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Executive Summary

As many neighborhoods in Minneapolis begin planning or implementing their allotted Phase II funds from the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP), many do so with a weary eye towards the future of neighborhood planning and support. At the time of this report, Phase II remains the final phase for which funds have been allocated for neighborhoods, with the future of NRP uncertain at best. This has caused neighborhood organizations and residents to wonder how they will remain sustainable when NRP support ends, which is expected to occur in 2009. With the possibility that they will receive no further NRP funds, there is pressure on neighborhoods to spend their Phase II funds wisely, while making plans for future sustainability.

In planning for Phase II spending, strategies for housing programs have been particularly important, due to the state mandate which requires that 50% of NRP funds be spent on housing.¹ Because neighborhoods are required to spend half of their funds on programs related to housing, choosing effective and appropriate housing programs is a high priority. With NRP support scheduled to end, it is in a neighborhood’s best interest to implement housing programs that generate program income and bring some of those housing funds back to the neighborhood, so that they can ensure organizational sustainability beyond the end of NRP support.

In addition to program income, there are certainly other things to consider when choosing a housing program. The question of what makes a good housing program is one that remains to be determined for many neighborhoods. This is the question addressed in this report. The objective of this report is to identify best practices for spending Phase II NRP funds in light of shrinking contributions and the potential end of NRP support, and

¹ 2005 Minnesota State Statute 469.205 Subd.3
increasing budgetary challenges, in general, for neighborhood organizations. As summarized below in this report, the recommendations of best practices for spending Phase II housing dollars include the following: focus issues of affordability, offer loan programs that fit the needs of the neighborhood while ensuring that those loan programs also generate program income, and plan for Phase II with an eye towards strategic future partnerships that could eventually replace the support of NRP.

**Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program**

In 1990, the Minneapolis City Council approved the creation of the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP). The City Council’s approval of NRP came after more than two years of planning in response to complaints by community activists that many neighborhoods were struggling to obtain any substantial funding for community development and revitalization projects. The plan approved by the City Council allocated $20 million per year for the next 20 years.\(^2\) As this funding level was not considered nearly enough to complete the type of neighborhood revitalization that the city hoped for, the funding offered to neighborhoods was considered “seed money” that would help neighborhoods to leverage other funds, in the hopes of securing long-lasting sustainability.\(^3\) The funding was designed to be allocated in two phases, which consisted of two ten-year periods.

Prior to the implementation of Phase I, initial funds offered to neighborhoods for preliminary planning was based on three neighborhood categories designated by NRP staff. These designations included protection, revitalization, and redirection. Protection

---


neighborhoods were considered stable neighborhoods with good housing stock, mostly located along the city’s parks or on the outer edges of the city. Revitalization neighborhoods consisted of those with declining housing stock, often located near industrial areas. Neighborhoods designated as redirection neighborhoods were experiencing a more serious decline in the value of housing stock and had greater social service needs. In addition to helping to identify different neighborhoods’ needs, the designations were also used in allocating funds for neighborhoods, with revitalization and redirection neighborhoods receiving more funding.

Housing is clearly a priority for NRP. While the amount of funding spent on housing varied by the neighborhood and its designation as protection, revitalization, or redirection, NRP directed a majority of its funds to housing-related strategies. In its progress report detailing its work in the years of 1990-2000, 46% of NRP funds was allocated for housing, the largest amount allocated to a single priority. With housing remaining a priority for both NRP and many neighborhoods in Phase II, it is in a neighborhood’s best interest to carefully examine their options for spending Phase II housing dollars to maximize their investment. Furthermore, the large cuts made in available Phase II funding for neighborhoods puts greater pressure on neighborhoods to spend their funds wisely.

