

# Report on Community Engagement & University of New Mexico Campus Development

"Community Activism for Sustainable Living"

Funded by Community Groups and Residents  
Summer Semester 2009

Instructor: Andrew Marcum, Ph.D. Candidate

Department of American Studies

University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico

Research Conducted by Class Members:

Judith Binder  
Sean DeBuck  
Liz Diesel

Eugene Lopez  
Rita Mercado  
Jeffrey Waldo

*"...value does not just come from bricks and mortar and the bottom line. Value also comes from community good will, quality of life, a more natural environment with hundreds of trees, and the space to think and breathe and be at peace. Value comes from preserving a small refuge for animals and migratory birds, and it comes from creating alliances, and building relationships, not tearing them down."*

*Dr. Sara Koplik, President  
North Campus Neighborhood Association  
March 12, 2007 letter to the University of New Mexico Board of Regents*

## ***Table of Contents:***

<b>I</b>	<b>Executive Summary: Report on Community Engagement and University of New Mexico Campus Development</b>	3
<b>II</b>	<b>Individual Abstracts Relating to Students' Research, 2009</b>	3-8
<b>III</b>	<b>Student Research</b>	
	Growth and Relationships in UNM Communities and University-Community Partnerships (interviews with neighbors and suggestions for partnerships. Liz Diesel	9 11 20
	Case studies illustrating how other colleges and universities have met the challenges of growth by interacting in a positive manner with the surrounding communities. Students' Research	25
	Smart Growth, Sustainability, Public Accountability and Community Engagement at the University of New Mexico. Rita Mercado	48
	Density, Mass Transit, and Affordable Housing in University Communities. Jeffrey Waldo	52
	Research on the Unique Architectural and Landscape Character and Heritage of the University of New Mexico Eugene Lopez	56
	Yale Park and How it Relates to Today. Sean DeBuck	60
	The History of Efforts to Preserve the North Golf Course and the Barren Fairways. Judith Binder	65
<b>III</b>	<b>Summary Findings and Recommendations on Community Engagement and the Campus Development Advisory Committee, 2009.</b>	69
	<b>Draft Resolution approved for the August 29, 2009 Agenda, Graduate/Professional Student Association Council meeting</b>	74
<b>IV</b>	<b>Web Sites and References</b>	77

# **Executive Summary**

## **Report on Community Engagement & University of New Mexico Campus Development**

In response to the 2008/09 Accreditation Report<sup>1</sup> from the Higher Learning Commission, the “Research Service Learning Class on Community Activism for Sustainable Living,” funded by community groups and residents and taught by American Studies Ph.D. candidate, Andrew Marcum, has produced the following report to be presented at the September 2009 meeting of the University of New Mexico Board of Regents. The Report includes:

- A brief history of UNM's interaction with its neighbors (1987-2009); a series of interviews with neighbors (2009); and suggestions for UNM to work cooperatively with its neighbors.
- Case studies illustrating how other colleges and universities have met the challenges of growth by interacting in a positive manner with the surrounding communities.
- A report on public accountability and community engagement at UNM (2007-2009).
- A report on smart growth and sustainable development.
- A report on the need to preserve the unique aspects of UNM architecture and landscape.
- Lessons learned from developments at Yale Park (1986).
- The history of efforts to preserve the North Golf Course and the Barren Fairways (1942-2009).
- Recommendations for reform of the Campus Development Advisory Committee, including greater participation—with voting privileges—for all neighborhoods affected by campus development.

### **Individual abstracts relating to the students’ Research**

#### ***UNM’s Relationships with Communities and University-Community Partnerships***

Albuquerque and the University of New Mexico have shared histories of growth and the environment in which we live. The expansion of the University into surrounding neighborhoods has not always been welcome. To learn more about how UNM’s growth has impacted surrounding neighborhoods, representatives from adjoining neighborhood associations were interviewed (July 2009). Common themes emerged: First, the takings of “green space” and the negatives of increased traffic. Second, lack of transparency and accessibility of information and lack of respect for neighborhood members' suggestions for future development. Third, need to respect the integrity of historic neighborhoods. The Report concludes with specific suggestions for creating successful University and Community Partnerships.

---

<sup>1</sup> HLC, Assurance p.11; Advance p. 4, <http://www.unm.edu/~accred/SupportingDocuments/>

***Case studies illustrating how other colleges and universities have met the challenges of growth by interacting in a positive manner with the surrounding communities.***

The Master Plan for the **University of Washington** was developed over five years and included the establishment of a City–University Community Advisory Committee. The University’s office of regional affairs outlined a Master Plan that led to a comprehensive analysis as to how the University would involve all people, including local government agencies and residents with a stake in the growth of the campus. Called, “Building a Vision with the Community,”<sup>1</sup> a letter of invitation from the president of the university was sent to nearly 80,000 residents within an 8-mile radius with the date and time for the first public meetings. All parties could ask questions and gain input. Altogether there were 120 presentations, including a campus tour for representatives showing them future expansion sites, open spaces, and how they all worked into the Master Plan. It took five years for the regents to approve the first draft of the Master Plan in 2003, and an overview was published in 2004.

In 2006, **Princeton University** introduced its ten-year plan for expansion. The administration hired a few architects and planners to add almost 2 million square feet by 2016. These designers will develop the campus while acknowledging the need for sustainable development that was defined by Daniel Chiras as “meeting current needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs through efficient use of resources, recycling, restoration, growth management, and other measures.”<sup>2</sup> Hoping to avoid sprawl and expansion while enhancing the nearby communities, The administration decided to increase density, while maintaining sustainability. Along with expansion of its campus, Princeton will revamp the nearby boroughs by planned retail and developing community assets, including an art and transit district that houses the subway to New York City. During the planning process, University officials and architects again emphasized sustainability. Throughout the entire planning process, Princeton University involved the stakeholders: students, staff, faculty, alumni, citizens, businesses, and anyone who might be interested in the proceedings and wellbeing of the campus.

Urban neighborhoods surrounding the **University of Missouri at Kansas City** rose up in conflict when plans were announced to change from a commuter campus to an on-campus community in 1998. The University had wanted to tear down 100 homes to be replaced with recreation fields. Residents had been sent letters requiring them to vacate, but when plans were delayed, UMKC failed to notify residents in a timely manner. The local newspaper, *The Kansas City Star*, wrote negative stories about abuse of power. Before resolution with the communities could be met, the Chancellor resigned and the Vice Chancellor in charge of campus expansion retired abruptly. A year later, the *Star* reported the University would not demolish houses in the neighborhoods. Since the public relations crisis, UMKC has developed an Office of Community and Public Affairs.

In 1997 the **University of North Carolina, Chappel Hill’s** long-range plan for campus development included deans and vice chancellors, a design and operations team, local citizens,

---

<sup>1</sup> University of Washington, *Master Plan Community Involvement Process*. Pg.176. 2003.

<sup>2</sup> Chairas, Daniel D. *Environmental Science*, Louis Bruno, Ed. Johns and Bartlett: Sudsbury, MA, 2006.

faculty, and a steering committee. All stakeholders, a balance of representatives from the University and the community, were involved. Architects and staff addressed the needs for increased facilities, parking, and sustainability. Students were invited to present their own master plan based on housing, parking, transit, and recreational concerns. Students also committed to sustainability issues, voting to increase their fees to help fund the free transit system. Today per capita bus ridership on the free fare Chapel Hill transit system (paid for in part by contributions from the University) is among the highest in the country.<sup>1</sup> The Town Council looked into zoning for campus development as well as storm drainage management. The University decided to focus on new building and growth on the existing campus, adding 5.9 million square feet over the subsequent ten-year period. In March, 2001—after five years of meetings and revisions—the Board of Trustees approved the Campus Master Plan. It was published in March 2002.

In 1996, with Philadelphia experiencing an economic turndown, a tragic death near the campus of the **University of Pennsylvania** caused the University administration to consider hiring a private developer to help re-establish the community. However, they felt developers might not be equipped for the long-term investment required, and developers might inhibit the possibility of having a true sense of communication with the community. The University decided to bear the full burden of responsibility for redevelopment and raising the quality of life for residents surrounding University. The outcome was the “West Philly Initiative,” a unique program that, unlike the approaches taken by many other universities around the country, was not merely another academic program. It was made a top priority by the Administration. The West Philly Initiative encompassed six issues: Economic Inclusion, Education Initiatives, Retail Development, Rental Housing, Homeownership, and Neighborhood Services and went a long way towards improving community relations. One of the outcomes was that the University investment of \$5,000,000 in neighborhood housing and development fund leveraged \$51,000,000 in equity. At the same time the numbers of robberies, assaults, burglary, and auto theft was greatly reduced.

### ***A report on public accountability and community engagement at UNM.***

Officials at the University of New Mexico have repeatedly stressed their commitment to accountability, transparency, and community engagement and have identified their core mission, sustainability policies, and master plans for campus development. However, UNM faces many challenges in meeting these goals. In the Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, and Threats report, the University recognizes the following are impediments to achieving its stated goals:

- Historic perception that decisions are made without input from those whom they will impact – community, faculty, staff, etc.
- Historic distrust of administration by faculty and the community
- Internal strategic communications
- Perceived “us” vs. “them” mentality between administration and faculty

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office of Sustainability, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, *The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 2007 Sustainability Report*, [http://sustainability.unc.edu/Portals/0/Documents/2007%20Sustainability%20Report\\_web.pdf](http://sustainability.unc.edu/Portals/0/Documents/2007%20Sustainability%20Report_web.pdf) (July 2009)

- Lack of school spirit<sup>1</sup>

Despite this acknowledgement, UNM has yet to define a path for community engagement in reaching either its sustainability goals or in its campus development aspirations. For example, The Campus Development Visioning Charrette, a four-day forum convened in November 2007 by President Schmidly to consider campus development, did not include perspectives or input from community leaders or neighborhood residents who clearly have a stake in UNM's growth and expansion.

### ***A report on smart growth and sustainable development.***

The University of New Mexico can pursue several suggestions for environmentally sustainable growth and preserving green space including densification strategies, working with the city and local community to increase and improve mass-transit, and creating more affordable housing for students both on and off campus. Regarding the reduction of car-related green houses gases (GHG), the report notes that continuous communication with the public domain: City of Albuquerque, Mid-Region Council of Governments, New Mexico Department of Transportation, and University students, faculty, and staff, as well as community members is a must. We need more investment in mass transit and open communication among those concerned.”<sup>2</sup>

“The University’s investment in local housing would aid ‘its mission to provide increased economic activity for New Mexicans’<sup>3</sup> as stated in the University Business Policies and Procedures Manual. Affordable housing will increase population and attract new business and industry”<sup>4</sup>

### ***A report on the need to preserve the unique aspects of UNM’s architecture and landscape.***

“The main campus of the University of New Mexico, the most architecturally distinct campus in the United States is a built environment which approaches the ideal of integrity flourishing amid vibrant change,”<sup>5</sup> wrote V.B. Price, author and Adjunct Professor of the Architecture and Planning Department at UNM. “Vibrant change” refers to the modernization occurring in the mid 1980s. UNM’s unique style was made possible by leaders and presidents of the university such as William G. Tight, George Zimmerman, and John Gaw Meem (leading architect for the University between 1933 to 1959, who designed some 40 buildings on the

---

<sup>1</sup> The University of New Mexico, “Institution-wide Environmental Assessment & SWOT Analysis,” The University of New Mexico [http://www.unm.edu/president/documents/Environmental\\_Assessment.pdf](http://www.unm.edu/president/documents/Environmental_Assessment.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> See Waldo, Jeffrey. “Density, Mass Transit, and Affordable Housing in University Communities,” pg. 3.

<sup>3</sup> 2100 Sustainability.” UNM Business Policies and Procedures Manual. University of New Mexico: June 1, 2008. Pg 7. <http://www.unm.edu/~ubppm/> (Cited in Waldo, pg. 4).

<sup>4</sup> “Environmental Scan 2000-2010.” Strategic Planning. University of New Mexico. 2000. Pp. 7 <http://www.unm.edu/~unmstrat/envscan.html> (Cited in Waldo, pg. 4)

<sup>5</sup> Price, V.B. *Albuquerque Tribune*, 3/18/84.

campus that lend to its Southwestern atmosphere).<sup>1</sup> All felt UNM needed to maintain its cultural integrity. The puebloization of Hodgkin Hall in 1908 was the first step made by President Tight to preserve the overall landscape. The University is “gradually shifting away from its community oriented open greenscape ideal into more of a modernized cityscape.” Preservation of green space as well as consideration for the communities surrounding the university needs to be central to the planning process.

### ***Lessons learned from development at Yale Park***

This report chronicles the public relations disaster caused when plans were announced to alter Yale Park (1986). First, plans were to build a parking garage and then later plans changed to build a bookstore. A clear, historical example that a lack of communication with the University community and a willful refusal to work with the City of Albuquerque results in dramatically higher development costs and a substantially diminished quality of life on campus.

### ***The history to preserve the North Golf Course & the Barren Fairways.***

When the University of New Mexico was founded in 1889, land was donated and some was put aside as a landbank for future development. Over time, efforts have been made by nearby residents, many with ties to the University, to be adequately informed of expansion projects contributing to education, recreation, as well as open, green space. Historically, such requests have generally been ignored, obfuscated, and placated with half measures and unfulfilled promises.

### ***Recommendations for reform of the Campus Development Advisory Committee to provide greater participation—including voting privileges—for the neighborhoods affected by developmnt.***

Neighbors are concerned that the only official avenue the University of New Mexico offers for dissemination of information concerning development and for response by the community is the “Campus Development Advisory Committee” (CDAC). Class members began an investigation of whether CDAC performs its duties adequately. After a careful review of the Senate Faculty Handbook pertaining to the CDAC, students posed questions to Committee Chair Alfred Simon in order to better understand the Committee’s specific role in the campus development process and assess how well the committee is positioned as “a forum for the communication and exchange of ideas and proposals regarding development on the campus and its impact on the campus community, the surrounding neighborhoods, and the City of Albuquerque.”<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> *Rocky Mountain Archive*. <http://rmoa.unm.edu/docviewer.php?docId=nmu1pict000-675.xml>

<sup>2</sup> University of New Mexico Faculty Senate Handbook, A61.5  
<http://www.unm.edu/~handbook/A61.5.html>

The students' research revealed that there were many avenues the University could pursue to enhance communication and participation with the surrounding communities by way of the Campus Development Advisory Committee:

- Expand CDAC neighborhood representation to include any and all neighborhoods with a stake in UNM's development.
- Neighborhood representatives should have a vote on those specific development projects that directly impact their neighborhood.
- The CDAC should meet after working hours in a larger, more open, and more accessible location such as UNM's Continuing Education Building.
- The CDAC should create a variety of methods to provide neighborhoods with relevant, timely, and regularly updated information on campus development projects.
- The CDAC should create mechanisms for soliciting and incorporating relevant feedback regarding the ideas and concerns from neighborhoods into the campus development process.
- The CDAC should establish a transparent process for tracking the implementation or rejection of its recommendations through each stage of project development.

