

- 1.1: Pursue City legislation to officially designate the district**
- 1.2: Develop graphics and signage system to establish identity of the district**
- 1.3: Explore the expansion of the existing Business Improvement District on Central Avenue to support Arts District programming and activities**
- 1.4: Create a temporary exhibition program, to install the work of local artists in storefronts and vacant buildings**
- 1.5: Create an association of businesses in the Arts District that will display (and sell) the work of Northeast Minneapolis artists**
- 1.6: Create a concentration of public art – both permanent and temporary – in the Arts District**
- 1.7: Extend the City’s percent-for-art requirement to include major private development in Northeast Minneapolis**
- 1.8: Conduct outreach on the Arts Action Plan and its recommendations to Northeast and larger community**

Recommendation 2

Secure sustainable, affordable spaces for artists’ studios, live-work spaces and arts-related businesses and activities; establish Northeast Arts Conservancy

- 2.1: Recruit and cultivate leadership to implement this recommendation**

- 2.2: Form a non-profit Arts Conservancy to oversee the development of arts spaces in the Arts District**
- 2.3: Pursue the purchase of development rights for selected properties**
- 2.4: Explore the creation of an Arts Credit Union that would specialize in financing arts facilities, mortgages for artists and small business loans to arts-related commerce**
- 2.5: Develop a program of grants and loans for arts space rehabilitation through MCDA**
- 2.6: Establish partnerships with for-profit and non-profit developers of properties for arts uses**

Recommendation 3

The City should use the Arts Action Plan as the template for a Cultural Plan for the entire City of Minneapolis

- 3.1: Create a City Cultural Plan**
- 3.2: Amend the Minneapolis Plan to expand the “Leisure and Culture” section**

Recommendation 4

Develop a comprehensive and ongoing program of technical support for artists living and working in the NE

- 4.1: Establish an ongoing series of artist training workshops and seminars**
- 4.2: Establish an arts space clearinghouse, to refer artists and arts businesses to available spaces**
- 4.3: Consider the creation of a “Materials for the Arts” program (like that initiated in New York City) to encourage businesses to donate surplus materials and equipment to artists**

Recommendation 5

Expand the level of arts programs – both visual and performing – in the Arts District

- 5.1: Expand Art-A-Whirl beyond a once-a-year event**
- 5.2: Encourage increased performing arts activities**
- 5.3: Expand the arts/crafts markets, held with local farmers' market**
- 5.4: Strengthen partnerships with cultural and non-profit organizations, to expand arts audiences throughout the City**

Recommendation 6

Coordinate with the City to institute changes in planning, zoning and regulations

- 6.1: Allow for easy temporary use permits for performances and exhibitions in NE properties**
- 6.2: Establish an Arts Overlay District in Northeast Minneapolis**
- 6.3: Ensure that property owners desiring to upgrade one or more of their buildings' systems are not required to bring every system up to code simultaneously**

Recommendation 7

Develop the role and capacity of NEMAA to expand programming, artists' support and information clearinghouse activities

- 7.1: Expand board membership**
- 7.2: Hire a full-time paid Executive Director**
- 7.3: Develop new resources through fundraising, increased membership dues, corporate partners, etc.**
- 7.4: Develop evaluation techniques to gauge success at achieving goals on a bi-annual basis**

Recommendation 8

Establish extensive marketing programs to publicize the activities and programming of the Northeast Arts District

- 8.1: Develop marketing techniques for the Arts District**
- 8.2: Develop television advertisements in concert with local businesses**

INTRODUCTION

Over the last quarter plus of the 20th century, American cities have witnessed a constant flux of artists' movement within their borders. Artists, traditionally attracted to places with inexpensive rent, flexible spaces with high ceilings and large windows, and permissive neighbors, have moved into neighborhoods that are often undesirable to anyone else; maybe next to an airport or a railroad track, or run-down with a bad reputation, declining industrial districts, or simply an undiscovered area.

Once artists move in, it is usually only a matter of time before the neighborhood takes on a new flavor. Artists improve their living and working spaces, coffeehouses and small restaurants spring up, landlords take up the charge and begin to make improvements, developers scent a whiff of money to be made – and relatively soon, the area is indelibly changed. New businesses arrive, condos are built, buildings are renovated into gleaming new offices, and the young couple with the Volvo and “Baby on Board” sticker think *they* might like to try loft living. And so, rents inexorably and steadily increase, until the artists who created the place have to move on.

As artists move, the cycle starts all over again. There is nothing intrinsically wrong with this cycle – when not slapped with the pejorative label “gentrification,” community improvement is considered desirable. Many times, this cycle results in neighborhoods that are cleaner, with less crime, fewer homeless people, more families and family activity centers. However, one population does consistently lose: the artists.

The community of Northeast Minneapolis has made a choice to resist this basic and economic process of artist pioneering followed by displacement; and has moved to do so well before the cycle has become inevitable. Minneapolis is no stranger to this syndrome – it plagued the Warehouse District, just across the river from Northeast, fewer than two decades ago. In the early 1980s, the Warehouse District was filled with artists living or working in converted studio spaces, developed with the support of the City. There were numerous galleries. But in the next decade, developers, drawn by the growing stature and popularity of artists' studio and open

house events, turned an eye to the Warehouse District and saw a bevy of buildings that could be rehabilitated and turned into luxurious condominium living spaces and offices. Rents on artists' studios were raised beyond the point of affordability, and many of the artists turned their attention across the Mississippi to Northeast Minneapolis for a new source of low-cost studio and live-work spaces.

Currently in Northeast there are at least six buildings that operate mainly or purely as artists' working studio spaces. These six structures – the Northrup-King, Thorpe, California Building, Grainbelt Bottling Plant and Warehouse, and the Fisk Building – are scattered around the Northeast community, providing working spaces for approximately 300 artists. In addition to these, numerous other buildings provide studio and/or living space for artists, and many artists work out of their homes. At best estimate, 400-500 professional artists work and/or live in the 12-square mile Northeast Minneapolis community.

This Arts Action Plan has two primary intentions at the heart of all of its recommendations and findings: the long-term support of individual artists and encouragement of artistic growth in Northeast. To accomplish this, the Plan outlines recommendations regarding protection against prohibitive rents for artists in the existing spaces; steps to support the building and rehabilitation of new artists' live/work spaces; marketing, public relations and other technical support; safety issues in studios; and exhibition spaces to help artists increase sales.

The Plan also addresses the designation and formation of a Cultural District and outlines governance models, funding mechanisms, visual signifiers and signage, and support of other arts disciplines, such as the performing arts. Throughout, the Plan's recommendations are made with an eye toward the cultural landscape of the entire Minneapolis community, in order to ensure that its objectives are shared by many, and that its ultimate formation meets the needs of the entire metropolitan area.

Northeast Minneapolis has much to offer to the entire city. It is the intent of the Arts Action Plan to help Northeast live up to a title bestowed upon it by a planning participant: "Northeast: The Art and Soul of Minneapolis."

PLANNING METHODOLOGY

The planning processes undertaken by Jerry Allen and Associates in developing the Minneapolis Arts Action Plan employed several approaches. These included:

1. The core consultant team, Jerry Allen and Elena Brokaw, reviewed and studied literature provided by the Northeast Minneapolis Arts Association (NEMAA), including local and regional plans, state and local reports, marketing literature, census data, foundation information, neighborhood association information, a two-year archive of the *Northeaster*, the neighborhood newspaper, and other materials.
2. NEMAA appointed a 43-member Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) and a 25-member Steering Committee (SC) to provide initial direction to the consultant team and to provide feedback on findings and recommendations. The TAC met a total of six times, and the SC met four times, throughout the process.
3. Over 50 key person interviews were conducted with leaders from the arts, government, business and community associations. In these meetings, facts and opinions were solicited on the cultural scene in Northeast Minneapolis, NEMAA's programs and the entire city, in order to develop a comprehensive picture of the community.
4. Six focus groups were held and facilitated by the consultants, in which individuals sharing a common interest and expertise were convened to review key issues.
5. The consultants wrote four distinct surveys, which NEMAA disseminated to artists, non-profit organizations, local businesses and individuals/residents of Northeast. The consultants tabulated and analyzed the resulting data from over 450 completed surveys.

6. The consultants contracted with ArtSpace, a local non-profit development firm, to assess four artists' buildings within the district.
7. The consultants conducted nationwide research to develop a matrix comparing cultural and arts districts in like-sized communities throughout the United States.
8. The plan was reviewed and modified through an extensive series of meetings and presentations with key stakeholders, including the NEMAA Board of Directors, Technical Advisory Committee, Steering Committee, City officials and others.

COMMUNITY HISTORY

From the time it was settled, Northeast Minneapolis has been an eclectic mix of different uses found side by side in neighborhoods throughout the community. There has been little separation or barriers between industrial and residential buildings, and thus, “from its earliest settlement, Northeast Minneapolis has been a community comprised largely of industries and workers and their families.”¹

Northeast Minneapolis has its roots in the flour milling age. It was during the latter half of the 19th century, when new mills and factories were fast being erected in St. Anthony, that the population increased so quickly; it grew from 300 to 3,000 between 1848 and 1855, and in the 1880s, there was a 251 percent population increase.² That population was made up predominantly of blue-collar workers, who came to work in the factories. “The portion of St. Anthony northeast of E. Hennepin was largely a worker’s enclave, first populated by Yankees, Irish, French Canadians, Germans and Swedes and then by large numbers of Poles and Eastern Europeans.”³ More recently, immigrants of Asian, South American, Middle Eastern and African descent have made Northeast their home.

In 1924, the City of Minneapolis introduced a new zoning ordinance that provided for greater separation between industrial and residential uses. However, “Northeast Minneapolis would maintain its ranking as the most industrial section of the city”⁴ and the signs of that industry are still prevalent today. The big factory and mill buildings are a major part of the draw that has brought so many artists to Northeast today.

The heritage of Northeast is important to the entire community and integral to the Arts Action Plan. The aim of the Plan is to maintain the unique and gritty feel of Northeast, while making the community a place where artists will stay for the long-term. It is our hope that this makes Northeast a more fulfilling place for the entire community. The results from the recent McKinsey

¹ Garneth O. Peterson and Carole Zellie, Northeast Minneapolis Historic Context Study, 1998. 1.

² Peterson and Zellie. 16.

³ Peterson and Zellie. 9.

⁴ Peterson and Zellie. 24.

Report, Community and Economic Development Internet Survey, conducted by the City of Minneapolis in April of 2002 revealed that “60% of respondents selected culture as ‘one of the best things about the City of Minneapolis.’” This was the highest percentage of responses, over recreation, livability, restaurants and nightlife, and more.⁵ There is a taste for culture in all of Northeast, and its roots are beginning to take hold in Northeast Minneapolis.

⁵ Community and Economic Development Internet Survey Results (City of Minneapolis, 24 April 2002).



FINDINGS

SECTION ONE

SUPPORT FOR ARTISTS

Northeast Minneapolis is the working home to a multitude of artists, who found in the community a nearly ideal situation: big, industrial buildings, then underutilized; neighborhoods that allowed them to operate heavy machinery and work all hours of the day and night; low rents. As artists have settled in Northeast, the arts have become a part of the community's flavor and ambiance, with residents and businesses proud and supportive of the artistic activity. This section of the Arts Action Plan addresses those artists' needs and means of providing support.

ARTS DISTRICT

Goal: *Create an identifiable district in Northeast, known for arts opportunities, artists, shopping and entertainment*

Findings:

- *Northeast has characteristics of an Arts Production Arts District*
- *Standard Arts District elements are lacking in the community*
- *The designation of portions of Northeast as an arts district will increase the public's awareness of artistic activity in the community*
- *The area to be designated as an arts district should be determined strategically*

Throughout this century, cultural districts have been created in the United States with increasing frequency. Historically, cultural districts have been formed as economic and development tools for cities. It has been repeatedly demonstrated in cities around the US that, as a of artists making their homes in a community, there is an increase in economic activity, aesthetic improvement and private investment.

“Success for cultural districts requires a long-term perspective, a focus on quality of design, genuine collaboration with artists, and a strong public/private partnership.”

– *David R. DeSimone, Vice President
Pittsburgh Cultural Trust
“Art Scape,” Urban Land, February 2001*

While all of this is good, the downside to this improvement, or gentrification, is that the artists who initiate the influx of activity can rarely afford to stay in an area in which rents and property values are soon inexorably rising.

“These days, it is fashionable for urban planners to praise artists for revitalizing old neighbor-hoods, but there are very few cities where artists’ communities are protected against real estate speculators.”

– *Andrei Codrescu, Writer*
 “Art: the vanguard of real estate,” *Architecture* 1999

Throughout the consultants’ interviews with the Northeast Minneapolis community, one thing became abundantly clear. Northeast Minneapolis’ reason for exploring the creation of an Arts District was not the same as other communities’. In other words, the reasons for examining the feasibility of such a district was to support first *the artists*, and thereby the larger community. It was *not* to use the artists to pump more money

into the Northeast Minneapolis area (although this will be a benefit).

As the community entered this planning process, the creation or designation of an arts or culture district was not a foregone conclusion. Northeast Minneapolis has some challenges that make the creation of an arts district complex: its vast size (approximately 12 square miles); a dearth of art galleries and performance venues; few pedestrian amenities; etc. These challenges will be discussed in detail throughout the report.

Cultural districts are of many different structures, sizes and types. There are essentially five different kinds of districts: cultural compounds, major arts institution districts, arts and entertainment districts, downtown districts and cultural production districts.⁶

Currently, Northeast has some of the characteristics of a “cultural production district.” (Production facilities are the primary factor of such districts, but they also include facilities like “arts centers with classroom space for the visual or performing arts, specialized spaces..., art-oriented high schools or colleges and presentation spaces such as private galleries and small theaters.”⁷) However, as the planning process proceeded, it became clear that the community does not want to focus only on production. Participants stated articulately that should the Arts Action Plan recommend that an arts district be designated in Northeast Minneapolis, it should be a new and innovative mix of the above five types.

⁶ Hilary Anne Frost-Krump, Cultural Districts: The Arts as a Strategy for Revitalizing Our Cities (Americans for the Arts, 1998) 15.

⁷ Frost-Krump 17.

There are pockets of arts activity and enterprise scattered throughout Northeast Minneapolis. In many ways, the entire community is a virtual arts district already. Recognizing this, the Plan recommends the designation of an Arts District with a focus on specific “Arts Zones.” While the Northeast Arts District is larger than a standard district, its size will allow for the inclusion of all of the highly populated and visible studio buildings, while the specification of zones will provide for focus of resources and activity in a highly visible manner.

In pursuing the Arts Action Plan, it is necessary to focus strategies and efforts on a few very active, highly visible arts production areas. These areas should be pedestrian oriented and attractive. They should be the first location for the mounting of street arts festivals and performances. They should serve as the visible signifiers that the entire community is one very large, active and prolific district that supports artists and culture.

Objectives: *Designate an arts district in Northeast Minneapolis, initially called the “Northeast Arts District,” with specific Arts Zones*

STUDIO/PRODUCTION SPACE

Goal: *Establish affordable arts production and studio space with relatively stable rents, available for at least ten years, for artists’ use only*

Findings:

- *62% of artists feel that rental studio space is **essential***
- *In cities throughout the United States, artists move away from the neighborhood when rents go up*
- *Landlords and the city have offered in-kind assistance to artists (rehabilitation, etc.)*
- *There is a distinct gap between what artists can afford to pay and what landlords can afford to accept as they improve artists’ spaces*
- *Studio space in Northeast Minneapolis rents for an average of \$3.60 - \$4.80 annually per square foot (according to surveys)*

According to the surveys conducted by the consultants during this project, there is some demand for live/work space, but the clear preference is for studio space for rent. When asked to rank six

potential scenarios from essential to irrelevant, 62% of the surveyed artists stated that rental studio space for work only was *essential* (see Table 1.1, “Artists’ Survey Results”). Rented production studios are the predominant arts spaces in Northeast Minneapolis at this point. Three buildings – the California Building, the Thorpe and the Northrup-King – together provide rental space for over 150 artists and artisans.

These artists are providing significant income for the Northeast neighborhoods. They shop at community markets, eat at local restaurants and volunteer at neighborhood events. And, if rents go too high, they will almost certainly have to leave. In San Francisco, after the dot-com boom,

<p>TABLE 1.1 ARTISTS’ SURVEY RESULTS</p> <p>Question: Indicate your interests in having the following services by circling the appropriate number:</p> <p>1 essential 2 very important 3 somewhat important 4 not very important 5 irrelevant</p> <p><u>PERCENT RANKED ESSENTIAL</u></p> <table> <tr> <td>Studio space to rent (work use)</td> <td>62%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Studio space to own (work use)</td> <td>30%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Live/work space to rent</td> <td>19%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Live/work space to own</td> <td>32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Long-term (5 years +) studio lease</td> <td>22%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Studio space to share with other artists</td> <td>11%</td> </tr> </table> <p><i>For complete survey results, see Appendix B, page 139.</i></p>		Studio space to rent (work use)	62%	Studio space to own (work use)	30%	Live/work space to rent	19%	Live/work space to own	32%	Long-term (5 years +) studio lease	22%	Studio space to share with other artists	11%
Studio space to rent (work use)	62%												
Studio space to own (work use)	30%												
Live/work space to rent	19%												
Live/work space to own	32%												
Long-term (5 years +) studio lease	22%												
Studio space to share with other artists	11%												

84% of the artists evicted after their rents increased left the city and even the region, in search of lower rents.⁸

This type of mass exodus could be replicated in Northeast, as there isn’t another obvious place in Minneapolis for artists to relocate. Some might move to the East Lake Street corridor, but most would be scattered throughout the region. The concentration of artists, and all the advantages it affords, would be lost.

Landlords have been generally supportive of artists in Northeast, providing them with space in existing buildings, updating fire and safety equipment, etc. However, this support creates a distinct disconnect between rent prices that artists can afford to pay and prices landlords can afford to accept. When artists invite the public to their studios, the buildings attract the attention of city inspection officers, who rightly say that the buildings need to be made safe. When landlords improve the buildings, rental rates go up to compensate.

The City Inspection Office has also been helpful in assisting artists to make their spaces more code-compliant, trying to work with artists and their specific needs. As a city planner stated:

⁸“Is the New Economy Squeezing the Life Out of San Francisco?,” Metropolis Magazine, March 2001.

“We want to prevent artists from going underground – instead, we want to make spaces safer, preserve existing buildings, and make the rehab process logical and predictable, so that everyone will know how to do it.”*

The ultimate issues when it comes to studio space are 1) availability, 2) cost and 3) sustainability. Landlords have reported waiting lists of artists looking for production space. When it comes to cost, the surveys showed that the majority of artists (46%) were paying between \$700 and \$1,500 monthly for rent *and* work facilities. Forty-two percent pay \$3.60 to \$4.80 per square foot annually for their studio space. (It is important to note that while these figures were reported in the surveys, planning participants reported that average rents are much higher than these figures indicate.) The average amount of space rented by artists is approximately 1,000 square feet. Studio rental at this point in time, then, would seem to be affordable for most artists. This makes point number three the priority: sustainability, or, in other words, *keeping* artists’ spaces that way.

We will address that issue on page 29. Before we get to that, the fact is that studio space is only one part of what one planning participant called the “triumvirate of needs” for artists. “There are three issues: production space, living space and gallery space. All three are equally crucial, and we must consider how all those types of spaces fit together.”

Objectives:

Ensure long-term affordability of artists’ studio spaces

Establish a jurying system for artists’ workspace, to ensure that professional artists get first priority

Create an incentive program for in-kind assistance

TURNING LEMONS INTO
LEMONADE
The Story of 2010 E. Hennepin

Some previously unusable sites in Northeast have been converted into mixed-use sites suitable for artists. The complex at 2010 E. Hennepin was originally the research laboratory for General Mills; the 6.5 acre lot was declared a hazardous waste site by the EPA in 1984. In 1990, a small private investment group called BBD Holdings purchased the site (for which General Mills was responsible for clean-up), and created a “business incubator” complex: a home for new businesses and approximately 14 artists and five music groups. This is a happy ending to a story that could have gone wrong in so many ways – if a loan had not been secured, if General Mills had not acted on its responsibility to clean up the lot, etc. Ultimately, it has proven popular for tenants and profitable (after many years) for its owners.

* Quotes that are not attributed within the document have been taken directly from one-on-one interviews, focus groups and planning session held throughout the Arts Action Plan process.

LIVING SPACE

Goal: *Create opportunities for artists' live/work spaces in Northeast Minneapolis*

Findings:

- *Local artists want the opportunity for an equity stake in Northeast Minneapolis*
- *Live/work space, for rent or purchase, was ranked second and fifth, respectively, out of six potential scenarios in the surveys*
- *Governmental support exists for the creation of innovative and affordable homes*

In the surveys, when artists were asked to rank their interests in various types of spaces, 32% felt that live/work space to own was essential, while 19% stated that live/work space to rent was essential. In overall rankings, owned live/work space came second (behind studio space to rent) and rented live/work space came fifth. (See Table 1.1 on page 20.)

These surveys show that the market for live/work space is not as pressing as the demand for production space only. These data back up statements made by landowners in Northeast, some of whom have conducted their own feasibility studies for converting a portion of their space into live/work apartments for artists.

However, there is a need. A non-profit called ArtStead has emerged whose central mission is the creation of artists' live/work space. Initiated by a group of Northeast Minneapolis artists, ArtStead has been exploring the creation of an artists' campus, in which production/studio space is situated across a courtyard from artists' homes. This would not only provide more flexibility for artists, but would also relieve landlords of shouldering the burden for the safety hazards that occur when tenants live in their work spaces.

This is a significant burden for landlords. While the Industrial Living Overlay District, established in 1999, permits persons to live in some buildings originally zoned for light

industrial, few landlords allow tenants to live in their buildings. Most agree that the cost and complication of making their buildings suitable for living is prohibitive.

There is also substantial interest, and potential financial assistance, by local, state and federal government in creating interesting living spaces. For example, the Minneapolis Empowerment Zone encourages and funds “unique life-cycle housing,” i.e., higher density housing on and around commercial corridors. This is part of the Empowerment Zone’s long-term attempt to “reverse the current topography of neighborhoods,” in which the lowest housing density is along the commercial corridors, and residency becomes denser about two blocks away from the main artery.

Objectives:

- Collaborate with government entities to explore live/work space funding options*
- Create artists’ Cooperative Bank or Credit Union to provide loans for individuals renovating and purchasing live/work space*

EXHIBITION SPACE

Goal: *Create a “scene” in Northeast, provide shopping activities for visitors and encourage local artists’ sales*

Findings:

- *There are few galleries in Northeast*
- *There is an opportunity to use vacant storefronts and properties to display art*
- *Most arts and cultural districts have a large number of exhibition and performance spaces*
- *Increasing sales opportunities will boost artists’ ability to support themselves*

The McKnight Foundation’s report entitled State of the Arts: Facts, Figures, Stats and Stories about Arts in Minnesota sums up the exhibition situation this way: “Plenty of artists and foundations, not enough galleries and collectors.”⁹

⁹ State of the Arts: Facts, Figures, Stats and Stories about Arts in Minnesota (McKnight Foundation).