6 In Phase I spending, Revitalization neighborhoods received more total funding, although Redirection neighborhoods received more funding per household.
8 In 2001, the Minnesota Legislature implemented changes to the tax system that severely affected tax-increment financing in Minneapolis, the main source of funding for NRP.
Corcoran Neighborhood

Although this report is intended to have usefulness to many neighborhoods, its focus is on the housing stock found in the Corcoran neighborhood. Corcoran, located in south Minneapolis, is bounded by east Lake Street to the north, east 36th Street to the south, Cedar Avenue to the west, and Hiawatha avenue to the east. The neighborhood is located adjacent to the Hiawatha light-rail line, which has increased neighborhood residents’ access to downtown and spurred recent development along the Hiawatha corridor.

According to the city of Minneapolis, Corcoran was comprised of 4,228 residents in the 2000 Census.\textsuperscript{9} The median household income in the neighborhood for the year 2000 was $33,393, placing Corcoran slightly below the city-wide median of $37,974.\textsuperscript{10} In 2000, 60% of housing units in Corcoran were owner-occupied, higher than the city-wide rate of 46%.\textsuperscript{11} The neighborhood’s 2000 median home value stood at $83,800, approximately $29,700 less than the median home value city-wide.

In its Phase I plans, Corcoran spent 58% of its NRP funds on housing related programs.\textsuperscript{12} These programs included home improvement loans, grants for emergency home repairs, homebuyer assistance, and rental conversion programs. Nearly 50% of the funds allocated for housing programs were spent on home improvement loans and grants. The neighborhood generated program income largely through its revolving loan program, and as of June 30, 2006, Corcoran had generated program income of $426,718. Not

\textsuperscript{10} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{12} Ibid.
surprisingly, the bulk of this program income was generated through principal and interest repayments of revolving loans from 1997-2001. The program income generated by repayment of the revolving homeowner loans allowed Corcoran to offer other programs to residents, such as homeowner and rental grants.

Phase II Planning

While some neighborhoods clearly spent their Phase I housing funds well and used it to make significant improvements to their housing stock, it is not realistic for most neighborhoods to implement those same programs and simply try to repeat the successes of Phase I. Due to limited funding being provided for Phase II, neighborhoods have much less funding to allocate in their Phase II planning. This is requiring neighborhoods to more carefully plan for Phase II, to use their available NRP money to leverage other funds. As a result, neighborhoods are seeking advice on which housing programs help to maximize their housing dollars, as well as leverage other funds and increase the value of neighborhood housing stock. Looking at ways to accomplish these goals will be discussed further in the results of this study.

Methodology

The objective of this report uses the term “best practices,” which is used in this context by focusing on specific criteria. Best practices for spending housing funds are considered in this case by housing stock improvements attributable to neighborhood housing investments as measured by two criteria. The first criterion is housing programs available for use by neighborhood residents. The housing programs will be considered in terms of how well they generate program income, if they are funded using any non-NRP

---

13 The Corcoran neighborhood, for example, is receiving 85% less funding for Phase I than it received in Phase I.
funding streams, and if they contain any sort of revolving aspect that returns program income back into the housing program. The second criterion that will be examined here is whether the housing program includes investments in other housing-related inputs, such as paid staff whose work plan includes goals concerned with housing revitalization.

To evaluate housing programs quantitatively, data was collected from two housing vendors, the Center for Energy and Environment (CEE) and the Greater Minneapolis Housing Corporation (GMHC). CEE and GHMC provided information about the different loan programs that they have administered on behalf of Minneapolis neighborhoods. They provided information regarding program income generated by neighborhoods through their different loan programs, to assist in evaluating the financial viability of the different loan programs. This data will be discussed further in the analysis of the results of this study.

While examining program income data from different neighborhoods is a rather simple analytical process, it is more difficult to measure the second criterion of different housing inputs that neighborhoods have invested in their housing programs. It seemed useful to gain further insight not only about different housing strategies neighborhoods have used, but also to learn more about what neighborhoods are willing to try in order to remain sustainable, and what methods have been tried or not tried. I also wanted to learn what programs are viewed by staff as contributing to neighborhood revitalization and preservation. In order to answer these questions, I administered a survey and completed follow-up interviews with neighborhoods based on their survey responses. I developed and administered a survey tool that was distributed to neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{14} The survey was distributed via email to 68 neighborhoods. The eight neighborhoods not given the survey

\textsuperscript{14} Survey attached as Appendix A.
were excluded for one or more of the following reasons: there was no current contact (staff or volunteer) at the neighborhood, or efforts to obtain a current email address or phone number for a neighborhood contact were unsuccessful.