# Growth and Relationships in UNM Communities and University-Community Partnerships

Liz Diesel  
Summer Semester, 2009  
Community Activism for Sustainable Living  
Instructor: Ph.D. Candidate, Andrew Marcum

The University of New Mexico (UNM) opened its doors to its first class in 1892. It was established on 20 acres of donated land east of Albuquerque's downtown, and consisted of a lone three-story brick building on a barren mesa. As the University phased out preparatory curriculum and focused on college-level education, campus expansion was necessary and more buildings were constructed.<sup>1</sup>

At the same time, Albuquerque saw rapid growth and development. In the first decade of the 20th century, the city's population nearly doubled to over 11,000, and houses began appearing east of Albuquerque's downtown center.<sup>2</sup>

After the passage of the GI Bill in 1944, Universities around the country saw increased enrollment, and UNM could scarcely keep up with the influx of new students.<sup>3</sup> During UNM President Popejoy's tenure from 1948 through 1968, the University expanded rapidly. The College of Education Complex, Johnson Gym, the Fine Arts Center, and Hokona Hall Dormitory were among the newly constructed buildings. UNM also developed Johnson Gym on the south golf course and built married student housing on the north golf course.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Hooker, Van Dorn, *Only In New Mexico, An Architectural History of the University of New Mexico*, (The University of New Mexico Press, 2000), p. 5 - 12.

<sup>2</sup>Biebel, Charles D., Pahl, Mary Rose Szoka, updated by Taylor, Phyllis. "A Sense of Place, Near Heights," Friends of Albuquerque's Environmental Story, <http://www.cabq.gov/aes/s2nearht.html>, accessed 23 July 2009.

<sup>3</sup>The University of New Mexico Faculty Handbook, Origin of the University, Section A10.

<sup>4</sup>Hooker, *Only in New Mexico*, p. 101 – 120.

The city of Albuquerque was also experiencing swift development due to population growth, especially in the Near Heights neighborhoods surrounding the University. In 1950, the city's population was almost triple the 1940 population and almost half of these new residents lived in newly developed areas near UNM.<sup>1</sup> Kirtland Air Force Base and the surrounding community were growing during this time as well. Kirtland and Sandia Laboratories were important contributors in the national war defense and the area saw developments of new hangars, buildings and a runway.<sup>2</sup> The rapid development of UNM, Technical-Vocational Institute (T-VI) and Presbyterian Hospital, along with the city's reliance on automobile transit changed the face of the Near Heights area. University Avenue and Lomas Boulevard were widened, Interstate 25 was built, and parking lots were constructed near UNM, T-VI and Presbyterian Hospital to accommodate cars. These structures consumed entire blocks of neighborhoods.<sup>3</sup>

Clearly, Albuquerque and UNM have shared histories of growth and have shared the environment in which they developed. The expansion of the University into surrounding neighborhoods has not always been welcome. To learn more about how UNM's growth has impacted surrounding neighborhoods, representatives from adjoining neighborhood associations were interviewed:.

---

<sup>1</sup> Biebel, Pahl, and updated by Taylor, "A Sense of Place, Near Heights."

<sup>2</sup> Collins, Mary Kay and updated by Gritton, Sr. Airman Paul. "A Sense of Place, A Community Called Kirtland," Friends of Albuquerque's Environmental Story, <http://www.cabq.gov/aes/s2krt.html>, accessed 22 July 2009.

<sup>3</sup> Biebel, Pahl, and updated by Taylor, "A Sense of Place, Near Heights."

## **Interview with Isabel Cabrera, Lomas del Cielo/Clayton Heights Neighborhood, 7/24/09**

Isabel Cabrera has lived in the Lomas del Cielo/Clayton Heights Neighborhood for many years. She remembers the area before The Pit, Isotopes Park, and the football stadium drastically changed her neighborhood. Once a quiet, family-oriented neighborhood, the masses of hard-partying sports fans and cars have had significant effects for residents. Ms. Cabrera talked about traffic problems, parking issues, litter, and alcohol consumption resulting from the nearby sports complex.

One of the major problems for the neighborhood is the lack of available parking for sporting events. Ms. Cabrera says the current parking lots hold 4,000 cars, but high attendance games can bring as many as 42,000 people, filling the neighborhood with the parking overflow. The crowds bring with them trash, intoxicated fans, and violations of privacy. Neighbors have seen minors drinking excessively, public urination, and have had people knock on their doors asking to use the bathroom. Some of the neighborhood is blocked off so sports fans are unable to park on residential streets, but Ms. Cabrera believes problems will continue until the entire area is blocked from venue parking. Practice times on the football field are also problematic. Coaches and athletes often practice as early as 5:00 a.m., and the noise of practices make it impossible for some neighbors to sleep. Neighbors recently learned of UNM's plans to close Avenida Cesar Chavez and University for a block party. They also discovered that University officials have been working on a plan to reduce parking egress time from one hour and 45 minutes to just 45 minutes – a plan that will help fans, but send a flood of cars into the neighborhood. Neighbors were surprised that this information came to them through the Albuquerque Police Department and not from UNM. Because of the proximity to sporting venues and related problems, neighbors

have seen their home values drop significantly and even have trouble leasing their houses because of constant noise and traffic.

When asked about her neighborhood's relationship with UNM, Ms. Cabrera described the fierce tactics used by residents to gain the attention, and action, of UNM. After direct appeals to UNM went unheard, the neighbors began a campaign of negative press in an attempt to improve issues in the neighborhood. Photos of minors consuming alcohol in parking lots and articles on television and in newspapers resulted in some tighter control over fan behavior. Ms. Cabrera feels that before these methods were used, UNM seemed dismissive when neighbors addressed their concerns. Neighbors have brought suggestions to improve park and ride service, shuttles, installing a parking structure, and utilizing Rail Runner. They have only seen improvement in shuttle service. UNM has cited funding as an impediment to improving sporting arena parking.

When asked to describe the perfect relationship between the neighborhood and UNM, Ms. Cabrera said she wanted the integrity and leadership of her neighborhood to be respected. She wanted to see her neighbors be invited to planning meetings and have a voice in decisions. She said that she wished UNM would realize that people live in that neighborhood every day and night, regardless of whether there is a game.

### **Interview with Mardon Gardella, Sycamore Neighborhood, July 24, 2009**

Mardon Gardella is the Treasurer for the Sycamore Neighborhood Association and long-time resident of the area. When asked to explain how development of the University of New Mexico (UNM) affected her neighborhood, she began by describing how the Federation of University Neighborhoods was established in 1989. For UNM's centennial celebration, neighborhoods joined together at the lead of Carol Kinney, wife of former mayor Harry Kinney,

to complete a landscaping project from Lomas Blvd. to Central Ave. and University Blvd. to Girard Blvd. After the project was completed, the neighborhoods surrounding UNM formed the Federation in order to organize and communicate about development that was impacting their communities. Neighborhoods were struggling with increased traffic and concerns about the development of the North Golf Course. The Sycamore Neighborhood was also experiencing the effects of a policy change to UNM's master plan from the 1960's. This master plan stipulated that buildings could be no taller than 2.5 to 3 stories, but the Board of Regents have changed the policy in recent years. The architecture building and plans for the new recreation center along Central Avenue are creating a building corridor that impedes the physical interface between the University and its neighbors. Ms. Gardella also spoke of her concerns about parking and the shuttle system. She believes that shuttles aren't as effective as they used to be, and that placing parking structures in existing, tax-funded parking lots around sports venues, rather than around campus, would be a better use of precious on-campus property. She is also concerned that current signage directing I-25 traffic does not function to route drivers out of residential areas by using Central Ave. and Lomas Blvd.

As an active member of the Sycamore Neighborhood Association and the Federation of University Neighborhoods, Ms. Gardella spoke at length about the relationship between UNM and the community. One of the reasons the Federation maintained itself as an organization was because community members felt UNM's communication with neighbors was ambiguous. Often, one neighborhood would be notified of an upcoming project, but other affected neighborhoods wouldn't be informed. The Federation was sustained to compensate for inconsistent communication about development plans. Ms. Gardella is one of four community representatives on the Campus Development Advisory Committee. She expressed her frustration with community members not having voting rights and the difficulty for many

members to attend committee meetings because of the time they are held. Because of these issues, she feels the committee is not accomplishing meaningful cooperation with the community. Ms. Gardella stated that inclusion of the community used to function differently. The previous master plan utilized input from neighborhoods by holding accessible meetings and implementing suggestions. The current master plan development is not including neighbor input in the same way. Many community members were not informed of planning meetings and at a meeting on July 7<sup>th</sup>, UNM representatives did not take notes of community members' suggestions.

When asked what an ideal community-university relationship would look like, Ms. Gardella immediately discussed transparency and accessibility of information. She also expressed her desire to have UNM representatives who are designated links between the university and neighborhoods, creating relationship building and effective communication. She felt that Regents looked upon neighbors' concerns as trivial, and wished for a relationship where community input was requested from the University and valued in planning decisions. Ms. Gardella said that administrators and planners often seem hesitant to have meetings with neighbors because they feel attacked, but if UNM made an effort to reach out to community and hear their needs and concerns, the surrounding neighborhoods would respond and begin to trust the University. Ms. Gardella also imagined a relationship with UNM that is consistent. She wished she could believe that promises made by UNM to neighbors would be kept by future administrations.

### **Interview with Sara Koplik, President North Campus Neighborhood Association, 7/28/09**

When asked about how UNM development has impacted the North Campus Neighborhood, Sara Koplik describes daily activities like crossing the street and parking as

being more difficult as greater numbers of students and faculty use UNM's north campus. She says that most development, however, has been met with little resistance in her neighborhood, except for the great public outcry over the proposed development on the North Campus Golf Course. This space is the largest green area in the core of Albuquerque and is used, free of charge, by as many as 2000 people each day. It is a source of recreation, relaxation, wildlife preservation, and egalitarian gathering for people from neighborhoods throughout the city.

Dr. Koplik describes the relationship between her neighborhood and UNM as positive. She speaks of good communication and accessibility, regular meetings with planners regarding the master plan, receptiveness to neighbors' suggestions, and mutual respect between the University and neighborhood. She believes this positive relationship comes from a politically active neighborhood organization and initiation of communication with the University. The neighbors have asked for a conservation easement for the golf course along with resources for preservation and view the continued survival of the golf course as an important accomplishment.

Dr. Koplik imagined a perfect relationship with the University as one where neighbors' suggestions were heard and incorporated in how UNM determines its future and how others are impacted. She pictured a relationship where all benefit through inclusion, a friendship that strengthens both community and university.

### **Interview with Loretta Naranjo Lopez , Martineztown Work Group, 7/24/09**

Loretta Naranjo Lopez remembers her neighborhood before development as a quaint, family-friendly area. She is proud of the historic houses in this original Albuquerque neighborhood. Many of the changes she has seen over the years are related to the change in zoning that has made this area the highest commercially zoned residential neighborhood in the city. As warehouses and businesses have moved in, Loretta Naranjo Lopez has seen a significant

increase in traffic on Mountain Road that has radically changed the neighborhood and impacted residents' lives. Some trucks ignore the 30-mile per hour speed limit and travel Mountain Road at speeds as high as 65 mph every day. Neighbors are concerned about the pollution, noise, vibration, and safety of using this residential street as an urban collector street. Adobe houses built in the 19<sup>th</sup> century are cracking from the vibrations caused by heavy trucks, and parents no longer feel safe allowing children to play in front yards or ride bicycles in the neighborhood. With increasing industry in the neighborhood, residents are concerned about air quality in the area and feel an environmental impact study is imperative. Loretta Naranjo Lopez is concerned that the proposal of DekkerParich and Sabatini (DPS) to extend Mountain Road east of the north frontage road and expand it to four lanes while removing sidewalks will further alter the neighborhood.

The Martineztown Work Group (MWG) has met with people from UNM regarding their concerns. They have been told that they need to "rethink" residential area design and that the plan would be more "European." The MWG directly opposes any change that would make Mountain Road less pedestrian friendly; in fact, they are seeking ordinances to remove current truck traffic and make the neighborhood more pedestrian accessible with lower speed limits and more lighting.

When asked about the perfect relationship with UNM, Loretta Naranjo Lopez said she would like planners to listen to concerns and utilize neighbors' suggestions for development. She wants UNM and the city to realize that Santa Barbara/Martineztown is an *extraordinary piece of Albuquerque history that should be celebrated and preserved.*

**Interview with Ann Nihlen – Campus Neighborhood, 7/27/09**

The Campus Neighborhood, lying north of Las Lomas between University and Yale Boulevards, originated as part of UNM's desire to recruit professors from the east coast. In the mid and late 1930's, UNM offered to lease land for \$1 per year for faculty to establish residences. The neighborhood and UNM enjoyed a positive and mutually beneficial relationship over the years. The area on Las Lomas between University Blvd. and Yale Blvd., including the land where Dane Smith Hall now stands, were part of the Campus Neighborhood. The area now has only 25 homes. In the late 1990's, neighbors in the Campus area continued the cordial relationship with UNM. They needed to have a road repaved and a wall built, and UNM agreed to fund these projects. Around the same time, neighbors asked UNM to renew the land lease, and a 60-year lease was approved at the \$1 per year leasing fee.

Neighbors were surprised when, in 2007, a few years after the lease renewal, the Board of Regents began to consider parts of the Campus Neighborhood for development of office space and presented a new lease to residents. The new lease increased rent to \$700 to \$800 per resident per year, with an annual increase of \$400 to \$500. This new rate created a financial hardship for many people living in the neighborhood. Neighbors were concerned that developing offices in the area would destroy home values and Campus residents became divided about how to approach concerns. Some believed they should fight the new lease and development plans while others felt that UNM had always been a friend to the neighborhood and should be trusted. Many neighbors viewed the previous 60-year lease as valid, and refused to sign the new lease as protest. The original lease agreement, however, contained a clause stating that homeowners wanting to sell must first offer the sale to the University. UNM refused to allow people to sell their homes unless they signed the new lease agreement, a tactic that was viewed by neighbors as blackmail. In order to keep the neighborhood relationship from being torn apart in the dispute

with UNM, they agreed to make some compromises. Finally, an area that was slated for development became UNM's real estate office, but many neighbors feel the University now has a toehold in the neighborhood.

When asked to imagine a perfect relationship with UNM, Dr. Nihlen spoke of the need for a sense of equality between the University and neighbors and the importance of reciprocity in communication. Dr. Nihlen also envisioned a relationship where UNM would keep the promises it made to neighbors in the past.

### **Interview with Robert Romero, Santa Barbara/Martineztown Neighborhood Association**

7/30/09

When Robert Romero discussed how UNM growth has affected his neighborhood, his major concern was with plans for future development. He felt the current problems with increased traffic on Mountain Road are due to issues with city planning and surrounding businesses using the road as a major thoroughfare. Mr. Romero discussed his concern with plans for UNM to develop a medical facility between the golf course and I-25. Along with this plan comes the proposed realignment of Tucker Ave. and Mountain Road, tying them into I-25 and dramatically increasing east to west traffic through the neighborhood.

Mr. Romero and the neighborhood association learned about the proposed medical facility and road realignment projects through the North Campus Neighborhood Association. Santa Barbara/Martineztown residents contacted UNM about their concerns with the master plan and have had several meetings with architects and planners at the University. The neighborhood association is not opposed to UNM development and is researching options for traffic flow that do not negatively impact residents. Neighbors are currently opposed to proposals to realign Mountain Road and Tucker Ave., but also feel that completely barricading

Mountain Road would make transportation problematic for residents. Mr. Romero felt that Dekker Parich and Sabatini (DPS) were open to suggestions from the neighborhood and interested in finding an acceptable compromise. Santa Barbara/Martineztown neighbors are also working with their city counselor and planners on a sector plan modification that will integrate UNM development.

