GENA Neighborhood Plan

Adopted by Common Council
Resolution No. 2006-06-018
June 9, 2006

Mark Johnsrud, Mayor

Council Members
Dorothy B. Lenard, 8th District
Andrew Monfre, 5th District
Bill Harnden, 6th District

Thanks to those who regularly attended meetings during the seven-month planning process and contributed to the development of the final plan:

Jennifer Anderson-Meger
F. E. Barmore
Harold Bartig
Jerome Boge
Patricia Boge
Mary Ann Brownell
Carmen DeYoe
Mike DeYoe
Peter Ferguson
Betsy Fowler
Bob Freedland
Maureen Freedland
Philip Gelatt
John F Horman
Fritz Kesselring
Eileen Kirsch
Richard Kotovich Jr.
Doug McVey
Chris Molstad
Steve Molstad
Francis Murphy
Sandra Oakley
Sally Oswalt
Nancy Peterson
Jim Ringstrom
Larry Robinson
Michael Ross
Cheri Schuyler
Jeanne Shuda
Martin Smith
Ruby Smith
Laurie Strand
Curtis Thienes
Craig Thompson
Peggy Thompson
Michael Valentine
Russ Wedeking
Charles Weeth
Corinne Weis
Ed West
Mary Ellen West
Carl Wiggert
Robert Wingate
Sharon Wingate
Bob Zeman

Special thanks to Matt Lewis from the University of Wisconsin at La Crosse who attended the February 8th meeting.

Special thanks to Jerry Kember, Bill Oldenburg, Tom Thompson, Ken French, and Deb Suchla from the La Crosse School District who attended the February 15th meeting.

Project Staff
Lawrence J. Kirch, Director of City Planning
Adryan Slaght, Senior Planner
Timothy Acklin, Associate Planner
COMMITTEE REPORT

Your judiciary and Administrative Committee having under consideration the annexed resolution approving Grandview Emerson Neighborhood Plan, and said matter having been referred to the City Plan Commission and same having made and filed its report thereon, recommends the same be adopted.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard P. Becker, Chmn.
Tom Sweeney
Andrew Monfre
Jim Bloedorn
Dorothy B. Lenard
Bruce Ranis

Typed: 5-31-06
Approved:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, in November 2005 the City of La Crosse authorized the Planning Department to prepare a neighborhood plan for the Grandview Emerson Neighborhood which lies south and east of the Goosetown-Campus Neighborhood Association and north of Cass St near UW-L, and;
WHEREAS, the City of La Crosse Planning Department mailed a survey to over 1,300 neighborhood property owners and held at least seven public meetings in order to gather input from neighborhood residents in an effort to preserve, protect and improve the neighborhood with residential, commercial, institutional and recreational areas, and;
WHEREAS, these goals are consistent with Chapter 8 of the La Crosse Comprehensive Plan (Neighborhoods and Housing Plan Element), which states that, "Strong and healthy neighborhoods are the building blocks of cities." and "The City's goal is to make La Crosse's neighborhoods as attractive as possible so that people want to stay or move into the City."; and
WHEREAS, the Grandview Emerson Plan has endorsed the adoption of this neighborhood plan; and
WHEREAS, the plan addresses the following goals for which the plan was originally intended:
1. Develop a vision with goals and objectives for the residential, business, educational and institutional stakeholders in the neighborhood.
2. Formulate strategies and plan recommendations for key issues identified by neighborhood residents in areas of traffic and parking, property maintenance, historic preservation, balance of single and multiple family housing, retention and strengthening of neighborhood businesses and institutions, vandalism and crime, land use, parks, marshes, and forests, etc.
3. Continue the positive and progressive relationship with UW-L as the major institution with the most immediate and dramatic impact on the neighborhood.
4. Identify both short- and long-term action strategies with recommendations to foster, initiate, monitor, and implement by state and local government officials, City staff, UW – L administrators, local businesses, and other neighborhood stakeholders.
5. Provide a framework for the numerous stakeholders in the neighborhood to help them better understand the dynamics of the area, the role that they could play in preserving, protecting and improving the area, and to identify opportunities in timing, funding, and public-private collaboration to achieve desired outcomes.
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City of La Crosse hereby approves the Grandview Emerson Neighborhood Plan as presented.
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Introduction

The Grandview Emerson Neighborhood is one of the more stable neighborhoods in the City of La Crosse. It is characterized by a more highly-educated population than the City as a whole, with a median family income well above the City median. There is relatively little poverty in the neighborhood. Median home values are roughly $20,000 higher than the City median, and nearly 60% of all units are owner-occupied compared to less than 50% for the City as a whole. The neighborhood has a number of assets within and adjacent to it, including the University of Wisconsin – La Crosse (UW-L), Emerson Elementary School, Memorial Pool, Myrick Park, Hixon Forest, and Forest Hills Golf Course, Tennis Courts, and Pool to name a few. With all of these assets, however, the neighborhood has voiced a number of concerns regarding issues that could contribute to a lower quality of life.

One of the major issues of concern to the neighborhood was the decision of the School District of La Crosse during the fall of 2005 to propose closing Emerson Elementary School as part of a cost-savings measure. With part of the neighborhood known as “baby buggy row,” and with many people choosing to live in this neighborhood specifically because of the presence of Emerson Elementary, this issue was especially salient. In addition to the proposed closing of Emerson Elementary, in 2005 the University of Wisconsin – La Crosse finished their campus master plan after nearly two years of work. This plan identified directions for the physical development of campus over the next 20 years. Some of the details of this plan that raised the concern of the Grandview Emerson Neighborhood were the intent of the University to convert the Memorial Pool site into parking and possibly street or building expansion, the inclusion of the Emerson Elementary School within the campus boundary, the plan to expand Veteran’s Memorial Stadium from 4,000 seats to roughly 10,000 seats, and the plan to reduce on-campus housing by 400 beds and revise out-of-state tuition to attract more students, thereby increasing pressure on the neighborhood to supply off-campus housing.

Together these two institutions are the cause of much of the concern within the neighborhood. Anecdotal reports have indicated that some people have already left the neighborhood in anticipation of these proposals becoming reality. In addition to these issues, the neighborhood is continually confronted with the issue of how to co-exist with these institutions, and deal with issues such as parking, speeding traffic, property maintenance, garbage, noise, loss of owner-occupied homes to rentals, etc.

Late in 2005, the Common Council of the City of La Crosse passed a Resolution allowing the Planning Department to engage in planning activities to address these and other issues within the neighborhood. Planning efforts began in earnest in early 2006. Meetings were held with UW-L, the School District of La Crosse, the Grandview Emerson Neighborhood Association, and other residents of the neighborhood. The results of these meetings, as well as a survey
mailed out to over 1,300 residents of the neighborhood, and census data were all used in the preparation of this plan.

The purpose of the GENA Neighborhood Plan is to devise strategies for addressing the neighbors’ concerns, and set the foundation for collaborative efforts between the public and private sectors to help implement the plan recommendations. More specifically, the neighborhood plan is intended to:

- Educate both city government and neighborhood residents about each other’s concerns and visions for the future.
- Promote collaboration between the City and the neighborhood in order to achieve mutual goals and a shared sense of responsibility.
- Create a “sense of place” within the community by identifying and developing the assets within each neighborhood.
- Initiate change, rather than simply reacting to it, by addressing specific issues and opportunities.
- Strengthen the City by strengthening neighborhoods.
Executive Summary

The GENA Neighborhood Plan is the result of a seven-month planning process involving GENA Neighborhood residents, property owners, business owners, and institutional representatives. The Plan is comprised of three main sections. The first section is the listing of issues and a summary of conditions. During the first months of the planning process the group did several exercises, and the City administered a neighborhood survey that examined the current conditions of the neighborhood and assisted in identifying the major issues within.

The second section contains the recommendations and policies to guide the Neighborhood Association in implementing the plan. There are four main subject areas in this section: Housing, Traffic and Parking, Institutions, and Public Utilities and Services. Each section contains an overall objective, followed by actions and policies that will guide future efforts aimed at improving the neighborhood. Included in this section are brief overviews of two implementation strategies; the City's Capital Improvement Budget process and the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program budget process. Each of these budget processes provides opportunities for the neighborhood to receive funding to implement eligible programs or projects.

The third section of the plan contains the appendices, including: a Neighborhood Map Summary; Census Tables and Charts highlighting specific demographic information; a 2000 Census Profile of the neighborhood; the final results of the neighborhood survey; and a summary of results from the survey that was given to the area east of Losey Boulevard.

Proposed Actions and Strategies

The actions outlined in this plan are intended to guide future efforts of the GENA Members, City Departments, and the City Council, as they work to improve the quality of life in the neighborhood and in the City. The plan recommendations range from broad actions or changes in policies to specific actions aimed at addressing concerns that directly affect some areas of the neighborhood. Many of the recommendations will also benefit other neighborhoods throughout the City. The following is a summary of the actions for each of the four subject areas.

A. Housing

The Objective of the Housing Section is to maintain and improve the quality of all existing housing (single-family and multi-family) within the neighborhood, ensure the quality and compatibility of all new residential construction, and to preserve the historic character of the neighborhood.

This section also contains two action sub-areas: Heritage Preservation and Property Maintenance.
The Heritage Preservation Actions are aimed at preserving and protecting the historic and architectural character of the neighborhood and call for the development of a Heritage Preservation Plan for the Cass and King Street NRHP Residential Historic District, as well as a zoning overlay district to be used as an implementation tool for the preservation plan. The neighborhood association will then work with the City and/or the UW-L History Department to prepare a NRHP application to designate the potential 23rd and 24th Street Residential Historic District.

The Property and Maintenance actions are aimed at improving the physical and visual appearance of the neighborhood.

B. Traffic and Parking
The objective of the Traffic and Parking Section is to address traffic volume and speed issues throughout the neighborhood, increase bicycle and pedestrian safety, and better address on-street and off-street parking issues.

C. Institutions
The objective of the Institutions Section is to address concerns of the possible closing of Emerson Elementary and the expansion of the University of Wisconsin - La Crosse (UW-L). This section also addresses the need to improve the relationship between the University and the Neighborhood.

This section is divided into two sub-categories: Emerson Elementary School and UW-L. The actions associated with Emerson Elementary are aimed at working to keep the school open and operating in the neighborhood. The school is highly regarded as an important asset for attracting new families to the neighborhood. The actions associated with the University are aimed at maintaining positive relationships with the neighborhood.

D. Public Utilities and Services
The objectives of the Public Utilities and Services Section are to upgrade the level and quality of City Services, encourage changes that will result in improvements to the physical characteristics of the neighborhood, and maintain a positive perception of the neighborhood.

This section is divided into four categories: Parks, Greenspace and Recreation; Safety and Security; Public Services, and Refuse and Recycling.

The Parks, Greenspace and Recreation actions were developed to guide the efforts of the City in maintaining facilities in the neighborhood. The parks category focuses on the future of Roellig Park, Memorial and Forest Hills Pools, and efforts to maintain or increase the amount of boulevard trees in the neighborhood.

The Safety and Security Actions call for a reduction in the amount of crime that occurs within the neighborhood. Recommended actions include
additional neighborhood watch zones, and increased participation by the La Crosse Police Department.

The Public Services actions call for improvements in the frequency and quality of City services in the neighborhood, such as stormwater management.