The responses received from the survey were used to follow up with neighborhood respondents who had described housing programs worthy of further attention. Follow-ups with these respondents were completed in the form of an interview with the participating neighborhood respondent at their neighborhood office. The interviews were intended to compliment the survey, and provide qualitative evidence of the successes of certain housing strategies. A total of 9 face-to-face interviews were conducted with neighborhood organizations, in addition to 2 phone interviews. All of the neighborhood interviews were conducted with neighborhood staff. This was not intentional, but unsurprisingly, neighborhoods with paid staff responded to the survey at much higher rate. These respondents most likely had more time to respond to the survey than a volunteer, and were more likely to be knowledgeable about existing and previous housing programs, as well as the details of the funding history of those programs.

Results

The survey distributed to neighborhoods offered some insight as to their past experience with successful housing programs, as well as their willingness to employ new approaches toward housing strategies.\(^\text{15}\) The survey results seem to show that neighborhoods are willing to find new innovative ways to remain sustainable, but most reported that are not currently undertaking any planning for projects with such an approach. This seems to be mostly due to the fact that 97% of survey respondents reported that their neighborhood is now planning for or implementing Phase II, so the

\(^{15}\) Survey results attached as Appendix B.
thought of having to employ some new strategies for housing programs might seem like a
distant reality for many neighborhoods.

The interviews with neighborhood organizations offered an opportunity to learn in
greater detail what neighborhoods have done for housing programs in the past, as well as
what they are planning for housing in the future. The interviews also helped to reiterate
some of the findings suggested by the survey – that neighborhoods are worried about
their preparedness for the potential end of NRP support, they are mostly just now
beginning to plan for such an event, and they are mostly unsure of how they will fund
neighborhood programming in the future. Additionally, the interviews offered some
insight into previous housing programs that have been successful for neighborhoods.

The interviews also helped confirm some of the findings of the survey, and
allowed neighborhood staff to expand on some of their ideas and concerns about the
future of funding for their housing programs. While ideas and concerns varied according
to the neighborhood’s housing stock, population, and service needs, the interviewees
generally mentioned two main areas of concern regarding strategies for maintaining and
improving their housing stock: maintaining the affordability of neighborhood housing
stock, and reconciling the issue of providing low-interest loans and grants to residents
while also making the terms of those loan and grant programs conducive to generating
program income and extending the life of Phase II NRP money.

In regards to the first area of concern discussed by the interviewees, many worried
that it would become increasingly difficult to entice neighborhood residents to take
advantage of neighborhood loan programs if they felt that they were being priced out of
the neighborhood. One interviewee recalled a study conducted by the Longfellow
Community Council in 2003 that concluded that 75% of Longfellow residents could not afford to buy their home at 2003 market rates. One interviewee reported that “Major remodeling and the basic home improvement loans were the big ones for program income to help people add on to their homes in the hopes that they would stay in the neighborhood. It’s something we’re looking at for Phase II….We’re looking at needs not met by the private market.” This concern regarding affordability was particularly high in neighborhoods with more transient populations that included high proportions of renters. Several interviewees expressed a desire to offer housing programs desirable to both homeowners and rental property owners, in an effort to keep housing affordable for both homeowners and renters. As one interviewee reported, “We’ll continue to do homebuyer assistance, low interest loan programs for rental property owners. If we help them fix their properties, they won’t pass those costs onto their renters and it will help keep rents affordable. The market drives that. It’ll be a mixed strategy.”