When asked about the perfect relationship with UNM, Mr. Romero felt that effective communication was of primary importance. He believes that UNM often behaves as though it is autonomous and unaware that there are “veins” that reach out into surrounding areas. Next to communication with neighbors, Mr. Romero wished for better communication within UNM departments. His neighborhood attempted to learn more about proposed development, but had difficulty finding someone at UNM with answers. In meetings with DPS, UNM representatives were not present. Mr. Romero feels that if UNM were more active in planning meetings, communication would improve.

## Suggestions for UNM to work Cooperatively with its neighbors.

Tension between Universities and host communities, also known as town and gown relations, are common throughout history.<sup>1</sup> In 2005, the Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement published a monograph from their 2004 conference addressing these relational issues. Dr. Barbara A. Holland, conference co-facilitator, describes university-community relations by saying:

In general, higher education institutions are seen as a benefit to their surrounding community. By its mere presence, an academic institution generates considerable and reliable economic activity that strengthens the overall community condition. But academic institutions also take property off local tax rolls, raise property values, consume nearby land and neighborhoods, generate traffic and parking problems, and occasionally release large numbers of party-minded students into once quiet residential areas. Higher education's tradition is not often one of strong town-gown relationships. Therefore it is not surprising, when academics reach out to invite community members to partner, they may be met with a cautious response. Even if the air is cleared over past tensions and disappointments, academics tend to be more intensely interested in explaining what they want and need from the partnership than skilled at listening and absorbing information about the community's motivations and expectations.<sup>2</sup>

Smerek, Pasque, Mallory, and Holland are quoted at length in explaining the need for universities to embrace engagement:

Our society is in a period of dramatic change with the transition from an industrial-based to a knowledge-based economy, as well as technological advances, fiscal challenges of higher education, and cultural shifts in society as a whole. Increasing collaborations between communities and universities in order to influence the public good becomes paramount during this time of dramatic change. As frustratingly slow as the movement to strengthen the relationship between higher education and society sometimes seems to be, few social institutions are better situated than colleges and universities to stimulate significant community improvement. Individually and collectively, institutions of higher education possess considerable resources-human, fiscal, organizational, and intellectual—which are critical to addressing significant social issues. Additionally, these institutions are physically rooted in their communities. Therefore, investing in the betterment of their immediate environments is good for both the community and the institution. However, it

---

<sup>1</sup> Mayfield, Loomis, "Town and Gown in America: Some Historical and Institutional Issues of the Engaged University," *Education for Health* 14 (2001), no. 2, p. 235.

<sup>2</sup> Holland, Barbara A., "Reflections on Community-Campus Partnerships: What Has Been Learned? What are the Next Challenges?" *Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement* (2005), p. 11.

is recognized that higher education institutions often fall short of making a real impact in their home communities.<sup>1</sup>

The monograph identified and summarized four models for effective partnerships between universities and communities. The first model was developed from the 1998 forum on engaged universities where eight teams were chosen as examples of successful partnerships. The essential qualities of these partnerships were evaluated and the Campus Compact Benchmarks for Campus/Community Partnerships was developed. The model was separated into three relational stages, with partnership characteristics in each stage:

#### Stage I: Designing the Partnership

Genuine democratic partnerships are:

- Founded on a shared vision and clearly articulated values.
- Beneficial to partnering institutions.

#### Stage II: Building Collaborative Relationships

Genuine democratic partnerships that build strong collaborative relationships are:

- Composed of interpersonal relationships based on trust and mutual respect.
- Multi-dimensional: They involve the participation of multiple sectors that act in service of a complex problem.
- Clearly organized and led with dynamism.

#### Stage III: Sustaining Partnerships Over Time

Genuine democratic partnerships that will be sustained over time are:

- Integrated into the mission and support systems of the partnering institutions.
- Sustained by a partnership process for communication, decision-making, and the initiation of change.
- Evaluated regularly with a focus on both methods and outcomes.<sup>2</sup>

The second model was created by Portland State University's scholarship on engaged university features and was presented at a joint forum on school, university, and community partnerships sponsored by U.S. Department of Education and U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. This model identified the following characteristics of effective partnerships as:

---

<sup>1</sup> Smerek, Ryan E., Pasque, Penny A., Mallory, Bruce & Holland, Barbara, "Partnerships for Engagement Futures," *Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement* (2005), p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> Holland, "Reflections on Community-Campus Partnerships," p. 12 – 13.

- Joint exploration of goals and interests and limitations.
- Creation of a mutually rewarding agenda.
- Operational design that supports shared leadership, decision-making, conflict resolution, resource management.
- Clear benefits and roles for each partner.
- Identification of opportunities for early successes for all; shared celebration of progress.
- Focus on knowledge exchange, shared learning and capacity building.
- Attention to communication patterns, cultivation of trust.
- Commitment to continuous assessment of the partnership itself, as well as outcomes of shared work.<sup>1</sup>

The third model was created by Community-Campus Partnerships for Health, an organization for academic and community partners that has helped shape institution-community partnership efforts, and whose widely used Principles of Good Community-Campus Partnerships lists the following standards:

Agree upon values, goals and measurable outcomes.

- Develop relationships of mutual trust, respect, genuineness and commitment.
- Build upon strengths and assets, and also address needs.
- Balance power and share resources.
- Have clear, open and accessible communication.
- Agree upon roles, norms and processes.
- Ensure feedback to, among and from all stakeholders.
- Share the credit for accomplishments.
- Take time to develop and evolve.<sup>2</sup>

The Council of Independent Colleges (CIC) along with the Consortium for the Advancement of Private Higher Education (CAPHE) developed the final model in a summit funded by a grant from the Engaging Communities and Campuses program. The Core Elements of Effective Partnerships are identified as:

Goals and processes are mutually determined, including training for people who will work with community organizations or residents.

- Resources, rewards and risks are shared among all parties.

---

<sup>1</sup> Holland, “Reflections on Community-Campus Partnerships.”

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 13 – 14.

- Roles and responsibilities are based on each partner's capacities and resources. Parity is achieved by acknowledging and respecting the expertise and experience of each partner.
- Anticipated benefits justify the costs, effort and risks of participation.
- Partners share a vision built on excitement and passion for the issues at hand. Partners are accountable for carrying out joint plans and ensuring quality.
- Partners are committed to ensuring that each partner benefits from participation.<sup>1</sup>

Upon review of the above models, Holland identifies six common themes in successful university/community partnerships:

- Partners must jointly explore and understand their separate as well as common goals and interests.
- Each partner must understand the capacity, resources, and expected contribution of effort for themselves and every other partner.
- Effective partnerships identify opportunities for success and evidence of mutual benefit through careful planning of project activities and attention to shared credit.
- If the partnership is to be sustained, as opposed to being a discrete task, the focus of the project activity and partnership interaction is not merely a set of tasks, but the relationship itself.
- The partnership design must ensure shared control of partnership directions.
- The partners must make a commitment to continuous assessment of the partnership relationship itself, in addition to outcomes.<sup>2</sup>

Holland acknowledges there are challenges to making these ideal partnerships a reality.<sup>3</sup>

Institutionalizing collaboration between local groups and communities in higher education is among the most complex of relationships. In their article titled *Challenges to Community-Higher Education Partnerships: A Call to Action*, David Cox and Sarena Seifer list several organizations supporting and teaching partnerships between universities and communities:

**American Association for State College and Universities' (AASCU) American Democracy Project** is based on community-campus partnerships.

**Community Campus Partnerships for Health (CCPH)** is a national organization that promotes health through community-campus partnerships.

---

<sup>1</sup> Holland, "Reflections on Community-Campus Partnerships," p. 14.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid, p. 14 – 15.

<sup>3</sup> Ibid, p. 15.

**Campus Compact** works with service learning and has lead to one of the larger national movements encouraging the development of partnerships.

**The National Forum on Higher Education for the Public Good** is providing leadership in addressing the link between partnerships and service to the broader interests of communities and higher education institutions.

**The Association for Community-Higher Education Partnerships** was formed with the explicit purpose of focusing on partnerships with economically distressed partnerships and is leading an effort to identify keys to “real” partnerships.

**The National Congress on Community Economic Development** (NCCED) sponsored the National Council on Community-University Partnerships (NCCUP) to advance partnerships with community members.

**The Johnson Foundation** has provided funding for community-higher education partnerships and has sponsored a series of conferences of the issues associated with developing effective partnerships.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cox, David and Seifer, Sarena, “Challenges to Community-Higher Education Partnerships: A Call to Action,” *Higher Education Collaboratives for Community Engagement and Improvement* (2005), p. 30.

## Students' Research

***Case studies illustrating how other colleges and universities have met the challenges of growth by interacting in a positive manner with the surrounding communities.***

University of Washington	Eugene Lopez	26
Princeton University	Jeffrey Waldo	30
University of Missouri, Kansas City	Liz Diesel	34
University of North Carolina, Chappel Hill	Rita Mercado	37
University of Pennsylvania	Sean DeBuck	43

Eugene Lopez  
Summer Semester 2009  
Community Activism for Sustainable Living  
Instructor: Ph.D. Candidate, Andrew Marcum

## **Community Involvement While Developing a Master Plan at the University of Washington, and How UNM Could Follow Their Lead.**

—

In 1998, the University of Washington developed a Master Plan in order to address campus growth and its affects on the surrounding community. The office of regional affairs that outlined the Master Plan and the University's approach during its development led to a comprehensive analysis as to how the University would involve all people with a stake in the growth of the campus. Before any work started on the Master Plan, the University created the Community Involvement Process that led to the creation of the Community Outreach Program. The Outreach Program was included during a three-year development of the Master Plan. Out of this planning process came the City-University Community Advisory Committee (CUCAC) instrumental in developing the Campus Master Plan. The committee consisted of four faculty, staff, and student body advisors along with one representative from each of the twelve communities affected by the expansion.

Once an agreement was made on the draft of the final plans, the Community Outreach Program went into action to gain information and concerns from the campus community: CUCAC, community businesses, residents, and local government agencies<sup>12</sup>. The Community Outreach Program was a very affective way for UW to obtain feedback from the community to bring forward their concerns and implement them in the planning process. Through the University's distribution of brochures and newsletters, the UW

---

<sup>1</sup> University of Washington. Overview of Master Plan. 2004.

Outreach Program was able to inform the public as to the ideas for growth and development and gain feedback through setting up a website and telephone hotline. The next step in the Community Involvement Process “Building a Vision with the Community,”<sup>1</sup> included a letter of invitation from the president of the university to participate. The letter was sent to nearly 80,000 residents within an 8-mile radius with the date and time for the first public meetings, informing the readers as to how one could become involved in the planning process. It included all of the different ways to suggest comment on the Master Plan. An effective way in which the university made information available to the public was through newsletters from the *University Week Newspaper*, where they found systematic updates on the progress of the Master Plan.

Once a consensus on the concerns of the communities and the university were established, (circulation, open space, and development) a series of public meetings was held in order to bring all parties together to ask questions and gain input. Altogether there were ten meetings each discussing the different phases of the Master Plan. Next there were presentations and briefings from the planning committee and each presentation was made open to the public. Over the span of three years, there were 120 presentations each building on earlier phases of the project, gaining input and information in the process. The university then held a campus tour for representatives from the CUCAC, showing them future expansion sites, open spaces, and how they all worked into the Master Plan.

It took five years for the regents to approve the first draft of the Master Plan and it was presented in its entirety, including the concerns of the campus and its surrounding communities. The plan clearly states the new approach to circulation routes, parking and

---

<sup>2</sup>University of Washington, *Master Plan Community Involvement Process*. Pg.176. 2003.

accessibility, along with future building sites and how they would meet the requirements agreed upon by the CUCAC<sup>3</sup>. Ultimately everyone involved agreed that the Master Plan and future development needed to nurture the work that was going on at the university while caring for the needs of the community that lives within close proximity to the campus. This type of community engagement reveals that with foresight and attention to detail, cooperation can facilitate harmony among different entities and be an example for other institutions.

As the University of Washington continues to follow guidelines with the Community Involvement Process, they are ensuring the public that they will have a say in how the campus transforms their community and city. Through a four-phase process that included goals and vision, assumptions and alternatives, draft master plan, and final proposed campus master plan the University of Washington and its community members worked together in every step of the planning process.

The expansion process for any university can be intense and stressful, but the manner in which UW went about creating the Master Plan should serve as a model for other universities around the country. When comparing the process that UW chose for preparing a master plan to the way University of New Mexico has gone about it, UW has obviously taken the communities involvement more seriously in the planning process. The University of New Mexico Campus Development Advisory Committee is the location where community engagement should be occurring. Aside from the Faculty Senate, Associated Students of UNM, and the planning architects no one else has a say in what plans will move ahead, and only four neighborhoods have representation and are not able

---

<sup>3</sup> University of Washington Campus Plan. Pg. 5.1999.

to vote on matters<sup>4</sup>. Here at UNM the input process only exists through surveys taken on-line. In order to better communicate with the public more avenues of input must be created.

The idea that UNM can only consider opinions of the surrounding community without them having a formal say in the matters concerning development is disrespectful and lacks regard for quality of life. For example, the development of both North and South Campus has displaced or destroyed community green space and disturbed neighbors. A change needs to come about here at UNM and we should follow UW's example for planning and development as a starting point for positive innovation. The concept of creating a city-university community advisory committee is brilliant and as UNM plans for the future, this would be a great way to gain input from everyone involved and affected by the growth, while satisfying the needs of the University to excel as an institution of high standing.

#### Bibliography:

1. University of Washington Office of External/ Regional Affairs. Overview of Campus Master Plan. 2004.
2. Community Involvement Process. Approved Compiled Plan. 2003.
3. Campus Planning at the University of Washington. Campus Plan. 1999.
4. UNM Faculty Handbook. 2009.

---

<sup>4</sup> University of New Mexico Faculty Handbook. 2009.

# **Princeton Comprehensive Master Plan with Community Inclusion**

**Jeffrey Waldo**

Summer Semester, 2009

Community Activism for Sustainable Living

Instructor: Ph.D. Candidate, Andrew Marcum

In 2006, Princeton University (PU) introduced its ten-year plan for expansion. The administration hired a few architects and planners to add almost 2 million square feet to the University by 2016. These designers will develop the campus while acknowledging the need for sustainable development that's defined by Daniel Chiras as "meeting current needs without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs through efficient use of resources, recycling, restoration, growth management, and other measures."<sup>1</sup> They also have plans for enhancing the neighborhoods in the area. Hoping to avoid sprawl and expansion into the nearby communities consistent with sustainability's values, Princeton University decided to expand its campus by increasing its density. Along with expansion of its campus, PU also wants to revamp the nearby boroughs through planned retail and developing community assets, including an art and transit neighborhood that houses the subway to New York City. During the planning process, University officials and architects again emphasized sustainability throughout the affected community.