The need for exhibition space is paramount. Without places in which to display and sell work, artists lose a huge portion of the potential to increase their income and thus their means of self-support. While Northeast Minneapolis has hundreds of studios where artists produce their work, there are very few venues in which they can *sell* their work other than the annual studio tour events. There are a few non-profit and commercial galleries scattered around the community, including the Art Collective, Clay Squared to Infinity and the Icebox on Central Avenue, Frank Stone Gallery on 2nd Street, Rogue Buddha Gallery on E. Hennepin, Flatland Gallery on E. Hennepin (in the St. Anthony neighborhood), Sosin/Sosin on 13th, and a smattering of others.

There are opportunities that have not yet been tapped to their fullest potential. This includes greater use of underutilized storefronts and vacant buildings, particularly along Central Avenue. At this point, some storefronts and vacant buildings are available, and some store owners would



The Art Collective, on Central Avenue

like to exhibit local artists' work in their windows. Storefront and vacant building programs have been used to great effect in other communities. The Tucson [Arizona] Arts District Partnership mounts a "Phantom Gallery" that "transforms vacant buildings into temporary exhibition spaces to showcase the visual art of local Tucson artists."¹⁰

While in Northeast this is only a partial solution to full-time, dedicated exhibition space, such a measure can significantly help as a signifier that Northeast Minneapolis is an active artists' community.

The creation of an Arts District in Northeast must include more exhibition/gallery spaces. Every focus group in the planning process addressed this issue. Many planning participants cited the Torpedo Factory Art Center, in Alexandria, Virginia, as a model to emulate in the creation of Northeast's arts district. The Torpedo Factory has six full-time galleries and 160 artists. (It is interesting to note that the Torpedo Factory was financed with City redevelopment funding. After many years, it generates a profit for the City.)

¹⁰ Jorge Garcia, interview.

One way to complement the traditional “bricks and mortar” gallery is to create a presence on the Internet, where many buyers do the majority of their purchasing. The publication Exhibit: A Basic Guide to Gallery and Exhibition Spaces in Minnesota, published by the Minnesota State Arts Board and Springboard for the Arts, recommends that artists examine the Internet as a venue for their work.¹¹ Many of the current artists and artisans in Northeast have already entered the Internet marketplace, with growing success.

Gallery space in Northeast Minneapolis is important for the development of the district, as well as of individual artists. Galleries have relocated to other Minneapolis neighborhoods when they have been offered financial incentives (sometime sponsored by the Neighborhood Associations and by Neighborhood Revitalization Program funds) to do so. This should be explored in Northeast, as a way to “seed” the gallery scene.

Objectives:

- Create incentives for galleries to locate in Northeast Minneapolis*
- Provide technical assistance on sales to artists*
- Establish a temporary exhibit program for local artists in storefronts along the commercial corridors*
- Create a Northeast Arts District Web site*

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Goal: *Empower artists to support and sustain themselves through artistic enterprise*

Findings:

- *Some technical assistance programs exist in Minneapolis/St. Paul*
- *Artists nationally are turning away from philanthropic/grant support and toward long-term sustaining support*
- *Northeast artists have specific technical assistance needs not provided by other outlets*

¹¹ Exhibit: A Basic Guide to Gallery and Exhibition Spaces in Minnesota (Minnesota State Arts Board and Springboard for the Arts) 5.

Throughout the planning process, particularly in the focus groups, the consultants heard the statement, in many forms, that artists ultimately need to be able to support themselves in order to make the Northeast Arts District successful. The only question is: What are the tools that those artists need in order to succeed in the long-term?

An arts professional, in her research with artists throughout the country, found that artists' focus has turned away from one-time or limited grants and toward long-term sustainability. "They recognize that philanthropic gifts are nice, but not something that they can count on."¹² Instead, they are interested in jobs, housing, financial services and health care.

NEMAA's mission is to promote and support the quality and diversity of artistic resources based in Northeast Minneapolis, to benefit the greater community. It essentially fulfills its mission through the studio tour and art show it sponsors once a year. While it has touched on other initiatives, the effort and drain of producing a large scale annual event such as Art-A-Whirl has consumed almost all of the organization's attention and resources. Some founders of NEMAA stated that in the beginning, its larger goal was to support artists throughout the year by serving as a clearinghouse for artists looking for studio space, marketing artists' products, helping artists find health care, etc.

Many individuals and entities in Northeast Minneapolis have recognized that helping artists think as businesspeople is crucial to their success in today's marketplace. The Logan Park Neighborhood Association, with fiscal receivership provided by the Northeast Community Development Corporation, has sponsored a series of courses called "The Art of Business/The Business of Art." These courses assist artists in developing their skills as businesspeople, providing artists with the tools to market themselves. Some regional entities also provide technical assistance services for artists. Springboard for the Arts, located in St. Paul, has informational services and a resource center, provides low-interest loans for "entrepreneurial arts projects," and offers small grants to help artists in emergency needs. The Empowerment Zone also offers technical assistance grants and deferred loans to small businesses located in Empowerment Zone areas.

¹² Holly Sidford, interview.

The question of technical assistance is larger than Northeast Minneapolis and should involve the entire artists' community of Minneapolis, possibly through a grant program administered by the City. Such a grant program could focus on neighborhood development and the arts, with an emphasis on how the arts can improve or rehabilitate neighborhoods. This issue should be addressed in the proposed Minneapolis Cultural Plan.

In the immediate, however, there is a call for NEMAA to serve in a technical assistance role to its constituency. Services should focus on helping artists become financially stable, complementing the "Business of Art" series. Technical assistance should provide for artists in various stages of their own professional development – emerging, mid-career and established. There is also a call for mentoring programs, with established artists providing support and guidance to emerging ones. Artists have also talked about the need for a clearinghouse agency to inform them of potential live/work spaces and other opportunities as they become available.

Objective: ***Establish a local technical assistance program that does not replicate regional services for artists***

MARKETING

Goal: ***Make Northeast Minneapolis an arts destination for visitors and residents, and encourage people to visit and live there***

Findings:

- *Northeast Minneapolis is not recognized as an arts destination except during Art-A-Whirl*
- *Building an audience and patronage is a long-term process*

While Northeast Minneapolis is home to many artists, it doesn't have a wide reputation as an arts community, even among residents and artists themselves. It is hard for a stranger to visualize, as he or she sets off on a tour of Northeast Minneapolis, that behind the closed doors of the huge old industrial buildings that dot the entire 12

"Tourism begins at home. It's most important that you plan the amenities of your community for your own residents, not for outsiders. If you don't love your own community, find it safe and enjoyable and stimulating, why should I want to come there?"

– Robert McNulty
President, Partners for Livable
Communities

SUSTAINABILITY

Goal: *Increase and ensure the long-term presence of artists in Northeast Minneapolis*

Findings:

- *Long-term sustainability is the major issue of the Arts Action Plan*
- *There are options to obtain control of artists' space: existing building purchase, development rights control, new building*
- *There is a current effort at non-profit arts redevelopment (i.e., Artspace at the Grainbelt)*

Ultimately, this is what the entire Arts Action Plan comes down to – sustainability. Practically everyone agrees that the priority of this planning process is to keep artists in Northeast Minneapolis, and ensure a long-term affordable supply of arts production and artists' living space.

The majority of artists interviewed by the consultants stated that the only assured way to maintain a long-term presence in Northeast Minneapolis in the face of commercial or market pressures was to purchase (or build, for artist-ownership) properties for studio and live/work space. The consultants believe that this is one potential means of sustaining an artists' presence in Northeast, but it is not feasible to presume that either individual artists or any existing artists' support group will have the financial capacity to purchase one (let alone a variety) of

“In areas with hot real estate markets (or where lifestyle lofts are already out of control, which includes many cities), the only way many artists can retain control of their spaces is through ownership, long-term rent subsidies, or the creation – and enforcement – of ‘Artists’ Protection Zones.’”

– *“The Ten Truths of Live/Work Planning Policy”*
The Live/Work Institute

these buildings. Indeed, the assumption that artist-ownership is the best way to maintain an artists' presence is debatable: Artspace, the non-profit whose goal is to develop affordable artists' live and work space, has pointed out that individual artists are as tempted as anyone else by the prospect of selling off newly valuable property for a profit. When it comes time to finance their retirement or to support their children's education, they too will sell their units to the highest bidder. In an attempt to broaden the possibilities of the Arts Action Plan, therefore, the consultants have outlined a variety of options. In this section, we discuss their feasibility.

A warning as we enter this section: *Extremely* low rents may not be a long-term possibility in Northeast Minneapolis. Sometimes new complexes run by artists and intended for artists' use, by dint of the fact that renovation and improvement is necessary, price out artists previously living in the complex. In Seattle, a group of artists called JEM Studios renovated an old hotel into the Horton building for artists, displacing a "handful of artists who had studios" before they came in.¹⁵ Those artists were then replaced by other artists, still paying below-market rates, but higher than the previously rock-bottom rents.

Purchase



The smokestacks of the Grainbelt Brewery complex

As artists grow older, the attraction of owning a home *and* paying out rent each month for a studio becomes less tenable. Artists get to a point, just like regular people, where they want to have equity in a space. Owning will protect their interests: "The best way to assure long-term occupancy is for artists to have direct control and ownership of the space they occupy. The second best way is to have the building owned by a non-profit organization which has as its mission to provide long-term affordable space for artists."¹⁶

A building could be either purchased by a group of artists, such as ArtStead, or by a non-profit whose goal is to provide long-term space for artists. Artspace is a very important resource. Over the past fifteen years, Artspace has been developing artist live-work space, first in St. Paul and more recently across the nation. No non-profit arts space has more experience and skills in this area. They are extremely generous in sharing their expertise. Artspace is currently negotiating with MCDA to develop the old bottling warehouse at the Grainbelt Brewery for artist live-work and arts production spaces.

¹⁵ Nina Shapiro, "Saving Spaces," *Seattle Weekly*, 18-24 January 2001.

¹⁶ "Live/Work Space: Housing for Artists in Your Community." 4.

Any effort to control the industrial buildings in Northeast Minneapolis must surmount one formidable obstacle – cost. Although underutilized, they are very valuable properties, many being held for speculative purposes, waiting for the day when redevelopment opportunities will make them highly lucrative. It is convenient to rent them for artists now, but the day will surely come when they will have greater potential for commercial use, office development or high-end residential. It seems unlikely that it will be possible to raise the level of funding needed for the outright purchase, then rehabilitation, then operating costs of these properties.

Development Rights Purchase: The “Arts Conservancy” Approach

Northeast is home to a great many buildings – formerly warehouses, factories, and plants – that are now at least partially home to artists’ studios. The building owners who have created these artists’ enclaves have done so partially because the demand for such spaces is so high and the spaces are easily rentable.

Many current building owners can provide space for artists because they have a flexible and diverse tenant mix. In the Northrup-King building, for example, 65 of 90 tenants are artists. (It is worth noting that while artists make up 72% of the occupants in Northrup-King, they provide only 19% of the rental revenue for the complex.) Other tenants in these buildings represent a variety of concerns, mostly commercial. That diversity creates stability, and building owners do not want to lose that vital stability.



Northrup-King Building, home to 65 artists

Since the outright purchase of properties is likely beyond the means of the artists and arts organizations residing in Northeast Minneapolis, the consultants have sought a strategy that will yield control of the future use of certain properties, without prohibitive costs. One strategy would be to acquire the development rights to the property, rather than the buildings themselves.

It could work like this: a non-profit organization, the Arts Conservancy, would be formed for the purpose of raising funds to purchase the rights. The Conservancy would then negotiate with individual property owners to purchase development rights, which would be held by the non-profit. The advantage to the property owner is that the owner would get an immediate infusion of cash – cash that could be used to purchase other properties, or to finance rehabilitation, or for any other purpose. In exchange for this payment, the building owner would accept a deed restriction that would limit all or a portion of the property to artist-related uses.

The property owner would be able to continue using the building in the same way in which it is currently being used. The property would remain in private hands and market forces would set the rents for the spaces. However, since this process limits the potential pool of renters for the spaces, rents would tend to be held down.

As an added incentive, it may be possible to create an arts overlay district that would result in down-zoning properties that accept the arts use restriction, resulting in lower property taxes.



Northrup, King and Company plant 1929 Photographer: Norton & Peel

Finally, there may be mechanisms that would allow the transfer of development rights between properties in Northeast or elsewhere in the city, adding another inducement for property owners to participate.

To the consultants' knowledge, this mechanism has never been used to control properties for arts uses. However, it has been successfully used to preserve natural resources and agricultural land, as well as for historic preservation. In the late 1970s, in King County, Washington, there was growing concern that the prime agricultural land in the Kent Valley was being converted from agricultural uses for industrial and residential development. The County was aware that outright purchase of the land would be prohibitively expensive. Instead, they passed a bond issue and negotiated with farmers for the development rights. The

County now owns those rights and the farmers are able to continue farming. Likewise, in the City of Galveston, Texas, local preservationists have purchased the development rights to buildings in the old historic district with the same results.

The national non-profit conservation agency, the Nature Conservancy, often uses this approach. It has met with great success through purchasing development rights, as the agency focuses on conservation by working with willing sellers, as opposed to coercing landowners into conservation. The agency has found that it is much more effective at achieving its long-term goals when it tries to “meet the financial expectations” of landowners.

The Conservancy establishes the value of the development rights by comparing the land value as would be developed with the value as restricted. It splits the difference, and bids on development rights using the mid-range figure. While the Nature Conservancy only purchases rights in perpetuity, it is also possible to use this method for a finite period of time, in which case the value would be markedly less.

This is only one of a variety of means the Conservancy uses in its environmental conservation methods. At one end of the spectrum, owners make an outright donation of their development rights, creating essentially a conservation easement; in return, the land owners get a significant donation credit and tax deduction. Paying full price for development rights marks the other end of the spectrum. Another method is a bargain sale approach, in which owners sell development rights at below market value, in which case they receive both cash and a tax deduction.

In Northeast Minneapolis, the Arts Conservancy will have to be approached through extensive outreach to the community, particularly landowners and artists. The specific nature of the “arts restrictions” – what it means when a building’s use is restricted, what uses are allowed, etc. – must be defined by that community. It must be remembered that this program would be strictly *voluntary*; no one landlord or building would be forced to sell its development rights.

The first step in pursuing the Arts Conservancy approach will have to be an extensive feasibility study, which will serve to: 1) determine a value for development rights of specific buildings; 2)

research uses of the method in other US cities; 3) determine fundraising potential for the approach, both locally and nationally; and 4) conduct in-depth research on potential buildings for arts-related uses.

New Building

ArtStead is currently in the process of exploring the option of building a new structure to serve as an arts campus for a group of artist owners. However, the creation of new live/work or studio space for artists is rare. Most buildings devoted to such space are re-uses of existing buildings. However, in some communities, such as Laguna Beach, California, which has no existing historic structures for adaptive reuse, development of artists' live/work space has centered on new buildings. The City has created the Laguna Beach Artists' Live/Work Ordinance to develop new spaces for artists.¹⁷ In researching the establishment of the ordinance, the City of Laguna Beach tried to locate similar programs in other communities; interestingly, it found none.

Building Renovation in Partner with Developer

When considering the renovation of an existing building, most artists and arts advocacy groups work with developers. Developers have the expertise to take on such projects, and non-profit developers know federal and other programs that can provide funding. Usually, non-profit developers (such as Artspace) collaborate with artists on these types of projects, but for-profit developers have also worked extensively, sometimes on a partially *pro-bono* basis, to develop artists' live/work space. In Boston, Massachusetts, for example, Laconia Lofts, a mixed-use development combining "undervalued loft apartments for artists with market-rate loft apartments for high-income purchasers"¹⁸ was developed by Jack McLaughlin of McLaughlin Development. (Now, the city is initiating a major drive to identify and develop artist-owned housing units.)

Often, partnering with a local non-profit organization or agency is a major plus to private developers. They find that projects are usually more universally accepted in the local community when such a partnership is present. As such projects become more prevalent, additional private

¹⁷ "Artists' Live/Work Ordinance – Another OCAPA Award Winner!" *Orange County Planner*.

¹⁸ John Villani, "Money for the Arts," *Urban Land* March 2000. 59.

SECTION TWO

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

The Arts Action Plan does not only concern or impact the artists in Northeast Minneapolis. The issue of supporting artists is one that affects the entire community, and indeed, should go beyond Northeast to impact and inform the entire City of Minneapolis. Not only does the presence of artists fundamentally change a city, but artists are extremely involved in their communities.

Creativity creates a profound community impact. As Richard Florida, writer of the book The Rise of the Creative Class states: “The key to understanding the new economic geography of creativity and its effects on economic outcomes lies in what I call the 3T’s of economic development: *Technology, Talent and Tolerance*. Each is a necessary but by itself insufficient condition: To attract creative people, generate innovation and stimulate economic growth, a place must have all three.”²¹

“...a set of strands once considered independent of one another – economic considerations such as the business tax rate; cultural features such as the liveliness of the local arts scene; amenities such as a downtown’s ‘walkability’ or neighborhoods’ attractiveness to diverse populations; and the ability of a city’s political and civic leadership to resolve difficult problems – all of these have come to be seen as intertwined.”

– “Mysteries of Urban Momentum,”
Governing Magazine April 2002

The issue of reinvigorating the civic pride of neighborhoods is one that the entire city faces. It is a broad focus of the City Council, neighborhood associations and the region. The Minneapolis Plan states that the city encourages community pro-activity, and that “Minneapolis will promote neighborhood based arts activities.”²²

Artists in the Minneapolis/St. Paul region are politically involved and proactive, as evidenced by data gathered by Columbia University in its Artists’ Study. Minneapolis/St. Paul artists consistently reported higher voting turnout in local, state and federal elections than the comparative cities of Los Angeles, San Francisco and New York.²³ (It is worth noting that artists in *all* cities had a high voter turnout; the average artists’ voter turnout was 83%.)

²¹ Richard Florida, The Rise of the Creative Class (Basic Books, 2002) 249.

²² “The Minneapolis Plan, Volume 1 – Policy Document” (City of Minneapolis, 2000) 1.1.9.

²³ “Information on Artists – Study 2,” Columbia University, 1998. Pages 10-11.

COLLABORATION

Goal: *Collaborate with arts and non-arts entities to achieve the community's and region's goals*

Findings:

- *The artists' community does not exist in a vacuum in Northeast Minneapolis*
- *83 of 84 surveyed Northeast residents support the creation of an Arts District*
- *NEMAA has already established partnerships with non-profit groups in Northeast*

The word “collaboration” was cited repeatedly during the planning process. People talked about it when they talked about artists working together; artists connecting with the external community; local organizations working together and with the City; etc. The notion of participation of all citizens, and collaboration on all levels, runs like a stream through nearly all of Minneapolis’ planning documents.

Most issues in Northeast emanate from the neighborhood level. There are 11 neighborhoods in Northeast Minneapolis, all tightly knit, as they seem to be throughout Minneapolis. While artists were not initially part of the indigenous mix of Northeast, they have been welcomed and embraced by long-time residents. In the surveys, 83 of the 84 individuals who live in Northeast support the designation of parts or all of Northeast Minneapolis as an arts district.

“In a project like this [a live/work artists’ co-op], you are in business with your neighbors. This is nothing to be entered into lightly.”

- Live/Work Space: Housing for Artists in Your Community, 11

NEMAA has made an effort to partner with entities outside of its immediate constituency of artists and has worked or made alliances with a number of organizations in Northeast and the city and region. These include the Central Avenue Mainstreet Program (CAMP), the Northeast Chamber of Commerce (formerly known as NEBA, the Northeast Business Association) and the Minnesota Institute for the Arts.

A phrase constantly encountered in tales of cultural districts and live/work buildings in the United States is “mixed-use.” Generally, buildings that are developed primarily for artists’ use often have a retail/commercial component attached. Or, buildings might provide housing for

artists and non-artists, in the same complex. This is part of what makes these districts so special. “The vision for live/work spaces is for artists to be part of the community, not separate from it.”²⁴

Some artists interviewed had a highly developed vision of such a space: a campus, which welcomes and houses artists and the community at large. An ideal space for such a campus could be found in one of the existing buildings (maybe the former Cream of Wheat Building on the corner of Stinson and Broadway). An ideal campus would have a mix of studios and live/work space, room for a variety of media, and involve the performing arts.

The Office of Cultural Affairs, before it was dismantled in February 2002, issued a work plan that emphasized support of many of the goals articulated here. These included supplying information, resources and products to “protect and develop art districts for affordable space in cooperation with the planning commission,” and encouraging “the development of cooperative marketing/public relation tools to benefit the arts community.”²⁵ It would be desirable for the proposed Minneapolis cultural plan to explore these goals in depth.

NEMAA has a powerful constituency and partnering with other entities will strengthen its ability to serve its own core group, as well as extend its influence community-wide. There should be a concerted effort to increase collaboration with schools (such as Sheridan in Northeast, an arts magnet school), major institutions (like the Minnesota Institute for the Arts), and arts collaboratives (such as the Twin Cities Fine Arts Organization) throughout the region. By establishing such partnerships, the new cultural district in Northeast can also serve as a model for other communities in Minneapolis and St. Paul wishing to protect their artists’ populations.

Objectives:

Strengthen ties with non-artists and non-cultural organizations in Northeast and the region

Conduct arts outreach into schools and neighborhood groups in Northeast

²⁴ “Live/Work Space: Housing for Artists in Your Community.” 1.

²⁵ City of Minneapolis Office of Cultural Affairs Draft Work Plan (City of Minneapolis, 18 September 2001).

COMMUNITY GATHERING PLACES

Goal: *Create spaces in which residents and visitors can gather during day and evening hours*

Findings:

- *Northeast Minneapolis lacks a large-scale gathering space or community center*
- *Capital funding dollars are in great demand and may not be available for new buildings*

Many planning participants bemoaned the fact that Northeast has no central gathering space, either for artists or for the general community. One of the reasons that void is so sorely felt is that the community, specifically Central Avenue, affords no reason for people to be out and about in the evenings, after most businesses have closed. (The Central Avenue Mainstreet Program is now making a concerted effort to relocate a 24-hour business into the area, to increase active hours.)

The Northeast Community Development Corporation conducted a survey of 302 community residents in 1997, to determine their interest in a “culture and fitness campus.” The community overwhelmingly supported the creation of such a facility – only 18% responded that they were not at all or not very interested.²⁶ The survey focused on sports components, but results showed that there was “strong support for the inclusion of performing arts space.”²⁷

“‘You’ve got two competing forces in a gentrifying neighborhood,’ Dr. Braconi [a researcher in the study on the forces of gentrification in neighborhoods] said. ‘The prices are going up, which gives low-income people an incentive to leave. But the neighborhood’s getting nicer, so people have more incentive to stay.’”

– John Tierney, “Gentrification: Bad Name, Good Trend,” New York Times, 26 March 2002

Gathering spaces need not be engineered specifically for that purpose. Theatres, restaurants, parks, churches and community centers often serve as “gathering spaces” – they bring people together for conviviality and shared experience. Such facilities also attract visitors. The “Making Central Avenue Great” plan, published in 1997, expounds on this idea. It acknowledges that “every community needs a center for its public life: a place we go to see people and to be seen.” To meet this need, the plan proposes: “Central Avenue be enhanced for walking from activity

²⁶ Northeast Culture and Fitness Campus survey results, October 29, 1997.

²⁷ Northeast Culture and Fitness Campus survey results.

node to activity node. The destinations can include shops, gardens, churches or parks. The physical character of the walkway must provide comfort, safety and convenience.”²⁸ The Minneapolis Plan supports this type of development: one implementation step is to “support commercial activities that provide neighborhood scale gathering places such as book stores, art galleries, coffee shops and ice cream shops.”²⁹

To attract visitors, and give residents some reason to get out and walk around after normal business hours, a focus for activity should be defined. It need not be cultural, necessarily, although many planning participants did point out that performing and visual arts venues can fill this need.