In addition to concerns about residents being priced out of the neighborhood, interviewees also expressed concern regarding the tensions between making a housing program attractive to residents while at the same time ensuring that it will generate program income or help to leverage other funds. When speaking about Phase II planning for her neighborhood, one neighborhood staff member said, “Unfortunately, if you look at the demographics of our neighborhood, loan programs don’t work very well. If you take away deferred loans and matching grants, you’re keeping the programs alive but not serving very many people. The strategies [for Phase II] are similar to Phase I, but the money will be divided up differently.” While the majority of the interviewees expressed concern regarding the conflicting goals of providing residents with useful loan programs
and generating program income, few of the interviewees reported having discussions with neighborhood board members about this inherent tension. In fact, 7 of 11 staff interviewed reported that they planned to include in Phase II the same variety of housing programs included in their Phase I plan, except on a smaller scale.

In addition to survey data collection and interviewing, data was also collected from two housing vendors who administer loan programs on behalf of Minneapolis neighborhoods. The Greater Minneapolis Housing Corporation (GHMC) and the Center for Energy and Environment (CEE) provided data on program income generated by various loan programs that they administered on behalf of neighborhoods. I also interviewed one staff member at CEE as well as two staff members at GHMC to seek information from their perspective regarding the housing loans that their organization has administered.

The interviews with GMHC and CEE staff generally confirmed the findings from many of the interviews conducted with neighborhood staff. The housing vendor staff members viewed a plan of providing a mix of housing grants and loans as the most strategic way for making housing programs useful to neighborhood residents while at the same time generating program income. The interviewees also praised neighborhoods for experimenting with innovative housing programs, even when such programs were not deemed successful. But in considering the past experimentation undertaken by different neighborhoods with their housing programs, the interviewees felt that emergency and home improvements grants, along with a revolving loan fund for home improvements, was most likely to accomplish the Phase II housing goals of most neighborhoods.
When asked about how their organizations were preparing for the neighborhoods’ potential end of NRP support, the interviewees expressed concern that both they and the neighborhoods that they work with had not come up with enough satisfactory ways to leverage other funds for housing programs. While discussing the possibility of administering loans for neighborhoods that were working without NRP funding, one interviewee replied, “It could be a struggle.” The interviewees appeared willing and eager to collaborate with the neighborhoods that they work with to think strategically about new ways to leverage other funds from existing NRP funds.

In examining the data on program income accumulated from GHMC, CEE, and NRP, the conclusions of many neighborhood and housing vendor staff can be confirmed. CEE and NRP supplied data that described the program income generated by each neighborhood. The NRP data was separated by strategy, while the CEE data was for the neighborhood as a whole, making it impossible to identify which specific strategy or loan program had generated program income. But in examining the NRP and CEE program data, one can see that the neighborhoods that offered a variety of housing programs, including revolving, low interest, and deferred loans, and grants and matching grants, generated the most program income overall. These neighborhoods with high program income are similar to the Corcoran neighborhood in that they are mostly neighborhoods originally designated by NRP as revitalization neighborhoods, and they have similar median incomes as well as homeowner-to-renter ratios.

The data supplied by GHMC on program income generated by different loans confirms the known fact that revolving loans are most likely to generate substantial program income. For some neighborhoods whose staff members were interviewed or
surveyed for this report, this type of loan is not an option for their planning because the income of neighborhood residents are not likely to be high enough to qualify for the terms of the loan. Corcoran, however, like other neighborhoods, has offered revolving loans for home improvements, with results that have attracted residents to use the loan program, improved neighborhood housing stock, and generated program income. Thus, the program income data supplied by GHMC confirms that revolving loans are likely to generate program income if they are offered in a neighborhood where residents’ income and housing needs are a good fit with the loan terms.