The Refuse and Recycling actions are aimed at decreasing the amount of litter and other garbage throughout the neighborhood. Specific actions include reviewing the requirements for garbage dumpsters versus cans; educating residents, especially tenants of rental property, on the garbage and recycling pick-up process and schedule; and enforcement of penalties for infractions.

Plan Implementation

The completion of the GENA Neighborhood Plan is only the first step toward achieving the goals that are outlined in the Plan. The actions contained in the plan will be used as guiding statements and ideas for the future work of the Neighborhood Association, various City Departments, the Common Council and other organizations. Upon adoption of this plan by the Common Council, implementation of the plan actions becomes the final and most crucial step in improving the quality of life for the neighborhood. The main group responsible for implementation of the recommendations is the Neighborhood Association itself, as it will be the main champion of specific recommendations. All City Departments are encouraged to reference this document as they prepare their Capital Budgets and yearly plans, and the Common Council is also encouraged to reference this document as they consider budget requests, and any proposals that will directly impact the neighborhood.
Neighborhood Planning Background

Neighborhood Boundaries and History

GENA History
In October 2002, a few residents of the neighborhood, who were active in the efforts of retaining the old Grandview Hospital as an office building instead of converting it to a private dormitory, sent 500 letters to residents in the area around UW-L announcing a neighborhood meeting. The first meeting was held on November 13 at Emerson Elementary School and neighbors began discussing the issues that they wanted to see addressed, starting with on-street parking. Since that time, about 100 families have been sending in voluntary dues and a newsletter is published highlighting different topics. Over the past 3 ½ years the group has met to work on finding solutions to various problems.

In 2003, at GENA’s request, the City reviewed on-street parking policies around UW-L and modified a number of the regulations. In 2004 neighborhood members followed the UW-L Master Plan as it was drafted, and worked with the City regarding the rezoning of old churches to new uses.

In 2005, GENA continued to work on parking issues. Candidates for City Council also participated in a forum and the school district gave members a presentation on the proposed referendum to close Emerson Elementary. That year, GENA volunteers also raised money and planted two gardens on Campbell Road, one at the cul-de-sac at La Crosse Street and the other at the entrance to Crowley Park.

As more residents attended meetings and became involved, the neighborhood group, with help from the City, began developing a neighborhood plan in November of 2005.

Most of the area now designated as the Grandview Emerson Neighborhood was originally the eastern side of the original Goosetown Campus Neighborhood. The residents east of UW-L did not feel that they were really a part of the Goosetown Neighborhood Association and began attending the GENA meetings, so the boundaries were modified to make 17th & Main Streets the southwestern boundary.

The boundaries for the GENA Neighborhood Association are West Avenue on the west, Cass Street on the south, Losey Boulevard on the east, Park Drive on the north to Hillview Avenue, Hillview Avenue & Myrick Park Lane on the west to Campbell Road, Campbell Road running southwest to State Street, State Street on the north to 16th Street, 16th Street running north to Vine Street, and Vine street on the north back to West Avenue. (See Figure 1)
Neighborhood Plan Development

The GENA Neighborhood Association met monthly from December 2005 through April of 2006 to identify the most important issues in the neighborhood and develop policies and recommendations. Several exercises were conducted and reports were prepared to assist in this process. They include the following:
- A Keep/Change Exercise
- A Neighborhood Survey
- An issue prioritization exercise (blue dot exercise)
- A Neighborhood 2000 Census Profile
- An Analysis of Police Statistics
- An Analysis of Inspection Statistics
- An Analysis of Neighborhood Maps

Following this data collection and the analysis of existing conditions and issues a summary report was developed to list the major issues as a section of the plan. This report was then used as a basis for an initial draft of planning recommendations. The draft was distributed to the Neighborhood Association in April of 2006, for editing and fine-tuning.

Planning Process Outcome

The outcome of this planning process is a set of plan recommendations and policies that will enhance the quality of life and the environment within the neighborhood. It is understood that the implementation of the plan recommendations will vary based upon existing resources, community support, and the priority of need relative to other community planning initiatives. However, the GENA Neighborhood strongly encourages the City, School District, community-based organizations, and the business community to consider funding the neighborhood’s recommendations in upcoming budget cycles, and to participate in neighborhood initiatives to improve the quality of life in the neighborhood.

Neighborhood Plan Implementation

There are two major steps for plan implementation:

1. Adoption of the GENA Neighborhood Plan by the La Crosse Common Council.

   Attached to this neighborhood plan is a Common Council resolution that designates City agencies and departments responsible for implementing the plan recommendations. Inclusions of neighborhood improvement projects in the capital or operating budget, work plans, CDBG program budget, or other sources of funding from state or federal governments are possible ways to implement plan recommendations.
2. **Monitor plan recommendations by District Council Members, a designated Planning Council, and/or neighborhood associations.**

   To ensure that the plan is being implemented, a Neighborhood Planning Council should be formed that is comprised of neighborhood residents, businesses, and other affected interests in addition to the five neighborhood groups. For the City’s part, the Planning Department should coordinate the development and submittal of an annual status report to the Common Council on plan implementation with other City departments.

**Possible Funding Sources for Implementation of Recommendations**

One of the roles of the GENA Neighborhood group is to search for possible funding to carry out the plan's recommendations. Possible sources include: City of La Crosse Capital Improvement Budget, Community Development Block Grant funding, non-profit organizations, the private sector, grants, and neighborhood and business associations.

**Neighborhood Role in Implementation of Recommendations**

Although the implementation of all recommendations is not guaranteed, there are five strategic steps that may help implement the neighborhood’s plan recommendations.

1. **Neighborhood and business community involvement.** One of the most critical factors in determining the success of the neighborhood plan is the involvement of citizens, neighborhood association members, and the business community in the planning process.

2. **Public and quasi-public involvement.** Building good working relations with District Council Members, the La Crosse County Board, City and County staff, school board representatives (to name only a few) is imperative. Government officials and staff are essential to chaperone recommendations through the necessary channels.

3. **Prepare carefully for public presentations.** Spell out the recommendations, the alternatives, and the pros and cons of a given issue as clearly as possible. Assemble critical back-up material (for example, results from a neighborhood survey) to help support your recommendations.

4. **Strategically campaign for plan implementation.** Developing a strategy for plan implementation is crucial. Strategically approach governmental officials, City departments, and non-profit organizations for funding during their annual budget cycles.

5. **Actively participate in the City’s Capital and Operating Budget process, as well as the CDBG Budget Process.** (See page 31 for an overview of budget processes).
Neighborhood Plan Update

The general planning horizon for this document is for the next 10 to 15 years. The plan should be viewed as a dynamic document, annually revisited by neighborhood association members, whose progress at meeting goals and objectives is annually reviewed, and whose goals and objectives are modified and/or added to, so as to better reflect the changing needs and desires of the neighborhood.

Neighborhood Planting Project at Crowley Playground
Neighborhood and Surrounding Area Attributes

The attribute map on Page 12 shows the location of various neighborhood attractions, services, amenities and unique attributes within walking distance for residents. A complete list of attributes can be found below.

Map Index

**Parks & Recreation**
P1- Forest Hills Golf Course, Tennis Courts, Pool
P2- Hixon Forest
P3- Roellig Park
P4- Myrick Park
P5- Weigent Park
P6- UW-L Tennis Courts
P7- Crowley Playground
P8- Memorial (municipal) Pool
P9- Goosetown Park

**Places of Worship**
W1- Church of Christ Fellowship Center
W2- Congregation Sons of Abraham
W3- First Presbyterian Church
W4- First Baptist Church ABC USA
W5- Blessed Sacrament Catholic Church
W6- First Congregational Church UCC
W7- Hmong Faith Alliance Church
W8- English Lutheran Church
W9- Lutheran Campus Ministry
W10- Crossroads United Campus Ministry
W11- Roncalli Catholic Newman Center

**Businesses**
B1- Olson’s Hillview Greenhouse
B2- Heeter’s Car Care
B3- Eagles Nest Sports Bar & Grill
B4- Secret Sun
B5- Cranky Paul’s Deli
B6- Humfeld’s Garage
B7- Recovery Avenue Rave
B8- Games People Play
B9- Fast Wok Restaurant
B10- Kate’s on State
B11- NDG (Nordeen Design Gallery)
B12- State Street Gallery
B13- Grandview Center
  - Family & Children’s Center
  - Birthright
  - Stepping Stones Coulee Region
  - Children’s Advocacy Center, LTD
  - Mississippi River Regional Planning Commission
  - Big Brothers Big Sisters of the Coulee Region
  - Bluffland Guardians and Conservators, Inc.
B14- Extreme Edge Salon & Tanning
B15- Fast Cash
B16- Hmong’s Golden Egg Rolls
B17- Kwik Trip
B18- Payday Loans Car Title Loans
B19- Beef & Etc.
B20- Squire Painting Contractors
B21- Subway
B22- Concordia Ballroom
B23- Papa John’s
B24- Loons on La Crosse/Howie’s Hof Brau
B25- Tequila Mexican Restaurant
B26- Magic Coin Laundry
B27- Quillin’s
B28- Taco Bell
B29- Olson Staffing
B30- Mr. D’s
B31- La Crosse Dental Center
B32- YMCA
B33- Schumacher Kish Funeral Homes Inc.
B34- Lasting Impressions Fine Gifts
B35- Sound World

**Schools**
S1- Emerson Elementary School
S2- UW-La Crosse
S3- Blessed Sacrament School
S4- Aquinas Middle/High School

**Other**
O1- Bethany on Cass Assisted/Independent Living
O2- City of La Crosse Housing Authority
O3- Franciscan Skemp Assisted Living Village on Cass
O4- Health Science Center
O5- Forest Park High Rise
O6- Oak Grove Cemetery
Figure 2 – Neighborhood Attributes Map
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GENA Neighborhood Vision Statement

“To create a neighborhood in La Crosse wherein residents work cooperatively with each other, property owners, business owners, UW-L staff, students, City staff and the School District to provide a safe, healthy, diverse, and family-oriented neighborhood while preserving its historic character, its environmental amenities and its neighborhood school.”
Summary of Conditions and Issues

This section lists the most pressing issues and challenges identified by the analysis of existing conditions through the background report, keep/change exercise, issue prioritization (blue dot) exercise and general discussions at the Grandview Emerson Neighborhood Association meetings.

Housing

- New multi-family construction does not fit into the character of the neighborhood.
- Too many single-family homes are being lost to rental properties.
- New multi-family and apartments buildings are too big for the lots they are being built on.
- New homes and buildings do not fit into the character of the neighborhood.
- Loss of historic character and homes in the neighborhood.
- Deteriorating neighborhood historic homes.
- Deteriorating neighborhood historic homes.
- Needs to be design review in the neighborhood for multi-family developments.

Property Management

- Some homes are lacking in exterior property maintenance.
- Some homes are lacking in lawn care maintenance.
- Code violations are not being enforced.
- Property owners are uninformed about typical code violations.
- Property owners are uninformed about typical code violations.

Traffic and Parking

- Traffic moves too fast through the neighborhood.
- Oppose the widening of La Crosse St to 4-lanes.
- Areas of the neighborhood are not bicycle and pedestrian friendly, especially along major corridors.
- Too many front, back, and side yards are being turned into parking lots for rental properties.
- Control on-street parking.
- Traffic moves too fast through the neighborhood.
- Cars are parking in front of carriage walks.
“Other” Issues

- Potential closure and loss of neighborhood school.
- There is a lack of communication between the neighborhood and UW-L.
- The billboards in the neighborhood need to be removed.