The California Building, home to 100 artists and Mill City Coffee

There is also a need for a gathering space for artists’ use. Artists talked about the opening of cafes in two of the artists’ studio buildings – Mill City Coffee in the California Building and the coffeehouse in the Thorpe – in glowing terms, discussing how the gathering place provides them with opportunities for sociability and collaboration that had been missing.

An existing successful artists’ gathering space is Open Book in Minneapolis. Open Book, officially known as the Minnesota Book and Library Arts Building, Inc., was established by three non-profits (Minnesota Center for the Book Arts, The Loft Literary Center and Milkweed Editions) whose only linkages were that they were all writing-oriented and were about to be displaced from their respective homes. Together they conceived, raised money for, and

²⁸“ Making Central Avenue Great: Northeast Minneapolis Central Avenue Plan” (September 1997) 25.

²⁹ “The Minneapolis Plan.” 1.1.10.

eventually created Open Book, a three story building on Washington Avenue that houses the three founding non-profits as well as two for-profit tenants, a coffeehouse and a book store.

The Loft is an interesting model, providing rented studio space for writers. Writers rent 6 hours per week of time in a quiet studio for \$60-75 per month. Studio rent is paid in addition to basic membership in The Loft. The organization produces materials for writers, including a bi-monthly newsletter featuring resident writers' work and articles. This model could not be applied in its entirety to a visual arts facility, as it is simply not reasonable to expect visual artists to happily share space (and the attendant paint blobs and ceramic shards), but its roles as an arts incubator and technical assistance provider might be emulated.

The ideal way to have a central gathering space – for artists *and* residents and visitors – is to build one. The drawback is that that will demand significant capital funding. According to the Minnesota Council on Foundations' 2001 report: "There are 112 current and anticipated arts, cultural and humanities capital or endowment campaigns in Minnesota with a combined goal of more than \$471.3 million," and "At least 72 anticipated arts and humanities capital or endowment campaigns plan to raise \$220.3 million* in the next five years. The total dollar goal of anticipated campaigns has increased more than 2,000 percent since 1997..."³⁰ Two thousand percent! Obviously, the demand for capital and endowment funds has grown exponentially, limiting the potential for significant capital dollars to be raised to support the proposed Arts District.

Objectives:

Establish series of cultural events involving the performing and visual arts on streets within the Northeast Arts District

Explore creation of .5% cultural impact fee on new development, to fund increased cultural activities and facilities

* It should be noted that one of the campaigns included in these figures is the Northeast Culture and Fitness Campus Task Force campaign, aiming to raise \$30 million. This campaign has not been realized as of yet.

³⁰ Capital and Endowment Campaigns in Minnesota, Minnesota Council on Foundations, July 2001. 2.

PEDESTRIAN AMENITIES

Goal: *Create a cluster of attractions within walkable distance that encourage pedestrian traffic*

Findings:

- *There is not a critical mass of attractions within walking distance*
- *Northeast is not a walkable, pedestrian-oriented community*

Many participants cited Central Avenue’s inaccessibility to pedestrians as a problem. It is difficult to traverse and not set up for pedestrian traffic. It is one of the city’s identified commercial corridors, and approximately 15,500 cars travel on Central daily. Now, “its role as a thoroughfare overshadows its role as a center for the community.”

This has not been ignored. The 1997 “Making Central Avenue Great” plan stated that “Central Avenue’s success will depend on making the avenue even more comfortable for pedestrians-residents and workers of the area.... And yet it must also accommodate and invite motor vehicles....”³¹



The Central Avenue Railroad Underpass

“When you ask people who have recently moved to the city what motivated them, the pedestrian life style is one of the first things mentioned.... The next reason for city living is that people claim to want to be among the diversity of a city.... The ironic point of this trend is that the return to city living is changing the cities themselves.... Suddenly that funky artist neighborhood is too expensive for the artists to live there.”

– “City Living,” *StarChamber*
16 August 1999

According to City planning documents, designated “commercial corridors” allow commercial usage, but must be either pedestrian-oriented now or progressing towards it. Commercial corridors in Northeast Minneapolis include University Avenue, Johnson, Broadway and Central Avenue. These are key elements of the Northeast Arts District area, and should be walkable, with pedestrian-friendly businesses.

Pedestrian accessibility is a major issue for all cultural districts. “The layout of the cultural district must be carefully considered. As multiple land uses are developed in and around a

³¹ Making Central Avenue Great. 1.

cultural district, the walkability and accessibility from one space to another must be considered. Visitors may not care to walk more than even a half-block from one facility to the next interesting space. Careful planning must be undertaken to ensure that walkways are well-lit, convenient, and attractive and that area businesses agree on hours of operation, to avoid ‘dead’ spaces between facilities.”³²

There has been some recent effort to increase Northeast’s walkability. The City is exploring the expansion of the Pedestrian Overlay District in the community. There has also been discussion about the creation of a program to make the railroad underpasses that traverse some of Northeast’s major corridors (including Central Avenue) cleaner and safer-feeling. Currently, pedestrians wanting to go any distance would have to walk under these underpasses, which can be foreboding.

Objective: *Concentrate amenities within focused areas in the Arts District, specifically in Zone areas*

BUSINESS DISTRICT

Goal: *Encourage the development of a vibrant business district in Northeast Minneapolis*

Findings:

- *Local businesses support Northeast artists*
- *Most Northeast businesses are small and owner-operated*
- *The business community in Northeast has gone through significant changes in the 20th century*

A large percentage of local businesses are already involved in the arts by one means or another. Of 83 businesses surveyed, 51 (62%) responded that they display art. More than half of the businesses participate in Art-A-Whirl in some capacity (everything from enlisting as a gallery site to buying ad space in the program).

³² Frost-Krump 33

**TABLE 2.1
LOCAL ARTS
AND BUSINESS**

Question: Rank, in order of importance five components of an Arts Zone.

PERCENT RANKED MOST
IMPORTANT

Artists' live/work space	15%
Support for artists	11%
Exhibition spaces	10%
Arts festivals and fairs	10%
Historic preservation	9%
More events like Art-A-Whirl	9%
Arts education programs	8%
Pedestrian amenities	6%
Signage	6%
Public art	5%
Performing arts venues	5%
Performing arts programs	4%
Literary events	2%

They champion the designation of an arts district, and overwhelmingly feel that certain segments of Northeast already have many of the elements of such a district (88% responded that it displays characteristics of an arts district). When asked to prioritize elements of a district, “artists’ live/work space” got the highest scores (see Table 3.1). “Support for artists,” “Exhibition spaces,” and “Arts festivals and fairs” were the next three.

Business survey recipients responded at length in the “comments” section of the survey, in support of a district. One said: “A more prominent arts community would beautify the neighborhood and attract new business and investors.” Another spoke with passion of the plight of

artists: “It has to start somewhere - the gentrification of artists and studios is quite appalling. Rezoning of this area to become ‘the village’ of Minneapolis is prime. Turning warehouse space from studios to condos is fine for tax base, but killing the arts.” Another said, simply, “The time is now or no suitable property will be able to be assembled feasibly.”

Despite their support of the Arts District, few businesses state that they realize a direct economic benefit from the current arts activities. Only a little over a quarter of businesses responded that they saw an increase in business during the Art-A-Whirl event. When asked to rate how the designation of an Arts District would impact their businesses, a little less than half – 44 % – responded with 3 or more (1 being no impact and 5 being drastic impact). This does not reflect the national statistics of how arts programs and activities have a significant beneficial impact on the community. For example, a study conducted in Tucson, Arizona, revealed that the Tucson Arts District and local arts activity created a \$75 million impact on the local economy.³³ There is little doubt that the creation of an Arts District in NE Minneapolis would eventually yield similar results. Completion of an economic impact study should be part of the proposed cultural plan.

³³ Garcia

Part of what makes cities economically successful is their culture. Cities have begun to realize how their *reputation* – as opposed to their job market or location or weather – has a major impact on their economic development and business relocation. “Part of that reputation is based on the city’s arts and cultural institutions, which are seen as a significant factor in attracting and retaining skilled professionals and managers.”³⁴

There are approximately 924 for-profit businesses in Northeast. Sixty percent are small businesses (i.e., have between one and five employees), and of those, 30% have only one employee. The densest business area is along Central Avenue, and Central has a distinct time cycle – busy from 10 a.m. to 5 p.m., but otherwise mostly quiet.

This was not how it used to be. “There was a time when everything you needed to sustain a moderate lifestyle could be purchased from the small shops along Central Avenue,”³⁵ as Catherine Geisen-Kisch said in her 1998 feasibility study for an art supply store on Central. But the shifting topography of American commerce affected Central as it did so many other small urban shopping centers; the big box stores sprung up on the outskirts or in the suburbs, and people who used to depend on their corner stores got in their cars and drove off in search of the cheapest 12-pack of Fuji film.

However, Central Avenue is still serving a growing portion of the Northeast population – immigrants who have moved into the community in the last 20 years. There has been a rapid turnover of businesses, particularly on the South end of Central, in the last few years, predominantly attributable to the fact that long-time business owners and community residents have begun to age and move away. This exodus has opened up room for some of the recent immigrants to open their own businesses. The new ethnic businesses reflect new occupancy in nearby neighborhoods. In many ways, these new ethnicities have helped keep Central Avenue as a key shopping area for the local citizenry.

“States compete to cut their energy costs, tax rates and other business expenses.... Eventually, however, when all those factors of production have been leveled around the nation to their lowest common denominator, it is the states with the highest qualities of life that will stand out in the competition for jobs, industry and overall economic growth.”

– Editorial
The Providence Journal-Bulletin
30 August 1996

³⁴ Lawrence O. Houston, Jr., “The Attraction of Art,” *Urban Land* October 2000. 45.

The “Making Central Avenue Great” plan of 1997 set out desirable attributes for Central Avenue businesses: “Greater variety of types and quality of goods available to the Central Avenue community; enhancement of attractiveness to both visit, live, shop and be entertained in the Central Avenue community; enhance investor confidence on Central Avenue...; and increase in number and variety of attractive employment options.”³⁶

The expansion of the existing business improvement district (BID) on Central Avenue in Northeast to encompass specific areas of the proposed Arts District would be a vital tool in supporting and enhancing the district’s activities. A portion of the building assessment in the BID should be devoted to enhance the arts attributes of the district.

Clearly, the goals of the business community are aligned with those of local artists. There has been some movement toward partnerships between NEMAA and the Chamber of Commerce (formerly the Northeast Business Association). These should be continued and expanded, and individual artists themselves should begin to strengthen their ties to the business community and their advocacy for artistic enterprise. Artists may, for example, join the Chamber of Commerce as small businesses, giving themselves a voice in community business concerns.

Objectives:

- Partner with Northeast business organizations in the implementation of the Arts Action Plan recommendations*
- Create sponsorship opportunities for local businesses in the marketing of the district*

HOUSING

Goal: *Create affordable housing for artists, working within the City’s housing priorities*

Findings:

- *Minneapolis is focused on creating housing options for all citizens*

³⁵ Catherine Geisen-Kisch, “Feasibility Study for an Art Supply Store Along Central Avenue: Is there a budding artist community in Northeast Minneapolis?” 1998. 3.

³⁶ “Making Central Avenue Great” 7.

- *Housing costs in Northeast are continuing to rise*
- *Artists provide opportunity for affordable housing*

Housing concerns are consuming cities all over the country. Issues of affordable housing, in-fill development and suburban expansion are being addressed in City’s master plans. Minneapolis is no different – the Minneapolis Plan articulates the goal that “Minneapolis will reasonably accommodate the housing needs of all its citizens.”³⁷

Housing prices are a concern in Northeast, as they are in the region in general. A City report produced in February 2002

showed that “household income increases have been outstripped by housing prices over the past 10 years.”³⁸ Planning participants who live in Northeast – owners of their homes as well as renters – discussed the skyrocketing cost of real estate as both a personal and community concern. They also reported that the lack of rental units was a worry for the future and may hinder population growth.

Housing trends across the country reflect a movement toward compact forms of housing, like townhouses, away from the traditional single-family home. This was related loud and clear in a local conference recently hosted by the Met Council. Consultant Peter Calthorpe presented a scenario in which millions of dollars, as well as thousands of acres of farmland, could be saved by building more housing within Minneapolis’ urban core.³⁹

“There is real need for affordable housing, but you can’t jam affordable housing down people’s throats.”⁴⁰ Mixed use housing is a movement which can address the concerns of affordable housing, but mixed with retail and other spaces that make it more palatable to neighborhoods as a whole. The Minneapolis Empowerment Zone (EZ) focuses on housing issues. The EZ’s

“Since the white flight of the postwar era, America has worried about what poverty would do to its cities, but only in recent years has wealth threatened to hobble what cities could be.... In San Francisco public attention has been turned to the plight of artists – mostly visual and performing artists, whose need for space is greatest. But the threat is far more pervasive: health-care workers are leaving the field in droves, and doctors...are among those who have suffered colossal rent increases.”

– “Is the New Economy Squeezing the Life Out of San Francisco?”
March 2001

³⁷ “The Minneapolis Plan, Volume 1 – Policy Document” 1.4.29.

³⁸ “Strengthening Community and Economic Development in Minneapolis” (City of Minneapolis, 21 February 2002) 8.

³⁹ David Peterson, “How Will We Grow – and Where?” *Star Tribune* 16 May 2002.

mission is to “create healthy and sustainable communities through economic development and services links.” One of the EZ’s main goals is to “develop in-fill housing that supports a mixed income community.”⁴¹ A portion of Northeast falls in the Empowerment Zone – from 18th Ave. NE to 5th St. NE along Central and about two blocks on either side. There is also another area North from East Hennepin to I35W, and the city border on the east.

(An example of the Empowerment Zone’s funding is an RFP that it issued in July 2002. Any awarded funds could be used for programs only [not capital campaigns or endowments], and had to fulfill one of the three primary foci of the EZ: Community-Based Services, Education, or Safety. All of these programs can be addressed through initiatives discussed in the Arts Action Plan.)

Creative housing in Northeast will fulfill many of the goals of the community, the Arts Action Plan and the city as a whole. Housing located near centers, and walkable areas, is a major component of livable cities in the US. As *The Utne Reader* stated: “Out-of-control sprawl, in fact, was one of the major reasons that several areas often lauded for their livability – Austin, Texas, and Minneapolis-St. Paul – didn’t make the list [of America’s ten most enlightened cities].”⁴²

Part of the uniqueness and charm of Northeast Minneapolis are its historic structures. Many of these are houses. In the surveys, the community expressed a desire to preserve historic structures. Attention should be given to preserving the historic nature of this district.

Objectives: *Establish partnerships with government agencies to fund and build or rehab affordable housing for artists*

DIVERSITY

Goal: *Involve diverse groups in Arts District programs*

Findings:

⁴⁰“ Strengthening Community and Economic Development in Minneapolis” 8.

⁴¹ “...Connecting People, Places and Business,” Minneapolis Empowerment Zone.

⁴² Jay Walljasper, “America’s Ten Most Enlightened Cities.” *Utne Reader* May/June 1997. 44.

- *Community is proud of its Northeast heritage*
- *New minorities have located in the community recently*
- *Some long-time residents have had difficulty accepting new population*
- *Religious centers are a major strength of Northeast*
- *Cultural programs can be an extremely effective tool in reaching diverse populations*

“There is a great sense of community in Northeast Minneapolis.” This was cited in many forms throughout the interviews. There is also a great deal of pride in the community’s roots. Originally settled by Poles, Ukrainians and other Eastern Europeans, the community has been going through enormous change. There is a new community of Hmong, Mexican, Middle Eastern and Somali populations congregated in Northeast – as well as many people who are by now just a mishmash of ethnicities.



*St. Mary's Russian Orthodox
Greek Catholic Church, Fifth
and Seventeenth Avenue
Northeast, 1888
Courtesy of the Minnesota*

In the surveys directed at individuals and artists, the consultants asked participants to identify their ethnicity. Of those who responded, 85% were Caucasian (of Northeast residents who responded, 70% were Caucasian). This is not representative of the diverse racial residency of Northeast, and points to a need for greater communication between diverse populations and the arts community

Part of the uniqueness of Northeast can be found in its churches, as well as mosques and temples. Beautiful old gems of churches, most built in the first half of the 20th century, dot the 11 neighborhoods (particularly on the West side of Northeast, which is part of the proposed Northeast Arts District). Thus far, there has been little dialogue between religious groups and arts entities.

All over the country, culture has been used as a tool in establishing intra-community communication, and influencing populations for the better. Outreach programs conducted by local arts agencies have had profound impacts on at-risk youth and families below the poverty

level. While participants mostly emphasized that Northeast is a safe neighborhood, with a strong sense of community, there is room for programs that use the arts to improve people's lives.

Outreach to diverse populations should ideally take place in those populations' comfortable territories. One reason that diverse populations may not be turning out to participate in arts activities or arts planning efforts is that currently they don't see "themselves" in Northeast's cultural community. People feel comfortable when they are in a familiar place, or when they see people who look like themselves. A distinct effort should be made to identify forums where the new ethnicities in Northeast congregate, and address them within those forums. It is likewise important that arts organizations in the area begin to reflect local demographics in their boards, memberships, constituencies and programs.

Objective: Create outreach and partnership programs to engage and include diverse groups in Northeast

This plan is focused on Northeast, but ultimately should have implications far beyond this community. The Minneapolis Plan vows to "enhance the city's unique arts and cultural resources that promote the city's identity within the region and in special 'niches' within the community."⁴³ The Arts Action Plan should be one of the tools to accomplish this goal.

⁴³ "The Minneapolis Plan, Volume 1 – Policy Document" 1.6.51.

SECTION THREE

LEADERSHIP AND ADVOCACY

Goal: *Identify an advocacy body that represents the artist constituency and understands local political processes and leadership*

Findings:

- *Implementation of the Arts Action Plan will demand an active advocacy entity, and one individual to lead the charge*
- *Government and funders want to work with organized entities with realistic business plans*
- *NEMAA is the obvious entity, but is not yet prepared to take on that role*

The stories of successful arts districts are often sprinkled with the name of just one man or woman who provided time, energy, constant vigilance and often money to the cause. In Miami Beach, Florida, it was Stanley Levine: After Lincoln Road began to reap the success of its cultural image, he personally bought neighborhood buildings to provide artists with affordable live/work space.⁴⁴ In Cincinnati, Ohio, industrialist Jim Verdin took up the charge.⁴⁵ The names are too many to list here, but the pattern has been repeated in many communities.

Leadership does not end with just one individual, however. It demands a committed, knowledgeable core group of people who speak for artists and have the artists' trust. This group needs to have a unique blend of political savvy, sophistication and sensitivity to artists' needs. It has to know and be trusted by its constituency, and be respected by local government and funding entities. It will not be easy to assemble this leadership. No clear individual or group has emerged in the planning process. It will be important for the Mayor and Council President Paul Ostrow to provide the initial support for this effort.

The need for an advocacy core is not new information for Northeast artists. The Northeast Arts District White Paper stated that "a core group should obtain training in group dynamics and

⁴⁴ Houston 107.

⁴⁵ John Villani, "Money for the Arts," Urban Land March 2000. 60.

leadership that prepares them to deal with moving things along while remaining democratic, giving contrarians the proper role of introducing caution while not stopping progress.”⁴⁶

In the 2001 Urban Land Institute Mayor’s Forum, several mayors “emphasized the importance of the arts community becoming more sophisticated in its negotiations with officials who approve funding for the arts.”⁴⁷ Local funders reiterated this when they discussed at length their desire for a professional, capable non-profit group to take the lead on organizing any major initiatives in the community.

A representative of the National Cooperative Bank, which has made loans to artists’ live/work developments, emphasizes “the importance of finding predevelopment dollars and building partner relationships.”⁴⁸ The advocacy group should take on this charge as it prepares to create the Northeast Arts District.

TABLE 3.1
ARTISTS’ MEMBERSHIP IN NEMAA

Question: If you are a member of NEMAA, please check off applicable reasons.

NUMBER OF ARTISTS WHO CHECKED OFF EACH CATEGORY:

Participate in Art-A-Whirl & Fall Fine Art Show	87
Help sustain the arts community in Northeast	75
Network with other artists	66
Receive newsletter	61
Improve your career as an artist	58
Be connected with the Northeast community	56
Receive e-mail updates	55
Receive advice on promotions, business, etc.	51

The Northeast Minneapolis Arts Association (NEMAA) serves in a crucial leadership capacity in Northeast Minneapolis. Established in 1995, it has now organized, financed and administered seven annual Art-A-Whirl events. NEMAA currently serves as the most visible and strongest of the artists’ organizations in Northeast Minneapolis, enjoying the support of a great portion of the local artists’ community.

NEMAA is the natural entity to take on advocacy for Northeast artists. Before they can do that, however, they must reach out within the community to create a bigger and broader constituency. NEMAA’s board is currently made up of five members, most of them artists. In general, it is the

⁴⁶ Northeast Arts Zone White Paper, Unknown date

⁴⁷ William H. Hudnut III, “Art Scape,” Urban Land February 2001. 64.

same story in most communities: while there are supposedly 300 NEMAA members, the same nine or ten people show up for every task, event, meeting and fundraiser. NEMAA will have to broaden its membership and leadership as the first step toward alleviating “the usual suspects” trap.

While NEMAA has always aimed to be open and inclusive, the very volunteer/grassroots nature of the organization may make it difficult for other community members to access. The organization is consumed by its annual events, and has traditionally been staffed by volunteers, with only two part-time staff (one clerical, and one solely to organize and oversee Art-A-Whirl). The board is a “working” board, meaning that they take a very hands-on role in organization and administration of the organization and its events.

NEMAA has come a long way in the last six years. Early members and founders reported that the first artist members resisted *any* form of organization or structure, feeling that it was confining and just not what they were. Six years later, the organization is still together, has consistently delivered its programs and events and has grown steadily in membership.

Most of the surveyed artists (71%) are members of NEMAA. They cited participation in studio tours as the number one reason for membership. The second most prevalent membership benefit, however, was to “help sustain the arts community in Northeast.” (See Table 3.1) Member artists clearly look to NEMAA as the primary advocacy entity for the Northeast Minneapolis arts community.

Planning participants stated that the only way to ensure that the Arts Action Plan goes forward is with vocal support from the city’s many constituents. There should be a “catchy” campaign to attract attention to the Plan’s goals and Northeast’s achievements. Additionally, three entities are crucial to the initiation of this plan’s recommendations: City Council, the McKnight Foundation, and arts community, with broad representation.

Objectives:

Broaden the board membership and leadership of NEMAA

⁴⁸ “Live/Work Space: Housing for Artists in Your Community.” 14.

Modify NEMAA's mission to include advocacy and the creation of an implementation strategy for the Arts Action Plan, while focusing on programming

Create a new non-profit foundation that can lead fundraising and grant-making for the Northeast Arts District

SECTION FOUR

PROGRAMMING

Programming is a vital component of any true Arts District. Currently, the most visible arts programs in Northeast Minneapolis consist of Art-A-Whirl, the Fall Fine Art Show, and Art Attack, all open studio tours held annually. There are also events that incorporate visual arts, such as the Central Avenue parade and various neighborhood association-sponsored events.