Discussion and Recommendations

The results of this report indicate a rather mixed picture in terms of neighborhood ideas for housing programs. While neighborhoods in Minneapolis are aware of the reality that NRP support may end, few have designed any housing programs to accommodate that fact, in that most neighborhoods have not made attempts to implement housing programs that leverage other funds, generate program income, and keep the neighborhood and its organization sustainable beyond NRP support. The few neighborhoods who have accomplished this have done so either by using other government or community funds that are no longer available, or by seeking out other partnerships. One partnership that a few neighborhoods have successfully created is with a local community land trust, which will be address in the following section. But as a whole, it appears that most neighborhoods, as they enter Phase II planning and implementation are unsure about their future plans for maintaining sustainability.

Despite the concern that is evident about future funding for addressing housing stock, many neighborhoods have successful housing programs from their Phase I
strategies that they hope to replicate in their plans for Phase II. While Phase I plans varied according to the neighborhood’s housing needs, many found success in offering a homebuyer assistance grants to bring homeowners into the neighborhood, emergency grants to help residents stay in the neighborhood, and home improvement revolving loans to improving housing stock while generating program income. Neighborhoods whose housing stock, median income, and homeowner rates were similar to those found in Corcoran experienced the most success in Phase I with this type of mixed strategy, and the majority of these neighborhoods plan to implement similar programs in Phase II. Combining this strategy with an eye towards future funding realities and a commitment towards establishing future partnerships appears to be the best strategy for Corcoran to implement for Phase II. Thus, in planning for Phase II, the best practices for spending housing funds are:

- Offer a combination of grants and loans to satisfy residents’ needs and generate program income
- Pursue potential partnerships with other neighborhoods to increase capacity-building and to help leverage other funds, and to increase cooperation and communication between neighborhoods
- Pursue potential partnerships with community land trusts and other organizations that could help to maintain the condition and affordability of housing stock

Limitations

One limitation of this report was the ability to contact neighborhoods in an effort to obtain information from them regarding their housing programs. This process was made difficult due to summer vacations and other absences by staff, as well as the fact
that many neighborhoods either did not have paid staff or did not have an available staff or volunteer that they considered knowledgeable enough to be surveyed or interviewed regarding housing programs. While the neighborhoods working on interesting or noteworthy housing programs were often the same neighborhoods that were most enthusiastic about this report, this was not always the case. Therefore, some insight on best practices was certainly missed from the neighborhoods whose staff or volunteers were unavailable for consultation.

A second limitation in this report was gaining access to quantitative data that would have further supported some of the conclusions offered here. Further insight could be offered on specific loan programs if I had been able to gain greater access to data on loan programs from different housing vendors. The major challenge of this report as it stands today was making recommendations for loan programs when there was little access to quantitative data on the success of specific programs.

**Recommendations for Further Research**

Upon completion of interviews and data analysis, it seemed worthwhile to look beyond the Phase II process and seek out other potential partners of support in both improving housing stock and addressing the issue of affordability. In light of the fact that NRP support will be ending, it also seemed useful to seek out potential means of support that could, to some extent, replace the support given by NRP.

*Land Trusts*

One possible partnership that had surfaced in an interview with a neighborhood staff member was the City of Lakes Community Land Trust. Two neighborhoods whose
staff members I interviewed had an ongoing relationship with CLCLT, and both interviewees offered positive comments regarding the nature of that partnership.

When I interviewed a staff member at CLCLT, he expressed optimism about the future of partnerships with other neighborhoods in Minneapolis. As NRP funding decreases and neighborhoods look towards other options to help with maintaining housing stock, the CLCLT staff member felt that this would be a time when it would be easier to get neighborhoods excited about the land trust. As he described, a partnership between a land trust and a neighborhood could be very beneficial for the neighborhood’s concerns of housing stock and affordability, as well issues often faced by neighborhoods such as absentee landlords and blighted properties: “The homebuyer initiated program that we do with neighborhoods is a win-win situation – we help homebuyers buy a home they couldn’t otherwise purchase, we help the neighborhood because we mandate owner occupancy and if the homeowner decides to sell.”