At the beginning of the planning process, Princeton University named the stakeholders: students, staff, faculty, alumni, citizens, businesses, and anyone who might be interested in the proceedings and wellbeing of the campus. While acknowledging the threat an expanding university might be to the nearby city, the administration decided to make the University "a positive and respectful citizen of the communities in which it resides," a good public relations attitude to have from the start. Acknowledging that the university and the nearby area "share a mutually beneficial relationship, sustaining strong community relations," became one of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Chairas, Daniel D. *Environmental Science*, Louis Bruno, Ed. Johns and Bartlett: Sudsbury, MA, 2006.

plans' main principles. Throughout the planning process, the University promoted public dialogue between the planning team and the stakeholders. The language alone is encouraging to the citizens who have concerns about PU's development.<sup>1</sup>

Princeton University kept the stakeholders informed of the progress of the development the entire time with public forums, and the blossoming plan was always available for review. "Plans in Progress," the main forum, catered to nine hundred students, staff, faculty, and community members. Here, the burgeoning plan was displayed for all to see, and at each visual presentation board there was an informed architect, planner, or individual to answer questions and receive input. Guests were handed a feedback card in case they wanted anonymity. Before the "Plans in Progress" meeting, a brochure displaying the comprehensive plans was printed out and made available to interested individuals. There was also a website that acted like a forum where anyone could log on to see the plans, review them, and make suggestions. This helped to identify needs for transit, pedestrian friendly walkways, and boundaries. The latter provides a prime example because neighborly citizens expressed want for a boundary line to end Princeton University development on one side of the campus. The administration and planning team heard their concerns and assured them their living space would not be bought out by actually designating a road on the Southern side as the "boundary beyond which the University proposes not to locate academic buildings."<sup>2</sup>

The art and transit district was an area of public utilization that would be revamped as well. Restaurants, cafes and other commercial venues will be housed in a cluster of buildings "interspersed with plazas and landscaped open spaces." The University understands the value of public and open space where students, staff, faculty, and community members can intermingle. The Dinky Station is the train station in the neighborhood. Once remodeled, the station will be a

---

<sup>1</sup> "Campus and Community." *Princeton Campus Plan*. Princeton University. 18 Feb. 2008. 17 July 2009. <http://www.princeton.edu/campusplan/pdfs/chapter2.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

“a focal point within the community that is designed for access to sustainable means of travel.” This means there will be a bike storage area and bus routes connected to the station making it easier for citizens to travel without a car. Such means of alternative transportation reduce car related green-house-gasses as well as traffic in the area. This transit neighborhood of Princeton University is a great example of sustainable development.<sup>1</sup>

The University worked with New Jersey Transit on plans to move and redesign the Dinky Station. There does not seem to be friction with the city or community in the art and transit district, and the plans to expand and make the transit station more comfortable for commuters came from the citizens. Princeton University did an excellent job informing its citizens of impending changes to the campus and the city around them. Not only did they produce massive public and online forums, but representatives appeared at community meetings as well. The people of New Jersey were given ample opportunity to review the progress.

Architects and planners took pride in announcing their unusual development strategy: the master plan would be a work in progress. Apparently, the ideas for expansion are not set in stone, as there can be alterations to the plan up until the final building is finished. This is different from most blueprints because problems noted early in construction serve as an example that can be improved upon during future construction. If there are complications or the community does not like something about the early development, the designers make sure to omit the objections from the next step in the comprehensive plan. Many design teams finalize a plan, but PU's team has created a revisable plan to service the stakeholders' likes and dislikes and scratch out complications.

Another area of interest pertains to affordable housing. Apparently, New Jersey municipalities must create their own housing developments within their surrounding area.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Community Spaces.” *Princeton University*. Jan 23, 2009.  
<http://www.princeton.edu/artsandtransit/design/public-space/>

Throughout the years, the University has donated funds and land to the state to create low-income housing.

The comprehensive plan for the needed expansion of PU is sustainable. By the greening of buildings and the good relations already established with the citizen's of New Jersey, PU meets two of the sustainability tiers: social equity and environmental protection. Through forums and information easily accessible to the public, the people of this community were able to share in the development process. Now the people's history of Princeton's comprehensive plan might tell a different story, but most signs indicate this Ivy League school is conscientious.

Perhaps UNM could adopt a similar, modern strategy as Princeton University. Citizens of Albuquerque seem to be fighting for a word with the planners of new development right now. The University of New Mexico's Campus Development Advisement Committee is responsible for collecting community suggestions, but only a few of the neighborhoods are represented on the board. UNM does not have an online forum for its master plan let alone public dialogue symposiums aimed at community engagement. The University of New Mexico is not Princeton University, but there are a few simple steps it could take towards better community relations. The first and foremost step is to increase communication with the city and community. The second is to make these entities and their opinions feel acknowledged and even valued. Princeton did this by making good community relations a guiding principle of the plan development; President Tilghman ordered, "sustain strong community relations."<sup>1</sup> These positive words from the head of an institution are very inviting and reassuring.

Princeton University's funding of affordable housing projects in the nearby area is a requirement of all New Jersey Municipalities by law. This seems entirely reasonable and honors the state of New Jersey. The University of New Mexico could be a catalyst for such legislation in the Albuquerque community.

---

<sup>1</sup> "Community Spaces." *Princeton University*. Jan 23, 2009.  
<http://www.princeton.edu/artsandtransit/design/public-space/>

**A Crisis in Kansas City: Conflict Between Neighborhoods and University of  
Missouri Kansas City  
as Reported by the *Kansas City Star***

Liz Diesel  
Summer Semester, 2009  
Community Activism for Sustainable Living  
Instructor: Ph.D. Candidate, Andrew Marcum

An article published in *The Journal of Promotional Management* by Kathie A. Leeper and Roy V. Leeper described a conflict between the University of Missouri Kansas City (UMKC) and its urban neighbors.<sup>1</sup> The article shows how lack of communication between institutions and communities can create adversarial relationships that strain the community and create public relations crises for universities.

Starting in 1998, the *Kansas City Star* wrote numerous stories of the conflict between the University of Missouri Kansas City (UMKC) and communities surrounding the campus. The first story announcing the trouble described UMKC's plan to change its design from a commuter campus to developing a larger on-campus community. The paper reported UMKC's plans to demolish over 100 houses in order to create recreation fields and the neighbors' outrage that the University planned to tear down one long-standing, vibrant community. In June of 1998, *The Star* reported UMKC's development of a 100-page master plan for expansion had not been widely distributed among the community or university administration. *The Star* learned that UMKC had purchased 36 properties on the edge of campus from the Board of Trustees to tear down for University development. This

---

<sup>1</sup> Leeper, Kathie A. and Leeper, Roy V. (2006). Crisis in the College/University Relationship with the Community: A Case Study. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 12(3/4), 139 – 142.

lack of transparent communication led the community to form activist groups, and *The Star* continued to write negative stories about the University's expansion practices. Opinion-editorial pieces accused UMKC of doing violence to its neighbors, abuse of power, and losing the moral authority to educate.

Protesters appeared at the Chancellor's door with picket signs and a bulldozer. The community formed an activist group called Citizens Against Residential Encroachment (CARE) that earned support from local legislators and met with HUD's Fair Housing and Opportunities Division to explore legal action against UMKC. On June 25, 1998, *The Star* reported an announcement from the University Systems President to develop a plan with a new course of action and intentions to meet with neighborhoods. The University decided to delay the residential expansion project for one year. Despite this statement of intent to work with the community, UMKC continued to communicate ineffectively. Residents in the 36 properties purchased by the University had been sent letters requiring them to vacate their homes, but after the expansion was delayed, UMKC failed to notify occupants before they moved. Community members were also disheartened when the University Chancellor left a meeting mediated by the U.S. Department of Justice before answering neighbors' questions about future expansion. The University showed signs of stress from the crisis when the Vice-Chancellor in charge of coordinating campus expansion retired before a resolution was found. This was followed by the resignation of the University Chancellor in January 1999.

UMKC hired an Interim Chancellor who vowed to focus on two-way communication between the University and stakeholders to identify, analyze, and resolve problems. He spent much of his first month meeting with community leaders and state legislators who were critical of UMKC's expansion plans. In March 1999, *The Star*

reported that UMKC decided to reduce plans for expansion, and would not demolish houses in surrounding neighborhoods. The story also described the University's pledge to meet with neighbors for consultation before implementing plans for future development.

Since the public relations crisis at UMKC, the University developed an Office of Community and Public Affairs. The goals of this office included focusing on fostering communication between the University and surrounding neighborhoods.

# Smart Growth and Sustainability at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

---

Rita Mercado

Summer Session 2009

Community Activism for Sustainable Living

Instructor: Ph.D. Candidate, Andrew Marcum

As the University of New Mexico continues to grow in response to its needs and desires to expand both the campus and its reputation, the University must remember to adhere to the goals outlined in the Master Plan and the sustainability guidelines included in the University's Business Policies and Procedures Manual.

The University of New Mexico can look to many universities and municipalities for examples. The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill's Master Plan for Development incorporates many of UNM's own stated goals of:

1. Alternative transportation
2. "Live, work, play environment" to keep students on campus
3. Healthy environment and healthy community
4. Community engagement

In 1997 UNC at Chapel Hill, officials began the process of developing a new campus Master Plan to address both the improvement of the intellectual environment and the continued physical growth of UNC at Chapel Hill. The University developed a plan that included an administration team (deans and vice chancellors), a design and operations team (citizens and faculty), and a steering committee that made final decisions. The architects divided the campus into four precincts, and along with staff established four geographic groups to handle specific precinct needs. These four groups addressed the needs for increased and improved facilities, parking, preservation of green space and the creation of an Arts Commons, pedestrian

connections in the southern and eastern sections of campus, undergraduate housing, athletics' needs, and landscaping. Advisory committees were also organized to deal with transportation, bicycling, pedestrian mobility, and neighborhood concerns. At each stage of development the stakeholders were involved, and committees included a balance of representatives from both the university and the community. In March 2001 after five years of meetings and revisions, the Board of Trustees approved the Campus Master Plan; the final report was published in March 2002.

The community of Chapel Hill along with the University employees participated from the beginning in the development of the Master Plan. Public forums were held to gain input from these stakeholders. "Students in particular adopted a unique and important role in shaping its characteristics."<sup>1</sup> Initially students formed their own committees and submitted their own master plan to early development committees. This plan addressed students' concerns on housing, parking, transit, and recreation facilities. In order to enact its plan to develop infill projects on campus, the university needed to work with Chapel Hill's Town Council to revise zoning laws. A new zoning district allows for the expansion of floor space on campus beyond previous ratios. Town councilors also met with university officials to address concerns over environmental, noise, lighting, and other impacts on adjacent areas before introducing building applications.

Neighborhood residents have a better idea of what conditions new projects must adhere to and may take those concerns to town planning officials."<sup>2</sup> Together the town and university have committed to address the issues of storm water management. A section of the plan concerns "on-site infiltration to recharge groundwater and absorb floodwater, capture and reuse

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office of Sustainability, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 2007 Sustainability Report, [http://sustainability.unc.edu/Portals/0/Documents/2007%20Sustainability%20Report\\_web.pdf](http://sustainability.unc.edu/Portals/0/Documents/2007%20Sustainability%20Report_web.pdf) (July 2009)

<sup>2</sup> Thorsten, Richard. "SMART GROWTH IN THE COMMUNITY." USA, EPA. [http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/pdf/uc\\_part4\\_sg\\_in\\_the\\_community.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/pdf/uc_part4_sg_in_the_community.pdf) (accessed July 17, 2009).

rainwater."<sup>1</sup> One innovative technique used on campus for the new FedEx Global Education Center is the use of stored rainwater to flush toilets and water landscaping. Also in accordance with UNC Chapel Hill's sustainability practices, the town and university have committed to a 60% reduction of green house emissions by 2060. The students of UNC also committed to sustainability issues voting to increase their fees to help fund the free fare transit system in Chapel Hill and "Carolina students were the first in the southeast to approve a renewable energy fee, which will raise \$1.2 million for renewable energy projects over a six-year period."<sup>2</sup>

One area that both University of New Mexico and UNC at Chapel Hill agree on is the promotion of infill. UNC at Chapel Hill decided to focus on new building and growth on the existing campus, adding 5.9 million square feet over the subsequent ten-year period. The infill strategy carefully adds new buildings on several existing parking lots and a few areas of underutilized paved open space. New parking decks will accommodate existing and planned vehicular traffic, while other areas will be reclaimed as open space. The increases in campus density will help facilitate more interaction on campus, as called for in the Intellectual Climate study. The infill strategy also provides increased opportunities for multimodal forms of transportation.<sup>3</sup>

In response to projected traffic growth, in addition to increasing parking spaces, UNC at Chapel Hill decided to provide for transportation alternatives—20 acres of surface parking spaces—planned to be removed to accommodate 10 acres of new buildings. These will be replaced by parking structures and 10 acres will be set aside for green space. The University set goals for itself of reducing single occupant vehicles, through walk-ability on campus, and the development of public transportation. Today, per capita bus ridership on the free fare Chapel

---

1 Ibid.

2 The Office of Sustainability, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 2007 Sustainability Report, [http://sustainability.unc.edu/Portals/0/Documents/2007%20Sustainability%20Report\\_web.pdf](http://sustainability.unc.edu/Portals/0/Documents/2007%20Sustainability%20Report_web.pdf) (July 2009)

3 Thorsten, Richard. "SMART GROWTH IN THE COMMUNITY." USA, EPA. [http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/pdf/uc\\_part4\\_sg\\_in\\_the\\_community.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/pdf/uc_part4_sg_in_the_community.pdf) (accessed July 17, 2009).

Hill transit system (paid for in part by contributions from the University) is among the highest in the country. The University reports half of employee and student commuters arrive via a means other than single occupant vehicles.<sup>1</sup> This high ridership is achieved in part by offering students and university employees free regional transit passes for those who live outside of Chapel Hill. To promote cycling, bike routes were included in the master plan as well as "improvements for potential cyclists, including showers, lockers, signage, and safety."<sup>2</sup> The Chancellor's goal is to offer a bed for every undergraduate to aid in reducing traffic flow onto campus. New undergraduate and student family housing is being planned. Besides placing new buildings near existing ones, the new housing is limited to four stories and includes traditional dorms along with apartments and retail space. "Since 2003, university housing has expanded by 50 percent to more than 3 million square feet"<sup>3</sup> with 85% of incoming freshmen choosing to live in campus housing.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office of Sustainability, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, *The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 2007 Sustainability Report*, [http://sustainability.unc.edu/Portals/0/Documents/2007%20Sustainability%20Report\\_web.pdf](http://sustainability.unc.edu/Portals/0/Documents/2007%20Sustainability%20Report_web.pdf) (July 2009)

<sup>2</sup> Thorsten, Richard. "SMART GROWTH IN THE COMMUNITY." *USA, EPA*. [http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/pdf/uc\\_part4\\_sg\\_in\\_the\\_community.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/pdf/uc_part4_sg_in_the_community.pdf) (accessed July 17, 2009).

<sup>3</sup> The Office of Sustainability, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, *The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill 2007 Sustainability Report*, [http://sustainability.unc.edu/Portals/0/Documents/2007%20Sustainability%20Report\\_web.pdf](http://sustainability.unc.edu/Portals/0/Documents/2007%20Sustainability%20Report_web.pdf) (July 2009)

## Conclusion

In December of 2006 UNC at Chapel Hill received from the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching the classification of a "community-engaged university."<sup>1</sup> In order to receive this classification the University needed to demonstrate a commitment to:

*curricular engagement, "which entails engaging students and faculty with the community;" outreach and partnership, "which combines the application and provision of institutional resources to mutually benefit the campus and the community, such as research and economic development; and a category that combines both aspects."*<sup>2</sup>

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill achieved this high standard not only through the town and gown relationship with the community of Chapel Hill but by also expanding its curriculum. A minor in sustainability was offered along with courses in sustainability in other areas of study—including its MBA program—as well as making community service a vital part of the University's mission.

In developing its master plan, UNC at Chapel Hill achieved a balance between itself and its neighbors. Though, when the process began in 1997, sustainability and smart design were not initially a primary focus for the university. As the plan developed with input from stakeholders, the master plan evolved to reflect both of these principals. The goal of the University is to "make development decisions predictable, fair, and cost-effective"<sup>3</sup> and include community input.