Parks and Recreation

- Loss of neighborhood pools due to lack of funding.
- Roellig Park is underutilized.
- The boulevard trees in the neighborhood are not properly watered or taken care of.

Safety and Security

- Too much crime in the neighborhood.

Public Services

- Sidewalks, curbs and streets take too long to be repaired.
- Not enough pedestrian lighting.
- Some intersections in the neighborhood flood during high rains.
- City waits too long to start collecting leaves.

Refuse and Recycling

- Properties owners do not have enough trash cans or dumpsters for their garbage.
- Too much garbage littered throughout the neighborhood.
- Property owners do not have enough facilities for their tenants.

The issues were then grouped into categories covering similar concerns. Each issue was phrased as a question to be studied, debated and resolved during the planning process. Each of these questions was used to guide the development of the objectives and actions, which can be found in the Neighborhood Plan Recommendation section. Issues were ranked in order of importance by the neighborhood Association.

Findings and Issues

Housing

Findings

- Roughly 58% of the residential structures in the neighborhood were built prior to 1939 and are more than 65 years old (2000 Census).
• According to the 2000 Census, 37.9% of the neighborhood housing units were renter occupied.
• Most of the Cass and King Streets NRHP Residential Historic District is located within the GENA Neighborhood Boundaries.
• 22% of the survey respondents felt that the quality of multi-residential housing was acceptable.
• 76% of the survey respondents felt that preservation of the historic character and architectural style of the neighborhood was important to them.
• 78% of the survey respondents felt that the conversion of single-family homes to rental units has a negative impact on the neighborhood.
• 82% of the survey respondents felt that design standards were needed to ensure the quality of new rental housing.

Issues
• What can be done to ensure that future multi-family construction does not detract from the neighborhood?
• How can single-family homes, currently used as rental properties, be reclaimed as owner-occupied single-family homes again?
• How can the neighborhood expand on the efforts of restoration in and around the Neighborhood Historic District?
• What can be done to support heritage preservation in the neighborhood?
• Is design review for new housing a tool the neighborhood should use?
• What can be done to keep oversized buildings from being constructed on small lots?

Property Management

Findings
• During 2005 there were roughly 4,800 “orders to correct” issued to slightly more than 2,000 different properties throughout the City by the City Building and Inspections Department. Those orders were issued to 348* properties within the Goosetown Neighborhood, 361 properties in the Lower Northside Depot Neighborhood, 237 properties in the Powell Hood Hamilton Neighborhood, 148 properties in the Washburn Neighborhood, and 136* properties in the Grandview Emerson Neighborhood. Of the 136* properties to receive orders in 2005, 26 were not rentals.
• Some of the most common orders issued in the Grandview Emerson Neighborhood were for outside storage – rental (57, 42%), clean up garbage – rental (24, 18%), outside storage – non-rental (12, 9%), and building repair – rental (10, 7%).
*The GENA boundary overlaps the original Goosetown Neighborhood. Excluding this overlapping area, there were 35 orders to correct issued in the Grandview Emerson Neighborhood.

Issues
• What can be done to decrease the number of housing maintenance complaints?
• What can be done to pressure property owners to practice better lawn care and property maintenance?

**Traffic and Parking**

**Findings**
• Most of the major traffic corridors in the Neighborhood are on the boundaries; Losey Boulevard, West Avenue, Cass Street. Other higher volume routes within the neighborhood are Main Street, State Street, and La Crosse Street.
• 59% of the survey respondents felt that traffic calming devices are needed to help reduce the speed of vehicles in the neighborhood.
• 60% of the survey respondents felt that there was an on-street parking problem in the neighborhood.
• 49% of the survey respondents felt that too much green space in the neighborhood was being converted to off-street parking.

**Issues**
• How can the speed of traffic be slowed? How can the current speed limits be better enforced?
• What can be done to prevent La Crosse Street from being expanded to 4-lanes?
• What can the Neighborhood do to ensure that the highest level of safety for pedestrians and bicyclists is in place along the major traffic corridors?
• How can the neighborhood keep its green space from turning into off-street parking lots for rental properties?
• How can on-street parking issues be addressed by the neighborhood?
• Are there alternatives to four-way stops and cul-de-sacs?

**Emerson Elementary School**

**Findings**
• There is considerable concern about the possible closure of Emerson Elementary, the neighborhood school.
• 79% of the survey respondents felt that Emerson Elementary School was a vital part of attracting and retaining families to the neighborhood.

**Issues**
• What can the neighborhood do to keep Emerson Elementary in the neighborhood?

**Parks and Recreation**

**Findings**
• 73% of the survey respondents felt that the neighborhood pools were a vital asset to the neighborhood.
According to the 2000 Census, 14.2% of the population in the GENA Neighborhood was below the age of 14. There was an additional 6.85% between 15 and 19, and 28.48% between 20 and 24. This compares with 15.41% below 14, 10.48% between 15 and 19, and 17.34% between 20 and 24 for the City as a whole.

66% of the survey respondents felt that the Municipal Pool is more important to the neighborhood than the Forest Hills Pool.

58% of the survey respondents felt that Roellig Park is underutilized.

There are numerous park and recreational facilities within walking distance of the GENA Neighborhood. Parks include: Weigent Park, Myrick Park, Crowley Park, and Roellig Park. Recreational facilities include: Memorial Pool, Forest Hills Golf Course, Pool, and Tennis Courts, Hixon Forest, and UW-L tennis courts and athletic facilities.

Issues
- What can be done to ensure that the Municipal Pool or the Forest Hills Pool or both are kept as an amenity in the neighborhood?
- What needs to be done to Roellig Park to encourage more utilization by residents of the neighborhood?
- What steps need to be taken by the neighborhood to ensure proper care and maintenance of existing and newly-planted boulevard trees and identify where additional boulevard trees are needed?

Safety and Security

Findings
- In 2005, there were approximately 1,050 "occurrences" requiring police action within the neighborhood. This compares with 1,153 in the Powell-Hood Hamilton (PHH) neighborhood, and 2,101 occurrences in the Lower North Side Depot Neighborhood (LNSD).
- The most common "occurrence" in the neighborhood was for noise/loud parties (185 occurrences), suspicious activity (134), attempt to locate (115), theft (100), and trouble with parties (93).
- The most common "occurrences" in the neighborhood of a more violent nature were fight (23), assault (7), battery (5), subject with a gun (4), and arson (2). This compares with the following:
  - LNSD - fight (0), assault (7), battery (10), shots fired/subject with a gun (4), and arson (0)
  - PHH - fight (13), assault (0), battery (0), shots fired/subject with a gun (3), arson (0) and attempted 1st degree murder (1).

Issues
- Is there a need for more neighborhood watch groups?
- How can the University and neighborhood work together to reduce crime in the area?
PUBLIC SERVICES

Findings
• 50% of the survey respondents feel that there should be more pedestrian lighting in the neighborhood.
• The residents of the neighborhood have indicated that there are numerous intersections in the neighborhood that have stormwater issues.

Issues
• How can stormwater management be improved throughout the neighborhood?
• What can be done to decrease the amount of time taken to repair cracked sidewalks, curbs, and streets?
• Can improvements be made to the quality of lighting in specific areas of the neighborhood?
• What can be done to help the City more efficiently collect leaves?

REFUSE AND RECYCLING

Findings
• The neighborhood feels that the majority of the refuse and recycling issues are in the parts of the neighborhood that contain student rentals.

Issues
• What can be done to better educate tenants and property owners on the City's refuse and recycling policies?
• How can the City improve its procedures for penalizing tenants and property owners who are not complying with existing garbage and refuse and recycling policies?
• What can be done about rental properties that have inadequate garbage facilities for its tenants?
• Should the City's refuse & recycling code be changed to correct identified problems?

"OTHER" ISSUES

Findings
• 42% of the survey respondents feel that UW-L did not address neighborhood concerns in their campus plan.
• 49% of the survey respondents felt that there does not need to be more local businesses in the neighborhood.
• 81% of the survey respondents felt that billboards were not appropriate for the neighborhood.

Issues
• How can the neighborhood keep informed on what UW-L has planned for its campus and how these plans will affect the surrounding area?
• What can the neighborhood do to keep new billboards from being erected in the neighborhood and remove existing ones?
Neighborhood Plan Recommendations

The Conditions and Issues section was used as the basis for developing the Objectives and Actions that follow. There are four broad categories that were used to organize the actions: Housing, Traffic and Parking, Institutions, and Public Utilities and Services. The Actions are listed in order of priority as determined via feedback received throughout the planning process. These priorities may change as projects are completed or as favorable circumstances arise regarding specific Actions.

A. Housing
   - Heritage Preservation
     - Property Maintenance
     - 22
   - 23
   - 24

B. Traffic and Parking
   - 24

C. Institutions
   - Emerson Elementary
     - UW-L
     - 27
     - 28

D. Public Utilities and Services
   - Parks, Green Space, and Recreation
     - Safety and Security
     - Public Services
     - Refuse and Recycling
     - 28
     - 30
     - 31
     - 32
A. Housing

The Objective of the Housing Section is to maintain and improve the quality of all existing housing (single-family and multi-family) within the neighborhood, ensure the quality and compatibility of all new residential construction, and to preserve the historic character of the neighborhood.

Housing Actions

1. Maintain and improve the quality of all existing housing within the neighborhood. The GENA Neighborhood Association will work with the Planning Department and Building and Inspections Department to ensure that the existing housing stock within the neighborhood remains acceptable to its residents. More specifically, the following actions will be pursued:

   a. Design Standards – The Neighborhood Association will work with the Planning Department to finalize the proposed multi-family design standards for existing and future housing. The overall goal of this action is not to prohibit the development of multi-family housing, but to ensure that multi-family housing is developed with the primary focus towards aesthetics, quality of materials, and parking requirements while reflecting the surrounding architectural and historic characteristics of the neighborhood.

      The Neighborhood Association will also work with the Planning Department and Building and Inspections Department to develop design guidelines or standards for single-family housing.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA, City Planning Department, Building and Inspections Department

2. Single-Family – Multiple-Family Conversion. The Neighborhood Association will work with the Planning Department and Building and Inspections Department to identify methods to prevent further conversion of single-family homes to multi-family residences within the neighborhood. In addition, these same parties will work to create incentives that encourage
conversion of single-family rentals back to single-family residences. The City will examine all possible incentive and funding mechanisms for returning rental homes, duplexes and triplexes, to owner-occupied status. Possible incentives include low-interest mortgages, down-payment assistance, rehabilitation assistance through loans and neighborhood assistance, and local, state and federal grant and lending sources. The Neighborhood Association and the Planning Department will research the following: other communities who are dealing with this issue, such as Winona, MN; allowing rentals by Conditional Use Permit; and the option of placing deed restrictions on homes to prevent them from being converted into a rental unit.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA, City Planning Department, Building and Inspections Department.