In addition to the parts of the land trust process that the staff member describes above, the land trust also provides grants to new land trust homeowners for home improvement projects. Therefore, in addition to contributing to neighborhood housing affordability and steady rates of homeownership, the land trust also assists with home improvements that otherwise may not be completed. Because of the many potential benefits mentioned above, partnering with a community land trust appears worthy of future consideration and discussion.

*Community Benefit Agreements*

During interviews with neighborhood staff, a few interviewees mentioned the emerging use of Community Benefit Agreements (CBA), which some neighborhoods and
communities across the United States have used in an effort to ensure that neighborhoods reap some of the advantages of new for-profit development. For some communities, this has meant the assurance of jobs to local residents, community input on local development projects, and convincing developers to turn commercial projects into mixed use ones, to create more housing. In some projects, including one in Minneapolis, this has occurred by working with a community land trust to designate some units in mixed use projects as affordable, thereby addressing one of the concerns by many neighborhood staff about the affordability of local housing stock.

When asked about Community Benefit Agreements in interviews and in the survey, several neighborhoods expressed skepticism about their usefulness for their neighborhood. Some felt that they did not have enough power or support from the city in development projects to motivate a developer to work on a CBA with the neighborhood. Another neighborhood staff person felt that such interactions between neighborhoods and developers had existed informally for years as neighborhood residents sought to have a voice in local development: “We’ve heard a lot about those [CBA] lately. That’s been a topic for awhile. To our knowledge, this is something being tried out. I think the jury’s still out on whether or not there’s a benefit. The CBA has become a formalized process that has already existed in neighborhoods in a less formal process. I haven’t seen it actually executed.” As CBA’s have just recently been integrated into a small number of development processes in Minneapolis, it is difficult to ascertain how useful they might be in helping to maintain and create affordable housing. While CBA’s are most likely not going to have much of a direct impact on improving existing housing stock, they could be useful to help address the concerns of affordable housing found in many neighborhoods.
Conclusion

The interviews, surveys, and data collected for this report form a picture of opportunities for improving neighborhood stock in Phase II that are not particularly revelatory but perhaps useful in terms of recognizing what has worked well for neighborhoods in the past, and what strategies neighborhoods plan to use in the future with their remaining NRP funds. The information presented here is also useful to remind neighborhoods about potential opportunities for collaboration that might otherwise be left out of the conversation. The best practices offered to the Corcoran neighborhood, therefore, are to offer a mix of loan programs to its residents to accomplish its goals of revitalizing housing stock, generating program income, and increasing the viability of the neighborhood organization. The process of Phase II should be implemented with an eye towards maintaining those goals even if NRP funding is to eventually end. It seems the most effective way to accomplish this is to seek out other potential partners and funding sources that will assist Corcoran in revitalizing its housing stock.
Appendix A – Neighborhood Survey

This is a survey being conducted by Emily Warren, research assistant at the Corcoran Neighborhood Organization, as part of a research project supported by the Center for Urban and Regional Affairs (CURA) at the University of Minnesota. The survey asks about your neighborhood organization’s use of collaborations, funding sources, and community benefits agreements.

Please answer the following questions honestly and to the best of your ability. The instructions for questions are listed in italics.

Collaboration

1. In the last 12 months, has your neighborhood organization collaborated with another neighborhood organization on any programming?

   _____ Yes
   _____ No

   *If no, please skip to question 2.*

1a. How many collaborations has your neighborhood organization participated in?

   _____ 1-2
   _____ 3-4
   _____ More than 4 collaborations

1b. Were any of these collaborations focused specifically on a housing program that was intended to improve or revitalize existing housing stock?

   _____ Yes
   _____ No

   *If no, please skip to question 1d.*

1c. Why did you choose to collaborate on a housing program?

   *(Please describe)*

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________

   ____________________________________________________________
1d. Would you describe your collaboration(s) as successful?

_____ Yes
_____ No

2. Would you consider collaborating with another neighborhood organization on a housing program intended to improve or revitalize existing housing stock if the collaboration brought new funding streams to your organization?