What stands out in the research conducted by the entire class this summer is that the administration at each university examined was willing to engage in communication with its stakeholders. In the development and execution of their Master Plans these university leaders acknowledge the importance of the town-and-gown relationship to the success of the schools.

The University of New Mexico has incorporated many of the same themes of community

---

<sup>1</sup> The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. *Carnegie Classification*. 2007. <http://www.unc.edu/cps/learn-more-carnegie.php> (accessed July 17, 2009).

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Thorsten, Richard. "SMART GROWTH IN THE COMMUNITY." *USA, EPA*. [http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/pdf/uc\\_part4\\_sg\\_in\\_the\\_community.pdf](http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/pdf/uc_part4_sg_in_the_community.pdf) (accessed July 17, 2009).

service, sustainability, and smart growth in its own Master Plan, yet in the execution UNM has failed to live up to its own goals. With the development of the North Campus Golf Course and the expansion of the medical school along with the Redondo parking structure debacle, the University has illustrated its willingness to ignore the concerns of the community in order to push through its own agenda. The University of New Mexico, as the state's flagship educational institution has an obligation to reflect the administration's desire to expand the school's reputation and to utilize its intellectual capital to create a sustainable community.

## Works Cited

- Office, UNC Sustainability. "Institutionalizing Sustainability at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill." *The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill*. 2007. <http://www.unc.edu/> (accessed July 17, 2009).
- The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. *Carnegie Classification*. 2007. <http://www.unc.edu/cps/learn-more-carnegie.php> (accessed July 17, 2009).
- Thorsten, Richard. "SMART GROWTH IN THE COMMUNITY." *USA, EPA*. <http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/>

# West Philadelphia Initiatives

Sean DeBuck

Summer Semester 2009

Community Activism for Sustainable Living

Instructor: Ph.D. Candidate, Andrew Marcum

*Unlike efforts by other institutions, West Philadelphia Initiatives were not an academic project or Community Affairs assignment. They were top priority, and widely engaged the institution. –West Philadelphia Initiatives; A Case Study<sup>1</sup>*

The University of Pennsylvania has created an award winning community engagement program. Its approach to being a good neighbor to its surrounding communities is dynamic and has created a mutually beneficial atmosphere for the educational community and the community at large. The program is called the West Philadelphia Initiatives and has relentlessly and successfully pursued raising the quality of life for residents surrounding the University.

Prior to 1996, Philadelphia as a whole was suffering due to depopulation caused in large part by a shift from the industrial based economy upon which the city was built, to a more retail and service based economy. In the University area, businesses were declining in quality and/or leaving, and crime had risen 10% in the past decade. There were previous community programs that had been put into place, but it was nothing really ambitious, and the University's consciousness of the community at large was minimal. The creation of closed structures and unattractive parking lots on the borders of the University only deepened the perception that the University was isolating itself from the community at large

In 1996, however, a Penn graduate student was attacked and murdered in one of the surrounding neighborhoods, and the immediate response was an outcry from the University community. If people could no longer feel safe at Penn, many of the University's educational goals would be in vain. Parents and faculty rallied around the administration for change.

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.aecf.org/upload/publicationfiles/cc3655k540.pdf>. p. 11.

In response, the University created a neighborhood revitalization program called the “West Philadelphia Initiatives.” One of the main aspects that made this program unique was that, unlike the approaches taken by many other universities around the country, this was not merely another academic program. It was made a top priority by the Administration itself. Though it was academically informed, the program had been given top University priority, and the interest of its success has been vested in the University’s top administrators.

Before the final plans were hammered out, in which UPenn decided to bear the full burden of responsibility for community development, other options were explored such as providing funds to and working with the city government, hiring private developers, or employing non-profit corporations (NPOs). However, the University felt that the need for innovation and entrepreneurship was unlikely to be provided by a government program. Hiring private developers was out of the question as well, because they may not be equipped for the long-term investment required, and they inhibited the possibility of having a true sense of communication with the community at large. Hiring NPOs was considered, but many lacked the organizational capacity to tackle such multifaceted issues, although they were eventually utilized in the West Philadelphia Initiatives and were given minor roles. Ultimately, the university decided that community development was going to be a primary initiative.

It should also be noted to UPenn’s credit that this was a very bold plan. One option they could have taken in response to a public safety issue would have been to simply beef up security and close up access to campus. Essentially, making it a fortress within the city. But in the end the UPenn decision makers decided to tackle the problem at their root cause, eventually leading to the creation of an atmosphere beneficial to the community at large.

The planning for these new initiatives was in depth, and produced six broadly defined areas which the University used to guide its new program for development. They were:

Economic Inclusion, Education Initiatives, Retail Development, Rental Housing, Home Ownership, and Neighborhood Services. Each of which were to be a separate domain.

Economic Inclusion consisted of making certain that the retail development program kept the money in the community, from hiring community members and opening more jobs for surrounding residents, to investing more money into the local economy.

Educational Initiatives had the goal of integrating local schools and community members into the University of Pennsylvania campus. A brand new University sponsored public school was approved by the local school board that reduced student-teacher ratio of other schools in the area; the University also sponsored after-school programs and also included other curricular programs that the University used to address the needs of the surrounding community.

Retail Development was part of the University's program to completely revamp the local economy. Spaces were purchased and marketed to investors. Marketing programs and the acquisition and renovation of space surrounding the University were undertaken. Features such as a new locally owned grocery store, or restaurants and a movie theater to name a few, replaced unattractive or vacated buildings.

Rental Housing and Home Ownership involved, of course, finding initiatives to increase residency in the University area. One strategy that helped integrate the ambitions of all these programs was encouraging Citizens Bank to invest 28.5 million dollars in financing loans and mortgage payments for local residents. (Citizens Bank's performance ended up being 300% stronger than expected).

Neighborhood Services focused on issues such as improved sanitation, security, the promotion of neighborhood assets, greening projects, and upgraded lighting. One of the issues acknowledged was the relatively unattractive appearance of the surrounding area. Litter, graffiti, etc. is unlikely to promote business or create a feeling of safety. The University created a program to assist the city sanitation department where it was lacking in the area by hiring

sanitation services of its own. This aspect also improved safety by employing 34 so-called “ambassadors:” citizens hired to provide directions to visitors and students and act as a liaison to the University Police Department. The University Police Department’s patrol area was also expanded to the surrounding community, and coordinated with the local Philadelphia Police. The Neighborhood Services initiative also helped advertise special events and the unique aspects of the community.

The West Philadelphia Initiatives as a whole was a long term and patient dedication to improving community relations. As a result of these ambitions, the resulting statistics showed that these efforts were not in vain.

From 1996-2002:

- General crime dropped 40%
- Robberies declined 56%
- Assaults were down 28%
- Burglary was down 31%
- Auto Theft plummeted 76

The results of a neighborhood survey showed that:

- 95% of residents reported that they felt the neighborhood was “cleaner,” or “much cleaner.”
- 71% said the area was “safe.”
- 95 percent reported that the area they lived in was in general “better” or “much better.”
- Home sale prices also rose from \$78,500 to \$175,000 (quite a return for a long time resident).
- The University investment of \$5,000,000 in neighborhood housing and development fund leveraged \$51,000,000 in equity.
- The trend of reduced homeownership (- 12% in the past decade) was reversed and had risen 6% in the following decade.
- Foot traffic was up 86%.
- 25 New businesses opened in less than four years.

This report amounts to only the tip of the iceberg from the details and programs described in published material. The information has been overwhelming. I would have spent a whole weekend piecing together statistics and information had I not found a source that tied it all

together for me. This is a problem I wish I could face when researching the University of New Mexico's initiatives for community outreach. I am thoroughly convinced that pressure needs to continue for reversing UNM's institutional neglect and apparent isolation from the surrounding community.

## **SOURCE**

All My data and statistics in this report were provided by one source

Kromer, John, and Lucy Kerman. West Philadelphia Initiatives: A Case Study in Urban Revitalization. Also available at:

<<http://www.aecf.org/KnowledgeCenter/Publications.aspx?pubguid={98188BA1-F151-4CEF-8A4A-9E904FB1C88E}>>.

# Smart Growth, Sustainability, Public Accountability, and Community Engagement at The University of New Mexico

---

Rita Mercado  
Summer Semester 2009  
Community Activism for Sustainable Living  
Instructor: Ph.D. Candidate, Andrew Marcum

As President Schmidly has said, these are indeed “exciting times” on campus as the University New Mexico undertakes the redevelopment of its Master Plan and proceeds with a unique opportunity to create a campus that reflects the sustainability principles outlined in the University’s Business Policies and Procedures Manual. The goal is to create a vibrant community and help make UNM one of the top universities in the country, reaching the President’s ultimate goal of inclusion in the Association of American Universities. Given the many strengths of the University, the process of updating the Master Plan will be guided by:

- Laying the groundwork for revitalization and future expansion in all precincts of the campus
- Preservation and enhancement of campus’ unique architecture, design, and aesthetic Optimizing its resources<sup>1</sup>

These principles along with UNM’s mission statement, “...to serve as New Mexico’s flagship institution of higher learning through demonstrated and growing excellence in teaching, patient care, and community service.”<sup>2</sup> point to an institution that in its pursuit of excellence is committed to its stakeholders.

---

<sup>1</sup> The University of New Mexico, “Interview and Focus Group Questions UNM Campus Plan, The University of New Mexico.

<sup>2</sup>The University of New Mexico “Campus Development Visioning Charrette,” The University of New Mexico, <http://frem.unm.edu/Docs/MASTER%20PLANS/CharretteBinder1.pdf>

The University has illustrated its position and desires for the development of the main campus throughout its mission statement and the Campus Development Visioning Charrette, a four-day forum convened at the request President Schmidly in November 2007. The purpose of the forum was to consider future and on-going plans for campus development and promote dialogue among select faculty in UNM's Architecture and Planning Department, UNM campus planners, and professional planning and design consultants. The University's commitment to community and sustainability are reiterated in the Charrette's report that states a well done Master Plan can transform UNM "into a performance-based, student-centered, scholarly-driven, community-connected institution."<sup>1</sup> These principles are stated again in the Master Plans created for both North and South campuses.

In addition to emphasizing community-connectedness, the Charrette's report also speaks to principles of sustainable growth. One of its stated goals was to address the need to maximize resources and "preserve and enhance the campus' unique architecture, design and aesthetic."<sup>2</sup> Besides highlighting efficient use of resources and maintaining UNM's aesthetic integrity, the sustainability document included in the University Business Policies and Procedure Manual stresses "environmental protection, social equity, and economic opportunity"<sup>3</sup> as essential to sustainable development. Yet in its own Institution-wide Environmental Assessment & Analysis, the Strengths, Weakness, Opportunities, and Threats (SWOT), the University identifies—along with its many strengths—challenges and difficulties it faces in the execution of this complex and multi-dimensional task. The University recognizes that,

---

<sup>1</sup> The University of New Mexico "Campus Development Visioning Charrette," The University of New Mexico, <http://frem.unm.edu/Docs/MASTER%20PLANS/CharretteBinder1.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> *ibid*

<sup>3</sup> The University of New Mexico, "University Business Policies and Procedures Manual," The University of New Mexico, <http://www.unm.edu/~ubppmanual/2100html>

## Relationships

- Historic perception that decisions are made without input from those they will impact – community, faculty, staff, etc.
- Historic distrust of administration by faculty and the community
- Internal strategic communications
- Perceived “us” vs. “them” mentality between administration and faculty
- Lack of school spirit<sup>1</sup>

Despite underscoring “community-connectedness” at the 2007 planning and development Charrette and in its documents pertaining to sustainability, UNM has yet to define a path for community engagement in reaching either its sustainability goals or in its campus development aspirations. The Campus Development Visioning Charrette for example, did not include perspectives or input from community leaders or neighborhood residents in the University area who clearly have a stake in UNM’s growth and expansion.

This lack of community participation and inclusion in the visioning process points to another challenge facing the University as outlined in the Charrette’s report—its location in an urban environment. To address the unique challenges and opportunities presented by this setting, the University joined the coalition of Urban Serving Universities, an institution committed to human capital, strengthening communities, and urban public health.<sup>2</sup>

Serving urban communities is a noble and important aim for the University of New Mexico to pursue. But achieving that aim will require direct engagement not only with the urban communities that immediately surround UNM, but with the city of Albuquerque as a whole and the greater metropolitan region. In order to establish a complimentary town and gown relationship between UNM, the city of Albuquerque, and the state as a whole, the University must adhere to its stated goals and principles. In UNM’s mission statement a desire

---

<sup>1</sup> The University of New Mexico, “Institution-wide Environmental Assessment & SWOT Analysis,” The University of New Mexico [http://www.unm.edu/president/documents/Environmental\\_Assessment.pdf](http://www.unm.edu/president/documents/Environmental_Assessment.pdf)

<sup>2</sup> The University of New Mexico “Campus Development Visioning Charrette,” The University of New Mexico, <http://frem.unm.edu/Docs/MASTER%20PLANS/CharretteBinder1.pdf>

to “to enhance the quality of life for all New Mexicans”<sup>1</sup> is identified as a “cornerstone of purpose.” Throughout the mission statement, accountability is heralded as a vital institutional virtue. The sentiments of smart growth, sustainability, public accountability, and community engagement expressed by UNM should not be just words on paper but also should be put into action in the course of the execution of its master plan.

### Works Cited

- The University of New Mexico. "Campus Development Visioning Charrette." *The University of New Mexico*.  
[http://www.unm.edu/president/documents/UNM\\_in\\_the\\_21st\\_Century\\_A\\_new\\_presidents\\_vision.pdf](http://www.unm.edu/president/documents/UNM_in_the_21st_Century_A_new_presidents_vision.pdf) (accessed July 29, 2009).
- "Institutional Support Services." *The University of New Mexico*. September 2007.  
<http://www.unm.edu/Docs/MASTER%20PLANS/MP%20Interview%20Questions%20PreCharrette.doc> - 2007-10-01 (accessed July 17, 2009).
- University Business Policies and Procedures Manual*. June 1, 2008.  
<http://www.unm.edu/~ubppm/ubppmanual/2100.html> (accessed July 22, 2009).
- The University of New Mexico, The Office of the Registrar. *The University of New Mexico Catalog 2009-2010*. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico, 2009.
- University of New Mexico. *Institution-wide Environmental Assessment & SWOT Analysis*. March 2008.  
[http://www.unm.edu/president/documents/Environmental\\_Assessment.pdf](http://www.unm.edu/president/documents/Environmental_Assessment.pdf) (accessed July 22, 2009).

---

<sup>1</sup> The University of New Mexico, The Office of the Registrar. *The University of New Mexico Catalog 2009-2010*. Albuquerque: The University of New Mexico, 2009.

# Density, Mass Transit, and Affordable Housing in University Communities

Jeffrey Waldo  
Summer Session 2009  
Community Activism for Sustainable Living  
Instructor: Ph.D. Candidate, Andrew Marcum

Automobiles increase carbon emissions that contribute to global warming and air pollution. University of New Mexico draws a large amount of traffic throughout the city and from Rio Rancho, Los Lunas, and Belen. Long individual commutes to UNM are unsustainable and unhealthy for the community. As described in the UNM Policies and Procedures Manual, the University expects to reduce its “transportation related green house gas (GHG) emissions by providing incentives and convenient accommodation for low emission transportation options.”<sup>1</sup> It is unclear how UNM plans to achieve its goals of reducing transportation related GHGs, but it is clear that building more parking lots that encourage individual car commuting is not the answer. Dense development and investing in alternative transportation and affordable housing is the way to decrease vehicular traffic in the area.