EVENTS

Goal: *Encourage visual arts events and programming in Northeast*

Goal:

- *Art-A-Whirl is the most recognized art event in Northeast*
- *Other entities also conduct visual art events*
- *Programs must be expanded and institutionalized*
- *Funding sources need to be developed, including support from the City of Minneapolis*

While NEMAA started what is still the premiere visual arts event in Northeast, Art-A-Whirl, others have begun to crop up. A group of galleries and businesses, Arts Retailers Tour, published a map. Business on 13th Avenue have created the “13th on 13th” promotion which involves consistent late-open hours and special promotions (including music or other attractions). Various community events have invited artists to have booth space. The Tile Heritage Foundation’s annual worldwide symposium will be held in the Twin Cities in September 2002, and Josh Blanc of Clay Squared to Infinity in Northeast has tied it into NEMAA through NEMAA co-sponsorship of their map of tile installations. These new events and opportunities suggest that extended arts programming in Northeast Minneapolis will find a market.

Planning participants talked repeatedly about introducing more visual arts events and activities. Some suggested adding a series of tours focusing on artists working in different media. Many talked about creating a juried, fine art show (more on this in the next section, “Art-A-Whirl”). Participants also discussed their desire and the community’s need to extend arts programming to non-arts focused entities, like schools, neighborhood groups and churches.

As one member of the Technical Advisory Committee put it, the plan will have to accommodate “multiple combinations of inter-disciplinary activity.” In other words, programming will have to be extended, made more regular, and will have to appeal to a diverse audience in order to attract a critical mass on an ongoing basis.

Increased events in Northeast should reflect an increase in cultural events throughout the City. Cultural events and programs scored very highly on the Internet survey results for the Strengthening Community and Economic Development in Minneapolis report the city conducted in early 2002. The entire city has articulated an interest in and desire for more cultural programming. Currently, the City is focusing on a monthly “First Thursday Art Crawl.” Northeast Minneapolis artists and galleries should be involved in the initiation of this program.

Objectives: *Create and market more visual arts programs and events in Northeast*

ART-A-WHIRL

Goal: *Build on the success of Art-A-Whirl to expand audience*

Findings:

- *There is a desire for more cultural events in Northeast*
- *Community wants a juried “fine art” division of Art-A-Whirl*
- *Participation costs for artists in Art-A-Whirl are low, but some artists feel participation fees are too high*

“...growth occurs in communities because they’ve got the kind of attributes – an innovative music scene, perhaps, or a vital community of creative artists, and an environment that encourages innovation and risk-taking – that attracts the kinds of creative people companies need to prosper.”

– “Mysteries of Urban Momentum,”
Minneapolis, April 2002

In most areas identified as cultural districts, there is a monthly – sometimes even twice a month – studio tour like Art-A-Whirl. Art-A-Whirl has been so successful, it may be time to increase its frequency, or introduce more events like it. Almost half of the individuals surveyed (47%) stated that they had attended Art-A-Whirl three or more times. The event draws approximately 15,000 annually.

Increasing the frequency of studio tours in Northeast may also provide the opportunity to distinguish between professional and avocational artists. Currently, Art-A-Whirl is undifferentiated, with artists at all levels thrown together. Attendees have no way of easily identifying artists of the highest caliber. Because of this, many established artists in Northeast decline to participate in the event. In order to address this issue, planning participants broached the possibility of establishing a juried element to Art-A-Whirl, either to run contiguously with the show, or as a separate event. To accomplish this, NEMAA could charge a slightly higher fee to professional artists, perhaps structured as a percentage of their sales.

Many artists also complain about the entry fee to participate in Art-A-Whirl. NEMAA charges \$25 for the two day show, for which artists receive a bullet on the map, materials, signs, banners and a great deal more. They also receive benefits of membership in this way. The reality is that this is far lower than other artists' participation fees in similar studio tours across the country. In Ventura, California, for example, the cost for a gallery to participate in a one-evening studio tour is \$50. NEMAA's artist fees contribute less than 15% of the total Art-A-Whirl budget.

Objectives:

Establish monthly gallery tours, potentially using vacant buildings and storefronts, in partnership with other communities in Minneapolis

Create a juried, professional division of Art-A-Whirl

PERFORMING ARTS

Goal:

Encourage performing arts spaces in Northeast Minneapolis

Findings:

- *Performing arts are a key component of most cultural districts*
- *Northeast has no spaces specifically for performing arts performances*

While the majority of artists who have made their working home in Northeast Minneapolis are visual artists, performing artists have also created – or tried to create – a presence. Performing arts are a key component of nearly every cultural district. They provide a synergy and ongoing

attraction that visual artistic pursuit, on its own, does not. Importantly, they contribute in a major way to the development of a 24-hour activity cycle in the area.

The Miami Cultural District in Florida provides a good example of how performing arts can leverage major benefits. Lincoln Road was a blighted street just off Miami Beach before the city designated it an Arts District. One of the District's initial strategies was to site performing arts groups' rehearsals in front of tall windows on the street, in the city-owned theatre, where passersby could watch. The people this simple practice attracted turned Lincoln Road into a thriving cultural and commercial pedestrian promenade, populated by galleries, theatres, studios, small shops and bistros.

Most of the buildings in Northeast Minneapolis currently occupied by visual artists are not suitable for performing arts, due to the support structure within. There are some available spaces, however – notably the Ritz Theatre on 13th Avenue, which the non-profit performing group Ballet of the Dolls is currently in the midst of renovating. The San Jose Redevelopment Agency has recently funded a program, *Ars Populus*, which supports a variety of arts activities to animate the street. Activities include roving musicians, mimes, poets and performers, as well as outdoor movies and arts exhibitions in vacant storefronts.

Objectives: *Complement the strong visual arts emphasis of Northeast with active performing arts programming*

ORGANIZATIONAL STRENGTH AND CAPACITY BUILDING

Goal: *Provide assistance to artists and arts organizations in Northeast*

Findings:

- *NEMAA can't accomplish all of the Arts Action Plan goals*

We have discussed NEMAA predominantly in this section. NEMAA, however, cannot provide all of the services discussed in the context of this plan. Over the fifteen-year framework of the plan, other entities will have to share that burden and take responsibility for additional programs.

The section on Technical Assistance (page 19) lists some of the ways NEMAA can provide services for artists. Many of those services can also be applied to non-profit organizations. However, there should be a more inclusive entity, perhaps guided by the City's Arts Commission, to provide technical assistance to cultural organizations throughout Minneapolis. A strong corps of non-profits can complement the lead NEMAA and the Arts Conservancy will take in developing the Northeast Arts District.

Objectives:

Foster the growth of sustainable cultural non-profits in Northeast by providing technical assistance through the Metro Regional Arts Council, a reconstituted Office of Cultural Affairs, or other entity.

SECTION FIVE

URBAN DESIGN

ARTS DISTRICT BOUNDARIES

Goal: *Create an identifiable Arts District in Northeast Minneapolis, with identifiable Zones of high activity*

Findings:

- *Northeast is too big to be entirely designated an Arts District*
- *The Arts District should concentrate on a few existing arts activity Zones*

Most of Northeast Minneapolis could easily be claimed to already be an arts district or zone, due to the plethora of artistic enclaves throughout the community. However, planning participants agreed from the outset of the process that the actual district needed to be focused in an identifiable and manageable area. The entire community is simply too large, at approximately 12-square miles, to be considered as a viable Arts District. As a business survey participant said, “All of Northeast is too large to be a district. Focus on building around existing thriving hubs, especially 13th Avenue.”

The question of exactly where focus should be directed was asked, in many different forms, throughout the planning process. Before the consultants were engaged, the plan started with a focus on Central Avenue. However, initial participants realized that “Northeast Minneapolis is too broad to be defined simply by Central Avenue,” and the scope of the plan grew. Much of the reason for the growth was Art-A-Whirl. That event has created an identity for the entire neighborhood, through the scope of its coverage: no artist, no matter how far off the beaten path or how small the studio, is excluded from the Art-A-Whirl map.

Without Art-A-Whirl, participants generally agreed that the district seems decentralized. As the planning process proceeded, however, natural boundaries began to come into relief as they were reiterated by participants repeatedly. Some of those boundaries were environmental (like the River, which marks the western edge of the Northeast Minneapolis district), while some are

commercial and human boundaries (such as Central and 13th Avenues, each of which has a significant amount of commercial enterprise and traffic).

The power of a cultural district is that it's walkable, identifiable, and provides entertainment and activity in a manageable area. Identifying a limited area as the primary district does not mean, however, that all of Northeast is not important to the district's success. The Central Avenue Community Development Implementation Ad-Hoc Committee addressed this issue in 2001, when they "generally agreed that we need to distinguish between the concepts of a neighborhood *service area* and neighborhood *target areas*. The service area is the much larger district that assumes the broad geographical purview of the CDC. The target area(s) are chosen as much smaller areas of geographical concentration for particular programs and services."⁴⁹

"The synergy that can emerge from collaborations among arts institutions as well as between these entities and related business interests...appears most promising when there is public recognition of a district where the arts are a prominent attraction."

- Lawrence O. Houston, Jr.
"The Attraction of Art"
Urban Land October 2000

Ultimately, the area recommended as the core of the Northeast Arts District is large, but manageable. It encompasses the area west of Central Avenue to Marshall Avenue, with north and south boundaries of 26th Avenue and Broadway. Within the District, the consultants have identified a series of high activity Arts Zones: 13th Avenue, Central Avenue (specifically in the area of the Thorpe, Tyler and Northrup-King buildings) and the California Building (at 22nd and _____). These areas were chosen due to their a) commercial corridors; b) retail, gallery or artistic activity already established; and c) pedestrian amenities. Activities within the district should be focused first on areas these highly trafficked Zones of arts concentration. At the same time, the district must also recognize other important areas throughout Northeast Minneapolis, with high artist population and/or activity.

Objectives:

Officially designate the following area as the Northeast Arts District:

- ***East/West boundaries: Central Avenue to Marshall Avenue***
- ***North/South boundaries: 26th Avenue to Broadway***

⁴⁹ Central Avenue Community Development Implementation Ad-Hoc Committee, June 12 2001.

Focus activities on Arts Zones within the district:

- *California Building*
- *13th Avenue*
- *Central Avenue*

Create potential for an Arts Overlay District of other sites in Northeast Minneapolis to be adopted into the Arts District

VISUAL SIGNIFIERS & PUBLIC ART

Goal: *Create visual plan for the Arts District*

Findings:

- *The Arts District needs visual signifiers*
- *CAMP's business-sponsored banner program was very successful*
- *Public art is a priority*

The visual unification of the community will be a challenge. As one participant said: "It's so diverse, how can we create a unifying image that incorporates all attitudes?" The official Arts District will need, at a minimum, a banner or signage program. This will significantly increase people's awareness of the district, and begin to give visitors a clue as to the hotbed of artistic activity behind the large buildings' closed studio doors.

There is precedent for such a program, supported by local businesses. The Central Mainstreet Program (CAMP) sponsored the Central Avenue banner project. CAMP issued an RFP to local artists to design a logo image to be printed on banners hung along Central Avenue between the 1700 and 2600 blocks. Local artist Lauri Svedberg won the contest. Individual businesses sponsored the project, contributing to the costs of creating and hanging the banners. The project was a success from all points of view, and CAMP would like to pursue other artist-involved initiatives.



*Lauri Svedberg's
Central Avenue banner*

The City supports such visual designation. The Minneapolis Plan states that the City “will support efforts that recognize both the increased vitality and importance of corner properties and the role of gateways in enhancing traditional neighborhood character.”⁵⁰ Identification and way-finding signage and kiosks will also help the zone become more recognizable and navigable.

“Your community’s cultural badge is worn outside in the external appearance of your community.”

– Bob McNulty, President
Partners for Livable Communities

Planning participants also identified the placement of public art as a priority. Northeast is home to one or two highly visible public art works. One of these is a gateway project installed on the chain link fences at the four corners of the intersection of Broadway and Central. The work was commissioned in 1992, and was one of the Minneapolis Arts Commission’s first public art projects. Currently, the work is in need of both protection and repair, as it has badly rusted over the last ten years and is a popular site for defacement. This is the official entry point from the South to the Northeast Arts District, and the project should be restored.

Another public art site lies just three blocks north, at the corner of 14th Avenue NE and Central. A sculpture garden, initiated by local artist Dave Monson, has shared the site with the City Tree Project. While the future of the site’s programming is unclear, there have been efforts to introduce a new partnership which would maintain the sculpture garden with other arts purposes on the corner lot.

Objective: ***Work with the City to create a concentration of public art in Northeast***

Develop, design and raise funds for signage and banners for the Northeast Arts District and other areas of Northeast

URBAN DESIGN

Goal: ***Retain ambiance of Northeast while encouraging quality design***

Findings:

- *Northeast has a unique “gritty” feel that should be retained*

⁵⁰ “The Minneapolis Plan, Volume 1 – Policy Document” 1.9.69.

- *Minneapolis has few design guidelines to direct the design of commercial districts*
- *CAMP has initiated a façade improvement program*

Part of the allure of visiting Northeast Minneapolis is that you feel like you're on an "urban adventure." It's not the kind of place that most of us visit every day. Blissfully devoid of Starbucks and Barnes & Noble, one drives directly up to huge factories that loom right next to the railroad tracks. The entire community feels strongly about retaining the "gritty" ambiance of Northeast Minneapolis.

But, as one survey participant stated, "[We need] walking space, decent coffee, etc. Central Avenue needs to get more upscale for artists to sell...people are frightened of coming here. We need to attract those who can afford to buy art!"

Many of the cultural districts that have been established across the United States face this issue: Because such districts are often used as economic revitalization tools, and are located in what was considered the "bad" part of town (abandoned manufacturing centers, skid rows, red light districts, etc.), making people feel safe is a major issue. In Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, they've adopted an unusual technique. "Night lighting is a major ingredient in animating the cultural district In addition to the main avenues and cross streets, the district is filled with back alleys and blank walls next to empty lots where buildings once stood. Lightwalls for beauty and safety were the answer rather than ugly, income-producing billboards."⁵¹

Minneapolis has few design guidelines; reviews happen project by project, outside of any larger design review context. Design issues are reviewed by the Planning Commission, and the Planning Department imposes some design restrictions, although that is not specifically its role. However, if a developer applying for a permit and the Planning Department disagree, the developer usually prevails. The Comprehensive Plan has general design guidelines, but they are not very stringent or comprehensive.

⁵¹ Paula Deitz, "Buttressing an Old City with New Artistic Girders." *The New York Times* 7 April 2000.

The Central Avenue Mainstreet Program (CAMP) has initiated a façade improvement program, in which grants of up to \$8,000 are awarded to businesses, which they must match one to one. There are no artists currently involved in the program; CAMP hired DJR Architects, which meets one-on-one with business owners. Minneapolis also has a paint and fix program, and there is funding available through the neighborhood associations and the NRP program for improvements to house exteriors. Residents report, however, that there is little to no pressure from within neighborhoods to keep up or improve appearances.

Objective: *Create a unified visual aspect of the Northeast Arts District and commercial corridors in the entire community*

SECTION SIX

FUNDING

In the end, funding is crucial – and scarce. No report is complete without an in-depth discussion of exactly how little money is available to support all of its recommendations. However, this is a crucial component of any plan. As one Steering Committee member put it: “No funding equals no mission.”

While the designation of an Arts District in Northeast Minneapolis will not result in an inordinate funding burden, implementing the strategies that enliven the district – and protecting and retaining artists will. As was stated earlier, there is no way to assure long-term sustainability for artists unless a non-profit acting in their interests, or the artists themselves, has a measure of control over the property. Creating control is what will drive the cost.

ARTISTS’ NEEDS

Goal: *Identify funding sources to support artists in Northeast Minneapolis*

Findings:

- *Artists earn very little through art sales and services*
- *72% of surveyed artists have other employment to support themselves*
- *Funding should come from services to help artists sustain themselves in the long-term, not solely grants*

There are two essential needs for artists when it comes to funding, and both lend to artists’ self-sufficiency and strength. Firstly, there is the need to create sustainable and affordable living and working space in Northeast Minneapolis. Secondly, there is the need to boost artists’ income through sales of their art.

Only 28% of artists surveyed support themselves solely through their art. Of those who don’t, a whopping 91% stated (vehemently!) that they would like to. Sixty one percent of all artists derive less than 25% of their income through art (see Table 6.1)

The community of Northeast Minneapolis has a very strong work ethic. Artists have become an integral part of the community. Artists display the same hard-working instincts as the community as a whole. Most of the artists who have studios in Northeast are paying rent to have a studio place to which they can go to create art *after* they have finished with their day jobs. This is not a group of slackers. As one artist put it, “I have a family, I have a child, I live in a home that we own and I don’t think that being an artist means you have to do without those things.”⁵²

Artists provide a great deal, financially and economically, to the community. As the Community and Economic Development survey said, “97% of Minneapolis respondents rate the Twin Cities as a better place to live than other U.S. Metropolitan areas.”⁵³ The Internet survey for the same study revealed that citizens feel that “...the best characteristics of the city relate to the quality of life – culture, recreation, neighborhood charm, and livability.”⁵⁴

TABLE 6.1 ARTISTS’ INCOME	
<u>ANNUAL INCOME</u>	
Under \$15,000	20%
\$15,001-25,000	21%
\$25,001-30,000	14%
\$30,001-40,000	23%
\$40,001-50,000	9%
\$50,001-60,000	5%
Over \$60,000	8%
<u>INCOME PORTION FROM ART</u>	
0-25%	61%
26-50%	13%
51-75%	6%
76-100%	20%

Some entities currently provide grants and loans to artists. These include the Minnesota State Arts Board, Springboard for the Arts, Forecast, the Dayton Corporation, and the Jerome, Bush, and McKnight Foundations. However, local artists have experienced difficulty obtaining loans from traditional financial institutions. The McKnight Foundation’s report on the arts in Minnesota says that artists and galleries are suffering, as collectors have slowed down on their purchasing. “Mid-career artists have it the hardest. Once they’ve made the rounds of all the major grant providers, it’s hard to find new sources of income.”⁵⁵

The proposed Arts Conservancy could serve as a body to partially address both of the needs listed above. The Foundation can serve as the purchase body and repository of development

⁵² State of the Arts: Facts, Figures, Stats and Stories about Arts in Minnesota.

⁵³ “Strengthening Community and Economic Development in Minneapolis” 7.

⁵⁴ Community and Economic Development Internet Survey Results, City of Minneapolis, April 24 2002.

⁵⁵ State of the Arts: Facts, Figures, Stats and Stories about Arts in Minnesota.

rights for buildings devoted in full or in part to arts and cultural use throughout the district. The Foundation can also serve as the fundraising and granting body, providing grants to individual local artists.

Objectives: *Identify new funding sources for artists*
 Expand existing funding sources

LOCAL PUBLIC SUPPORT

Goal: *Increase City funding for culture in Northeast Minneapolis and the entire City of Minneapolis*

Findings:

- *Since the Office of Cultural Affairs disbanded in 2002, there is no official City cultural agency or funding available*
- *Goals of the Arts Action Plan match many of the City's goals, as articulated in the Minneapolis Plan*
- *Local government agencies have been working in Northeast*

The Technical Advisory Committee, early in the planning process, stated that the Arts District must be funded through a mix of sources, including government funding.

The City of Minneapolis' Office of Cultural Affairs was disbanded in February 2002. The Office did not have an extensive grant program while it was active – it granted a total of \$30,000 annually to all communities in Minneapolis. This is substantially less than might be expected from a city of this size and cultural importance. Most cities of Minneapolis' size and stature have cultural grant programs in the hundreds of thousands of dollars; many devote well over \$500,000 annually to artists and arts organizations.⁵⁶

Outside of the cultural realm, the City has been very supportive. The Minneapolis Plan is littered with references to initiatives and partnerships that it will support, many of which are directly applicable to the Arts Action Plan. "Minneapolis will work with private and other public sectors

⁵⁶ "Grantmaking by Local Arts Agencies, Fiscal Year 2000," Americans for the Arts.

to invest in new development that is attractive, functional and adds value to the physical environment.... Minneapolis will continue to provide a wide range of goods and services for city residents, to promote employment opportunities, to encourage the use and adaptive reuse of existing commercial buildings, and to maintain and improve compatibility with surrounding areas.”⁵⁷

Improvements being conducted in these areas are conducted by a wide variety of local government entities: The Met Council, Minneapolis Community Development Authority (MCDA), the Empowerment Zone, the City Planning Department, to name a few. These agencies are currently working in Northeast. The MCDA has worked on the Grainbelt complex and has created live/work space for artists in South Minneapolis. The question is how to strategically direct efforts so that they impact artists in the most important ways.

The Council clearly supports neighborhood initiatives. There should be opportunities for partnerships between entities such as the Arts Commission, the Committee on Urban Environment, Historic Preservation, etc.

The City is making a concerted effort to realign the partnerships among City agencies like the MCDA, NRP and the Planning and Zoning Departments. Mayor Rybak in June of 2002 announced a key shift in organization, in an attempt to redirect government agencies to areas where they can creatively help. Minneapolis city government has vowed to work on a small-scale level. The City will “...maintain and strengthen the character and marketability of small-scale commercial areas throughout the city through technical and financial assistance to qualified neighborhood businesses, neighborhood based business associations and local development corporations.”⁵⁸

City support does not need to be given in terms of money or loans alone. This February, the local City Council voted to give a local sculptor six months to find \$14 million in financial backing to develop a live/work, residence and retail complex in downtown Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. The

⁵⁷ “The Minneapolis Plan, Volume 1 – Policy Document” 1.9.69.

⁵⁸ “The Minneapolis Plan, Volume 1 – Policy Document” 1.4.33.

Council did this despite the presence of other three other developers, with funding and construction documents prepared, who wanted to develop the same property – but not in a way that made the city feel comfortable. Their plans looked like Anywhere, USA – in the sculptor’s plans, the Council saw something unique, and cast their vote with him.⁵⁹

In Peekskill, New York, the City uses Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) funding to support rehabilitation of spaces into artists’ live/work spaces. It uses portions of its annual allocation of \$500,000 in CDBG funds to make loans to developers turning commercial into residential space.⁶⁰ (Peekskill also made a direct investment, purchasing a vacant building and creating studios and retail space. It intends to recoup its investment by selling the rented building to a private investor.)

Many cities have made a direct investment, expecting to recoup their investment, into initiatives such as those described in this plan. In Providence, Rhode Island, the City has AS220, an artists’ support organization which rents live/work spaces to artists, a \$500,000 loan to buy their building center in the Arts and Entertainment District. The city of Alexandria, Virginia, bought a complex of buildings formerly operated as a torpedo factory and in 1974, renovated the complex as an art center. Today, the Torpedo Factory has five galleries, 83 studios, hosts education programs, international shows and attracts more than 800,000 visitors each year.

Although the City is not currently funding the arts through grants, it has supported cultural enterprise: For example, it is subsidizing the new parking ramp for the Walker Art Center and the Guthrie Theatre with \$43 million (with plans to recoup some initial costs through operations income). Through the Empowerment Zone (which is funded by a combination of federal and city funding), the City made a commitment of \$150,000 to an individual artist attempting to convert the historic Alamo Building on Central Avenue into an antique store with attendant artists’ studio spaces and art classes (the grant will probably not be provided because the project has not been successfully implemented). At this point, however, most of the cultural funding in the region is provided by private foundations. These foundations have indicated that it is time for the City to

⁵⁹ “Pittsburgh – Artists’ Utopia,” *San Francisco Chronicle* 23 February 2002.