3. Heritage Preservation. The GENA Neighborhood Association will work with the City Planning Department, the La Crosse Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC), and the Building and Inspections Department to develop a plan for the Cass & King Historic District that outlines future preservation efforts, guidelines for building restoration, and guidelines for new building construction in the district.

a. Zoning Overlay District. The City, the Neighborhood Association, and the La Crosse HPC will develop a zoning overlay district to assist with the implementation of the preservation plan in conjunction with the Neighborhood Heritage Preservation Plan. The overlay district will be developed to address design, materials, and special uses to enhance or protect the historic district.

b. 23rd & 24th Street Historic District. The Neighborhood will work with the City and/or the UW-La Crosse History Department to prepare and submit a National Register of Historic Places application to the State Historical Society for designation of the 23rd & 24th Street Residential Historic District.

Once the proposed district is officially listed with the National Register of Historic Places, the GENA Neighborhood Association will work with the City Planning Department, the La Crosse Heritage Preservation Commission (HPC), and the Building and Inspections Department to develop a preservation plan for the district.
c. **Local Designation.** The City Planning Department and the Heritage Preservation Commission will work with the Neighborhood to educate property owners on the benefits of historic preservation and identify and designate historically-significant properties to the Local Register of Historic Places.

**RESPONSIBILITY:** GENA, City Planning Department, Building and Inspections Department, La Crosse Heritage Preservation Commission

4. **Housing Maintenance Complaints.** The Building and Inspections Department, the Refuse and Recycling Department, and the Neighborhood Association will continually work together to identify problem areas in the neighborhood and educate property owners through reference materials that will outline the City's general property maintenance requirements and methods to achieve compliance.

**RESPONSIBILITY:** GENA, Building and Inspections Department, Refuse and Recycling Department.

### B. Traffic and Parking

The objective of the Traffic and Parking Section is to reduce traffic speed, reduce traffic volume, address the type of traffic along the major corridors throughout the neighborhood, increase bicycle and pedestrian safety, and better address on-street and off-street parking issues.

**Traffic and Parking Actions**

1. **Traffic.** There are several high-volume traffic corridors in the neighborhood. La Crosse Street, Losey Boulevard, West Avenue, and Campbell Road are four such corridors where speeding, high levels of traffic and traffic type are issues. The Neighborhood Association, the City Traffic Engineer, the Police Department, and the Planning Department will work together to identify areas along these corridors where the issues noted above are a serious problem.

   a. **Traffic Speed.** Once identified, issues of speed will be addressed by utilizing traffic-calming techniques that aim at sustaining through movement in the neighborhood rather than additional stop signs, lights, and cul-de-sacs. This can include speed bumps, chicanes, roundabouts, planted medians, or other methods. Some issues of speed will have to be monitored and enforced by the Police Department.
In addition, there has been an issue with increased truck traffic on Losey Boulevard. Neighborhood residents have complained about the high speed at which the semi-truck traffic frequently travels, as well as the impact the vibrations have on the adjacent properties. The Neighborhood Association will have to work with the La Crosse Police Department to increase enforcement in the areas the residents have identified as problematic. The Neighborhood Association can also work with the Streets Department to raise the sunken manhole covers along Losey Boulevard in order to reduce the noise and vibration caused by hitting them.

b. **Traffic Volume.** The City of La Crosse only has three major north-south traffic corridors, two of which are the eastern and western borders of the neighborhood. In addition to these high-volume corridors, the neighborhood also sees a lot of vehicles on Main Street, Cass Street, and La Crosse Street. Because of the high-volume of daily traffic on these corridors, it would be difficult to dramatically decrease the amount without decreasing City-wide driving rates. In order for the Neighborhood to have a dramatic impact on this issue, the Neighborhood Association will be involved in promoting and supporting all forms of multi-modal transportation, such as walking, biking, and public transit in order to help the community become less dependent on their vehicles.

**RESPONSIBILITY:** GENA, Engineering Department, La Crosse Police Department, City Planning Department, Streets Department, and the La Crosse Area Planning Committee (LAPC).

2. **La Crosse Street.** Recently the Wisconsin Department of Transportation (WisDOT) proposed expanding La Crosse Street to four lanes, between Losey Boulevard and West Ave, due to projected traffic counts. However, the counts never materialized, in part due to the addition of a lighted signal at Cass Street and Losey Boulevard which siphoned off some of the projected increase in traffic. There is still some concern within the neighborhood that WisDOT will again propose to widen this portion of La Crosse Street. The Neighborhood Association needs to monitor the City of La Crosse’s yearly Capital Improvement Program and La Crosse Area Planning Committee’s (LAPC) Transportation Improvement Program to become aware of any projects that involve the widening of La Crosse Street. In the event that any projects are identified, GENA will work with the LAPC, the Planning Department, the Public Works Department, UW-L, and the Common Council to ensure that the neighborhood’s best interests are represented. These efforts apply to all transportation projects in the neighborhood. Particular attention should be paid to the major traffic corridors within and bordering the neighborhood (including, but not limited to, La Crosse Street, Losey Boulevard, West Avenue, and Campbell Road).
RESPONSIBILITY: GENA, Engineering Department, La Crosse Police Department, City Planning Department.

3. Bike/Pedestrian Safety. The Neighborhood Association will work with UW-L, Emerson Elementary School, the LAPC Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee, the Engineering Department, and the Planning Department to implement those recommendations in the LAPC Transportation Plan that are beneficial to the neighborhood. The major focus will be on increased bicycle and pedestrian safety throughout the neighborhood with an emphasis on the major traffic corridors. As mentioned earlier in the plan, the Neighborhood Association will support all means of bicycle and pedestrian travel, including the construction of bike/ped facilities.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA, UW-L, Emerson Elementary School, LAPC Bicycle & Pedestrian Advisory Committee, Engineering Department, and the Planning Department.

4. Off-Street Parking. With the large amount of multi-family housing that supports the University, there has been an ongoing issue concerning off-street parking. The Neighborhood Association will work with the Planning Department, the Building & Inspection Department, the Common Council, and the Apartment Owner’s Association to re-evaluate the existing off-street parking requirements in the La Crosse Municipal Code to prevent green-space and back yards from being converted to parking lots. The requirements to be reviewed are: drive lane widths, minimum vs. maximum parking requirements, parking stall size, and landscaping requirements.

The Neighborhood Association will also work with the Planning Department to finalize the Multi-Family Design Standards for new multi-family development that addresses these off-street parking issues.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA, Planning Department, Building & Inspection Department, Common Council, and the Apartment Owner’s Association.
5. **On-Street Parking.** With the presence of the University, on-street parking has been an ongoing issue between the students and the neighborhood residents that live within a few blocks of the University. Students have to pay to park in the University parking lots, while on-street parking in the surrounding neighborhood is free and sometimes closer to their on-campus destination. Parts of the neighborhood have regulated on-street parking with two-hour limits and resident parking permits, but this has only shifted the problem to other areas within the neighborhood.

The Neighborhood Association will work with the City Traffic Engineer and the La Crosse Police Department to identify areas where on-street parking is still a problem. The Neighborhood Association will request a report from the traffic engineer that outlines a variety of possible solutions for the problem areas. The Neighborhood Association will continue to support the University’s policy for incoming freshmen to not bring their personal vehicles, while also encouraging the University to fund and build an on-campus parking structure. The Neighborhood Association may also ask that the ad hoc parking committee be reconvened in order to assist in addressing these issues.

**RESPONSIBILITY:** GENA, City Engineering Department, La Crosse Police Department.

### C. INSTITUTIONS

The objective of the Institutions Section is to address concerns of the possible closing of Emerson Elementary and the expansion of the University. This section also addresses the need to improve the relationship between the University and the Neighborhood.

**Institutions Actions**

1. **Emerson Elementary.** Emerson Elementary is considered the most important asset to the neighborhood and a valuable resource for attracting new families. The loss of this school as an educational institution would be detrimental in the eyes of the neighborhood. The Neighborhood Association will work with the School District to keep Emerson
Elementary open as a Neighborhood School and develop a landscape plan to beautify its surroundings. In the event that the school is ultimately closed, the neighborhood shall work with the School District to ensure that the school is used as a community facility. If no community use can be found, efforts should be made to ensure that any future use of the site is desirable to the neighborhood.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA and School District.

2. UW-L. The presence of UW-La Crosse is one of the main assets of the neighborhood. However, with all of the positive impacts from the University, there is also the potential for negative impacts because of proposed actions listed in the University’s Campus Master Plan. The Neighborhood Association will work with UW-L to improve communication either through a Reinvigoration of the University Relations Committee or by appointing a liaison(s) from each organization to attend neighborhood and University meetings in order to keep informed on issues of importance to one another, and in order to work towards a mutually beneficial existence.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA and UW-L

D. PUBLIC UTILITIES AND SERVICES

The objectives of the Public Utilities and Services section are to upgrade the level and quality of City Services, encourage changes that will result in improvements to the physical characteristics of the neighborhood, and maintain safety and a positive perception of the neighborhood.

Public Utilities and Services Actions

Parks, Green Space and Recreation

1. Neighborhood Pool. Due to recent budget constraints, Forest Hills Pool was closed in 2005. In addition, there has been some discussion on closing the Municipal Pool in the near future. UW-L has also expressed interest in the Municipal Pool site for future parking or building expansion. Along with
Emerson Elementary, both pools have been listed by the neighborhood as important amenities when attracting new families.

The Neighborhood Association will work with the Parks and Recreation Department, Board of Park Commissioners, and the Common Council to keep both the Municipal and Forest Hills Pools from closing; this includes researching possible outside sources of funding. In the event that there is only enough funding to operate one of the two pools, the Neighborhood Association will work to ensure that the Municipal Pool remains open. Use of UW-La Crosse’s Mitchell Pool shall also be evaluated.

**RESPONSIBILITY:** GENA, Board of Park Commissioners, the Common Council, and the Parks and Recreation Department.

2. **Roellig Park.** Concern was expressed that Roellig Park was underutilized in its current state. The Neighborhood Association will work with the Parks and Recreation Department to determine potential uses of Roellig Park. After determining what potential uses the park can accommodate, the neighborhood will work with the Board of Park Commissioners and the Common Council to obtain funding through the yearly Capital Improvement Budget and the Community Development Block Grant program.

If it is determined that Roellig Park is unsuitable as a neighborhood park, the Neighborhood Association will work with the City Forester to plant additional trees within the park.

**RESPONSIBILITY:** GENA, Board of Park Commissioners, the Common Council, the Parks and Recreation Department and the City Forester.

3. **Boulevard Trees.** Boulevard trees were listed as another important amenity in the neighborhood. Boulevard trees are important because they help clean the air, reduce the impact of storms, reduce urban heat island effects, and help improve the visual character of the neighborhood.
The Neighborhood Association will work with the City Forester to identify areas of need and recruit residents and property owners to take care of newly planted trees. The Neighborhood Association will also work to encourage a requirement that all boulevard trees that are removed are replaced by the party responsible for removing the tree. The party replacing the tree should be required to consult with the City Forester to select the proper tree species for the location. If needed, the Neighborhood Association will seek funding for additional street trees throughout the neighborhood through the City’s yearly Capital Improvement Budget and the Community Development Block Grant program. The Neighborhood Association will also work with the City Forester to identify boulevard trees that are blocking stop signs and intersections in order to ensure safety for pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicles.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA and the City Forester.

Safety and Security. 2005 Grandview Emerson Neighborhood crime statistics were compared to three other neighborhood associations within the City. In general, crime in the GENA neighborhood was less severe than the other neighborhoods. However, no area is completely crime free and residents have expressed their desire to reduce the amount of crime that occurs in the neighborhood.