Urban sprawl is a major contributor to car related GHGs. Urban sprawl is when development moves out of its borders and begins to take up more land. For the University of New Mexico, new development outside of the main campus and satellite campuses contributes to urban sprawl in the city of Albuquerque. Unconnected learning facilities maximize the need for private transportation and parking. Even when shuttle operations are created to accommodate off campus parking lots, commuters still settle into the green house gas producing lifestyle. Building up instead of out—a more dense development—creates a pedestrian friendly environment and sets a good example for the city and communities’ future development. An easily walk-able campus creates a vital and active University center that is conducive to the creation and

---

<sup>1</sup> “2100 Sustainability.” UNM Business Policies and Procedures Manual. University of New Mexico: June 1, 2008. Pg 4

exchange of intellectual ideas. When educational needs can be met on the main campus, the need of a car is lessened and a more sustainable University is the result.

Alternative transportation is an excellent resource that can reduce the number of commuter journeys and in turn lower carbon emissions. The University's investment in the Albuquerque bus system was a first step in the right direction. But, to date, the free bus ride available to the UNM community may be revoked. The introduction of the Uptown and Westside parking depots is also a sustainable action. The University needs to continue and expand this initiative. Working with the city, UNM could suggest setting up more bus depots throughout Bernalillo and Sandoval Counties. A depot in Rio Rancho would most likely be a success and would greatly reduce the GHG emissions. Dale Dekker, a principal architect of Dekker/Perich/Sabatini, recognizes the need for change in his Op-ed "UNM Campus Needs To Graduate Beyond Cars." Dekker declares he is working with public entities including the city of Albuquerque on transit strategies "because UNM cannot solve regional transportation issues alone."<sup>1</sup> Princeton University included a revamping of the Dinky Train Station, an area combining transit and arts. Once remodeled, the station will be a "a focal point within the community that is designed for access to sustainable means of travel."<sup>2</sup> This means there will be a bike storage area and bus routes connected to the station, making it easier for citizens to travel without a car. Such simple access to alternative transportation lowers car related green-house-gasses and traffic in the area. The transit neighborhood of Princeton University is a great example of sustainable development, and the inclusion of the Rail Runner with the Albuquerque bus system is a step to full-fledged alternative transit.

To succeed in reducing car-related GHGs, networking is very important with continuous communication with the public domain: City of Albuquerque, Mid-Regional Council of

---

<sup>1</sup> Dekker, Dale R. "UNM Campus Needs to Graduate Beyond Cars." Albuquerque Journal. July 17, 2009.

<sup>2</sup> "Community Spaces." Princeton University. Jan 23, 2009. <<http://www.princeton.edu/artsandtransit/design/public-space/>>

Governments, New Mexico Department of Transportation, and UNM students, faculty, and staff, as well as community members is a must to successfully create fuel efficient transportation.

Alternative transit systems need to meet the needs of those who will utilize them. To lessen the number of automobile commuters to and from the University, we need more investment in mass transit and open communication among those concerned.

Affordable housing near UNM's main campus can also help reduce GHG emissions. So many citizens commute because economically viable housing is scarce in the UNM area. Rent is cheaper outside of Albuquerque. According to UNM's environmental scan 2000-2010 "lower land and housing costs in Rio Rancho, Los Lunas, and Belen have attracted people to move to those communities"<sup>1</sup> and commute to UNM's main campus. A good way to lower car related GHGs, is to keep those people here within walking distance of the University. To do this, the cost of housing in the area must compete with the prices of these outer areas. Dekker notes this initiative with a call to provide "more on-campus housing,"<sup>2</sup> but living in the residence halls is only an option for few. Many students feel it is too expensive, and faculty and staff cannot even apply. UNM's investment in affordable housing in the immediate University area is a more viable idea. With close to campus residence being accessible, affordable and safe, the UNM community would be able to walk to and from school and work, reducing vehicular transportation. The University's investment in local housing would aid "its mission to provide increased economic activity for New Mexicans"<sup>3</sup> as stated in the University Business Policies and Procedures Manual. Affordable housing in the area would create a surplus of funds saved from eliminating the cost of transportation. A livelier University neighborhood would create

---

<sup>1</sup> "Environmental Scan 2000-2010." Strategic Planning. University of New Mexico. 2000. Pp. 7

<<http://www.unm.edu/~unmstrat/envscan.html>>

<sup>2</sup> Dekker, Dale R. "UNM Campus Needs to Graduate Beyond Cars." Albuquerque Journal. July 17, 2009. <[http://www.abqjournal.com/opinion/guest\\_columns/172147142432opinionguestcolumns07-17-09.htm](http://www.abqjournal.com/opinion/guest_columns/172147142432opinionguestcolumns07-17-09.htm)>

<sup>3</sup> 2100 Sustainability." UNM Business Policies and Procedures Manual. University of New Mexico: June 1, 2008. Pg 7. <<http://www.unm.edu/~ubppm/>>

need for retail and food services. With affordable housing, an increase in population in the immediate UNM area would increase “the city’s ability to attract new business and industry.”<sup>1</sup>

## **GREENING**

The literal greening of UNM’s campus is a sustainable initiative. Plants help reduce carbon emissions; UNM should work to preserve and further develop the vegetation on all open spaces on campus. The North Campus Golf Course is one of the largest open spaces in the City of Albuquerque and should remain. The golf course is in close proximity to the “Big I,” the intersection of Interstates 40 and 25, where it helps to keep the University area from becoming a heat island. Dense development elsewhere will preserve the golf course. Regional trees and plants should be included whenever possible with all new development. This is necessary to counter GHG emissions from around the city. Plants that are native to this area need less water yet will provide shade and beauty without using up New Mexico’s scarce water source. More plants throughout the main campus would help this initiative. Not only would they reduce greenhouse gases and heat, but they also create shade and natural beauty for community members.

For additional information on Albuquerque traffic for 2008, go to: [http://www.mrcog-nm.gov/images/stories/pdf/maps\\_and\\_data/traffic\\_flow/tfm08urban.pdf](http://www.mrcog-nm.gov/images/stories/pdf/maps_and_data/traffic_flow/tfm08urban.pdf). There you will note that approximately 180,000 travel through the “Big I,” the intersection of Interstates 40 and 25 each day.

---

<sup>1</sup> “Environmental Scan 2000-2010.” Strategic Planning. University of New Mexico. 2000. Pp. 7  
<<http://www.unm.edu/~unmstrat/envscan.html>>

# **Research On The Unique Architectural And Landscape Character And Heritage of The University Of New Mexico Along With The Previous Vision of Growth.**

Eugene Lopez  
Community Activism for Sustainable Living  
Summer Semester 2009  
Instructor: Ph.D. Candidate, Andrew Marcum

From its founding in 1889 the University of New Mexico has stood as an icon for southwest culture that is unique to New Mexico. Through the years the campus has been a living museum preserving the heritage that has shaped its very existence. As growth and development are necessary, so is the importance of communities working together to maintain the beauty and diversity that make UNM an institution that compares with no other.

Will Moses, former Ph.D. student at the University of New Mexico, recently published his dissertation titled, A Cultural Landscape Report for the University of New Mexico. In his report Moses breaks down the historical occurrences that have shaped the UNM campus to the present day. Moses describes how the landscape and architecture of UNM's Albuquerque campus were planned with thoughtful intent in order to blend New Mexico culture with its natural landscapes. Moses writes "Naturalistic landscapes reflect a Romantic ideal of nature. Proponents of Romantic design believe that exposure to nature or naturalistic settings fostered moral behavior and aided in intellectual pursuits."<sup>1</sup> However, according to Moses, UNM has gradually shifted from its community oriented open greenscape ideal into more of a modernized cityscape.

---

<sup>1</sup> Moses, C.L.R. A Cultural Landscape for the University of New Mexico. Dissertation, 2006.

Realizing the importance of green space here on the UNM campus was one of the major concerns for presidents William G. Tight and George Zimmerman, and maintaining this standard should still be incorporated in the UNM planning process today.

In 1988 Al Stotts wrote an article for the *Campus News*, a faculty and staff newspaper, that said, "UNM could not be in any other place, an architectural critic once observed. Its strength, its intimacy, its individuality are all derived from the land and its people."<sup>1</sup> This quote reveals that UNM has grown with the help of the people who were driven by the rich culture that exists in New Mexico. More than 20 years ago Stotts could still say, "Today we have a campus that elegantly praises New Mexico and its heritage."<sup>2</sup> Stotts' praise of heritage suggests that UNM had been greatly influenced by those who served it in every aspect. In order to ensure that this heritage is preserved as UNM expands in the next 20 years, UNM needs to work with all of the surrounding communities.

V.B. Price, author and Adjunct Professor of Architecture and Planning Department at UNM, wrote an article in the *Albuquerque Tribune* called "UNM Cares for its Cultural Settings," which gave his view on the uniqueness of the campus. He wrote, "The main campus of the University of New Mexico, the most architecturally distinct campus in the United States is a built environment which approaches the ideal of integrity flourishing amid vibrant change."<sup>3</sup> The vibrant change he refers to is the modernization that was occurring at the time. UNM's unique style was made possible by leaders and presidents of the university such as William G. Tight, George Zimmerman, and John Gaw Meem

---

<sup>1</sup> Stotts, A. *Campus News*. 4-21-1988).

<sup>2</sup> Ibid

<sup>3</sup> Price, V.B. *Albuquerque Tribune*, 3/18/84.

(leading architect for the University between 1933 to 1959, who designed some 40 buildings on the campus that lend to its Southwestern atmosphere),<sup>1</sup> all of whom felt UNM needed to continue to blend in with its surroundings early on and to maintain its cultural integrity. The puebloization of Hodgkin Hall in 1908 was the first step made by President Tight to preserve New Mexican culture here at the University.

In the same article Price goes on to say, “Growth for the sake of growth and growth in the service of commercial expedience has produced a largely decadent environment one of often cynical utilitarian value rather than intrinsic worth.”<sup>2</sup> Price’s insight suggests that development cannot always be so uniform and we need to consider the value of culture and implement those values into the plans for growth in cooperation with the neighbors of UNM. At one time the campus had a close relationship to the people; however, it has undergone drastic changes and expansion.

It seems the relationship between the University of New Mexico and the people of New Mexico has been lost, and those in charge presently feel that bigger is better and development for the sake of profits is number one. But as UNM tries to expand—with estimates of extended growth for the years to come—we cannot lose sight of what makes our university special. A mix of students, faculty, and community have brought us to where we are today, and the campus is, according to Moses, “gradually shifting away from its community oriented open greenscape ideal into more of a modernized cityscape”<sup>3</sup> Will the encroachment of more buildings and parking lots and less green space be beneficial to the citizens of Albuquerque? Preservation of green space as well as consideration for the communities surrounding the university needs to be central to the

---

<sup>1</sup> *Rocky Mountain Archive*. <http://rmoa.unm.edu/docviewer.php?docId=nmu1pict000-675.xml>

<sup>2</sup> Price, V.B. *Albuquerque Tribune*, 3/18/84.

<sup>3</sup> Moses, C.L.R. *A Cultural Landscape Report for the University of New Mexico*. Dissertation, 2006.

planning process at UNM. The concept of open space and natural settings is what New Mexico is famous for, and the University campus should be a reflection of that.

# Yale Park and How it Relates to Today

Sean DeBuck

Summer Semester 2009

Community Activism for Sustainable Living

Instructor: Ph.D. Candidate, Andrew Marcum

The current University of New Mexico bookstore was born out of a torrent of controversy within the communities surrounding the campus. The site that it now rests on was part of a large lot of green space called “Yale Park,” an area that many people, including the first term Mayor of Albuquerque Marin Chavez, fought rather heatedly to save. Though UNM eventually had its way, it didn’t come without a cost of community and city relations, money, time, and added limitations that cut back on the original vision for the bookstore.

Yale Park was given to the University in 1914 and was maintained by UNM until 1964, when UNM entered into an easement agreement with the city of Albuquerque, putting the responsibility for maintaining and developing the park under city control.<sup>1</sup> The city had planned to create a visitors’ center in the park, but the plans for this were never followed through. During its time under city control, the park was host to many different events and a wide variety of people. It was host to anti-war demonstrations and cultural events, as well the home to many of the city’s homeless and transient, sometimes to the chagrin of the park neighbors, who were uncomfortable with the types of crowds the park attracted<sup>2</sup>.

In 1986 UNM expressed its desire to regain control of Yale Park. Toying with the idea of refurbishing the park, which had become somewhat polluted (with cigarette butts,

---

<sup>1</sup> Mckinney, Joe “Background Information on Yale Park” 1986: p.1.

<sup>2</sup> Price, V.B. “Yale Park Serves to Symbolize Issues of Urban growth” Albuquerque Journal, 24 Mar. 1985: D2.

bottles, etc...)<sup>1</sup>, and building an art museum within its boundaries,<sup>2</sup> University planners had drafted conceptual plans concerning its future use. Assuming that the University would tend to the park responsibly, Yale Park was put back into the University's hands in 1986 without consultation from the surrounding neighborhoods. This happened prior to a city ordinance that was passed in 1992 requiring neighborhood groups to be notified when the city makes decisions concerning development.<sup>3</sup> Some residents complained that they would have opposed it had they known the city was considering transferring Yale Park back under the wings of the University. An expression that, had UNM decision makers paid attention, foretold of the coming controversy facing UNM about the bookstore.

While looking through an old UNM planning report on Yale Park, I found a small paragraph detailing that a "Social Issues Taskforce" created a questionnaire that was distributed among the surrounding businesses and communities, with the intent of learning how local neighbors felt about Yale Park development. Included were questions about the best outcome for its development and even a question asking residents if they wished to see it remain as a community park.<sup>4</sup> Though it would be interesting to see the results of this survey, I was unable to find what the results were, and to whom the results was administered.

Following the termination of the easement agreement, none of the conceptual plans expressed by UNM (such as an art museum, park refurbishment, etc.) took fruition. In fact over the next four years, the city had disconnected the pipelines that were used to

---

<sup>1</sup> Ripp, Bart. "Yale Park Problems Spill Onto Campus" Albuquerque Tribune 1 Sept. 1984.

<sup>2</sup> Price, V.B. "Yale Park Serves to Symbolize Issues of Urban growth" Albuquerque Journal, 24 Mar. 1985: D2.

<sup>3</sup> Davis, Tony. "City Could Have Had Last Word on Yale Park" Albuquerque Tribune p.C12

<sup>4</sup> Mckinney, Joe "Background Information on Yale Park" 1986: p.1.

water the park, and UNM failed to take over those responsibilities, causing the green life to deteriorate. As less attention was paid to upkeep, security issues continued to be a problem surrounding Yale Park<sup>1</sup>

Around 1992 there began another flare up when the UNM Regents and planning committee hired an architectural firm and drafted a development plan that included placing a parking structure in Yale Park. Eventually these plans were scrapped, when local businesses and residents became vehemently opposed to having an unsightly parking structure on the skyline, and issues concerning funding were in doubt. The architect who had designed the original plans became frustrated and terminated his contract with UNM.<sup>2</sup>

The University administrators could have avoided the headache that this plan created by simply asking neighboring residents and businesses how they felt about a parking structure on the edge of campus *before* drafting a plan and hiring an architect. One has to wonder if the survey by the Social Issues Taskforce was forgotten barely six years after it was conducted. Now fast forward another 17 years and we find that UNM may be making the same mistakes. The most recent issue that comes to mind is the proposed parking structure on University, where neighborhood groups rallied city council to deny UNM's attempts to build a parking structure directly on the edge of campus. Seeing as it is in the best interest of UNM to complete its projects quickly and without controversy, it would be helpful to implement strategies that would give UNM the foresight to avoid these problems. But the toll taken by this lack of foresight did not end there.