_____ Yes
_____ No

Funding

3. Has your neighborhood organization ever implemented a housing program that was funded entirely from a source OTHER THAN the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP)?

_____ Yes
_____ No

*If no, please skip to question 4.*

3a. What was the source of your other funding?

*(Please describe)*

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

3b. Did any housing program(s) that your neighborhood organization implemented with funding from a source NOT FROM NRP generate any program income?

_____ Yes
_____ No

*If no, please skip to question 4.*
**Community Benefits Agreements**

4. Has your neighborhood organization ever negotiated a CBA (Community Benefits Agreement)?

   _____ Yes
   _____ No

   *If no, please skip to question 5.*

4a. In your opinion, was the main objective(s) of negotiating a CBA to:

   Please check all that apply.

   _____ Ensure community input in a development project.
   _____ Preserve existing affordable housing
   _____ Create new affordable housing
   _____ Ensure the creation of jobs for community residents
   _____ Other (*Please describe*) ________________________________

**NRP Process**

5. At what stage is your neighborhood organization in for planning and spending NRP funds?

   Please check all that apply.

   _____ We are planning for Phase I.
   _____ We are implementing Phase I.
   _____ We have completed Phase I.
   _____ We are planning for Phase II.
   _____ We are implementing Phase II
   _____ We have completed Phase II.
   _____ Other (*Please describe*) ________________________________
If you are willing to be contacted about any questions regarding your survey responses, please include your contact information below.

Name: _________________________________________

Organization: _________________________________

Email: _________________________________________

Phone: _________________________________________

Thank you for completing this survey. Your answers are essential for creating a useful and productive report that will benefit all neighborhood organizations in Minneapolis. Please email your survey to Emily Warren at warre152@umn.edu, or fax it to her attention at 612-721-7588.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| In the last 12 months, has your neighborhood organization collaborated with another neighborhood organization on any programming? | Yes – 23 (72%)  
No – 9 (28%)  
Missing – 0 (0%) |
| How many collaborations has your neighborhood organization participated in? | 1-2 – 12 (38%)  
3-4 – 6 (19%)  
More than 4 – 6 (19%)  
Missing – 8 (25%) |
| Were any of these collaborations focused specifically on a housing program that was intended to improve or revitalize existing housing stock? | Yes – 7 (22%)  
No – 17 (53%)  
Missing – 8 (25%) |
| Would you describe your collaboration as successful?                     | Yes – 23 (72%)  
No – 0  
Missing – 9 (28%) |
| Would you consider collaborating with another neighborhood organization on a housing program intended to improve or revitalize existing housing stock if the collaboration brought new funding streams to your organization? | Yes – 29 (91%)  
No – 1 (3%)  
Missing – 2 (6%) |
| Has your neighborhood organization ever implemented a housing program that was funded entirely from a source OTHER THAN the Neighborhood Revitalization Program (NRP)? | Yes – 4 (13%)  
No – 28 (87%)  
Missing – 0 (0%) |
| What was the source of your other funding?                               | Foundation money – 1 (3%)  
Government money – 1 (3%)  
HOMS Initiative – 1 (3%)  
Missing – 29 (91%) |
### Appendix B Continued – Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did any housing program(s) that your neighborhood organization implemented with funding from a source NOT FROM NRP generate any program income?</td>
<td>Yes – 1 (3%)&lt;br&gt;No – 8 (25%)&lt;br&gt;Missing – 23 (72%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has your neighborhood ever negotiated a CBA?</td>
<td>Yes – 1 (3%)&lt;br&gt;No – 29 (91%)&lt;br&gt;Missing – 2 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At what stage is your neighborhood organization in for planning and spending NRP funds?</td>
<td>Implementing Phase I – 1 (3%)&lt;br&gt;Planning for Phase II – 12 (38%)&lt;br&gt;Implementing Phase II – 19 (59%)&lt;br&gt;Missing – 0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>