1. Neighborhood Watch. Many of the crime issues within the neighborhood tend to be of a nuisance variety (noise, suspicious activity, etc.) As a part of formation, the association shall work with the Police Department to educate residents and promote the neighborhood watch program in the Grandview Emerson neighborhood. It is intended that the association will assist in initiating and expanding the number of neighborhood watch groups in the neighborhood by recruiting block captains and participants. Once formed, the block captains will work with apartment and property owners to include tenants in the watch groups.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA, Police Department.

2. Greater Police Presence in the Neighborhood. The Police Department will be called upon to increase the number of patrols in the neighborhood. Specifically, an increase in the number of foot and bicycle patrols will be sought. Along with other neighborhood groups, the Grandview Emerson Neighborhood Association will request and seek increased funding for these patrols.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA, Police Department.
3. **Drug and Alcohol Activity.** The Neighborhood Association will work with the Police Department and the Neighborhood Watch Program to educate residents on the proper methods for identifying and reporting suspicious activity that may be related to drugs and alcohol.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA, Police Department.

4. **Vandalism and Break-ins.** The Neighborhood Association will work with the Police Department to discourage vandalism and break-ins through proactive crime prevention efforts. The Association will encourage increased offerings of the La Crosse Police Department Landlord Training Program, which is a crime-prevention program, and encourage all neighborhood property owners to participate. The association will also support increased advertisement of the program and encourage its publication through the neighborhood association.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA, Police Department.

5. **Noise Violations.** The Association will partner with the Police Department to develop strategies aimed at decreasing the amount of noise in the neighborhood.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA, Police Department.

**Public Services**

**Stormwater Management.** There are a number of intersections within the neighborhood that flood during rain events. This is due to inadequate stormwater facilities and increased runoff. The Neighborhood Association will work with the Public Works Department and the Engineering Department to address stormwater quality in the neighborhood and determine the feasibility of creating a rain garden pilot program.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA, Public Works Department and the Engineering Department.

1. **Pedestrian Lighting.** The Neighborhood Association will work with the Public Works Department and the Engineering Department to develop a street-lighting plan for the neighborhood. The plan should include potential funding mechanisms for pedestrian-scale lighting in alleys, methods for eliminating dark areas of street lighting, theme lighting in historic neighborhoods, and a refocusing of street lights to pedestrian needs.
RESPONSIBILITY: GENA, Public Works Department, and the Engineering Department.

2. Refuse and Recycling. The Neighborhood Association Members will work with the Refuse and Recycling Department to improve education on how to handle household waste, enforcement when household waste is not handled appropriately, and how to handle the increased amount of garbage associated with the end of the University’s term.

a. **Education on Refuse and Recycling.** The neighborhood association will assist the Refuse and Recycling Department by distributing information concerning the what, when and where of refuse and recycling collection. The Association will also encourage better utilization of the media to educate the public on refuse collection and recycling practices in the City. Possible avenues for education and promotion include:

- The Internet
- Community calendar ads on TV and radio
- Refrigerator magnets with pertinent information
- A list of businesses that accept large items, metals, etc.
- A depository site of garbage and recycling information for apartment owners to distribute to tenants (on the Web)
- Information available for the visually impaired

b. **Penalties.** The Refuse and Recycling Department will be encouraged to examine the penalties for those who do not adhere to the refuse and recycling ordinances. Where possible, the Common Council should adopt higher penalties for these ordinance violations.

c. **Term-End Garbage Collection.**
   The Neighborhood Association will work with the Refuse and Recycling Department to support refuse pick-up at the end of school semesters.

d. **Dumpsters.**
   The Neighborhood Association will work with the Refuse and Recycling Department to review the requirements for the location of garbage dumpsters on a lot, the size requirement for dumpsters, when garbage cans are allowed versus dumpster, screening, and the frequency of collection.

RESPONSIBILITY: GENA, Refuse and Recycling Department.
Implementation Strategies

Neighborhood Improvement Funding

After your neighborhood group has identified neighborhood projects, the next steps are to develop a project plan and identify potential funding sources. Neighborhood improvements often require funding from a range of sources including public, private, and non-profit agencies. The key steps in exploring funding alternatives are to: 1) identify potential funding sources; 2) develop reasonable funding requests based on funding criteria established by funding agencies; and 3) approach funding agencies at strategic times during budget process or funding cycle timelines.

In addition to building funding partnerships with the City of La Crosse, neighborhood groups should continually explore funding partnerships with neighborhood residents and businesses, local non-profit organizations, and other public, private, and non-profit agencies that provide funding for civic improvement projects.

City of La Crosse Capital Improvement Budget

Budget Request Process

The City budget outlines the City of La Crosse’s funding priorities. The annual City budget is comprised of two parts: the operating budget and the capital budget. The operating budget supports the daily operations of City government, including employee salaries and wages, supplies, and equipment. The capital budget supports major infrastructure improvements, such as street and sidewalk repairs, land and building acquisitions, and physical improvements to City property, such as park playground equipment. The City’s operating budget is not typically used for funding neighborhood projects, but does indicate the City’s spending priorities.

Capital budget requests are submitted to the Common Council in May. The Finance Department combines these requests and prepares a draft budget in July. The Plan Commission then holds a series of meetings/hearings in August, September, and October. A final budget is submitted to the Common Council for approval in either November or December.
Capital Budget Requests
Residents and neighborhood groups can participate in the City’s capital budget process in three main ways. **First**, neighborhood groups can contact Council members to discuss the City budget process and effective advocacy strategies. **Second**, neighborhood groups can contact specific City Departments between January and June to discuss funding for particular neighborhood improvements. **Third**, neighborhood group representatives can attend public meetings/hearings held by the Common Council, City Plan Commission, and Committees during the budget process.

How to Get Started:
- **Identify budget request(s).** Identify the neighborhood improvement(s) for which you wish to request funding. Prioritize your list of improvements in order to focus on priority issues.
- **Discuss budget requests with your district Council Member and appropriate City staff.** Contact your district Council Member to request his/her support for your budget request and to discuss advocacy strategies. Also contact appropriate City staff to discuss the likelihood of funding for your request and determine its consistency with existing policies and plans. Determine whether your budget request should be in the operating budget or the capital budget.
- **Develop a strategy to advocate for your budget request(s).** Advocating for budget requests entails contacting Council Members and City staff to describe why your budget request is important for your neighborhood. With the help of your Council Member, make a list of the appropriate City Departments, Boards, Commissions, and Committees to contact concerning your neighborhood improvement priorities. Also prepare a timeline which outlines when you plan to contact specific agencies and personnel.
- **Submit funding requests to appropriate City agency by May.** The early stage of the budget process is where neighborhood groups can often have the most impact on the priorities identified in the City budget. Since the City faces budget constraints, the initial list of items proposed for budget consideration must be narrowed and prioritized by the Plan Commission before the Common Council approves the final capital budget. The earlier you submit your neighborhood improvement requests, the more consideration they are likely to receive in this ongoing process of prioritization.
Attend appropriate Board/Commission/Committee meeting(s) and hearing(s). Between August and October, many City Boards, Commissions, and Committees hold public meetings to discuss budget priorities. At this time, the Plan Commission holds a series of hearings on the City capital budget. Ask your district Council member and City staff to describe effective ways for your neighborhood group to advocate for your neighborhood priorities at this stage of the budget process.

Attend Common Council budget hearings. Between October and November, the Finance & Personnel Committee and the Common Council hold at least two public hearings on the City capital budget. At this stage of the budget process, neighborhood groups can advocate for neighborhood priorities by submitting written comments to the Common Council and/or speaking at the Common Council hearing(s). Contact the Finance Department office beginning in August to find out about hearing dates, and how to submit written comments and/or register to speak at a hearing or meeting.

Prepare for future budget process. The City cannot provide funding for every neighborhood improvement proposed throughout the budget process. However, neighborhood groups should keep in mind that advocating for City funding for particular neighborhood improvements is an ongoing process that often requires more than one budget cycle.

The capital budget schedule is outlined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capital Budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests submitted to Common Council (C.C.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall budget developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Hearing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Budget submitted to C.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Budget approved by C.C.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks &amp; Rec. Department City of La Crosse</th>
<th>City Clerk’s Office City of La Crosse</th>
<th>Planning Department City of La Crosse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd Floor</td>
<td>2nd Floor</td>
<td>1st Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 La Crosse Street</td>
<td>400 La Crosse Street</td>
<td>400 La Crosse Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crosse, WI 54601</td>
<td>La Crosse, WI 54601</td>
<td>La Crosse, WI 54601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 789-7533</td>
<td>Phone: 789-7510</td>
<td>Phone: 789-7512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Engineering Department City of La Crosse</th>
<th>Public Works Department City of La Crosse</th>
<th>Finance Department City of La Crosse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th Floor</td>
<td>5th Floor</td>
<td>6th Floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 La Crosse Street</td>
<td>400 La Crosse Street</td>
<td>400 La Crosse Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Crosse, WI 54601</td>
<td>La Crosse, WI 54601</td>
<td>La Crosse, WI 54601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone: 789-7505</td>
<td>Phone: 789-7599</td>
<td>Phone: 789-7567</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Development Block Grant Funds

Five Year Consolidated Strategy and Plan
The Consolidated Strategy and Plan is a five-year plan that identifies Housing and Community Development Needs, establishes a five-year strategy for investing Federal resources, and identifies proposed annual usage of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership Funds. The annual Action Plan serves as the application to the Federal Government for CDBG and HOME Investment Partnership Program funds. The basic goals of the Consolidated Strategy and Plan are to benefit low- and very-low-Income persons by:

CDBG
The primary objective of the Community Development Program is the development of viable urban communities, by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities, principally for persons of low and moderate income.

Each of the activities carried out with CDBG funds must meet one of the three broad National Objectives:

A. Benefiting low- and moderate-income families. Examples include job creation and retention, homeownership opportunities and transportation programs.
B. Preventing or eliminating slums or blight by acquiring and/or renovating blighted properties.
C. Meeting an urgent need. One example includes providing assistance to a situation requiring immediate attention because the existing condition poses a threat to the safety or health of the community and other financial resources are not available to meet the community’s needs.

The Five-Year Consolidated Strategy and Plan for the City of La Crosse, Wisconsin is to be submitted to the Department of Housing and Urban Development annually in February. It provides an in-depth view of Housing and Community Development Needs and a Five-Year Strategy for addressing those needs. The Plan also contains a One-Year Action Plan, submitted annually, which will identify how federal funding will be used in the upcoming program year.

In recent years, the CDBG Program has funded a variety of neighborhood projects; such as park improvements, a neighborhood center, community gardens, Skates for Kids, and the Hamilton School Recreation Program.
HOME

The HOME Program is a federal housing block grant. The primary objectives of the HOME Investment Partnership Act are to expand the supply of decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable housing with the primary focus on rental housing for very low- and low-income Americans; to strengthen the abilities of state and local units of government to design and implement strategies for achieving adequate supplies of decent, affordable housing; and to encourage public, private, and non-profit partnerships in addressing affordable housing needs.

Each of the activities carried out with HOME funds must provide affordable housing for persons whose incomes do not exceed various income limits as established by the HOME Regulations.