---

<sup>1</sup> Davis, Tony, "City Could Have Had Last Word on Yale Park" Albuquerque Tribune p.C12

<sup>2</sup> Johnson, Doug. "Regents Dig Themselves a Nice Hole" Daily Lobo 8 Feb 1995 p.1

Following the departure of the previous architectural firm, Holmes Sabatini Architects were hired to design a three-story 50,000 square foot bookstore in its current location along Central Avenue. Seeing as the controversy surrounding their last plans were based on the unattractiveness of the originally proposed parking structure, the thinking may have been that a well designed bookstore would be more aesthetically pleasing and garner less disapproval. So once again plans were drafted and a new bookstore with a \$3.9 million price tag was ready to go.<sup>1</sup> When local residents found out that these plans spelled the elimination of 2/3 of Yale Park, another storm of controversy erupted, this one leading to a much more drawn out, and costly battle.

Many people came out of the woodwork and performed vocal demonstrations in opposition to the building of the new bookstore. Students, community members, and local writers, who were uncomfortable with the threat that the bookstore would pose to local bookstores in the area, all turned up to express disapproval. One woman even chained herself to a tree to prevent bulldozers from tearing it down.<sup>2 3</sup>

In an effort to find a compromise that would save Yale Park, Mayor Chavez made an offer that would give UNM the rights to develop on the site of the city owned water reservoir, which takes up a large space on Redondo near Central Avenue.

In response to the suggestion of this acquisition, University Director of Facility Planning Roger Lujan remarked that, though he had not thoroughly looked at the site, "lack of short term parking and delivery access might be a problem," and that the area along Redondo would be better suited for academic use. Concerning the potential

---

<sup>1</sup> Doug Johnson "Regents Dig Themselves a Nice Hole" Daily Lobo 8 Feb 1995 p.1.

<sup>2</sup> Maiello, Mike. "Writers Join in Yale Park Protest." Daily Lobo 4 May 1994.

<sup>3</sup> Mangieri, Gina. "Protesters Urge UNM to Save Yale Park." Albuquerque Tribune p.A6.

compromise, Mayor Chavez stated, "It seems to me to be a win-win situation...I think the University needs a new store. This would address the problem of the green space."<sup>1</sup>

This controversy proved to be costly. During the subsequent delays to the construction of the bookstore, Bill Sabatini approached the Regents stating that building prices had gone up within the three years since the original plans were created, and the design could not be carried out within budget. Eventually a whole story of the original bookstore was lopped off, and the floor took a 4,000 ft reduction.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps having to hire two different architects, and being forced to draft three different plans for the UNM bookstore could have been avoided had UNM been conscious of how the neighborhood would react. Perhaps a new way of doing business could be undertaken at UNM, that would maximize the benefits not only to the University but the community as well.

### **Works Cited**

- Davis, T. (n.d.). City Could Have had Last Word on Yale Park. *Albuquerque Tribune* .
- Johnson, D. (1995, April 20). Plans for New Bookstore Still Rolling. *Daily Lobo* .
- Johnson, D. (1995, February 8). Regents Dig Themselves a Nice Hole. *Daily Lobo* .
- Maiello, M. (1994, May 4). Writers Join in Yale Park Protest. *Daily Lobo* .
- Mangieri, G. (n.d.). Protesters Urge UNM to Save Yale Park. *Albuquerque Tribune* .
- Mckinney, J. (1986). Background Information on "Yale Park".
- Price, V. (1985, March 24). Yale Park Serves to Symbolize Issues of Urban Growth. *Albuquerque Journal* .
- Ripp, B. (1984, September 1). Yale Park Problems Spill Onto Campus. *Albuquerque Tribune* .
- Tipton, N. (1994, July 15). Mayor Offers University Site for New Bookstore. *Albuquerque Journal* .
- Tipton, N. (n.d.). UNM Bookstore Foes Take Root. *Albuquerque Journal* .
- Tipton, N. (1994, July 17). UNM to Eye Reservoir Site. *Albuquerque Journal* .

---

<sup>1</sup> Tipton, Nancy "Mayor Offers University Site for New Bookstore" [Albuquerque Journal](#) 15 July 1994.

<sup>2</sup> Johnson, Doug "Regents Dig Themselves a Nice Hole" [Daily Lobo](#) 8 Feb 1995 p.1

# A Brief History of Efforts to Preserve the North Golf Course and the Barren Fairways.

Judith Binder

Summer Semester, 2009

Community Activism for Sustainable Living

Instructor: Ph.D. Candidate, Andrew Marcum

There is no doubt that the University of New Mexico is a driving—if not deciding—force in New Mexico, Albuquerque, and most importantly, in the communities bordering its campus. For a generation, however, the families living in those communities, as well as citizens throughout Albuquerque, have been unable to reach a mutual understanding with the University, especially about green space.

The original 27 hole Golf Course stretched from near Central Avenue and Girard on the east spreading northwest across Lomas over to the Escarpment on the west: A land bank for future development. In 1950, the clubhouse, designed in the Pueblo Style by the architectural firm, Meem, Zehner, Holien, and Associates, was located by what was then the 14th green. Later, Van Dorn Hooker, campus architect and author, wrote:

*The plan for the North Campus, done in 1977, stated: "The golf course at the northerly end of the site contains the only mature trees and vegetation on campus, and it is clear that continued irrigation and sensitive planning efforts should be applied to maintain the environmental amenity. The golf course should be kept operational as long as possible since the income from it maintains the landscaping of the area."*<sup>1</sup>

Many of those thousands of trees had been donated in 1942 by neighbors whose homes bordered the property.<sup>2</sup>

Today, the continually expanding Medical complex lies to the south of Tucker. To the north and west are The Ronald McDonald House—an eight-room residence for families of critically ill children—built in 1982. The building has been expanded twice and now has 30 rooms. Adjacent is Casa Esperanza, a non-profit home that is also supported by the American Cancer Society. It is a home-away-from-home for families of cancer patients who must stay in Albuquerque while their family member is being treated. Continuing north on Yale are the Children's Psychiatric Center and the Pete and Nancy Domenici Hall. Built in 2002, Domenici Hall comprises the "UNM MIND Imaging Center, The MIND Institute and the UNM BRAIN Center, [expanding] the existing facility by 42,315 square feet [and] will support research and patient treatment."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Hooker, Van Dorn, Howard, Melissa, & Price, V.B. *Only in New Mexico*. Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 2000. 102.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, 100

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.unm.edu/~market/cgi-bin/archives/000301.html>

To the east on Tucker is the New Mexico Court of Appeals building under construction adjacent to the Law School's Bratton Hall, which was built in 1952. In 1976 the architectural firm, Meem, Zehner, Holien, and Associates was contracted to design the addition to the Law Library. Van Dorn Hooker, University Architect, included in his instructions on the expansion that he wanted "to make the design of the addition conform exactly to that of the original building so that you could not tell where it connected."<sup>1</sup>

*"UNM's blend of Pueblo/Spanish style architecture with regionally sensitive modernist forms is a direct reflection of New Mexico's singular place in American culture. No other major college campus in this country is so deeply rooted in indigenous American and Hispanic history, nor so intimately tied to a long existing regional outlook and aesthetic."*<sup>2</sup>

Looking back, in 1961, the Pueblo/Spanish Revival style was mandated by the university's regents as the school's official architectural style,<sup>3</sup> and enhanced through the work of John Gaw Meem, Architect.

---

### ***Ms. Alice Sickels, Former President of Friends of the North Golf Course***

*The following historical perspective has been compiled from material related to the North Course Neighborhood Association available in the UNM Southwest Research Center Archives and from the personal file of Alice Sickels, a former President of Friends of the North Golf Course. It is believed that Ms. Sickels is also the author of a poignant history of the North Campus, probably completed before 1994. Specifically, she wrote of the Barren Fairways, an historically significant few acres located adjacent to the first and second fairways of the official nine-hole UNM North Golf Course. As recently as 1987, administrations have supported reclamation of the area—but at various times have withdrawn support.*

\* \* \* \* \*

When, in April 1987, Casa Esperanza was on the drawing boards, Alice Sickels, project coordinator for Friends of the North Golf Course (FNGC), said in an interview with the *New Mexico Daily Lobo*, "UNM has never created a comprehensive plan concerning the development of the [golf course] land and has developed the land in a piecemeal fashion." Van Dorn Hooker, University Architect, indicated that "[T]here are no plans to develop except for a small building with the Ronald McDonald house . . . of approximately eight units." Sickels said that "plans such as these signal the beginning of a trend toward further development of the area."<sup>4</sup> And later, she said:

*We have no thought of opposing new construction [Casa Esperanza] on the North Campus, to be sure. The medical complex in particular seems likely to continue to expand, clearly for the good of the community. What we ask is that sites to be chosen with care, with*

---

<sup>1</sup> Hooker & Price, *Only in New Mexico*, UNM Press. Albuquerque, p. 224

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.*, p. xi

<sup>3</sup> *ibid.*, p. xviii

<sup>4</sup> Clark, C. C., Controversy Over Golf Course Increase, IV. *Daily Lobo*, 2/5/87, p.1.

*consideration of the recreational and, no less, the health interests of the community in fairways, dirt paths, and fresh air.<sup>1</sup>*

At that time, local legislative allies “Sen. Cisco McSorley and Rep. Dick Minzner, supporting the group’s opposition to continued unorganized development at the golf course, proposed House Memorial 13,<sup>2</sup> and Senator Tom Rutherford, attending the Regents meeting in April 1987, said that “UNM has not taken the neighborhoods into consideration in its planning”<sup>3</sup>

In the transcript from the Regents’ meeting of May 14, 1987, President Ken Johns spoke of the need for “master planning the entire 120 acres that is called the golf course which also includes everything north of Tucker and east of the ditch.”<sup>4</sup>

Several speakers, including Mark Hartman of the Graduate Students’ Association, concluded, “few people would argue that the University was effective in its communication.”<sup>5</sup> Ken Johns went on to consider “permanent continuing representation on the campus planning committee made up from, somehow these groups are going to have to get together and decide, some type of rotating basis and provide representation to the University.”<sup>6</sup>

Regent President Johns then continued by describing his walk around the entire open space with UNM President Gerald May:

That is one of the most beautiful areas I think that probably still exists in the city of Albuquerque. And it is certainly my intent personally, and I think I speak for the rest of the Board of Regents, to keep that open space just as long as possible. It doesn’t mean we can do it forever.<sup>7</sup>

The net result from the May 14<sup>th</sup> Regents meeting was the compromise reached and unanimous approval of a Resolution regarding Casa Esperanza proposed by the Finance and Facilities Committee that states, in part:

It is further recommended that no future development will take place until the comprehensive master plan has been updated and approved by the full Board of Regents. The formulation of this plan will include active input from neighborhood groups and will balance the needs of the comprehensive responsibilities of UNM to all citizens of New Mexico and its responsibilities for the welfare of the local community. It is with these stipulations that the Committee recommends the approval of the site to the Board.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Statement of the Friends of the North Golf Course Area, February or March 1987.

<sup>2</sup> Statement of the Friends of the North Golf Course Area, February or March 1987.

<sup>3</sup> Awalt, Jeff, Golf Course Plan Upset Neighbors, Albuquerque Journal, 4/14/87, p. B1.

<sup>4</sup> Transcript of part of the UNM Regents meeting, May 14, 1987.

<sup>5</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>7</sup> *ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> Minutes of the Meeting of the Regents, UNM, May 14, 1987.

Generally, inquiries to the University about plans for development have met with vague responses about master plans. Friends of North Golf Course sought to establish communication with UNM, hoping to “assure preservation and access to the pathways around the area . . . some looking fifty years hence dreamed of an open space secure against development” that would create a “distinctive, natural and health promoting environment in the heart of an ever-expanding city.”<sup>1</sup>

During this period, “the Albuquerque Historic Preservation Group renovated the Meem rest structure,” and after the bruhaha over Casa Esperanza was settled, FNGC “obtained the cooperation of the university (heavy equipment, water), more than \$60,000 in grant money from the city, and hundreds and hundreds of volunteer hours” to reclaim the Barren Fairways. However, following the fiasco with building over Yale Park, President Peck began to promote a driving range and “a new club house where the rest structure now stands.” The resulting controversy ended with “the defeat of the driving range [and] withdrawal of the University from the beautification project.” At this point, “FNGC returned \$30,000 of the grant money, the second stage proposal, to the city.”<sup>2</sup>

Throughout the files archived at Zimmerman Library, and including typed board minutes and miscellaneous notes between May and November 1990, were several references to work on “reclaiming the Barren Fairways.” These included purchase of “new plantings including shrubs,” the “participation from youngsters from the Children’s Psychiatric Hospital,”<sup>3</sup> and repair to the “John Gaw Meem Rest Station in coordination with the Albuquerque Conservation Association (TACA).<sup>4</sup> Folder 22 of the Archives includes a notation whereby the City of Albuquerque had approved \$12,000 for North Course and Barren Fairways Reclamation Project, with the statement, “Your association has committed to provide \$8,000 for this project.”<sup>5</sup>

Friends of North Golf Course was formed in late winter 1986 and went inactive in 1993; at the same time many participants were members of The North Campus Neighborhood Association that began meeting in 1989 and continues to inform the community through its website, “Neighborsforgreenspace.”<sup>6</sup> It is acknowledged that early University of New Mexico presidents set aside the North Golf Course and what is now the Barren Fairways as a “land bank” for future growth. *But how can we—the stewards for future generations of students and the University communities—let these special places disappear? There has to be some moment when we say stop. There has to be some place where we draw the line, where buildings cease, and the drone of the backhoe and the crash of steel against steel are silenced.*

---

<sup>1</sup> Sickels, Alice. From Personal Files, 1980s and 1990s. Untitled History. p. 2

<sup>2</sup> *ibid.* Untitled History, p. 3.

<sup>3</sup> UNM Archives: Friends of North Campus NA [Neighborhood Association}, Board Meeting Notes 1989-1990. Box 1, Folder 4b. November, 6, 1990.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, Folder 5, April 4, 1991.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, Folder 22 1988-1992

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.neighborsforgreenspace.com/forum>

## **Summary of Findings on Community Engagement and The Campus Development Advisory Committee**

As part of a four-week course on sustainability, urban development, and community participation in the development of Albuquerque, students in American Studies 309 examined the policies, procedures, and mission governing the University of New Mexico's Campus Development Advisory Committee (CDAC). After a careful review of the Senate Faculty Handbook pertaining to the CDAC, students posed questions to Committee Chair Alfred Simon in order to better understand the committee's specific function and role in the campus development process and assess how well the committee is currently positioned to meet its stated mission : to serve as "a forum for the communication and exchange of ideas and proposals regarding development on the campus and its impact on the campus community, the surrounding neighborhoods, and the City of Albuquerque."<sup>1</sup>

Community Engagement is not only a foundational principle of sustainable development, it is also one of four stated goals guiding the development of UNM's Master Plan for North Campus and the Health Sciences complex and is part of the CDAC's core mission as well. Given this, the question of how well the CDAC is able to fulfill this mission is crucial. To date, the Campus Development Advisory Committee is the only official outlet for community and resident involvement for contributing to UNM's development that directly affects hundreds of thousands of residents throughout the city of Albuquerque.