⁶⁰ Gil Schames, “Lofty Plans for Artists,” *Planning* August 1996. 16.

increase its support, in order to support their efforts. A city commitment to the cultural growth of its communities, in turn, may well inspire further and more extensive private foundation giving.

Objectives: *Create programs and initiatives that promote cultural development in Northeast as pilot programs*
Expand programs to the entire City of Minneapolis

LOCAL PHILANTHROPY

Goal: *Increase individual support and tap foundation support for visual artists throughout Minneapolis*

Findings:

- *Minneapolis/St. Paul have several local foundations which support visual artists*
- *Individuals have not given to visual arts programs as much as performing arts programs in the twin cities*
- *Artists and arts organizations in Northeast have not fully tapped the potential of either individual or foundation support*

Minneapolis and St. Paul are home to many well-known, major arts institutions – the Guthrie Theatre, Walker Art Center, the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, the St. Paul Chamber Orchestra and many more. This is partially due to the fact that in the 1950s and 60s, many local corporations “pledged to give 5 percent of their pre-tax profits back to the community, making possible world-class cultural institutions.”⁶¹

Such generous support has continued. There are a number of foundations in Northeast – McKnight, Jerome, Bush are just a few of the private foundations. Corporate foundations such as General Mills have also given extensively to the local community.

Many foundations are using PRIs – program related investments – to complement their standard giving methods. PRIs include loans, loan guarantees, real estate mortgages and stock purchases, and are implemented in order to fulfill the foundation’s basic mission and purpose.

Many individual donors give generously to the performing arts in Northeast; this support may be extended to the visual arts community as well. The Benton Harbor Arts District in Michigan is funded by the Arts Investment Fund (AIF). The AIF was established to provide loans for arts-related development projects, including loft and gallery space. The fund was created by two local donors, Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Mendel, who contributed seed funding of \$500,000 to the Fund. Their initiation gift was matched by the local Whirlpool Foundation.

Objective: *Conduct outreach program to local donors, and discuss Arts Action Plan with foundations*

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

There have been quite a few artists' live/work buildings initiated or supported by for-profit developers. For example, in Boston, Massachusetts, Jack McLaughlin of McLaughlin Development created the Laconia Lofts project. The Lofts have 100 units total, of which 40 are structured as artists' lofts and sell below market rate. "By making room for below-market-rate artists' apartments at Laconia Lofts, we increased the marketability of this neighborhood,"⁶² says Mr. McLaughlin.

"If you don't own the dirt, you're at risk."

– Sarah Clements, Former Executive Director of the Tucson Arts District Partnership, from Margaret Regan, "The Arts Give New Life to Tucson's Warehouse District," New Village 1999

Private development is not always a friendly ally. Too often, a rich artistic environment is just the first step in an inexorable march toward high-end development – and this seems only to be accelerating. As Andre Codrescu wrote in 1999, "The process of using art as a wedge for development is already three decades old in most cities.... What is new is the speed with which the displacement occurs. What was once allowed, mostly through sloth and inefficiency, to flourish until it acquired character, is now devoured in bud. If speculators as much as catch a whiff of an emerging arts community, they move in like sharks smelling blood."⁶³

⁶¹ "Mysteries of Urban Momentum."

⁶² Villani 59.

⁶³ Andrei Codrescu, "Art: the vanguard of real estate," *Architecture* 1999.

Minneapolis citizens want developers who support the priorities of the City. “Development in the city needs to be more creative and proactive. We need to inspire developers to think outside of their world and we need to inspire the public to support more visionary thinking.”⁶⁴

The Arts Action Plan has been supported by small local businesses. Two developers granted funding to NEMAA for the completion of the plan. Local businesses, as demonstrated in the surveys, and through individual interviews, have articulated their support and potential funding for creative measures to develop the community of artists in Northeast Minneapolis.

One step to take in initiating the process of funding for the purchase of a building is for NEMAA to host a local presentation by the National Cooperative Bank Development Corporation (NCBDC). The NCBDC will make a presentation on how live/work projects are funded, and a group of artists hoping to own and govern such space is a viable candidate for a loan from NCBDC (available by phone at 202 336 7642).

⁶⁴ Community and Economic Development Internet Survey Results.

SECTION SEVEN

PLANNING, ZONING AND REGULATORY ISSUES

Goal: *Implement the City's stated strategies for Leisure and Culture*

Findings:

- *The Minneapolis Plan articulates specific goals for the city's cultural community*
- *Funding is not directed to realize those goals*

One of the tasks outlined in the Request for Proposals for the Arts Action Plan was to review the regulatory environment in Northeast Minneapolis, to identify any zoning or code enforcement issues that might be barriers to the development of arts spaces and arts related uses. Somewhat to the surprise of the consultant team, virtually none of the artists or property owners interviewed identified any such regulatory barriers. Certain changes in the zoning and codes in recent years had essentially eliminated such concerns, and the property owners, in general, reported that they had good and cooperative relationships with City officials.

Nonetheless, there are certain actions that could be taken to reinforce the role of the arts in the revitalization of Northeast Minneapolis. The Minneapolis Plan has a section devoted to Leisure and Culture, with specific goals and strategies:

6.5 *Minneapolis will continue to promote the economic and creative vitality of arts activities based in the city, both as a regional center for art with an international presence, as well as a unique arts environment that responds to local specialty interests.*

Enhance the city's unique arts and cultural resources that promote the city's identity within the region and in special 'niches' within the arts community.

Position the Arts Commission to act as a liaison between all city agencies the sponsor public arts activities in order to enhance the cultural life and enrich the experience of citizens through the arts.

6.6 *Minneapolis will continue to support the role of the arts in tourism and community pride.*

Promote the arts and entertainment in downtown Minneapolis as a source of economic development and tourism.

*Coordinate and facilitate city involvement in school and neighborhood-based arts activities.*⁶⁵

The inclusion of these goals and strategies suggest that the City is well aware of the positive role that the arts can play in the life of the city, at least in theory. The problem lies in implementation. The overall level of support for the arts by city government is surprisingly low, compared to other similar cities across the nation. The city must translate the mandate to support the arts articulated in the Minneapolis Plan into concrete actions that will bring this vision into reality. With the elimination of the Office of Cultural Affairs and the elimination of staff and funding, the Arts Commission has few resources with which to promote the artistic and cultural development of the city.

There are several actions the City should make that would assist property owners to support arts uses and activities in the Northeast. Firstly, the City should establish an Arts Overlay District, to encourage cultural development. Secondly, the City should ensure that temporary use permits for performances and exhibitions are easy to obtain and do not impose undue burdens. Thirdly, the City should establish a program that directs landowners and artists to buildings that can be upgraded gradually, and away from buildings in which one improvement triggers the need to bring all systems up to code. (Currently, phased improvements are permitted, unless the use of the building is being changed – this is a state mandate.)

Ultimately, the City should also explore the creation of a tax abatement program for landowners considering creative adaptive reuse of buildings within the Arts Overlay District for arts-related uses (such as artists' studio space, live/work space, or exhibition/gallery).

⁶⁵ "The Minneapolis Plan, Volume 1 – Policy Document" 1.6.49.

In Providence, Rhode Island, City council passed legislation that provides low-interest loans and 10-year property tax abatement for property owners who renovate buildings within the city's Arts and Entertainment District (an economic development zone) for artists' residence. Additionally, the City can abate up to 90% of a building owner's taxes if s/he renovated commercial space into residences.⁶⁶ Providence created these tax breaks in order to make its downtown into a neighborhood. Now, almost everyone involved in that district acknowledges that these tax breaks were the "key" to the Arts and Entertainment District's success.

In Boston, Massachusetts, "artist live/work zoning" has been established, allowing artist residential occupancy of commercial buildings. The goal was to "build a different type of building in what effectively was a spot zone that allowed the city to bring a new building's tax base into existence while creating affordable housing."⁶⁷

Properties that are part of the Arts District may also be able to receive tax credit for lowered rents, as a de facto donation; in that case, the rent for the portion of the building devoted to arts uses would have to be paid to the landlord by a non-profit entity (perhaps the Arts Conservancy) and gathered from the artist tenants by that entity. The Conservancy should carefully consider taking on that role, if the tax relief is an incentive to landowners.

Objective: ***Ensure that zoning and code enforcement are supportive of artist spaces and art-related uses in Northeast Minneapolis***

⁶⁶ "Advance for the Arts," *The Providence Journal-Bulletin* 30 August 1996.

⁶⁷ Villani. 59.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1: Establish the Northeast Arts District from Central to Marshall Avenues, and from 26th to Broadway, with Arts Zones of highest artist concentration and cultural activity; allow for other locations that encompass important concentrations of artists.

Strategy 1.1: Pursue City legislation to officially designate the district

Action steps *1.1.1 Fall, 2002* Present plan to City Council, requesting designation of the Arts District by Council proclamation

1.1.2 Winter, 2002/03 Work with the City policies and code departments to officially designate the district

Lead Agency City of Minneapolis

Convening parties Northeast Minneapolis Arts Association (NEMAA)

Resources required None

Strategy 1.2: Develop graphics and signage system to establish identity of district

Action steps *1.2.1 Fall, 2004* Create visual signage plan for the Northeast Arts District, working in concert with the design standards set by the Central Avenue Mainstreet Program and City programs

1.2.2 Winter, 2004/05 Raise funds for the visual signage plan components, from public and private sources, including business sponsors – also raise sufficient funds to create a maintenance endowment

1.2.3 Summer, 2005 Solicit proposals for District logo and design element from local artists and regional graphic and design firms

1.2.4 Fall, 2005 Coordinate with City to hang banners and erect signage for the District

Lead Agency NEMAA

Resources required \$75,000

Strategy 1.3: Explore the expansion of the existing Business Improvement District on Central Avenue to support Arts District programming and activities

Action steps 1.3.1 *Summer, 2003* Coordinate meeting to explain the organization and benefits of expanding the Business Improvement District in Northeast Minneapolis

1.3.2 *Winter, 2003/04* Petition City for expansion of the Business Improvement District

Lead Agency Northeast Community Development Corporation

Convening parties NEMAA
Northeast Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce

Resources required Financed by business membership fees

Strategy 1.4: Create a temporary exhibition program, to install the work of local artists in storefronts and vacant buildings

Action steps 1.4.1 *Summer, 2003* Coordinate with business organizations in Northeast to determine mechanism for identification of vacant buildings and storefronts

1.4.2 *Fall, 2003* Create a directory of artists interested in being considered for temporary exhibitions

1.4.3 *Winter, 2003/04* Act as a clearinghouse to partner businesses and storefronts with artists to mount exhibits

1.4.4 *Ongoing* Assist artists with publicity

Lead Agency NEMAA

Convening parties Northeast Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce
Central Avenue Mainstreet Program

Resources required \$15,000

Strategy 1.5: Create an association of businesses in the Arts District that will display (and sell) the work of Northeast Minneapolis artists

<u>Action steps</u>	<p>1.5.1 <i>Fall, 2003</i> Conduct outreach to local businesses, working with business organizations</p> <p>1.5.2 <i>Spring, 2004</i> Disseminate artists' directory (see Strategy 1.4.2) to all businesses in the Northeast Arts District</p>
<u>Lead Agency</u>	NEMAA
<u>Convening parties</u>	Northeast Chamber of Commerce
<u>Resources required</u>	Minimal

Strategy 1.6: Create a concentration of public art – both permanent and temporary – in the Arts District

<u>Action steps</u>	<p>1.6.1 <i>Fall, 2003</i> Work with the City to determine sites appropriate for public art</p> <p>1.6.2 <i>Spring, 2003</i> Conduct fundraising effort with local businesses to support temporary and permanent public art in the District</p> <p>1.6.3 <i>Winter, 2005/06</i> NEMAA may create a guidebook of public art sites in Northeast Minneapolis</p>
<u>Lead Agency</u>	City of Minneapolis
<u>Convening parties</u>	NEMAA
<u>Resources required</u>	City percent for art monies, augmented with private donations

Strategy 1.7: Extend the City's percent-for-art requirement to include major private development in Northeast Minneapolis

<u>Action steps</u>	1.7.1 <i>Immediate</i> Conduct a preliminary study of public art financing in the City of Minneapolis
---------------------	---

1.7.2 Fall, 2003 Conduct a public art planning process, as a component of the City’s Cultural Plan (see Strategy 3.1)

Lead Agency City of Minneapolis

Convening parties NEMAA
 Minneapolis Community Development Agency (MCDA)

Resources required \$30,000

Strategy 1.8: Conduct outreach on the Arts Action Plan and its recommendations to Northeast and larger community

Action steps *1.8.1 Winter, 2002/03* Begin making presentations at community associations and other local Northeast groups, on the Arts Action Plan

1.8.2 Spring, 2003 Raise funds to conduct random household survey to determine community support for the Northeast Arts District

1.8.3 Fall, 2003 Conduct survey, using professional firm, and publish results

Lead Agency NEMAA

Resources required \$15,000

Recommendation 2: Secure sustainable, affordable spaces for artists’ studios, live-work spaces and arts-related businesses and activities; establish Northeast Arts Conservancy

Strategy 2.1: Recruit and cultivate leadership to implement this recommendation

<u>Action steps</u>	<p><i>2.1.1 Immediate</i> Identify individuals and entities with interest and expertise in the Arts Action Plan’s issue areas, and regional applicability</p> <p><i>2.1.2 Winter, 2002/03</i> Announce the Arts Action Plan at a venue outside of Northeast (potentially the Minneapolis Institute of Arts), to press and potential funders</p> <p><i>2.1.3 Spring, 2003</i> Approach individuals to solicit their involvement</p>
<u>Lead Agency</u>	City of Minneapolis Council office
<u>Convening parties</u>	NEMAA
<u>Resources required</u>	None

Strategy 2.2: Form a non-profit Arts Conservancy to oversee the development of arts spaces in the Arts District

<u>Action steps</u>	<p><i>2.2.1 Fall, 2003</i> Create a non-profit Conservancy and solicit a Board of Directors (from the above)</p> <p><i>2.2.2 Fall, 2004</i> Following the completion of the fund-raising feasibility study, raise funds to support the Northeast Arts District</p>
<u>Lead Agency</u>	Arts Conservancy
<u>Convening parties</u>	NEMAA
<u>Resources required</u>	To be determined; at least \$100,000 in start-up money

Strategy 2.3: Pursue the purchase of development rights for selected properties

<u>Action steps</u>	2.3.1 <i>Spring, 2003</i> Conduct a detailed market analysis of targeted properties to determine the value of future development rights
2.3.2	<i>Fall, 2003</i> Conduct a fund-raising feasibility study to determine the optimal strategies for raising funds from both public and private sources, to be complete by early 2004
<u>Lead Agency</u>	Arts Conservancy
<u>Convening parties</u>	NEMAA
<u>Resources required</u>	\$150,000

Strategy 2.4: Explore the creation of an Arts Credit Union that would specialize in financing arts facilities, mortgages for artists and small business loans to arts-related commerce

<u>Action steps</u>	2.4.1 <i>Spring, 2004</i> Initiate conversations with local lending institutions and technical assistance providers, to create credit union for Minneapolis artists
<u>Lead Agency</u>	NEMAA
<u>Convening parties</u>	Springboard for the Arts
<u>Resources required</u>	None immediately

Strategy 2.5: Develop a program of grants and loans for arts space rehabilitation through MCDA

<u>Action steps</u>	2.5.1 <i>Spring, 2005</i> Initiate conversations with MCDA
<u>Lead Agency</u>	Arts Conservancy
<u>Convening parties</u>	MCDA City of Minneapolis Local building owners

Resources required Initial funding of at least \$250,000

Strategy 2.6: Establish partnerships with for-profit and non-profit developers of properties for arts uses

Action steps 2.6.1 *Winter 2004/05* Create Northeast Arts District strategic plan

2.6.2 *Ongoing* Include specific opportunities for development of specific properties

Convening parties Arts Conservancy
Local and regional developers

Resources required None immediately

Recommendation 3: The City should use the Arts Action Plan as the template for a Cultural Plan for the entire City of Minneapolis

Strategy 3.1: Create a City Cultural Plan

<u>Action steps</u>	<p><i>3.1.1 Fall, 2002</i> Conduct a planning workshop to identify parameters of the study, planning priorities, and key stakeholders. Discuss the key components of a Cultural Plan, including leadership; marketing and visibility; artists’ support systems; organizational support; funding and sustainability; arts and cultural education; civic aesthetics; public art; cultural facilities; ethnic and cultural diversity; and integration of arts into city planning</p> <p><i>3.1.2 Winter, 2002/03</i> Issue RFP to consultants to complete the comprehensive cultural plan</p> <p><i>3.1.3 FY 2003/2004</i> Conduct the cultural plan</p>
<u>Lead Agencies</u>	City of Minneapolis Minneapolis Arts Commission
<u>Convening parties</u>	Arts community
<u>Resources required</u>	\$200,000 – \$250,000

Strategy 3.2: Amend the Minneapolis Plan to expand the “Leisure and Culture” section

<u>Action steps</u>	<i>3.2.1 Fall, 2004</i> The community Cultural Plan should include recommendations on new language for the existing Culture and Leisure component of the Minneapolis Plan
<u>Lead Agency</u>	City of Minneapolis
<u>Convening parties</u>	Arts community
<u>Resources required</u>	None

Recommendation 4: Develop a comprehensive and ongoing program of technical support for artists living and working in Northeast

Strategy 4.1: Establish an ongoing series of artist training workshops and seminars

<u>Action steps</u>	<i>4.1.1 Summer, 2004</i> Using Arts Action Plan surveys to determine need and interest, create a series of workshops to provide training in: Small business management; Marketing; Sources of support: grants and commissions; Putting together a real estate deal; Etc.
<u>Lead Agency</u>	NEMAA
<u>Convening parties</u>	Northeast Community Development Corporation
<u>Resources required</u>	\$10,000 annually in grant funding, plus participants' fees

Strategy 4.2: Establish an arts space clearinghouse, to refer artists and arts businesses to available spaces

<u>Action steps</u>	<i>See Strategy 1.4</i>
<u>Lead Agency</u>	NEMAA
<u>Convening parties</u>	Northeast Community Development Corporation Northeast Chamber of Commerce
<u>Resources required</u>	<i>See Strategy 1.4</i>

Strategy 4.3: Consider the creation of a “Materials for the Arts” program (as in New York City) to encourage businesses to donate surplus materials and equipment

<u>Action steps</u>	<i>4.3.1 Fall, 2003</i> Identify central location where businesses donate surplus materials (paint, metal, office equipment) for a tax credit, and artists can access them
<u>Lead Agency</u>	NEMAA

Resources required None

Recommendation 5: Expand the level of arts programs – both visual and performing – in the Arts District

Strategy 5.1: Expand Art-A-Whirl beyond a once-a-year event

<u>Action steps</u>	<p>5.1.1 <i>Fall, 2005</i> Expand the Fall Fine Art Show to the level of Art-A-Whirl, creating a twice a year event</p> <p>5.1.2 <i>Spring, 2006</i> Introduce a juried component to the tour, with a decision-making panel composed of professional artists including representation from outside of the region</p>
<u>Lead Agency</u>	NEMAA
<u>Resources required</u>	\$60,000

Strategy 5.2: Encourage increased performing arts activities

<u>Action steps</u>	<p>5.2.1 <i>Immediate</i> Support the renovation of the Ritz Theatre</p> <p>5.2.2 <i>Winter 2002/03</i> Petition the City to allow for temporary uses of buildings for performing arts</p> <p>5.2.3 <i>Fall, 2004</i> Establish music and performing arts festivals, to be held on highly visible streets in the Arts District</p> <p>5.2.4 <i>Ongoing</i> Create programming with an emphasis on inclusiveness, sensitivity, and responsiveness to multiple ethnicities</p>
<u>Lead Agency</u>	NEMAA
<u>Convening parties</u>	Northeast Chamber of Commerce Northeast Community Development Corporation
<u>Resources required</u>	To be determined, on an activity by activity basis.

Strategy 5.3: Expand the arts/crafts markets, held with local farmers' market

<u>Action steps</u>	5.3.1 <i>Summer, 2003</i> Expand the arts and crafts sales portions of the farmers’ market, in conjunction with the opening of the Eastside Co-op
	5.3.2 <i>Ongoing</i> Conduct marketing campaign in conjunction with Eastside Co-op
<u>Lead Agency</u>	NEMAA
<u>Convening parties</u>	Eastside Cooperative Food Market
<u>Resources required</u>	\$5,000

Strategy 5.4: Strengthen partnerships with cultural and non-profit organizations, to expand arts audiences throughout the City

<u>Action steps</u>	5.4.1 <i>Summer, 2003</i> Explore programming partnerships with city-wide cultural institutions and agencies
<u>Lead Agency</u>	NEMAA
<u>Convening parties</u>	Community non-profits and arts entities
<u>Resources required</u>	Minimal

Recommendation 6: Coordinate with City to institute changes in planning, zoning and regulations

Strategy 6.1: Allow for easy temporary use permits for performances and exhibitions in NE properties

Action steps *6.1.1 Spring, 2004* Hold workshop for artists with the City Planning Department, to educate them on permitting, etc.

Lead Agency City of Minneapolis Planning Department

Convening Party NEMAA

Resources required Minimal

Strategy 6.2: Establish an Arts Overlay District in Northeast Minneapolis

Action steps *6.2.1 Spring, 2004* Determine the zoning and tax abatement potential for properties within the Arts Overlay District

6.2.2 Fall, 2004 Encourage developers to create arts spaces in the District

6.2.3 Ongoing Allow for workspace in residential units within the Arts Overlay District, and sales out of homes

Convening parties City of Minneapolis

Resources required None initially

Strategy 6.3: Ensure that property owners desiring to upgrade one or more of their buildings' systems are not required to bring every system up to code

Action steps *6.2.1 Spring, 2004* Hold workshop for property owners and artists with the City Planning Department, to assist them in determining proper uses for buildings

Lead Agency City of Minneapolis Planning Department

Convening Party NEMAA

Resources required Minimal

Recommendation 7: Develop the role and capacity of NEMAA to expand programming, artists' support and information clearinghouse activities

Strategy 7.1: Expand board membership

<u>Action steps:</u>	<p>7.1.1 <i>Winter 2002/03</i> Engage organizational consultant to develop a board development plan</p> <p>7.1.2 <i>Spring, 2003</i> Identify individuals who serve specific needs on the board, including representation of diverse populations in Northeast</p> <p>7.1.3 <i>Summer, 2003</i> Solicit board members</p>
<u>Lead Agency</u>	NEMAA
<u>Resources required</u>	\$15,000

Strategy 7.2: Hire a full-time paid Executive Director

<u>Action steps</u>	<p>7.2.1 <i>In process</i> Hire Executive Director qualified to implement the Arts Action Plan</p> <p>7.2.2 <i>Fall, 2002</i> Continue to raise funds to ensure full-time Executive Director</p>
<u>Lead Agency</u>	NEMAA
<u>Resources required</u>	\$60,000

Strategy 7.3: Develop new resources through fund-raising, increased membership dues, corporate partners, etc.