HOME funds can be used for three types of housing programs: homeownership (for homebuyers, down payment assistance, and single-family rehabilitation); rental housing; and tenant-based rental assistance.

Under the three categories, Participating Jurisdictions may use HOME funds to develop and support affordable rental and homeownership projects through: acquisition of property; new construction; reconstruction; conversion; moderate rehabilitation (less than $25,000); substantial rehabilitation (more than $25,000); tenant-based rental assistance; relocation of displaced persons; project soft costs; administration/planning; and operating expenses.

The GENA Neighborhood Association boundary does have low-moderate census tract areas that automatically qualify for Community Development Block Grant Funds. They are Census Tract 5, Blocks 3 thru 6 of Block Group 1 and Blocks 5 thru 8 of Block Group 3 and Census Tract 8 Blocks 0 thru 7 of Block Group 2. The eligible areas are also marked on the Census Tract Map on page 45.
How to Get Started:
The following is the schedule for both the CDBG and HOME Programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| August | Application and funding guidelines available  
Notice regarding September informational meeting and public hearings is published |
| September | PUBLIC HEARINGS (4)  
Organizations and citizens comment on:  
a. Community Development Issues  
b. Housing Needs  
c. Overall CDBG Program Performance  
d. Impediments to Fair Housing Choice |
| October | DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF APPLICATIONS  
MEETING for presentations |
| November | MEETING for Project Selection |
| January | Common Council Monthly Cycle |
| April | Plan Program Year Begins |

Contact
Community Development Administrator  
City of La Crosse Planning Department  
400 La Crosse Street  
La Crosse, WI 54601  
Phone: 789-7512 Fax: 789-7318
Appendix A

Neighborhood Map Summary

The following pages summarize various maps of the GENA Neighborhood and provide a picture of existing conditions. The descriptions below are for the corresponding maps, which begin on Page 42.

Neighborhood Zoning (Page 42)

- The area north of Campbell Road is predominantly zoned R-1 Single Family, with the exception of 5 parcels that are zoned C-1 Local Business.

- The area south of Campbell Road and north of Cass Street from Losey Boulevard to 19th Street is comprised mostly of R-1 Single family. There are a couple of parcels zoned C-1 Local Business along Campbell Road near State Street and one parcel zoned R-6 Special Multiple at the northwest corner of Losey Boulevard and Cass Street.

- Most of the area from 19th Street to West Avenue between Cass Street and Main Street is zoned R-1 Single Family with a few parcels zoned R-5 Multiple along King Street, a few parcels zoned R-4 Low density Multiple at the corner of 16th Street and Cass Street, and a few parcels zoned R-2 Residence along King Street, 14th Street south of King and on West Avenue between Main and King Streets.

- The area between 19th Street and 17th Street, from State to Main is comprised of a mix of zoning that includes C-1 Local Business, R-2 Residence, C-2 Commercial, and R-5 Multiple Dwelling.

- East of West Avenue to 17th Street between Vine Street and Main Street is comprised mostly of R-2 Residence and R-5 Multiple Dwelling. There are some R-1 Single Family between 15th and 16th and Main and State. There is also one parcel zoned C-1 Local Business on West Avenue between State and Main. There is also a small area zoned PS Public & Semi-public on the southern portion of Vine Street between 15th and 16th which is owned by the University.
Historic Districts (Page 43)

Cass & King NRHP Residential Historic District
Most of the Cass and King National Register of Historic Places Residential Historic District is located within the GENA Neighborhood boundary. The historic district is comprised of 221 “Contributing” properties and 66 Non-contributing properties. The Cass and King Historic District represents La Crosse residential architecture from the late 19th century through the early 1940’s. The full range of historic styles is represented including Italianate, Romanesque Revival, Queen Anne, Classical and Georgian Revival, Colonial Revival, Tudor Revival, Spanish-Colonial Revival, Neo-Gothic Revival and Prairie.

This district is architecturally significant as the most outstanding concentration of fashionable late 19th and early 20th century residential architecture in the City of La Crosse. Many of the buildings are designed by La Crosse’s most prominent architectural firms. The buildings constructed in the district between 1884 and the end of the historic period, 1946, are excellent representatives of the residential styles and construction preferred by La Crosse’s most prominent industrialists, professionals, businessmen and middle class families.

Potential 23rd & 24th St NRHP Residential Historic District
The proposed 23rd & 24th Street Historic District is located entirely in the GENA Neighborhood Boundary. It is made up of 115 houses with 93 potentially listed as “Contributing” and 22 potentially listed as “Non-contributing”. This district encompasses part of the Crowley Homes Addition that was platted in 1930. Brick, stucco and wood materials characterize the houses in this “upper-scale” neighborhood. Two-story, late-historic styled houses, particularly Colonial Revival houses, and to a lesser extent, Tudor Revival, dominate the historic environment in the district.

Nomination and designation of this district to the National Register of Historic Places requires an application to be prepared and sent to the State Historical Society in Madison, Wisconsin. Preparing this application is a recommendation that is stated in the Heritage Preservation Element of Confluence, La Crosse’s Comprehensive Plan.

Occupancy Status (Page 44)

The occupancy status map illustrates whether a property is owner occupied or renter occupied. The occupancy status for this map was determined by examining the property address and the billing address for properties on the 2006 City tax roll. If the addresses were the same, they were given the designation of owner-occupied; if they were different, they were designated renter-occupied. This method only provides a rough estimate of the tenancy of the neighborhood, and is not guaranteed to be 100% accurate.
In general, the occupancy status pattern in the neighborhood seems to be more owner-occupied structures than renter-occupied. The majority of renter occupied structures is clustered around the UW-L campus and where the zoning is at a higher density. Of the identified properties on the map, approximately 76% are owner occupied and 24% are renter occupied.

**Age of Structure (Page 45)**

The table below shows the percentage of homes built during the age categories on the map. Approximately 82% of the homes built in the GENA Neighborhood were built between 1901 and 1950. It should be noted that there were no construction dates listed or available for 96 parcels, most of which are non-residential uses. These parcels were not calculated into the percentage table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Structure</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1800 – 1850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1851 – 1900</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901 – 1925</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926 – 1950</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951 – 1975</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976 – 2004</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1087</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of La Crosse Assessor’s Department*

**2000 Census Tracts (Page 46)**

The Census map shows that the GENA Neighborhood is made up of 2000 Census Tracts 5, 6, and 8. In Census Tract 5, Blocks 3 thru 6 of Block Group 1; Blocks 0 thru 3 of Block Group 2; and Blocks 5 thru 8 of Block Group 3 are within the GENA boundary. In Census Tract 6, all of Block Groups 2 and 3 are within the GENA boundary. In Census Tract 8, all of Block Group 1 and Blocks 0 thru 7 of Block Group 2 are within the GENA boundary. The 2000 Census tables and graphs represent data gathered for these block groups during the 2000 Decennial Census.

Census Tract 5, Blocks 3 thru 6 of Block Group 1 and Blocks 5 thru 8 of Block Group 3 and Census Tract 8 Blocks 0 thru 7 of Block Group 2 have been identified as low-moderate income census tract areas and are eligible for Community Development Block Grant funding.
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Figure 6 – Age of Structure Map
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Appendix B - Census Tables and Charts

2000 Census Profile

The following neighborhood profile highlights demographic, socioeconomic, and housing information for the GENA neighborhood compiled from the 1990 Decennial Census.

Total Population. In 2000, 3,648 people lived in the GENA Neighborhood. This represented 7.04% of the total City of La Crosse population of 51,818 people.

Population by Age. The 2000 census data shows that there was a clear dominance in the neighborhood by people ages 20-24 with a total of 1,039 (28.48% of the total population). The closeness of the neighborhood to WWTC, and UW-L may account for this high percentage. At the City level, 1,039 represents 11.56% of the total population for this age group.
Ethnic Background. As is the case at the City level, the GENA neighborhood is predominantly populated by whites who comprise 96.9% of the total population of the neighborhood. The Asian (1.07%), Pacific Islander (.03%), Native American (.25%), and African American (.74%) groups combined account for only 2% of the population of GENA.

Poverty. In 2000, 18% of the total population of the neighborhood was below the poverty level. For the entire City of La Crosse, 1% of the people below the poverty level live in the GENA neighborhood.

To determine a person’s poverty status, one compares the person’s total family income with the poverty threshold appropriate for that person’s family size and composition (see table below). If the total income of that person’s family is less than the threshold appropriate for that family, then the person is considered poor, together with every member of his or her family. (Source: Census Bureau 1999)
Families. In 2000, married-couple households represented about 84.33% of all the households in the Grandview Emerson neighborhood. This rate is high compared with 76.30% for the City of La Crosse. The number of married-couple family households in the neighborhood represents about 7% of the total married-couple family households in the City of La Crosse.


**Housing Types.** In 2000, single-unit homes in the GENA neighborhood accounted for 62.96% of the total housing in the neighborhood. This was very high compared to 52.8% for the entire City of La Crosse. The total number of single-unit homes in the neighborhood accounts for 3.93% of the total single-unit homes in the City of La Crosse.

The number of 3-4 unit homes comprised 2.96% of the housing in the neighborhood, while 5-9 units made up an additional 1.3% of the neighborhood. These numbers are low compared to the City percentages of 6.98% and 6.26% respectively for 3-4 unit structures and 5-9 unit structures.
Tenancy. The 2000 Census results showed that the GENA neighborhood has a relatively low percentage of renter-occupied units. 38% of the housing units in the neighborhood are renter-occupied, and 58% are owner-occupied. At City level, renter-occupied units comprise 46.8% and owner-occupied units 48%.
## Appendix C

### GENA Neighborhood 2000 Census Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GENA Neighborhood</th>
<th>City of La Crosse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of GENA total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>3,648</td>
<td>7.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>1,240</td>
<td>5.89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>GENA Neighborhood</th>
<th>City of La Crosse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>3,535</td>
<td>96.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or More Races</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>GENA Neighborhood</th>
<th>City of La Crosse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 24</td>
<td>1,039</td>
<td>28.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 29</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>4.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>9.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>12.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>8.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 69</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>5.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 to 79</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>5.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 to 84</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>2.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 +</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age (Years)</td>
<td>30 to 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Family Type</th>
<th>GENA Neighborhood</th>
<th>City of La Crosse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married-Couples Families</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>84.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married-Couples Fam. w/Children</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>82.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Householder</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>12.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Householder w/Children</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Householder</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Householder w/Children</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Families</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>6.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Families w/Children</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>7.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education (25 years and over)</th>
<th>GENA Neighborhood</th>
<th>City of La Crosse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 9th grade</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th to 12th grade (No Diploma)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School graduate</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>8.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>8.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associates Degree</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>3.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors Degree</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>12.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>7.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional or Doctorate Degree</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>3.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GENA Neighborhood 2000 Census Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GENA Neighborhood</th>
<th>City of La Crosse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of GENA total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Population</strong></td>
<td>3,648</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-primary</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kindergarten through 8th Grade</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>11.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9th Grade through 12th Grade</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>24.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, Professional, and Related Occupations</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>30.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Related Occupations</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>21.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Occupations</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>14.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales &amp; Office Occupations</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>22.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farming, Forestry, &amp; Fishing Occupations</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction, Extraction, and Maintenance Occupations</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production, Transportation, and Material Moving</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>6.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class of Worker</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For Profit Wage</td>
<td>1,074</td>
<td>29.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not-for-Profit Wage</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>3.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Government</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>5.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Government</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Employed</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpaid Family Workers</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GENA Neighborhood 2000 Census Profile