In light of this, the students of American Studies 309 respectfully submit the following findings and recommendations to Campus Development Advisory Committee Chairman Alfred Simon, Associate Dean School of Architecture and Planning for its voting and non-voting members. These findings and recommendations are offered in the spirit of collegiality, cooperation, and constructive observation and with a sincere desire to help UNM fulfill its noblest ambitions. They fall broadly into two main categories: **Representation and Community Participation** and **Committee Advisement and Oversight**.

### **Representation and Community Participation**

#### ***Finding***

Presently, neighborhood representation on the CDAC is limited to four representatives from neighborhood associations that are located in the four quadrants (north, east, south and west) that are contiguous with the main and north campuses; these four neighborhood representatives are selected by the Federation of University Neighborhoods. This means that several neighborhoods directly affected by UNM's growth have no representation at all. Moreover, these neighborhood representatives are listed as non-voting members. They can "voice" their concerns on campus development to the committee but have no final say in decisions made by the committee.

---

<sup>1</sup> University of New Mexico Faculty Senate Handbook, A61.5  
<http://www.unm.edu/~handbook/A61.5.html>

### ***Recommendation***

To be a forum that is truly inclusive and meaningful, the CDAC must expand its neighborhood representation to include any and all neighborhoods with a stake in UNM's development, including those neighboring south campus and the Rio Rancho campus. Neighborhood representatives should also have a vote on the committee.

### ***Finding***

Currently, the committee meets on Thursday afternoons in a small conference room in UNM's Office of Planning and Campus Development. Both the meeting space and the meeting times are major impediments to public participation and input. Meeting at 2 or 2:30 PM on a work day is hardly conducive to a broad exchange of ideas since neighborhood residents, faculty, and students most often work, teach, and attend class at these times. Moreover, the observation that the CDAC meetings are frequently "packed" (though technically true) is somewhat misleading since relatively few people can "pack" a small, closed conference room in a building with limited community accessibility and parking. Informal conversations with neighborhood leaders revealed that this was a major problem for those who would like to attend more often but simply can not.

### ***Recommendation***

To facilitate greater community, student, and faculty participation, the CDAC should meet after working hours in a larger, more open, and more accessible location such as UNM's Continuing Education Building.

### ***Finding***

According to neighborhood residents, the proceedings, findings, and recommendations of the CDAC are not as transparent or available to the public as they could be or should be. The committee's recommendations are forwarded to the Provost's office and to Institutional Support Services. Committee minutes are forwarded to the Faculty Senate. But there is no clear, quick, easy, or reliable way for students, faculty, or neighborhood residents to access this information. There is no central on-line website or physical location where residents, students, faculty, and interested city officials can go to simply learn about the proceeding, pending recommendations, or upcoming agenda items of the CDAC, let alone offer important, relevant, and timely feedback or comments on the University's campus development plans.

### ***Recommendation***

In the interests of transparency and a more inclusive, democratic, and dynamic planning process that truly and consistently incorporates the needs and concerns of our shared communities, the CDAC should make its recommendations and minutes easily accessible and broadly available. This could include (but need not be limited to):

- The creation of a staffed and interactive website where information could be posted and regularly updated and residents can provide input on projects pertinent to their neighborhood.
- The production of a monthly or quarterly newsletter distributed to neighborhoods detailing UNM's evolving plans for growth and development and inviting feedback from residents while actively encouraging attendance to the CDAC's monthly meetings.
- Making hard copies of this information readily available at the Planning and Campus Development Office.

Additionally, the CDAC should work with university planners, neighborhood residents, students, and faculty to devise clear, creative, and effective strategies for improving communication with its neighbors and increasing community participation in UNM's future growth and development. At a minimum, this could include soliciting feedback and ideas through the aforementioned website, a newsletter, and regularly and widely attended monthly or quarterly meetings.

Finally, ideas and feedback must not simply be heard. They must be implemented. The community (including neighbors, students, and faculty) must have their ideas taken seriously. Without mutual respect, understanding, and shared interests in mind, neighbors will not participate or cooperate in good faith with the university. Achieving cooperation among university and community members will require consistent transparency, sustained community engagement, and clear structures of accountability that can track the implementation and/or rejection of ideas submitted by neighbors, students, and faculty to university planners and professional consultants. Other universities such as the University of Washington, Seattle and the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill have developed these structures of participation and accountability by forming separate neighborhood committees or City-University councils that work with, and make recommendations to, existing university committees. UNM must accordingly develop strategies that work for us and for our neighbors.

### **Committee Advisement and Oversight**

#### ***Finding***

The Campus Development Advisory Committee's scope of review is quite broad, including everything from signage design approval to issues regarding campus master plans. In its evaluation of projects, the committee is charged with considering everything from the health and safety of everyone on campus and visitors to campus to the aesthetic impact of a project and whether or not a project incorporates practices of sustainable or "green" development. But, as of now, the CDAC is only an advisory committee. The Committee can only comment on aspects of the projects presented to them. They have no direct say in whether or not a project should actually be undertaken. Only Capital Projects and Institutional Support Services make those decisions.

Although the project manager of a particular project can take the CDAC's recommendations under consideration as they work with consultants in developing the project, there appear to be no clearly defined mechanisms in place to ensure that the Committee's recommendations are actually implemented, and there is no way to "track" the implementation of the Committee's

recommendations. This means that even though the CDAC listens to the ideas of both voting and non-voting members, there is still no way to actually ensure that those ideas are meaningfully incorporated into a project. Thus, even if broad representation and community participation in campus development is achieved, there is still no way to make that participation markedly influential.

### ***Recommendation***

Currently, a project of any size is brought to the CDAC three times—in the early planning/design stage, in the design development stage, and in the construction stage. In addition to implementing the community participation strategies discussed above, the CDAC should develop a clear process for tracking the implementation or rejection of its recommendations as projects develop, while keeping the public informed and involved throughout. Those projects that directly affect neighborhoods will require sustained tracking and community input and the Committee must work with neighborhood representatives to ensure that input occurs and is acted on.

### **Concluding Remarks on the Cost-Effectiveness, Institutional Benefits, and Challenges of Implementing these Recommendations**

We recognize that there may be costs and challenges associated with implementing many of these suggestions. Sustained and meaningful community engagement requires a significant and persistent financial investment in university out-reach programs and community-based service learning initiatives. Expanding the responsibilities of a Senate Faculty Advisory Committee such as CDAC will certainly require greater allocations of time and resources and may, or may not, require broader changes in the structure of University government. In any case, we believe the benefits of implementation far outweigh the costs of inaction and make the challenges of implementation well worth pursuing for the following reasons:

#### **1. Community Engagement is Cost Effective and Improves the Quality of Education.**

Community Engagement is cost effective both in terms of planning and development and in terms of providing quality education for students. Community engagement organized on the Research Service Learning Program (RSLP) model, for example, is highly cost effective, and it fulfills UNM's commitment to research, teaching, service, and civic responsibility. A requirement of RSLP courses is that students devote at least 36 hours per term to direct or indirect community-engaged work. A class with 25 students would contribute a minimum of 900 hours. Placing a value of \$8.50/hour on this work yields a benefit to the community and University of \$7,650 per course. When a series of courses is offered over several semesters by the same instructor, the value increases because baseline data will have been collected and more advanced work can be completed.

Moreover, developing a clearly defined, consistent, open, inclusive, and effective process for community input on, and participation in, campus planning and development will mitigate the costly delays, legal challenges, and project cancellations that result from a lack of community consultation and cooperation. Recent challenges to UNM's plans to build a parking structure in the Spruce Park area, the scrapping of a proposed retirement community on the North Campus

Golf Course, and the publicized complaints of residents in the South Campus area following the expansion of athletic and recreational venues without their knowledge or consultation are but three of the most recent illustrations of the costs paid by both the University and its neighbors due to lack of communication and community participation.

## **2. Community Engagement Strengthens Institutional Integrity**

In its 2008/09 Accreditation Report, the Higher Learning Commission (HLC) noted the UNM Board of Regents' recommendation to President David Schmidly that he adopt "Communicate" as the President's theme for 2008/09, adding: "Faculty and student public forums voiced perceptions to the visiting team that decisions were delivered 'top-down' with little engagement from the University community."<sup>1</sup> Also in its report, the HLC explicitly acknowledged that the University community included the University's neighbors, and they suggested that community engagement extended to campus planning and development decisions, writing:

Open and honest communication is critical not only within the university, but must also be extended from UNM to local community citizens to establish and maintain credibility and trust. For example, citizens living near the north golf course apparently feel they were misled by the university in the loss of former green space for north campus expansion.<sup>2</sup>

There have been a plethora of reports from commissions, councils, and developers (many of which are included in the document) that speak of community participation. But citizens become frustrated when their presence has no authority. An early effort at establishing mutual goals would increase effectiveness and, at the same time, reduce costs. Citizens are the best authorities on what works in the communities.

---

<sup>1</sup> Higher Learning Commission Report, <http://www.unm.edu/~accred/SupportingDocuments/UNMAssurance.pdf> p. 11.

<sup>2</sup> (HLC) [.unm.edu/~accred/SupportingDocuments/UNMAdvance.pdf](http://www.unm.edu/~accred/SupportingDocuments/UNMAdvance.pdf) Pg. 4, 5.

***This Resolution of the Graduate and Professional Student Association Concerning Community Engagement in the University of New Mexico's Planning and Development Process is submitted for consideration by the GPSA Council.***

**WHEREAS** plans are currently underway to expand the University of New Mexico over the next twenty years; and

**WHEREAS** community engagement is a foundational principle of sustainable development, one of four stated goals guiding UNM's plans for growth and expansion, and part of the Campus Development Advisory Committee's (CDAC) core mission; and

**WHEREAS** graduate and professional students are community members and are invested in successful collaborative relationships between our communities and the university as teaching assistants, research assistants, students, and employees; and

**WHEREAS** the CDAC is the only official outlet for community and residential involvement for contributing to UNM's development that directly affects hundreds of thousands of residents throughout the City of Albuquerque; and

**WHEREAS** neighborhood representation on the CDAC is limited to four representatives from neighborhood associations that are located in the four quadrants (north, east, south and west) that are contiguous with the main and north campuses;

**WHEREAS** several neighborhoods directly affected by UNM's growth have no representation at all; and

**WHEREAS** neighborhood representatives have no vote on the Campus Development Advisory Committee; and

**WHEREAS** according to neighborhood residents, the proceedings, findings, and recommendations of the CDAC are neither transparent nor readily available to the public; and

**WHEREAS** there is no central on-line website or physical location where residents, students, faculty, and interested city officials can go to learn about UNM's growth and development and offer important or relevant feedback or comments on the University's campus development plans; and

**WHEREAS** the Campus Development Advisory Committee is only an advisory committee with no direct say in whether or not a project should actually be undertaken; and

**WHEREAS** there are no mechanisms in place to ensure that the Committee's recommendations or the suggestions and concerns of neighbors are actually implemented and there is no way to "track" the implementation of said recommendations; and

**WHEREAS** historically the CDAC has not been the most effective mechanism for citizen input because it often addresses issues not pertinent to neighborhood concerns; and

**WHEREAS** Community engagement modeled on the Research Service Learning Program (RSLP), is highly cost effective, and it fulfills UNM's commitment to research, teaching, service, and civic responsibility; and

**WHEREAS** an effective process for community participation in, and input on, campus planning and development will mitigate the costly delays, legal challenges, and project cancellations that result from a lack of community participation; and

**WHEREAS** in its 2009 accreditation report, The Higher Learning Commission noted that community engagement is crucial to institutional integrity and that "Open and honest communication is critical not only within the university, but must also be extended from UNM to local community citizens to establish and maintain credibility and trust."<sup>1</sup>

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by this council that the University of New Mexico establish a clearly defined, consistent, open, inclusive, and effective process for community participation in, and input on, campus planning and development,

**IT IS RESOLVED** that this council calls on the University of New Mexico with the advice of the UNM student body to create a separate entity (be it a board, commission, or committee) to specifically focus on community participation, communication, and relations,

**IT IS RESOLVED** that this entity be empowered to convene community-university committees as needed to address the concerns of specific neighborhoods relevant to particular development projects,

**IT IS RESOLVED** that the UNM Board of Regents direct President Schmidly to work with the Office of the Provost, the Office of Institutional Support Services, Campus Planning and Development, neighborhood representatives, and the Campus Development Advisory Committee to:

- develop a process for communicating with neighboring communities and the City of Albuquerque at the outset of its plans for campus construction and campus expansion to begin with the relevant Request for Proposal (RFP).
- allow adequate time for feedback on development plans and to determine and establish shared goals for campus development (i.e. before construction begins).
- communicate with communities, including (but not limited to): the creation of a staffed and interactive website where citizens could provide direct feedback on development plans and where information could be posted, dated, and regularly updated. Hard copies of this information should be available at the Planning and Campus Development Office. Regular and consistent contact with neighborhood

---

<sup>1</sup> Higher Learning Commission Report (HLC)  
.unm.edu/~accred/SupportingDocuments/UNMAAdvance.pdf Pg. 4, 5.

leaders and residents through quarterly forums, the production of a monthly or quarterly newsletter, detailing UNM's evolving plans for growth and development and inviting feedback from residents.

- give neighborhood representatives a vote and expand neighborhood representation on the Campus Development Advisory Committee to include any and all neighborhoods with a stake in UNM's development, including those neighboring south campus and the Rio Rancho campus.
- call on the Board of Regents to track and implement the CDAC's recommendations
- facilitate greater community, student, and faculty participation on the CDAC by requiring the committee to meet after working hours in a larger, more open, and more accessible location such as UNM's Continuing Education Building.

**IT IS RESOLVED** that in the interests of transparency and a more inclusive, democratic, and dynamic planning process that truly and consistently incorporates the needs and concerns of our shared communities that the ideas and feedback of UNM's neighbors are not simply heard but are implemented.

## **References**

### **University of New Mexico Web Resources**

- <http://www.unm.edu/>
- <http://www.unm.edu/~accred>
- [http://frem.unm.edu/MasterPln\\_Interviews.shtml](http://frem.unm.edu/MasterPln_Interviews.shtml)
- [http://frem.unm.edu/MasterPln\\_Interviews.shtml](http://frem.unm.edu/MasterPln_Interviews.shtml)
- [http://www.unm.edu/president/documents/Environmental\\_Assessment.pdf](http://www.unm.edu/president/documents/Environmental_Assessment.pdf)
- <http://www.unm.edu/~ovpsa/2008%20Campus%20Projects.pdf>

### **Resources and methods for university administrators and educators to become fully engaged with the community**

*"The Minneapolis Neighborhood Revitalization Program is an innovative effort to bring residents into the priority-setting process of their city. It is based on the belief that the empowerment of residents and the mobilization of untapped resources, energy and creativity can make our progressive vision of the future a reality."*  
[www.nrp.org](http://www.nrp.org)

Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service. *Journal of Extension*. October 2002 v. 40 , #5, Tools of the Trade, 5 TOT 5.  
<http://www.joe.org/joe/2002october/tt5.php/>

Seattle Dept. Neighborhoods  
[www.ci.seattle.wa.us/eighborhoods/](http://www.ci.seattle.wa.us/eighborhoods/)

Urban Environment Management: An interdisciplinay approach to urban environment management that includes public education and networking.  
<http://www.gdrx.org/uem/documents.html>

Walljasper, Jay. *The Great Nighborhood Book: A Do-it-Yourself Guide to Placemeking*. New Society Publishers, 2007.

---