<u>Action steps</u>	<p>7.3.1 <i>Spring, 2004</i> Create strategic plan, with fundraising goals</p> <p>7.3.2 <i>Fall, 2004</i> Expand membership and increase dues for participation in Art-A-Whirl</p> <p>7.3.3 <i>Winter, 2004/05</i> Establish partnerships with local businesses</p>
---------------------	---

Lead Agency NEMAA

Resources required To be accomplished by full-time Executive Director

Strategy 7.4: Develop evaluation techniques to gauge success at achieving goals on a bi-annual basis

Action steps 7.3.1 *Ongoing* Conduct evaluation session each winter

Convening parties NEMAA (Board and Executive Director)

Resources required None

Recommendation 8: Establish extensive marketing programs to publicize the activities and programming of the Northeast Arts District

Strategy 8.1: Develop marketing techniques for the Arts District

- Action steps
- 8.1.1 *Summer, 2004* Create strategic plan, with marketing component
 - 8.1.2 *Fall, 2004* Create Northeast Arts District website
 - 8.1.3 *Fall, 2004* Establish Marketing Committee on the Board
 - 8.1.4 *Spring, 2005* Establish sponsorships with local print, radio, and television media
 - 8.1.5 *Ongoing* Conduct measured outreach and publicity plan, focusing on regional publicity first
- Lead Agency NEMAA
- Resources required \$15,000, initially

Strategy 8.2: Develop television advertisements in concert with local businesses

- Action steps
- 8.2.1 *Spring, 2004* Develop corps of local businesses to sponsor television advertisements
 - 8.2.2 *Spring, 2004* Identify television design personnel to develop advertisement *pro bono*
 - 8.2.3 *Summer, 2004* Run advertisements on regional cable networks, highlighting the Northeast Arts District and a specific business in each ad (business fees will pay for air time)
- Lead Agency NEMAA
- Convening parties Northeast Chamber of Commerce
- Resources required Seek *pro bono* services from advertising firm to develop public service announcements.

SUMMARY TIMELINE, BUDGET AND RESPONSIBLE PARTIES

Strategy	Details	Initiation	Responsible Agency	Budget
FISCAL YEAR 2002/03				
1.7	Extend the City's percent-for-art requirement to include major private development in Northeast Minneapolis	Immediate	City	\$30,000
2.1	Recruit and cultivate leadership to implement Arts Conservancy (securing sustainable spaces for artists)	Immediate	Council	\$0
5.2	Encourage increased performing arts activities	Immediate	NEMAA	\$0
7.2	Hire a full-time paid Executive Director	In process	NEMAA	\$60,000
1.1.	Pursue City legislation to officially designate the district	Fall, 2002	City	\$0
3.1	Create a City Cultural Plan	Fall, 2002	City	\$200,000-\$250,000
1.8	Conduct outreach on the Arts Action Plan	Winter, 2002/03	NEMAA	\$15,000
7.1	Expand board membership	Winter, 2002/03	NEMAA	\$15,000
2.3	Pursue the purchase of development rights for selected properties	Spring, 2003	Trust	\$150,000
FY 2002/03 NEMAA BUDGET INCREASE:				\$90,000
FISCAL YEAR 2003/04				
1.3	Explore the expansion of the existing BID on Central to support Arts District programming and activities	Summer, 2003	NECDC	\$0
1.4	Create a temporary exhibition program, to install the work of local artists in storefronts and vacant buildings	Summer, 2003	NEMAA	\$15,000
5.3	Expand the arts/crafts markets, held with local farmers' market	Summer 2003	NEMAA	\$5,000

Strategy	Details	Initiation	Responsible Agency	Budget
5.4	Strengthen partnerships with cultural and non-profit organizations, to expand arts audiences throughout the City	Summer, 2003	NEMAA	Minimal
1.5	Create an association of businesses in the Arts District that will display (and sell) the work of Northeast Minneapolis artists	Fall, 2003	NEMAA	Minimal
1.6	Create a concentration of public art – both permanent and temporary – in the Arts District	Fall, 2003	City	TBD
2.2	Form a non-profit Arts Conservancy to oversee the development of arts spaces in the District	Fall, 2003	Trust	TBD
4.3	Consider the creation of a “Materials for the Arts” program (like that in New York City) to encourage businesses to donate surplus materials and equipment to artists	Fall, 2003	NEMAA	\$0
2.4	Explore the creation of an Arts Credit Union that would specialize in financing arts facilities, mortgages for artists and small business loans to arts-related commerce	Spring, 2004	NEMAA	\$0
6.1	Allow for easy temporary use permits for performances and exhibitions in NE properties	Spring, 2004	City	Minimal
6.2	Establish an Arts Overlay District in Northeast Minneapolis	Spring, 2004	City	\$0
6.3	Ensure that property owners desiring to upgrade one or more of their buildings’ systems are not required to bring every system up to code	Spring, 2004	City	Minimal
7.3	Develop new resources through fundraising, membership dues, corporate partners, etc.	Spring, 2004	NEMAA	\$0

Strategy	Details	Initiation	Responsible Agency	Budget
8.2	Develop television advertisements in concert with local businesses	Spring, 2004	NEMAA	\$0
FY 2003/04 NEMAA BUDGET INCREASE:				\$20,000
FISCAL YEAR 2004/05				
4.1	Establish an ongoing series of artist training workshops and seminars	Summer, 2004	NEMAA	\$10,000
8.1	Develop marketing techniques for the Arts District	Summer, 2004	NEMAA	\$15,000
1.2	Develop graphics and signage system to establish identity of district	Fall, 2004	NEMAA	\$75,000
3.2	The community Cultural Plan should include recommendations on new language for the existing Culture and Leisure component of the Minneapolis Plan	Fall, 2004	City	\$0
2.6	Establish partnerships with for-profit and non-profit developers of properties for arts uses	Winter, 2004/05	Trust	\$0
2.5	Develop a program of grants and loans for arts space rehabilitation through MCDA	Spring, 2005	Trust	\$250,000
FY 2004/05 NEMAA BUDGET INCREASE:				\$100,000
FISCAL YEAR 2005/06				
5.1	Take Art-A-Whirl to the "next level"	Fall, 2005	NEMAA	\$60,000
FY 2005/06 NEMAA BUDGET INCREASE:				\$60,000
ONGOING				
7.4	Develop evaluation techniques	Ongoing	NEMAA	\$0

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
CULTURAL STRUCTURE SURVEY

**Assessment of Northeast Minneapolis Properties
For Arts-Related Uses**



Prepared For:
Jerry Allen and Associates

By: Artspace Projects, Inc.

Introduction

Jerry Allen and Associates engaged Artspace Projects to conduct site visits and general assessments of various buildings in the Northeast neighborhood of Minneapolis. The questions to be answered in the assessments were provided by Jerry Allen and Associates (the original questionnaire form is attached to this report). The intention of this report is to provide information on the properties including but not limited to: physical condition, lay-out and design, current uses and to assess the sites individually and by comparison to one another, based on their suitability for arts uses.

This report is arranged according to the three-category questionnaire assessment form. The categories are “Basic Information,” “Conditions” and “Assessment.” Following the individual property narratives, detail and assessments, is a comparison and rating worksheet of all four properties based upon the findings.

Artspace Staff coordinated with Heidi Andermack of NEMAA for contact names and addresses. Assessments and comparisons of the following buildings are included in this report:

Northrup-King
1500 Jackson Street Northeast
Contact: Debbie White

Alamo
1517/1519 Central Avenue
Contact: Mike Lent

Thorpe
1620 Central Avenue
Owner: Sander Commercial Real Estate
Contact: Jon Sander

Tyler Street Building – old Ironworks facility
1331 Tyler Street NE
Owner: Marvin Greenstein
Contact: Brad

The following information is based upon cursory site visits and Artspace staff review of documents provided by building management and owners. Findings are not intended as a comprehensive assessment, but rather as a preliminary foundation from which to explore.

NORTHRUP-KING

Address: 1500 Jackson Street, NE
Owner/Contact: Debbie White

BASIC INFORMATION

The Northrup-King site is a sprawling complex comprised of ten, mostly interconnected buildings, all built prior to 1950. The original buildings were erected in 1917. Future additions occurred in the 1920s and again in the 1940s (during the war years). Because of the sprawling nature of the complex and varying construction periods, the construction materials and overlays vary, as do corridor and ceiling widths and heights. Corridors and spaces allow for ample mobility and large-scale production. Corridors average at approximately 8 feet in width, while ceiling heights range from 10' to 16' in building #5. The basement area boasts 9' ceilings that are adequate for various uses including storage, shop, studio and common space.

The square footage of the full property complex is approximately 780,000 square feet. The buildings themselves comprise approximately 578,704 square feet. The square footage breakdown can be found in the chart below.

With exception of the buildings constructed in the 1940s, and the adjacent metal shed/garage facilities, the complex is of masonry, concrete and heavy timber construction. The buildings erected in the 1940s include wood flooring.

Access to the complex and parking availability is ample. The current blacktop lot can accommodate more than 50 cars. With redesign, the lot area could accommodate more parking and/or green space. Loading dock areas run adjacent to buildings 1, 1A and 2, providing access to the main entrance and interior freight elevators and direct access to individual tenant spaces.

Current public and tenant access to the buildings are found at five separate entryways: in building 1A; at either end of building 1; the northeastern end of building 2; and the eastern end of building #9A. There is security after hours and tenants have key access to three primary entrance points 24 hours a day. There are no passenger elevators, however there are 10 freight elevators (9 of which are functioning; 1 is condemned). Most tenants utilize the stairways for daily access to spaces.

There is abundant natural lighting available from the large, original warehouse windows, many of which contain levered centers for outside ventilation.

The complex is currently used for both arts and related/unrelated commercial purposes. Artist studios account for 19% of the occupied space within the complex, while the bulk of the revenue is derived from the large commercial tenants, many of which occupy entire floors or buildings. Of the available spaces, management maintains 100% occupancy. There are portions of the complex that are not available for lease. There is an onsite management office, and the building is operated in a manner that is inviting both to individual artists and arts organizations.

The following chart provides a breakdown of the buildings' dimensions, square footage, construction and general notes.

*square footage and dimensions are approximate (materials provided by management are inconsistent)
 * Total property square footage is approx. 780,000sf

Bldg.	Per Floor Sq.Ft.	Total Sq. Ft.	Dimensions	Floors	Year Built	Construction Type	Flooring	Notes	
*1A	22,390	89,560	118'x190'	4	1917		concrete	Angular; see site plan detail	
*1	29,800	119,200	299'x97'	4	1917		concrete		
*2	13,318	79,908	132'x 100'	6	1917		concrete	Existing water towers	
3	22,420	44,840	362.7'x73.4	2	1920s		concrete	Not heated/ storage only	
3A	1,500	3,000	73.4'x15'	2	1920s		concrete	Small annex/Not heated	
4	10,586	21,172	154'x70'	2	1920s		concrete	Not heated	
5	6,240	18,720	50'x130.4'	3	1940s	masonry	wood		
6	6,240	18,720	50'x130.4	3	1940s	masonry	wood		
7	5,000	5,000	50'x100'	1			concrete	Corrugated Shed	
8	7,700	7,700	73'x90'	1	1920's		concrete	adjacent to building #2	
9/9A	15,576	62,304	118'x130'	4	1940's		wood		
10	34,020	68,040	160'x216'	2	1940's	concrete block	concrete	Angular; see site plan detail	
Shop	2,240	2,240		1				Mech./adjacent to bldg #2	
Garage	3,000	3,000	52'x57'	1				Maintenance Garage	
Bsmnt	35,200	35,300						located beneath bldg 1	
		578,704							
* original buildings									

The buildings' leasable spaces are currently 100% occupied. Single, large commercial tenants comprise a majority of the spaces. A summary of single tenant occupied and non-leasable space follows:

Building 2	5 th and 6 th floors are reserved for single tenant use due to accessibility 1 st –3 rd floors are leased by single tenants each
Building 3, 8	Storage only, not heated
Building 4	Non-leasable
Buildings 5, 6, 9	Single tenants on the 1 st and 2 nd floors
Building 10	Single Tenant
Basement	Non secure leasable storage space
Garage/shed	Management/maintenance use only

CONDITIONS

In general, the Northrup is exceptionally well cared for and kept up both mechanically and structurally. It is a very solid complex. Because of its sprawling nature, however, various portions of the complex differ from one another with regard to capital improvement schedules and mechanical systems.

The exterior of the building shows itself in good condition, including foundation, exterior walls, walkways, windows and entrances. The brick and detail are not in noticeable need of repair or improvement. The loading dock area is usable and without signs of structural decline. The parking area is asphalt that is breaking up and would benefit from repair.

The complex roofing is in various states of its useful life. There are new roof sections that were replaced between 2 and 5 years ago. There are also sections that are in need of repair. These areas are primarily roofs of buildings that are either vacant or used for storage only. Because of the intense summer heat and extreme winters, the roof material undergoes a lot of stress. A heat reflecting system has been recommended but not yet incorporated in all areas.

Interior leasable spaces and common areas appear in excellent condition. This includes both wood and concrete flooring as well as masonry and drywall.

Fire and safety systems are operational. Fire separation systems between buildings are not tied to the alarm, but closures are heat activated. There is an active dry sprinkler system that is powered by a single 17 valve electric compressor. Concrete emergency exit stairways are located within the complex.

The electric systems appear well maintained. There are three electrical services for the entire complex. They are located in the following areas: basement, building #5 and the 4th floor (buildings 1A, 1 and 2). The fourth floor electric service was updated in 1998. The service for buildings 5, 6, 9 and 9A, have been updated between 1980 and the present. The basement service feeds the basement and the 2nd floors. The back building (#10) runs off of the original transformer located in the electrical vault.

The complex has two steam boilers. The first, larger boiler is natural gas run and provides heat for all the buildings (with the exception of #3 and #4 which are not heated). The second boiler has a 25,000 oil tank and is reserved for back up uses only. The boiler system was recently re-worked. The system had been high pressure steam and is now low pressure steam. New controls, modules, cut-offs, and pumps have been incorporated. There is also an auto chemical feeder. Separate gas heaters are used for the back building (#10). Old steam lines do exist in this location, but separation was recommended. Management communicates that the heat system works well and keeps the building very warm in the winter. A visual inspection supports that the system is in good condition and well maintained.

There are no notable environmental concerns. The basement does contain non-friable asbestos pipe wrapping, which appears well maintained.

There are 10 freight elevators that serve the complex, nine of which are operational. They are located in the following buildings:

- #1
- #1A
- #2
- #3
- #10

The following chart provides information on the roof and replacement history

Building	Roof Type	Age	Issues/Notes
1A, 1, 2	Built up, membrane	4-5yrs old	Needs heat reflection system; newest section
3, 3A	Tin		
4	Membrane		Needs replacement, space vacant
5, 6, 9	Membrane, rock	2-3yrs old	
7	N/A		Metal Shed
10	Membrane		Needs repair, leaking

The following chart details the heat system distribution

Building	Heat
1, 1A, 2	Yes – main boiler system
3	No
4	No
7	No
5-9	Yes – main boiler system
10	Yes - Separate gas heat system

ASSESSMENT

Site Suitability for Ongoing Artist Production Studios

Positive Factors

It has been possible for the arts to find a home at the Northrup. This is due in part to management sensitivity as well as the buildings' attributes of wide corridors, high ceilings, loading dock and freight elevator availability, ample free parking and large windows.

It would appear that management meets its budget needs primarily through leases with large commercial enterprises and does not intend to out price its independent arts tenants, which is an unusual luxury.

Also, because the Northrup is so well maintained, there does not appear to be any issue with regard to basic services, comfort or safety.

Challenges

Visibility and easy public access through the meandering complex may be a negative factor when it comes to artist promotion, sales and interaction with the public.

Based upon the 100% occupancy figures provided by management, there is clearly a great need for space. There are underutilized portions of the complex that if brought up to a leasable state would provide additional opportunities. Although costly to repair/upgrade the roof, heat system and the buckled floor in building #4, the benefits would be great.

The lack of passenger elevators can be challenging for public access and uses.

As a privately owned enterprise the Northrup is under no obligation to maintain an arts friendly leasing policy. Although not of immediate concern, this can present challenges for long-term arts uses.

The Northrup is an extremely large complex. Long-term uses focused primarily and specifically on the arts, would need to incorporate a strong capital improvement plan and reserve plans as well as a conservative business plan to maintain adequate operations and reserves funding.

Site Suitability for Conversion of All or Part of the Facility for Live/Work

Positive Factors

Because the complex is made up of separate buildings, there is great possibility for a portion of the complex to be converted into live/work spaces, while still providing commercial enterprises and studio production to continue. With choice arts-friendly businesses, the quality of life for residents would be positive.

Ample space for parking will meet conservative housing criteria.

The same building attributes that make it a great place for artist studios, also lend themselves to artist housing. This includes ample natural light, concrete/wood flooring, large corridors, high ceilings, solid construction etc.

Because of recent upgrades, some systems and improvements may be re-usable in some capacity.

Challenges

Renovation for housing will require new electrical/mechanical/safety systems that are separate from the rest of the complex. Because the complex essentially operates as one large center now, an assessment would be necessary to understand the best location for the housing portion of the project, and distinct separation key.

The freight elevator shafts will lend themselves well in rehabilitation, but new passenger elevators will be required.

Accessibility and any environmental remediation would need to be addressed.

CONCLUSION

The Northrup-King is a vital operation that is well maintained and cared for. It provides a home that is valued by artists and arts organizations. It is a huge complex that will require capital funds for some necessary improvements and presumably substantial income to keep it operating. Some of the buildings are underutilized due to capital and maintenance issues. These vacant and storage areas however, do not affect the usable areas of the complex in any negative capacity. It is conceivable to add new construction to the six-story building, which adds to future possibilities.

Continued use by studio artists and arts organizations, in a status quo manner is positive. There is room for improvement for long-term uses however, including additional space, access and visibility.

With regard to artist housing development, there are interesting mixed-use scenarios that would be worth exploring. Housing could occur on top floors of existing buildings or be situated on all floors of an entire building(s). A feasibility assessment would provide the best direction for such a development.

ALAMO

Address: 1517/1519 Central Avenue
Owner/Contact: Mike Lent

BASIC INFORMATION

The Alamo is a privately owned building, with a simple original, single story, heavy timber structure that dates back to 1902. The building has been added on to since that time and currently houses the owner's business as well as one or two other industrial/commercial tenants. With the exception of the front first floor and lofted office space build out, the structure is made up of two primary, single-story, open and long warehouse sections. There is one primary entrance on the front façade and two large rolling garage door exits to the grade level loading areas at the back. The property extends past the building at the back and is used primarily for tenant loading/unloading and heavy equipment storage for the owner. This area would be ample for parking or other similar uses.

Building Section A

The first half of the building (owner occupied) is limestone with brick infilled windows where the newer metal building attaches alongside (tenant occupied). This first half of the building is open but divisible by timber beams into three bay sections. The first bay (to the left as you enter; north) measures approximately 22 feet in width. The center section measures approximately 32 feet and the third bay (south) matches the first at 22 feet for a total width of approximately 76 feet across. The length of the building from the garage doors to the offices measures approximately 285 feet.

The ceiling heights also vary slightly with the slope of the roof and range from approximately 16 feet (north bay) to 18 feet (south bay) to 25 feet in the center.

One section of the roof is metal (south bay). The center and north bay roofing is gabled, trussed wood. The floor is concrete slab on grade.

There is some natural light available through sky lights in the metal roof area and windows that run high along the southern side of the first half of the building. The front of the building has glass block sections that provide light to the current office build out.

Because the building has been used primarily for industrial purposes, there currently exists a working heavy industrial lift that is tracked down the center of the first half of the building.

Building Section B

The second section of the building is an open metal shed construction addition. This section is approximately 50 feet in width and 285 feet in length, has a steel truss system roof and slab on grade flooring. Identical to the first half of the building, there is a large garage door leading to the back lot area and the space boasts high ceilings.

CONDITIONS

In general the building is in good condition, both on the interior and exterior. There are no apparent signs of decline or instability. Some of the original load bearing timber structural beams have been reinforced, and appear to be holding up well. The windows that run high along the length of Building A are missing panes of glass and are temporarily shielded with plastic.

There was no access to the roof available, but the owner indicated that the roof is in good condition with upgrades made as necessary.

There is an old boiler room below ground with precarious access at the back of Section A and adjacent to the rolling garage door. Heat is currently supplied through a ceiling heat radiant system in Section A of the building. Section B is heated/cooled by four rooftop units in a gas powered forced air system.

The fire/safety system for both sections of the building is an active dry, sprinkled system that appears in good condition.

Both sections of the building are sodium lit. There is also a new 3-phase electrical panel and new gas piping.

ASSESSMENT

Site Suitability for Ongoing Artist Production Studios

Positive Factors

The industrial nature, amenities and lay out of the building would make it most adequate for industrial type arts uses (sculpture, welding etc), large scale (scenery production) or perhaps (with appropriate build-out) media arts production. These types of uses would benefit from the garage door access, high ceilings, concrete flooring and open, flexible space.

Challenges

The building is currently fully occupied and would not accommodate artist studio leasing very easily. The owner utilizes the entire section A and back lot area. Section B is leased to other tenants, but this section is not securely subdivided from section A.

Any artistic discipline requiring natural light would not be recommended.

Water sources and ventilation systems would need to be addressed for a number of different arts uses.

It is unclear how adequate the heating system and insulation is in the severe winter months.

Currently the building is not highly visible and has an ambiguous primary entrance. Working with the owner to increase visibility would be essential.

Site Suitability for Conversion of all or Part of the Facility for Live/Work**Positive Factors**

Not Applicable

Challenges

Neither the structure, layout, amenities, nor size of the building would appropriately accommodate an artist live/work project.

CONCLUSIONS

The Alamo is a simple, owner occupied, industrial use building. Conceivably there are artist studio and commercial arts uses that could make a home here; however, the uses would be very specific and the space would not accommodate more than a few studios or organizations. Pursuing a lease from the owner may make sense for some individual companies, but generally the owner would retain the best amenities. Investing a lot of time or money in further exploration of the Alamo is not recommended in light of other building stock in the neighborhood.

THORPE BUILDING

Address: 1620 Central Avenue
Owner/Contact: Jon Sanders/Sanders Commercial Real Estate

BASIC INFORMATION

The Thorpe is a sprawling heavy industrial commercial and arts use complex that is comprised of three primary, interconnected building sections totaling approximately 250,000 square feet. Currently about 200,000 square feet of this space is usable and leased. Arts tenants occupy a significant portion of the complex (approximately 100,000 square feet). The remaining 50,000 square feet are comprised of common areas and management facilities.

The two smaller, original structures which sit in a prime frontage location along the highly trafficked Central Avenue, were constructed prior to the 1940s and are two-stories (Building A) and three-stories (Building B) in height respectively. This older section is brick, steel and heavy timber construction. To give a sense of percentage of square footage, the 2nd and 3rd floor areas comprise only approximately 20% of the total complex square footage.

The bulk of the complex (Building C) was constructed in the 1940s as a WWII manufacturing plant and its construction reflects the hard-core industrial use for which it was built. This massive, true warehouse-like, one-story, masonry building, is slab on grade with concrete flooring, and steel/heavy timber construction. The beam pattern varies though out the building, but there is significant free-span space, with some areas boasting 40-50 foot widths. This section of the complex also includes the highest ceilings, which throughout the complex range from 16 to 22 feet.

The individually leased spaces range greatly in their layout and size. This is due in part to the triangular shaped footprint of the complex. Management was not able to provide a breakdown of this information. A majority of arts tenants have congregated in the front building (Building B). These primarily small to mid sized artist studios and organizations have spaces that average 1000 to 4000 square feet. Building A currently houses the management office and is well suited for office spaces.