#### Median Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>GENA Neighborhood</th>
<th>City of La Crosse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>$51,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>$61,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Household Income

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Income</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent of Total</th>
<th>Percent of City Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>9.76%</td>
<td>5.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$10,000 to $14,999</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>5.32%</td>
<td>3.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15,000 to $19,999</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
<td>3.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20,000 to $24,999</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10.48%</td>
<td>6.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$25,000 to $29,999</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
<td>4.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30,000 to $34,999</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.10%</td>
<td>5.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$35,000 to $39,999</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>7.42%</td>
<td>6.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$40,000 to $44,999</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.48%</td>
<td>5.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45,000 to $49,999</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>4.92%</td>
<td>6.06%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$50,000 to $59,999</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8.39%</td>
<td>5.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$60,000 to $74,999</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
<td>5.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 to $99,999</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>9.92%</td>
<td>9.84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$100,000 to $124,999</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5.89%</td>
<td>17.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$125,000 to $149,999</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>31.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150,000 to $199,999</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.74%</td>
<td>15.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$200,000 or More</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Poverty Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Status</th>
<th>GENA Neighborhood</th>
<th>City of La Crosse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent of Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Families</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>10,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Couple</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married Couple w/Children</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Householder</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Householder w/Children</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Householder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Householder w/Children</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons Below Poverty Level</td>
<td>594</td>
<td>8,085</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GENA Neighborhood 2000 Census Profile

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units in Structure (total housing units)</th>
<th>GENA Neighborhood</th>
<th>City of La Crosse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Housing Units</strong></td>
<td>1,385</td>
<td>22,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 unit</td>
<td>872</td>
<td>11,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.10%</td>
<td>7.44%</td>
<td>52.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 unit</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>2,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.96%</td>
<td>2.65%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-4 unit</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 unit</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>6.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19 unit</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1,291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.57%</td>
<td>7.05%</td>
<td>5.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-49 unit</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.92%</td>
<td>6.57%</td>
<td>5.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more units</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td>3.18%</td>
<td>7.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>1.47%</td>
<td>2.45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Owner-Occupied                    |                   |                   |
| Owner-Occupied                          | 806               | 10,668            |
| 58.19%                                 | 7.56%             | 48.05%            |
| Renter-Occupied                         | 525               | 10,380            |
| 37.91%                                 | 5.06%             | 46.75%            |

| Tenure by Race                          |                   |                   |
| White Owner-Occupied                    | 781               | 10,438            |
| 96.90%                                 | 7.48%             | 97.84%            |
| Non-White Owner-Occupied                | 25                | 230               |
| 3.10%                                   | 10.87%            | 2.16%             |
| White Renter-Occupied                   | 520               | 9,629             |
| 99.05%                                 | 5.40%             | 92.76%            |
| Non-White Renter-Occupied               | 5                 | 751               |
| 0.95%                                   | 0.67%             | 7.24%             |

| Total Structures                        | 1,385             | 22,201            |
| 6.24%                                   |                   |                   |

| Year Structure Built                    |                   |                   |
| 1939 or earlier                         | 806               | 6,649             |
| 58.19%                                 | 12.12%            | 29.95%            |
| 1940 to 1949                            | 247               | 2,762             |
| 17.83%                                 | 8.94%             | 12.44%            |
| 1950 to 1959                            | 103               | 3,101             |
| 7.44%                                   | 3.32%             | 13.97%            |
| 1960 to 1969                            | 81                | 2,449             |
| 5.85%                                   | 3.31%             | 11.03%            |
| 1970 to 1979                            | 84                | 2,886             |
| 6.06%                                   | 2.91%             | 13.00%            |
| 1980 to 1989                            | 38                | 2,174             |
| 2.74%                                   | 1.75%             | 9.79%             |
| 1990 to March 2000                      | 26                | 2,180             |
| 1.88%                                   | 1.19%             | 9.82%             |

| Owner Moved into Unit                   |                   |                   |
| 1969 or earlier                         | 170               | 2,417             |
| 12.27%                                 | 7.03%             | 10.89%            |
| 1970 to 1979                            | 107               | 1,355             |
| 7.73%                                   | 7.90%             | 6.10%             |
| 1980 to 1989                            | 178               | 1,774             |
| 12.85%                                 | 10.03%            | 7.99%             |
| 1990 to March 2000                      | 351               | 5,122             |
| 25.34%                                 | 6.85%             | 23.07%            |

| Hsg. Costs                              |                   |                   |
| Median Value of Owner-Occ. Unit          | $105,000          | $83,200           |
| Median Contract Rent of Renter-Occupied  | $470              | $386              |
Appendix D

Neighborhood Survey Summary Report
March 2006

The GENA Neighborhood survey was conducted between February 10 and March 13, 2006, and was designed to gain additional input from residents, business owners, and property owners, on what issues should be addressed by the neighborhood group. The survey consisted of 34 questions and was mailed by the City Planning Department to every property owner and resident in the neighborhood.

Survey results were compiled and processed using Microsoft Excel. The findings from the survey will be used to augment the identification of conditions and issues that are the basis for the recommendations in the neighborhood plan.

1373 surveys were mailed out to the property owners, renters, and business owners in the GENA Neighborhood. Approximately 357 surveys were returned which resulted in a 26% response rate. Survey questions 1 through 4 were questions that were asked in order to gather some background information on the survey respondents and their preferences.

Role of Survey Respondents. The majority of the survey respondents were home owners. They returned 286 surveys and accounted for 80% of the total responses. Property owners were responsible for completing 41 surveys which accounted for 12% of the total, and renters completed 23 surveys for 6% of the total responses.
Desirables. The survey asked residents and property owners to select the characteristics of the neighborhood that they found to be the most desirable. 283 of the 357 responses found that the location of the neighborhood was most desirable. The next most desirable characteristic was housing quality. The top five were:
1) Location (283)
2) Housing Quality (180)
3) Boulevard Trees (160)
4) Parks (153)
5) Schools (143)

Top Concerns. Survey respondents were asked to rank the priority of 10 potential issues facing the neighborhood on a scale from highest priority to lowest priority. Due to space constraints, only the results indicated as very high and high priority were tallied to determine the most important issues. The results of that ranking can be seen below.

Neighborhood Direction. 42% of the respondents felt that the neighborhood direction was getting neither better nor worse, while 28% of the respondents felt that the neighborhood was getting worse.
Identified Issues

Survey questions 5 through 34 were issue questions that asked respondents about their preferences and concerns in the GENA Neighborhood. Questions 5-10 asked questions about on- and off-street parking issues.

Question 5. On-Street parking is a problem in the neighborhood:
1. Strongly Agree (96)
2. Agree (115)
3. Neutral (61)
4. Disagree (62)
5. Strongly Disagree (17)
351 total responses

Question 6. Alternate side parking is needed during the winter months.
1. Strongly Agree (99)
2. Agree (129)
3. Neutral (40)
4. Disagree (59)
5. Strongly Disagree (26)
353 total responses

Question 7. Repealing winter alternate-side parking and replacing with declarations of snow emergency should be considered.
1. Strongly Agree (72)
2. Agree (77)
3. Neutral (67)
4. Disagree (69)
5. Strongly Disagree (63)
348 total responses

Question 8. Two-hour parking zones are an effective method to regulate on-street parking in the neighborhood.
1. Strongly Agree (51)
2. Agree (125)
3. Neutral (57)
4. Disagree (73)
5. Strongly Disagree (44)
350 total responses
Question 9. Current fines for parking violations are appropriate.

1. Strongly Agree (19)
2. Agree (122)
3. Neutral (123)
4. Disagree (48)
5. Strongly Disagree (35)
347 total responses

Question 10. Conversion of green space to off-street parking is a problem in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (60)
2. Agree (107)
3. Neutral (103)
4. Disagree (50)
5. Strongly Disagree (19)
339 total responses

Question 11. Inadequate facilities for trash, garbage, and recycling is a problem in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (52)
2. Agree (87)
3. Neutral (81)
4. Disagree (108)
5. Strongly Disagree (23)
351 total responses

Question 12. Junk/abandoned cars and refrigerators are a problem in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (30)
2. Agree (77)
3. Neutral (87)
4. Disagree (126)
5. Strongly Disagree (28)
348 total responses
Question 13. Parties & noise are a problem in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (32)
2. Agree (79)
3. Neutral (88)
4. Disagree (119)
5. Strongly Disagree (32)

350 total responses

Question 14. Crime and vandalism are a problem in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (19)
2. Agree (90)
3. Neutral (102)
4. Disagree (119)
5. Strongly Disagree (20)

350 total responses

Question 15. A neighborhood Watch Program is needed in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (33)
2. Agree (122)
3. Neutral (137)
4. Disagree (45)
5. Strongly Disagree (8)

345 total responses

Question 16. The quality of multi-unit residential buildings in the neighborhood is acceptable.

1. Strongly Agree (7)
2. Agree (71)
3. Neutral (84)
4. Disagree (128)
5. Strongly Disagree (59)

349 total responses
Question 17. Preservation of the historic character and architectural style of the neighborhood is important to me.

1. Strongly Agree (149)
2. Agree (118)
3. Neutral (57)
4. Disagree (23)
5. Strongly Disagree (4)
351 total responses

Question 18. The conversion of single-family homes to rental units has a negative impact on the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (186)
2. Agree (89)
3. Neutral (31)
4. Disagree (29)
5. Strongly Disagree (16)
351 total responses

Question 19. Design standards are needed to ensure the quality of rental housing development within the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (161)
2. Agree (124)
3. Neutral (29)
4. Disagree (20)
5. Strongly Disagree (13)
347 total responses

Question 20. Design standards are needed to ensure the quality of single-family residences and to maintain the traditional character of the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (117)
2. Agree (119)
3. Neutral (51)
4. Disagree (39)
5. Strongly Disagree (19)
345 total responses
Question 21. Pedestrian safety, especially for the elderly and very young, is satisfactory within the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (22)
2. Agree (146)
3. Neutral (57)
4. Disagree (86)
5. Strongly Disagree (43)

354 total responses

Question 22. Traffic calming is needed to reduce the number and speed of vehicles through the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (87)
2. Agree (119)
3. Neutral (79)
4. Disagree (55)
5. Strongly Disagree (8)

348 total responses

Question 23. The traffic light at 16th & Main is still useful for

1. Automobiles (227)
2. Bicyclists (214)
3. Pedestrians (250)
4. No longer needed (61)

Question 24. Emerson School is a vital part of attracting and retaining families with young children to the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (161)
2. Agree (113)
3. Neutral (61)
4. Disagree (11)
5. Strongly Disagree (4)

350 total responses
Question 25. Neighborhood pools are a vital asset to the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (103)
2. Agree (153)
3. Neutral (67)
4. Disagree (26)
5. Strongly Disagree (3)

352 total responses

Question 26. Which pool is important to you?

1. Municipal/Memorial Pool (179)
2. Forest Hills Pool (64)
3. Other (27)

270 total responses

Question 27. There are enough parks within the neighborhood to meet my needs.

1. Strongly Agree (65)
2. Agree (215)
3. Neutral (36)
4. Disagree (30)
5. Strongly Disagree (4)

350 total responses

Question 28. In its current form, Roellig Park is underutilized.

1. Strongly Agree (65)
2. Agree (120)
3. Neutral (116)
4. Disagree (14)
5. Strongly Disagree (5)

320 total responses
Question 29. Neighborhood concerns have been addressed by UW-L in their new campus plan.

1. Strongly Agree (10)
2. Agree (38)
3. Neutral (136)
4. Disagree (87)
5. Strongly Disagree (46)

317 total responses

![Pie chart showing distribution of responses to Question 29](image)

Question 30. There should be more local businesses in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (22)
2. Agree (69)
3. Neutral (88)
4. Disagree (120)
5. Strongly Disagree (51)

350 total responses

![Pie chart showing distribution of responses to Question 30](image)

Question 31. Billboards are appropriate in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (4)
2. Agree (25)
3. Neutral (40)
4. Disagree (103)
5. Strongly Disagree (180)

352 total responses

![Pie chart showing distribution of responses to Question 31](image)

Question 32. The height and condition of fences is a concern within the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (25)
2. Agree (70)
3. Neutral (147)
4. Disagree (88)
5. Strongly Disagree (18)

348 total responses

![Pie chart showing distribution of responses to Question 32](image)
Question 33. There should be more pedestrian lighting in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (71)
2. Agree (106)
3. Neutral (110)
4. Disagree (46)
5. Strongly Disagree (16)

349 total responses

Question 34. Outdoor light pollution is a problem within the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (21)
2. Agree (38)
3. Neutral (120)
4. Disagree (136)
5. Strongly Disagree (29)

344 total responses

Summary

In general, the survey results tend to support the findings of the neighborhood profile, which includes all information gathered about the neighborhood from the keep/change exercise, the 2000 census profile, inspections and police complaint summaries and neighborhood map analysis. The Grandview Emerson Neighborhood remains an attractive place to live due to its location, the positive interaction between the people in the neighborhood, the influence of UW-L, etc. At the same time there are areas of concern including, future plans of UW-L and the School District for Emerson Elementary, and traffic/parking issues.
Appendix E

Area East of Losey Survey Summary Report
April 2006

In April, 2006, an additional survey was mailed out to the property owners east of Losey Boulevard (between Cass and La Crosse Street). This survey came about as the result of a number of residents from this area attending the GENA Neighborhood meetings toweigh in on shared concerns with issues such as the potential closing of Emerson Elementary, traffic on Losey Boulevard, etc. As with the original survey, this survey consisted of 34 questions and was mailed by the City Planning Department to all property owners in the neighborhood.

Survey results were compiled and processed using Microsoft Excel. The findings from the survey will be used to augment the identification of conditions and issues that are the basis for the recommendations in the neighborhood plan.

125 surveys were mailed out to the property owners in the GENA Neighborhood. Approximately 28 surveys were returned which resulted in a 22.4% response rate. Survey questions 1 through 4 were questions that were asked in order to gather some background information on the survey respondents and their preferences.

Role of Survey Respondents. Homeowners represented 25, or 89% of the 28 respondents to the GENA East survey. The majority of the survey respondents were home-owners. The remaining surveys were completed by two self-identified property owners (7%), and one (4%) self identified renter.
**Desirables.** The survey asked residents and property owners to select the characteristics of the neighborhood that they found to be the most desirable. As with the original survey, the most important characteristic of the neighborhood was location, as indicated by 23 of the 28 respondents. Similarly, housing quality was the second most important characteristic (19 of 28 respondents). The top five neighborhood characteristics were:

1) Location (23)
2) Housing Quality (19)
3) Parks (15)
3) Schools (15)
5) Churches (13)

**Top Concerns.**
Survey respondents were asked to rank the priority of 10 potential issues facing the neighborhood on a scale from highest priority to lowest priority. Due to space constraints, only the results indicated as very high and high priority were tallied to determine the most important issues. The results of that ranking can be seen below.
Neighborhood Direction. Only three (11%) of the respondents felt that the neighborhood was getting better, 16 (57%) felt the neighborhood was staying the same, five (18%) felt the neighborhood was getting worse, and four (14%) did not know whether the neighborhood was getting better or worse.

Identified Issues
Survey questions 5 through 34 were issue questions that asked respondents about their preferences and concerns in the GENA Neighborhood. Questions 5-10 asked questions about on- and off-street parking issues.

Question 5. On-Street parking is a problem in the neighborhood:
1. Strongly Agree(4)
2. Agree (8)
3. Neutral (6)
4. Disagree (6)
5. Strongly Disagree (3)
27 total responses

Question 6. Alternate side parking is needed during the winter months.
1. Strongly Agree(4)
2. Agree (8)
3. Neutral (6)
4. Disagree (6)
5. Strongly Disagree (3)
27 total responses

Question 7. Repealing winter alternate-side parking and replacing with declarations of snow emergency should be considered.
1. Strongly Agree(5)
2. Agree (6)
3. Neutral (7)
4. Disagree (8)
5. Strongly Disagree (1)
27 total responses
Question 8. Two-hour parking zones are an effective method to regulate on-street parking in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (1)
2. Agree (5)
3. Neutral (10)
4. Disagree (6)
5. Strongly Disagree (4)

26 total responses

Question 9. Current fines for parking violations are appropriate.

1. Strongly Agree (1)
2. Agree (7)
3. Neutral (14)
4. Disagree (3)
5. Strongly Disagree (3)

28 total responses

Question 10. Conversion of green space to off-street parking is a problem in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (1)
2. Agree (8)
3. Neutral (10)
4. Disagree (4)
5. Strongly Disagree (3)

26 total responses

Question 11. Inadequate facilities for trash, garbage and recycling is a problem in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (2)
2. Agree (5)
3. Neutral (6)
4. Disagree (12)
5. Strongly Disagree (3)

28 total responses
**Question 12.** Junk/abandoned cars and refrigerators are a problem in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (2)
2. Agree (2)
3. Neutral (9)
4. Disagree (10)
5. Strongly Disagree (5)

**28 total responses**

**Question 13.** Parties & noise are a problem in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (2)
2. Agree (5)
3. Neutral (7)
4. Disagree (11)
5. Strongly Disagree (2)

**27 total responses**

**Question 14.** Crime and vandalism are a problem in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (1)
2. Agree (4)
3. Neutral (10)
4. Disagree (11)
5. Strongly Disagree (0)

**26 total responses**

**Question 15.** A neighborhood Watch Program is needed in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (3)
2. Agree (7)
3. Neutral (14)
4. Disagree (2)
5. Strongly Disagree (1)

**27 total responses**
**Question 16.** The quality of multi-unit residential buildings in the neighborhood is acceptable.

1. Strongly Agree (2)
2. Agree (7)
3. Neutral (9)
4. Disagree (6)
5. Strongly Disagree (2)

26 total responses

**Question 17.** Preservation of the historic character and architectural style of the neighborhood is important to me.

1. Strongly Agree (8)
2. Agree (10)
3. Neutral (4)
4. Disagree (4)
5. Strongly Disagree (1)

27 total responses

**Question 18.** The conversion of single-family homes to rental units has a negative impact on the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (9)
2. Agree (12)
3. Neutral (0)
4. Disagree (3)
5. Strongly Disagree (1)

25 total responses

**Question 19.** Design standards are needed to ensure the quality of rental housing development within the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (11)
2. Agree (10)
3. Neutral (4)
4. Disagree (2)
5. Strongly Disagree (0)

27 total responses
Question 20. Design standards are needed to ensure the quality of single-family residences and to maintain the traditional character of the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (9)
2. Agree (10)
3. Neutral (4)
4. Disagree (1)
5. Strongly Disagree (3)

27 total responses

Question 21. Pedestrian safety, especially for the elderly and very young, is satisfactory within the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (2)
2. Agree (10)
3. Neutral (3)
4. Disagree (7)
5. Strongly Disagree (5)

27 total responses

Question 22. Traffic calming is needed to reduce the number and speed of vehicles through the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (9)
2. Agree (8)
3. Neutral (8)
4. Disagree (2)
5. Strongly Disagree (1)

28 total responses

Question 23. The traffic light at 16th & Main is still useful for

1. Automobiles (17)
2. Bicyclists (15)
3. Pedestrians (23)
4. No longer needed (5)
**Question 24.** Emerson School is a vital part of attracting and retaining families with young children to the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (12)
2. Agree (9)
3. Neutral (3)
4. Disagree (1)
5. Strongly Disagree (3)

28 total responses

**Question 25.** Neighborhood pools are a vital asset to the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (10)
2. Agree (11)
3. Neutral (3)
4. Disagree (2)
5. Strongly Disagree (2)

28 total responses

**Question 26.** Which pool is important to you?

1. Municipal/Memorial Pool (5)
2. Forest Hills Pool (14)
3. Other (7)

26 total responses

**Question 27.** There are enough parks within the neighborhood to meet my needs.

1. Strongly Agree (7)
2. Agree (12)
3. Neutral (4)
4. Disagree (5)
5. Strongly Disagree (0)

28 total responses
**Question 28.** In its current form, Roellig Park is underutilized.

1. Strongly Agree(9)
2. Agree (8)
3. Neutral (8)
4. Disagree (2)
5. Strongly Disagree (1)

28 total responses

**Question 29.** Neighborhood concerns have been addressed by UW-L in their new campus plan.

1. Strongly Agree(1)
2. Agree (4)
3. Neutral (13)
4. Disagree (3)
5. Strongly Disagree (2)

23 total responses

**Question 30.** There should be more local businesses in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree(2)
2. Agree (5)
3. Neutral (4)
4. Disagree (10)
5. Strongly Disagree (7)

28 total responses

**Question 31.** Billboards are appropriate in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree(1)
2. Agree (2)
3. Neutral (1)
4. Disagree (6)
5. Strongly Disagree (18)

28 total responses
Question 32. The height and condition of fences is a concern within the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (3)
2. Agree (6)
3. Neutral (10)
4. Disagree (6)
5. Strongly Disagree (3)
28 total responses

Question 33. There should be more pedestrian lighting in the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (5)
2. Agree (8)
3. Neutral (13)
4. Disagree (0)
5. Strongly Disagree (2)
28 total responses

Question 34. Outdoor light pollution is a problem within the neighborhood.

1. Strongly Agree (1)
2. Agree (3)
3. Neutral (14)
4. Disagree (9)
5. Strongly Disagree (1)
28 total responses

Summary

For the most part, the results of this survey fall in line with the results of the initial neighborhood survey. Predictably, the residents east of Losey Boulevard preferred that the Forest Hills Pool stay open rather than the Municipal Pool. The GENA neighborhood displayed much more concern regarding the plans of UW-L than did those residents east of Losey Boulevard, while the status of Emerson Elementary remained important to both groups. Overall neighborhood deterioration and housing/property maintenance also were of significant concern to both sets of respondents.
If you have questions or concerns about the GENA Neighborhood, the GENA Neighborhood Plan, or would like to become involved with the GENA Neighborhood Association, please contact the City Planning Department at (608) 789-7512.

For additional information, including meeting notices and meeting minutes, please visit the City of La Crosse Website at:

www.cityoflacrosse.org

and navigate to the GENA Neighborhood section of the Neighborhood Planning pages.
This Project was supported by the City of La Crosse Planning Department and Community Development Block Grant funds from The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development