Parking availability and loading access is excellent. There are five loading docks in the back of the complex. This amenity combined with wide interior hallways provides easy accessibility for many industrial and arts type uses. The parking facility is an unmonitored, wide gravel drive that encircles the complex. In total the grounds can accommodate up to 200 parking spaces.

Currently the complex is accessible to tenants 24 hours a day, but the complex is locked down in the evening hours at which time it is only accessible by key.

Management has promoted a positive mix of commercial and arts uses within the complex. Commercial enterprises include a coffee shop, which is scheduled to open under new ownership within the coming months. Other commercial activities range from storage to various commercial fabrication shops. The complex maintains a high level of occupancy.

CONDITIONS

In general the Thorpe complex is a very solid, well maintained facility. True to the period of its construction and intended use, it is a simple, industrial feeling and looking building devoid of any decorative or frivolous components. However, what it may lack in quaint curb appeal it makes up in its ability to hold up over time. The exterior masonry is tight without any apparent deferred maintenance issues. The foundation, walls, entrances, etc. appear structurally sound and also well maintained. The complex has minimal windows. The windows and skylights that do exist are metal framed with wire in the glass. Some components are operable, but not all.

The complex has five acres of roof area that is in generally good condition. The roofing materials include both rubber membrane and tar and pitch design. The current maintenance strategy has one acre of roof being replaced or repaired every year. Based upon the condition of the roof, it would appear that this is a positive, proactive plan.

The interior of the complex reflects the same solid construction and maintenance program as the exterior. Corridors, ceilings, and walls are all in good condition. The eighteen-inch concrete slab is nearly impenetrable. Although there is no central air conditioning, the complex is massive

enough to keep interior areas from becoming too hot in the warm summer months. Tenants on the perimeter have in many cases installed window units to cool their spaces.

The original industrial design has incorporated floor drains throughout the complex. Although plumbing in individual studios was not evident, it could be surmised that a tenant could tie into the plumbing system if necessary. There are common use restrooms located throughout the complex, all in varying degrees of quality.

The bulk of the complex, being one story, does not require elevator access. Building A (two-stories) has an oversized elevator for passenger use. Building B (three-stories) has a freight elevator only, which is accessible by double doors leading out to an on grade loading area. Although an amenity for the many arts and other tenants that have large items to load in or out, it is inconvenient for the general public that may be visiting. Tenants clearly rely heavily on stairways, making the building inaccessible by current ADA standards. Although the complex is compliant under a grandfathered clause, future rehabilitation plans and tenants seeking greater public interaction or funding, would need to consider this issue.

The electrical service capacity is excellent. This is again an amenity of the building's original heavy industrial uses. The service is in generally good condition with breaker panel upgrades, regular maintenance and exceptionally accessible distribution. Electric is not sub metered, so tenants pay a share of operating to cover the cost of usage.

The steam boiler heating system has been refurbished and is in good condition. The complex originally had five boilers. Three of them have been decommissioned; the fourth is kept for back up use only. The fifth has been refurbished with all new controls.

The complex is fully sprinkled with a part wet and part dry system. There are nine zones in the system. This is an excellent safeguard in the event of an emergency and provides the additional benefit of not sacrificing security during scheduled maintenance. Corridors are wide and reasonably well lit. Emergency exits are well marked and clearly meet current fire code. It

should be noted that recent fire damage did not a result from a safety system failure. In contrast, the nine-zone system prevented further damage from the suspected acts of arson.

Although environmental hazards are not overwhelming, asbestos tile is evident and asbestos wrapped piping could be better maintained. Ultimately remediation would be recommended.

ASSESSMENT

Site Suitability for Ongoing Artist Production Studios

Positive Factors

Artists have clearly made a home at the Thorpe building, creating a friendly and strong community. An owner that appears sensitive to tenants needs and takes a hands on, proactive approach to management and maintenance adds to this positive environment.

Ample parking along with loading dock accessibility, wide corridors, high ceilings, concrete floors and freight elevator access make the complex very appealing for industrial, messy and large scale type arts uses.

The location of the complex off of Central Avenue, allows visibility and marketing opportunities for artists and arts organizations that rely on public interaction.

The existing coffee shop and potential future additional performing artist space, points toward continued positive growth, synergy and public interaction activities that can be a great benefit to artists and arts organizations.

The electrical system is more than adequate for industrial arts uses.

There is some suitable office space in Building A that would lend itself for arts organization offices or shared office space for artists.

Challenges

Accessibility is an issue in the original, two and three story structures.

Windows are minimal, which restricts the types of artist studio uses. It is unlikely that fine artists requiring natural light would prefer this complex.

The current keyed entry system does not promote after hour studio openings, business hours, workshops or other public events.

Site Suitability for Conversion of all or Part of the Facility for Live/Work

Positive Factors

Not applicable

Challenges

Neither the layout, design nor natural light opportunities lend themselves to a live/work conversion.

CONCLUSIONS

The Thorpe building is a massive, solid complex that works exceptionally well for industrial type artist production studios of varying sizes and needs. Artists that would naturally gravitate to this complex include: welders, sculptors, woodworkers, photographers (using artificial light sources), graphic designers, performing artists, jewelers and other manufacturing disciplines. Although there are some spaces that lend themselves to arts organization needs, these spaces are few by comparison.

The current owner is clearly supportive of the artist community that makes its home here, and is very attentive to the upkeep of the structure and systems within the buildings. The Thorpe building appears to be a positive site for continued arts related uses.

TYLER STREET BUILDING – old Ironworks facility

Address: 1331 Tyler Street NE
Owner: Marvin Greenstein
Contact: Brad

BASIC INFORMATION

The Tyler Street building is a series of attached, turn of the century, two-story buildings of varying depths that together create a long, thin, roughly rectangular footprint. Although constructed as separate buildings originally, the buildings were connected as early as the 1920s when purchased by a single manufacturing company “Johnson Ironworks”. The buildings do not offer a great deal of aesthetic appeal being of a more traditional, simple, industrial warehouse design. The complex is approximately 100,000 square feet in total. Artist studios currently comprise approximately 30% of the leasable square footage and are located primarily on the second floor. Management was not able to provide current individual building or tenant space square footage breakdowns, however it would appear that most artist studios range from 1500 to 2200 square feet. While the first floor is occupied primarily by independent, storefront accessed tenant spaces, the second floor is connected and accessed by a double loaded corridor. This allows for tenant spaces on either side of the corridor to have depths of approximately 30-35 feet. Ceiling heights vary with each building. Some buildings are single, two story free span spaces that reach as high as 30 feet while others are divided into two stories with ceiling heights ranging from approximately 10 to 11 feet. Because access into leased spaces was minimal, it unclear whether most spaces are free spanning or not.

The buildings vary slightly in their construction and include some heavy timber, but are primarily a structural concrete design, with a brick façade. Flooring materials vary accordingly providing either the aesthetic of wood or the durable versatility of concrete. All buildings are slab on grade.

The complex sits on a large site that could provide a tremendous amount of parking spaces. Currently much of this land is leased by two commercial tenants. There is available parking both in marked stalls in the front of the building and in the open, wide gravel drive area adjacent to

the complex. As an amenity to both commercial and arts tenants, there are several loading dock access points in back.

Current non-arts commercial tenants include such light industrial enterprises as a cab company and wrecker service (who also lease exterior areas for their businesses), an antique dealer, and a large-scale sign making company.

Like other complexes of its type, keyed access to the building is available 24 hours a day to tenants, but is locked down to the general public in the evenings.

CONDITIONS

In general the Tyler Street building is in fair to good condition. Although aesthetically it appears a little rough around the edges it is generally well maintained. The brick façade does show signs of needing some tuck-pointing.

There are ample windows running along the east and west sides of the building. This is an amenity to the second floor tenants who can all enjoy natural light due to the lay out of the interior spaces. The windows themselves are metal framed with wire in the glass. They appear in good condition with most being operable.

The roof varies from building to building with an age range from new to ten years old. Roofing materials also vary and include both built up tar and pitch as well as rubber membrane systems. All appear to be in generally good condition.

The interior appears to be in generally good condition as well. The heating system has been upgraded significantly and is in excellent condition. The original boilers have been decommissioned and a new phased hydronic boiler system has been installed. Eight small, efficient and modern boilers provide heat to the entire building.

The building is not centrally cooled. Window air conditioning units could be installed by individual tenants, although none were noted.

There are well maintained, common area restrooms that are in very good condition.

Corridors are adequately wide. There are expanded hallway sections in the artist occupied areas where the artists have hung their works. This adds to the interior appeal and clear sense of community and ownership on the part of the artist tenants.

A single freight elevator provides access to the second floor. Tenants appear to use the stairs for normal activity in and out of the buildings. Although grandfathered in, this is an accessibility concern.

In keeping with the industrial history of the building there is a substantial amount of power available. The system has been upgraded through the years and appears in good condition. Electric is not sub metered.

The buildings are fully sprinkled with a dry, multi zone system. This well maintained system should provide excellent protection in the event of a fire. The emergency exits have adequate signage and clearly meet current fire code regulations.

Like many other structures of its time, asbestos containing tile and pipe wrap insulation are abundantly evident throughout the common areas of the building. Although non-friable, the pipe wrapping is not as aggressively managed as it could be. Ultimately remediation should be pursued.

ASSESSMENT

Site Suitability for Ongoing Artist Production Studios

Positive Factors

The artist community within the building is clearly close knit and thriving. Although the current owner/manager has not necessarily pursued artist tenants for his building, he has been generally supportive.

Although the building may appear a little rougher than some others, it is generally well maintained, has received mechanical system upgrades, and is looked after by a hands-on site manager directly employed by the owner.

Generally high ceilings, freight elevator and loading access, natural light sources, concrete/wood flooring and wide corridors all lend themselves to a number of light industrial and fine arts disciplines.

Challenges

Accessibility is an issue for second floor tenants. This can create roadblocks for non-profit tenants seeking funding or create issues for any tenant with a disability. It can also be a detriment to those who wish invite and interact with the general public.

The owner is not driven by a mission or a goal of providing space to artists. Although having artist tenants has worked out well, it is unclear whether artist studio rentals would continue if a higher and better use for the space were marketable.

Current non-arts commercial uses in the complex, although not a direct hindrance to the artists, do not necessarily add to the long-term sustainability or growth of arts activities.

Site Suitability for Conversion of all or Part of the Facility for Live/Work

Positive Factors

This complex could lend itself well to an artist housing or mixed-use redevelopment. The lay out of the buildings encourages live/work spaces to be placed on either side of the double loaded corridor. This would provide good sized, flexible spaces with natural light sources.

The complex is well situated between an adjacent residential neighborhood and its accompanying amenities, and the buildings' own light industrial neighborhood. This could make it appealing to artist residents as well as the neighboring community who may view it as a softer transition into the commercial landscape.

The site sits on a vast piece of property that would be large enough to provide both ample parking and green space for artists and their families.

Ground floor spaces would lend themselves well to exterior accessible housing units or arts friendly businesses.

Upgraded systems may be re-usable and/or able to be incorporated into the new concept.

Challenges

Exterior and interior environmental hazard testing and clean up (or encapsulation) would be essential.

Current owner plans and obligations are unknown.

Accessibility strategies would need to be explored.

CONCLUSIONS

The Tyler Street building although not overly impressive at first glance has many positive attributes including layout, design, natural light sources, location, ceiling height, mechanical upgrades, earnest management over-site and unencumbered adjacent property. It is not, however, without need of further improvements.

There is a thriving artist community within the complex, but it does not define the building's identity. The complex would likely benefit from an increase in artist and arts friendly occupants if the operating budget could be managed in this scenario.

Continued use by artists for studio production is positive. The complex would also appear to convert well to artist housing or a mixed-use development. Certainly further exploration of this concept is warranted.

NORTHRUP-KING ALAMO THORPE 1331 TYLER

Basic Information

Total SF	780,000	36,000	250,000	100,000
Age	1917-1950	1902-Present	pre 1940-1940s	1900s
Construction Type	masonry; timber; metal shed; structural concrete	heavy timber; metal shed	structural concrete structural steel heavy timber	structural concrete heavy timber
Dimensions	varies by building (10 total)	285'x76' 285'x50'	varies	varies 2nd flr 30'-35' depth
Flooring	concrete; wood	concrete slab on grade	slab on grade concrete	concrete slab on grade concrete and wood
Parking	available, 50+ cars	approx, 10 spots in front; occupied lot in back	available, up to 200 unmarked	ample (marked /unmarked) leased land
Access	24 hours	24 hours	24 hours	24 hours
Commercial Space	100% occupied but leasable	Owner occupied/leasable	Fully occupied/leasable	Fully occupied/leasable

Conditions

Exterior	Excellent	Good	Excellent	Fair
Roof	Excellent to Needs repair	Good	Good	Good
Interior	Good	Good	Good	Good
Elevators	Fair, (9 of 10 operational/freight)	NA	Fair (freight & lg. Pass.)	Fair (one freight)
Electrical Systems	Good	Good	Excellent	Good
Emergency Systems	Good	Good	Excellent	Excellent
Heating	Good	Good	Good	Excellent

Best Art Discipline Use

Industrial	yes	yes	yes	yes
Fine Arts	yes	no	no	yes
Performing/media	yes	yes	yes	no

Existing Artist Studios

	yes	no	yes	yes
--	-----	----	-----	-----

**Assessment
(Rating A to D) A = highest**

Artist Studio	A	D	A	B
Artist Live/Work	B	D	D	A

**Assessment Checklist
Northeast Minneapolis Properties
For Arts-Related Uses**

Building Name: _____
Address: _____
Owner: _____
Contact: _____

Basic Information:

1. Square footage of building:
 2. Building age:
 3. Building construction type and materials:
 4. Dimensions of each floor:
 5. Construction material of floors:
 6. Availability of parking:
 7. Building access (limited or 24-hour in current use)
 8. Retail space (any currently active or potentially available)
-

Conditions:

1. Exterior conditions (general impressions of foundation, walls, entrances, loading areas, windows, drainage, eaves, decorative details, as appropriate)
 2. Roof condition (if easy access is possible)
 3. Interior conditions (general impressions of basement, HVAC, plumbing, walls, structural systems, ceilings, stairs, corridors, as appropriate)
 4. Elevators (number, type, capacity)
 5. Electrical systems (service available to units, type of wiring, general impression of condition)
 6. Emergency systems, including sprinkler system.
-

Assessment:

1. General comments on suitability for ongoing artist production studios:
 2. General comments on suitability for conversion of all or part of the facility for live-work:
 3. Significant problems or challenges for long-term arts-related uses:
 4. Other observations:
-

APPENDIX B
SURVEY RESULTS

ARTISTS: 136 surveys received

	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>TOTAL NUMBER</u>
<u>GENDER</u>		
Female	51%	69
Male	49%	66
<u>ETHNICITY</u>		
Caucasian	75%	83
Other	25%	28
<u>AGE</u>		
Under 30	16%	20
30 to 29	30%	38
40 to 49	31%	40
50 to 59	16%	20
Over 59	8%	10
<u>EDUCATION LEVEL</u>		
Some college	25%	33
Undergraduate	41%	55
Graduate	29%	39
Other	5%	7
<u>DISCIPLINE</u>		
Painting	71%	70
Sculpture	19%	19
Ceramics	10%	10

ARTIST HAS MAINTAINED A STUDIO IN NE MINNEAPOLIS FOR

Fewer than 5 years	54%	70
6-10 years	22%	29
11-20 years	8%	10
More than 20 years	0%	0
No studio in NE	16%	21

ARTIST HAS MAINTAINED CURRENT STUDIO FOR

Fewer than 5 years	74%	91
6-10 years	18%	22
11-20 years	8%	10
More than 20 years	0%	1

ARTIST LIVES IN NE MINNEAPOLIS

No	65%	88
Yes	35%	47

MONTHLY EXPENSES FOR LIVE AND WORK FACILITIES

Under \$300	8
\$301-400	7
\$401-500	10
\$501-600	13
\$601-700	9
\$701-1,000	34
\$1,001-1,500	25
\$1,501-2,000	12
\$2,000-2,500	5
Over \$2500	4

RENT FOR SQUARE FOOT, PER MONTH, FOR STUDIO SPACE

\$.20-.30	6
\$.30-.40	33
\$.40-.50	7
\$.50-.60	9
\$.60-.70	6
\$.70-.80	5
\$.80-.90	2
\$.90-1.00	5
\$1.00 and over	11

<u>RANKED INTEREST IN EACH SERVICE</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Studio space to rent (work use)	72	21	9	2	13
Studio space to own (work use)	35	24	23	10	23
Live/work space to rent	22	19	14	18	37
Live/work space to own	37	23	15	7	32
Long-term (5 years +) studio lease	25	21	21	17	20
Studio space to share with other artists	13	21	32	16	27

WEIGHTED FINDINGS

Studio space to rent (work use)	22%
Live/work space to own	17%
Studio space to own (work use)	17%
Long-term (5 years +) studio lease	15%
Live/work space to rent	14%
Studio space to share with other artists	14%

NEMAA MEMBERSHIP

No	39
Yes	74

HOURS DEVOTED WEEKLY TO ART ACTIVITY

0-10	12
11-20	40
21-30	31
31-40	23
41-50	9
50+	18

SELF-SUPPORT AS ARTIST, FULL-TIME

No	92	72%
Yes	36	28%

WOULD LIKE TO SUPPORT FULL TIME AS ARTIST

No	6	8%
Yes	62	91%

ANNUAL INCOME

Under \$15,000	25
\$15,001-25,000	26
\$25,001-30,000	18
\$30,001-40,000	29
\$40,001-50,000	11
\$50,001-60,000	7
Over \$60,000	10

PORTION OF ANNUAL INCOME DERIVED FROM ART-MAKING

0-25%	77	61%
26-50%	16	
51-75%	8	
76-100%	26	

COMMERCIAL REPRESENTATION

No	96
Yes	35

SURVEY RESULTS

BUSINESSES: 83 surveys received

	<u>PERCENT</u>	<u>TOTAL NUMBER</u>
<u>DISPLAY ART</u>		
Yes	61%	51
No	39%	32

<u>PARTICIPATE IN ART-A-WHIRL</u>		
Yes	59%	47
No	41%	33

<u>EFFECT OF ART-A-WHIRL ON SALES</u>		
None	72%	54
10% increase	8%	6
20% increase	11%	8
30-40% increase	5%	4
50% and more increase	4%	3

MOST IMPORTANT ELEMENTS OF AN ARTS DISTRICT

Artists' Live/Work Space	15%
Support for Artists	11%
Exhibition spaces	10%
Arts festivals and fairs	10%
Historic preservation	9%
More events like Art-A-Whirl	9%
Arts education programs	8%
Pedestrian amenities	6%
Signage	6%
Public art	5%
Performing arts venues	5%
Performing arts programs	4%
Literary events	2%

BELIEVE NE MINNEAPOLIS DISPLAYS ATTRIBUTES OF ARTS DISTRICT

Yes	88%	68
No	12%	9

SURVEY RESULTS

INDIVIDUALS: 224 surveys received

PERCENT TOTAL NUMBER

GENDER

Female	60%	133
Male	40%	90

ETHNICITY

Caucasian	75%	83
Other	25%	28

AGE

Under 30	17%	35
30 to 29	34%	70
40 to 49	28%	58
50 to 59	14%	30
Over 59	7%	14

ATTENDED THE ART-A-WHIRL EVENT

Once	23%	49
Twice	27%	56
Three or more times	47%	100
Never	3%	7

WHAT IS THE MOST EVER SPENT ON A PIECE OF ART AT GALLERY TOUR

Less than \$100	27%	59
\$100-\$399	18%	39
\$400-\$799	4%	9
\$800-\$1,499	2%	4
\$1,500-\$3,999	0%	1
Over \$4,000	1%	2
None	48%	104

RANKED INTEREST IN EACH SERVICE **1** **2** **3** **4** **5**

Artists' Live/Work Space	65	35	19	14	12
Arts Education	8	14	15	20	16
Arts Festivals and Fairs	19	19	22	20	22
Exhibition Space	30	29	18	8	25
Historic Preservation	5	12	19	14	17
Literary Events	2	1	5	2	3
More Events Like Art-A-Whirl	17	20	15	24	20
More pedestrian amenities	4	8	9	7	7
Performing arts programs		9	11	11	10
Performing arts venues	9	10	12	7	10

Public Art	13	10	12	22	24
Signage			5	5	3
Support for Artists	27	25	25	25	7

WEIGHTED FINDINGS

Artists' Live/Work Space	20%
Support for Artists	13%
Exhibition Space	13%
Arts Festivals and Fairs	10%
More Events Like Art-A-Whirl	10%
Public Art	7%
Arts Education	7%
Historic Preservation	6%
Performing arts venues	5%
Performing arts programs	4%
More pedestrian amenities	4%
Literary Events	1%
Signage	0%

APPENDIX C
SAMPLE SURVEY

ARTISTS' SURVEY

**Conducted by Northeast Minneapolis Arts Association and
Jerry Allen and Associates
April – May, 2002**

TO ALL ARTISTS:

The Northeast Minneapolis Arts Association (NEMAA) is working with Jerry Allen and Associates to create a fifteen year Arts Action Plan for NE Minneapolis. Part of that process is an in-depth assessment of local artists' needs, to help create a plan that responds to those needs. Please help us in this process by completing the questions below.

The entire survey should take no more than 15 minutes to complete. Please return it to NEMAA, at the address at the end of the survey, no later than May 31, 2002. If you have any questions, please contact Heidi Andermack at 612-788-1679.

BASIC INFORMATION

1. GENDER: ___ Male ___ Female
2. AGE: ___ years
3. ETHNICITY (Primary): _____
4. HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED:
- Grade School _____
- High School _____
- Some College _____
- Undergraduate Degree _____
- Graduate Degree _____
5. PRIMARY DISCIPLINE:
- Painting _____
- Sculpture _____
- Photography _____
- Print _____
- Installation _____
- Video _____
- Ceramics _____
- Textiles _____
- Performance _____
- Other _____ Please describe: _____

STUDIO SPACE

1. For how many years have you maintained a studio in NE Minneapolis?

- Fewer than 5 _____
- 6-10 years _____
- 11-20 years _____
- More than 20 _____
- Don't have a studio in NE _____

2. How long have you maintained a studio at your current address?

- Fewer than 5 _____
- 6-10 years _____
- 11-20 years _____
- More than 20 _____

3. Do you share your studio with other artists?

- Yes _____
- No _____
- If yes, how many? _____

4. Before you were located in NE Minneapolis, did you have a studio elsewhere?

- Yes _____
- No _____
- If yes, where (city, state, or neighborhood)? _____

5. Do you live in NE Minneapolis?

- Yes _____
- No _____
- If yes:
 - a. for how many years? _____
 - b. do you own your home? _____

6. Does the building in which your studio is located allow live and work space?

- Yes _____
- No _____

7. Do you live at your studio?

Yes _____
 No _____

If no, would you like to have that option at this point in time? _____

8. Do you believe that the building in which your studio is located meets current zoning and building codes?

Yes _____
 No _____

9. Are there any safety features that you would like to incorporate into your building?

Yes _____
 No _____

If yes, what are they? _____

10. How much do you currently expend monthly for both live and work facilities?

Under \$300	_____	\$701-1,000	_____
\$301-400	_____	\$1,001-1,500	_____
\$401-500	_____	\$1,501-2,000	_____
\$501-600	_____	\$2,000-2,500	_____
\$601-700	_____	Over \$2,500	_____

11. What are you currently paying for square foot per month for studio space? (*Calculation: monthly rent divided by square feet = cost per square foot*)

\$.20-.30	_____	\$.70-.80	_____
\$.30-.40	_____	\$.80-.90	_____
\$.40-.50	_____	\$.90-1.00	_____
\$.50-.60	_____	\$1.00 and over	_____
\$.60-.70	_____		

12. How many square feet is your studio space? _____

13. Indicate your interests in having the following services by circling the appropriate number:

1=essential	2=very important	3=somewhat important			
4=not very important	5=irrelevant				
a) Studio space to rent (work use)	1	2	3	4	5
b) Studio space to own (work use)	1	2	3	4	5
c) Live/work space to rent	1	2	3	4	5
d) Live/work space to own	1	2	3	4	5
e) Long-term (5 years +) studio lease	1	2	3	4	5
f) Studio space to share with other artists	1	2	3	4	5

14. Indicate your interest in having the following studio elements by circling the appropriate number:

1=essential	2=very important	3=somewhat important			
4=not very important	5=irrelevant				
a) Tall ceilings	1	2	3	4	5
b) Cement floor	1	2	3	4	5
c) Wood floor	1	2	3	4	5
d) Natural light	1	2	3	4	5
e) Internet access	1	2	3	4	5
f) Industrial facilities	1	2	3	4	5
g) Street access	1	2	3	4	5
h) Water access	1	2	3	4	5
i) 24 hour access	1	2	3	4	5
j) Ventilation (for fire, toxic fumes)	1	2	3	4	5
k) Privacy	1	2	3	4	5
l) Building community	1	2	3	4	5
m) Ability for noise	1	2	3	4	5
n) Ability for quiet	1	2	3	4	5
o) Loading dock	1	2	3	4	5
p) Retail space	1	2	3	4	5

15. Do you have any additional comments and/or concerns about work space and/or live space?

DIALOGUE AND SUPPORT FOR ARTISTS

1. Over the last five years, how many times have you attended group meetings of artists to discuss arts-related issues?

None	_____	5-6	_____
1-2	_____	7-8	_____
3-4	_____	Over 8	_____

What groups/types of meetings did you attend? _____

2. Indicate your interest in the following by circling the appropriate number:

1=essential 2=very important 3=somewhat important
 4=not very important 5=irrelevant

a) Dialogue among artists	1	2	3	4	5
b) Arts-related instruction/training	1	2	3	4	5
c) Additional funding resources	1	2	3	4	5
d) Quality art criticism	1	2	3	4	5
e) Forums and lectures	1	2	3	4	5
f) Relationship with broader community	1	2	3	4	5
g) Professional/business training	1	2	3	4	5
h) Having a fiscal agents for grants	1	2	3	4	5

3. Do you participate in any local activities that are not primarily art or culture oriented?

Yes _____
 No _____
 If yes, what activities? _____

4. Are you a member of NEMAA?

Yes _____
 No _____

If yes, please check off applicable reasons below:

- a) To participate in Art-A-Whirl and Fall Fine Art Show _____
- b) To be network with other artists _____
- c) To receive newsletter _____
- d) To receive e-mail updates _____
- e) To help sustain the arts community in Northeast _____
- f) To improve your career as an artist _____
- g) To receive advice on promotions, business, etc. _____
- h) To be connected with the Northeast community _____
- i) Other: _____

If no, please check off applicable reasons below:

- a) Do not participate in Art-A-Whirl _____
- b) Do not depend on local artist network _____
- c) Not aware of year-round benefits _____
- d) Other: _____

EXHIBITION/EXPOSURE

1. Are you currently represented by a commercial gallery?

Yes _____
 No _____
 If yes, in what city/ies? _____

2. How many times has your work been shown in the past two years?

NE Minneapolis	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more times
Minneapolis/St. Paul	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more times
Nationally	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more times
Internationally	0	1	2	3	4	5 or more times

3. Indicate your interests in having the following services by circling the appropriate number:

1=essential	2=very important	3=somewhat important			
4=not very important	5=irrelevant				
a) Opportunities to exhibit/present work	1	2	3	4	5
b) Media coverage	1	2	3	4	5
c) Representation through a gallery	1	2	3	4	5
d) Representation through an agent	1	2	3	4	5
e) Opportunities to teach	1	2	3	4	5

4. How many hours per week do you devote to your art-making activities?

0-10 ___ 11-20 ___ 21-30 ___ 31-40 ___ 41-50 ___ 50+ ___

5. Have you ever received an art-related fellowship, award, or grant (e.g., NEA, Guggenheim, etc.)?

Yes _____
 No _____

6. How many grants do you apply for annually, on average?

0 ___ 1-5 ___ 6-10 ___ Over 10 ___

7. What additional facilities are most needed in NE Minneapolis? (please choose up to three [3])

- Non-profit exhibition/performance space _____
- Co-op exhibition/performance space _____
- Commercial galleries _____
- Neighborhood/school galleries _____
- Artists' "service center" _____
- Galleries in centrally located businesses _____
- Art retail stores _____
- Artist gathering place _____

8. Do you support yourself as a full-time artist?

- Yes _____
- No _____

If no:

- a. Do you have an alternate job? _____
- b. Would you rather devote your time to art? _____

9. What is your annual income?

- Under \$15,000 _____
- \$15,001-25,000 _____
- \$25,001-30,000 _____
- \$30,001-40,000 _____
- \$40,001-50,000 _____
- \$50,001-60,000 _____
- Over \$60,000 _____

10. What portion of you annual income is derived from your art-making?

- 0-25% _____
- 26-50% _____
- 51-75% _____
- 76-100% _____

If there is an individual – artist or other profession – that you feel the consultants should meet with in creating the NE Minneapolis Arts Action Plan, please list name(s) here:

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS SURVEY!

Please return to:

**NEMAA
NE Minneapolis Arts Association
2205 California St. NE, Suite 108
Minneapolis, MN 55418**

You may also fax it to NEMAA, at 612-788-1668.

APPENDIX D

NATIONAL CULTURAL DISTRICT COMPARISON STUDY

Tucson Arts District - Tucson, AZ

Population

486,000

District size

4 square miles

Established

1989

Governing body

Non-profit Tucson Arts District Partnership

Initiated by

Grass-roots response to the threat of demolition of a landmark building, by a coalition of artists, community activists, and civic leaders

Official programs

ArtWalk (every Thursday October - May); Art Market (5 times annually); Studio Tour (twice annually); Downtown Saturday Night; Historical Walking tours; Phantom Gallery; Support to other groups' Downtown events; Master permitting for city sites downtown

Facilities

Tucson Museum of Art, Temple of Music and Art, Leo Righ Hall, Tucson Convention Center Exhibition Hall, etc. Partnership owns old dental hinge factory (former owner donated \$300K of the value of the building, \$200K financed through city and county industrial loans)

Budget

\$350,000 annually

Staff

2 full-time and 4 part-time

Financed by

City Transient Occupancy Tax revenues

Special zoning

None

Studio tour fees

\$25/Art Market and Studio Tour
\$0 for ArtWalk or Phantom Gallery

Pittsburgh Cultural District - Pittsburgh, PA

Population

335,000

District size

14-square blocks

Established

1989

Governing body

Pittsburgh Cultural Trust

Initiated by

Revitalization of City's red-light district. "The plan [for a cultural district] was built on the foundation of the District's major performance facilities - - and key projects already underway at the time, including the streetscape improvements, Byham Theater renovations, conceptual design of the O'Reilly Theater and restorations to buildings in the historic section of the Cultural District."

Facilities

Heinz Hall, Benedum Center for the Performing Arts, Byham Theater

Special zoning

Use night lighting to promote safety

WALDO (changing to Powerhouse District) - Jersey City, NJ

Population

228,537

District size

8 blocks - growing to 12

Established

1995

Governing body

WALDO

Initiated by

Individual artists who championed the city to denote 8 block area as Work And Live District Overlay (WALDO) for Artists.

Budget

None

Staff

None

Financed by

None yet

Special zoning

Work and Live District Overlay: in addition to previous zoning, only artists may live in the District. Retail allowed, but 1/3 has to be art-related. Problem: economic expectation was so high that no-one was willing to buy buildings and develop them

Studio tour fees

N/A

Arts and Entertainment District - Providence, RI

Population

173, 618

District size

12 square blocks

Established

1996

Governing body

Arts and Entertainment District Commission; AS220

Initiated by

Revitalization: downtown was identified as economic development zone, and "Providence is the first American city to use fiscal incentives to lure artists to its downtown area." (Art and Antiquities magazine)

Official programs

Tax abatement: writers, composers and artists living in the District do not pay state income tax. Art sold within the district is not subject to sales tax (passed by State). Building owners get tax breaks when rehab commercial buildings into residential (passed by City)

Commission places artists, works with building owners, encourages private sector investment, etc.

Facilities

Trinity Repertory Company, NewGate Theater, CenterCity Artisans, Providence Black Repertory Company, Providence Performing Arts Center, AS220, Groundwerx Dance Company and Perishable Theatre

Special zoning

Economic Development Zone: downcity district, 10 block area - residences allowed, tax free, historic structures exempt from parking requirements, up to 90% tax abatement for owner when building rehabbed for residential

Voted "best place to be an artist" by SWING magazine, July/August 1997

APPENDIX E

REFERENCE MATERIALS

ARTICLES

Richard H. Bradley, "Vive La Renaissance!" *Urban Land* (September 1999).

Andrei Codrescu, "Art: the vanguard of real estate," *Architecture* (1999).

Paula Deitz, "Buttressing and Old City with New Artistic Girders" *The New York Times* (7 April 2000).

Bonnie Fournier, "Home is where the art is," *Planning* (August 1993).

Joyce Goodrich, "Grain Belt Redevelopment Area Project takes shape," *Minnesota Real Estate Journal* (April 1 2002).

Lawrence O. Houston, Jr., "The Attraction of Art," *Urban Land* (October 2000).

William H. Hudnut III, "Art Scape," *Urban Land* (February 2001).

Robert McNulty, *Culture Can Build Community!* (Partners for Livable Communities).

Julie Pratt McQuiston, "Urban Hipsters: The Making of an Arts District in Indianapolis," *Dialogue* (March/April 2002).

Joseph R. Molinaro, "Live-Work Unites: A New Way to Live? A New Way to Build?" *Land Development* (Winter 1997).

David Peterson, "How Will We Grow – and Where?," *Star Tribune* (May 16 2002).

Garneth O. Peterson and Carole Zellie, *Northeast Minneapolis Historic Context Study* (1998).

Margaret Regan, "The Arts Give New Life to Tucson's Warehouse District," *New Village* (1999).

Judith Rubin, "Arts as Economic Catalyst," *Urban Land* (February 2001).

Joel Sanders, "Artists' live/work housing," *Progressive Architecture* (January 1994).

Gil Schamess, "Lofty Plans for Artists" *Planning* (August 1996).

Nina Shapiro, "Saving Spaces," *Seattle Weekly* (January 18-24 2001).

John Tierney, "Gentrification: Bad Name, Good Trend," *New York Times* (March 26 2002).

John Villani, "Money for the Arts," *Urban Land* (March 2000).

Jay Walljasper, "America's Ten Most Enlightened Cities." *Utne Reader* (May/June 1997).

"Advance for the Arts," *The Providence Journal-Bulletin* (30 August 1996).

"Arts Districts and more Government Spending are What's Hot for 2001," *Downtown Idea Exchange* (January 1 2001).

"City Living," *Starchamber* (August 16 1999).

"Double Exposure," *ArtNews* (February 2002).

"Is the New Economy Squeezing the Life Out of San Francisco?" *Metropolis Magazine* (March 2001).

"Mysteries of Urban Momentum Feature: Minneapolis," *Governing Magazine* (April 2002).

"Pittsburgh – Artists' Utopia," *San Francisco Chronicle* (February 23 2002).

"Smart Growth," *In Studio* (Toronto Artscape, Spring/Summer 2001).

"Redevelopment effort really booming," *Reno Gazette Journal*.

"'When Gentrification Turns Vicious and Excessive...' Jane Jacobs Reflects" *In Studio* (Fall/Winter 2000).

REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS

"Cultural Districts: The Arts as a Strategy for Revitalizing Our Cities" (Americans for the Arts) 1998.

ArtStead: Artists for Ownership.

"Report and Recommendations to the Northeast Community," *Central Avenue Community Development Implementation Ad-Hoc Committee* (June 12 2001).

"Design Recommendations: Central Avenue Mainstreet Program Business Guide," *Central Avenue Mainstreet Program* (2001).

"Making Central Avenue Great: Northeast Minneapolis Central Avenue Plan." (September 1997).

"Opportunities for Creativity: The East Hennepin Charette," City of Minneapolis Planning Department.

“Strengthening Community and Economic Development in Minneapolis,” City of Minneapolis (February 21 2002).

“Community and Economic Development Internet Survey Results,” City of Minneapolis (April 24 2002).

“Information on Artists – Study 2,” Columbia University (1998).

Catherine Geisen-Kisch, “Feasibility Study for an Art Supply Store Along Central Avenue: Is there a budding artist community in Northeast Minneapolis?” (December 7 1998)

“The Arts Economy in 20 Cities: Where Does Atlanta Stand?,” Research Atlanta, Inc. and the Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University.

“Guidelines for the Rehabilitation of Existing Buildings,” *International Conference of Building Officials* (2001).

Cheryl Kartes, Creating Space: A Guide to Real Estate Development for Artists (1993).

“Northeast Minneapolis Historic Context Study,” *Landscape Research* (1998).

“The Ten Truths of Live/Work Planning Policy,” *The Live/Work Institute*.

“State of the Arts: Facts, Figures, Stats and Stories about Arts in Minnesota,” *McKnight Foundation*

“Minneapolis Empowerment Zone: A Roadmap for Transforming Communities,” *Minneapolis Empowerment Zone* (1999-2001).

“...Connecting People, Places and Business,” *Minneapolis Empowerment Zone*

“The Minneapolis Plan: A Workbook for Citizen Comment,” *City of Minneapolis* (2000).

“The Minneapolis Plan, Volume 1 – Policy Document,” *City of Minneapolis* (2000).

“City of Minneapolis Office of Cultural Affairs Draft Work Plan,” *City of Minneapolis* (September 18 2001).

“Logan Park Neighborhood Action Plan,” *Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program* (December 18 1998).

“Capital and Endowment Campaigns in Minnesota,” *Minnesota Council on Foundations* (July 2001).

Annual Report, *Minnesota State Arts Board* (2001).

“Exhibit: A Basic Guide to Gallery and Exhibition Spaces in Minnesota,” *Minnesota State Arts Board and Springboard for the Arts*

“Space: A Basic Guide to Performance and Rehearsal Spaces in Minnesota,” *Minnesota State Arts Board and Springboard for the Arts*

“Live/Work Space: Housing for Artists in Your Community,” *Monographs* (National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies, August 1995).

“The Creative Economy Initiative: The Role of the Arts and Culture in New England’s Economic Competitiveness,” *New England Council* (June 2000).

“The Role of the Arts in Economic Development Issue Brief,” *NGA Center for Best Practices* (June 25 2001).

Northeast Arts District White Paper.

“Duluth’s Washington Junior High School Renovated to Serve Artists,” *Preservation Alliance of Minnesota*.

“The Arts in Religious and Theological Studies,” The Religion and Art Program – *United Theological Seminary of the Twin Cities* (2002).

“Avenue of the Arts Report,” *Avenue of the Arts, Inc.*, Philadelphia, PA

“Dallas Arts District Friends Report” (Web Site)

“The Pittsburgh Cultural Trust – Pittsburgh’s Cultural District” (Web Site)

INTERVIEWS

Umberto Crenca, Interview, September, 2002

Jorge Garcia, Interview, May, 2002

Holly Sidford, Interview, June, 2002

Ridge Schuyler, Director, Piedmont Program, August, 2002

APPENDIX F
PLANNING PARTICIPANTS

NEMAA BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Mark Wilde, President

Ingrid Aubol, Secretary

Kyle Fokken, Treasurer

Dave Monson

Sarah Whiting

ARTS ACTION PLAN STAFF

Heidi Andermack, Project Coordinator

TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Andriana Abariotes, Local Initiatives Support Corporation

Mary Altman, Public Art Coordinator, City of Minneapolis

Eric Anderson, Minneapolis Foundation

Jack Becker, Forecast

Joe Biernat, Councilmember, Minneapolis City Council

Jerry Boardman, Minneapolis Community Development Authority

Dave Byfield, Minneapolis Citizens' Environmental Advisory Committee

David Dacquisto, Zoning Department, City of Minneapolis

Bill Dees, Greater Minneapolis Convention and Visitors Association

Pete Driessen, Artist

Walt Dziedzic, Minneapolis Park & Recreation Board

Dave Ericson, David Ericson Design

Kyle Fokken, Artist; Board Member, NEMAA

Catherine Geisen-Kisch, Council President Aide, City of Minneapolis

Kim Havey, Director, Empowerment Zone

Diane Hofstede, Minneapolis Public Library Board

Becky Hunter, Council Ward Three Aide, City of Minneapolis

Charles Huntley, Northeast Bank

John Kremer, California Building Company
Mike Lamb, HGA
Eric Lennartson, RSP
Margaret Lund, ArtStead; North Country Development Foundation
Gail Manning, Inspections/Plan Review Department, City of Minneapolis
Denise Mayotte, McKnight Foundation
Fred Neet, Planning Department, City of Minneapolis
Lonnie Nichols, Planning Department, City of Minneapolis
Louise Olsen, Arts Commission, City of Minneapolis
Paul Ostrow, Council President, Minneapolis Council
Sharon Rodning Bash, Metro Regional Arts Council
Jon Sander, Sander & Co.
Maureen Scallen, Greater Minneapolis Convention & Visitors Association
Charles Schatz, DJR Architects
Sue Sjoselius, Northeast Bank
Dave Sonnenberg, Public Works, City of Minneapolis
Jim Stanton, Shamrock Properties
Mark Stenglein, Hennepin County Commissioner
Erik Takeshita, Mayor's Office, City of Minneapolis
Joan Wells, Springboard for the Arts
Debbie White, Shamrock Properties
Mark Wilde, Board President, NEMAA
Pierre Willette, City of Minneapolis
Jason Wittenberg, Development Services, City of Minneapolis
Jenny Yanke, Empowerment Zone
Jennifer Young, California Building Company

STEERING COMMITTEE

Margo Ashmore, Art-A-Whirl Coordinator, NEMAA
Ingrid Aubol, Artist; Board Member, NEMAA; Co-owner, Art Collective
Beth Baker, Artist; Teacher; Co-owner, Art Collective; Art-A-Whirl Education
Coordinator; ArtStead Founder
Noreen Buhmann, Director, Emma B Howe Northeast YMCA

Julia Burman, Board Member, Northeast Community Development Corporation
Angela Currier, Executive Director, Central Avenue Mainstreet Program
Chank Diesel, Artist; Former NEMAA Board Member
Laura Drabant, Artist; Former NEMAA Board Member
Betsey Giles, Owner, Artamotive Gallery
Brian Gorecki, Artspace
Craig Harris, Executive Director, Ballet of the Dolls
Nick Heille, Northeast Minneapolis Artist Concierge Service
Rosie Heille, Northeast Minneapolis Artist Concierge Service; Former NEMAA Board Member
Perry Ingli, Artist; ArtStead Founder; Former NEMAA Board Member
Ken Jerome Stern, East Side Food Coop
Robert Johnson, Artist; Owner, Neo Neon
Phill Lindsay, Former Minneapolis Arts Commissioner; Arts Consultant
Dave Monson, Artist; Board Member, NEMAA
Lois Porfiri, Northeast Community Library
Tom Rine, Artist; Owner, Island Glass
Chip Schilling, Artist; Owner, Indulgence Press
Stephanie Stebich, Minneapolis Institute of Arts
Laurie Svedberg, Artist; Teacher
Sarah Whiting, Artist; Board Member, NEMAA; Owner, Art Collective

PLANNING PARTICIPANTS

John Adams, University of Minnesota
John Anderson, Anderson Building; Joint Operations, Inc.
Bob Andrews, Andrews, Inc.; Fisk Building
Yuri Argis, Artist
Kerry Ashmore, Northeaster
Nicole Azizi, Crescent Moon
Josh Blanc, Owner, Clay Squared; Former NEMAA Board Member
Paul Boecher, Artist
Bob Booker, Minnesota State Arts Board
Allison Chapman, Minnesota Center for Book Arts

Howard Christopherson, Icebox Gallery
Neil Cuthbert, McKnight Foundation
Julie Dalglish, Bush Foundation
Laura Drabant, Former NEMAA Board; Artist
Chank Diesel, Artist; Former NEMAA Board
Walt Dziedzic, Former City Councilmember; Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board
Farhad Esmaili, Artist
Nancy Fushan, Bush Foundation
Cynthia Gehrig, Jerome Foundation
Catherine Geisen-Kisch, Former Aide to Council President Paul Ostrow
Sue Gens, Minnesota State Arts Board
Marvin Greenstein, Investment Real Estate
Jim Grell, Modern Café
Julie Gubbin, Northeast Community Development Corporation
Suzi Hagen, Northeast business consultant
Nicholas Harper, Artist; Owner, Rogue Buddha Gallery
Larry Homstad, BBD Holdings
Jan Johnson, Art Collective
Robert Johnson, Artist
Jen Kartak, Moonlighting Images
Karen Kelley-Ariwoola, Minneapolis Foundation
Brant Kingman, Artist
Peggy Korsmo-Kennon, Minnesota Center for Book Arts
Timothy Kremer, Owner, Mill City Coffee
Bill Laden, East Side Neighborhood Services
Kelly Lindquist, Art Space
Jimmy Longoria, Artist
Maude Lovell, Northeast Business Association
Chuck Lutz, MCDA
Lynda MacDonald, Office Connection
Layl McDill, Artist
B.M. McMullen, Artist
Dave Mather, Goldenflow

Evan Maurer, Director and President, The Minneapolis Institute of Arts
Stacey Mickelson, Artspace
Clarence Morgan, Artist; Professor, University of Minnesota
Fred Neet, Planning, City of Minneapolis
Chad Neumann, James Page
Mia Nelson, Outhouse Exhibitions
Loni Nichols, Planning, City of Minneapolis
Tom Nordyke, ArtSpace
Marianne Norris, Minneapolis School District; Minneapolis Arts Commission
Paul Ostrow, Council President, Minneapolis City Council
Doug Padilla, Artist; Former NEMAA Board Member
Chris Paddock, Bobino Café and Starlite Lounge
Juris Plesums, Artist
Joyce Pooley, Elim Church
Rip Rapson, McKnight Foundation
Kevin Reich, Holland Neighborhood Association
Rollie Reis, Owner, Goldenflow
Beth Robinson, Owner, Fired Up
Robyne Robinson, Flatland Gallery
RT Rybak, Mayor, City of Minneapolis
Tom Schrunk, Artist
Bob Sorg, Owner, Two 12 Pottery; Board, Sheridan Neighborhood Organization
Georgette Sosin, Owner, Sosin/Sosin Gallery
Henry Sosin, Owner, Sosin/Sosin Gallery
Lorrie Stromme, Aide to Council President Paul Ostrow
Scott Tankenoff, Hillcrest Development
Dean Trisko, Artist; Instructor
Mike Welton, Artist
Karlene Wieland, NEMAA volunteer
Victor Yepez, Artist