A City/Institutional Partnership

Northwestern University/Evanston Research Park

The Players

• Evanston:

- First suburb north of Chicago
- 75,000 people
- Diverse population
- City manager form of government
- Seven largest employers non-profits
- Highest property tax rate in region
- Substantial "citizen input" in decision-making

The Players

- Northwestern University
 - Private university
 - 12,000 students
 - -4,000 faculty & staff
 - Occupies 5% of land in city
 - \$440M research budget
 - \$6B endowment
 - History of conflict with city

Benefits to the City

- Redevelopment of 20 acres of underused land (adjacent to downtown and the university campus) into a technology park
- Grow a new economic "knowledge sector"
- Expand tax base: create better jobs
- Position Evanston as a "cool" city
- Create a new and stronger partnership with the university

Benefits to the University

- Needed off-campus site for \$25M Basic Industry Research Lab (BIRL)
- Wanted new industry connections for sponsored research & BIRL contracts
- Needed Park to lure "star" faculty
- Wanted increased stature (only Harvard, U of Chicago without parks)
 Jobs for students (undergrads & grads)
- Political points for helping city strengthen the local economy

Description of Site

- Adjacent to Evanston CBD and university campus
- Land owned equally by city, university, private owners
- Used by both for "backyard" uses
 - auto pools
 - university building and grounds/shops
 - city dog pound, public works, salt storage, etc.

Site Map & Land Uses

♦ Light rail lines toChicago on east andwest borders (35 min.ride)

♦New Transportation Center at lower apex of park

♦Downtown has 300+ retail stores, 70

♦Parking & hotel in center

♦ Theaters, retail at bottom



Presentation to Pacific Northwest National Laboratory by Ron Kysiak, January 14, 2009 Northwestern University Campus

Downtown Evanston

The Deal

- City to provide:
 - public improvements
 - acquisition of remaining properties not owned by university
 - demolition and relocation re new sites
- University to provide:
 - marketing
 - management
 - university services and amenities to park
 companies Presentation to Pacific Northwest

The Deal (cont)

- Both to provide:
 - Jointly-owned for-profit development corporation & operating expenses
 - Equally split board of directors (14)
 - Funds to run it (\$250K each per year)
 - Contribution of owned lands
 - Demolition/remediation of owned sites

Power and Control

- Two for-profit corporations
 - Research Park Inc, (RPI) operating entity with evenly split board of 14
 - Incl university trustees, attorneys, etc.
 - TOPCORP, oversight organization, approves all land sales, budgets for RPI
 - Board of Mayor, City Manager, Chair of Econ Dev Ctte; NU president, Senior VP Biz/Finance, VP Institutional Relations

Issues between city & university

- History of conflict between partners
 - e.g., which name first on Park
- Council minority bloc opposition
- Who pays, who controls?
- Citizen concerns re:
 - Safety
 - Environment
 - Traffic/congestion
 - University as the "great Satan"

Other issues affecting the project

- Large tech companies not moving R&D to urban sites (No market study)
 - "Synergy" among companies not of interest to large R&D companies
- Lack of easy east-west access to site
- Promised creation of 3,000 jobs in 10 years
- University sure of its ability to attract big users

Better to Be Lucky than Good

- Large companies did not come
- But small, start-up companies did were attracted to park because it had:
 - Tech Incubator
 - Seed capital fund
 - Technical assistance for start ups
 - Availability of good labor force (grad students)
 - Adjacency to downtown amenities, restaurants
 - Urban "cool," a sense of "place"

Developer Requirements

- Had to build out entire park
- Had to pay 75% of marketing expenses
- No "munitions" research companies
- Design approval on bldgs required by Park
- Park shared in sale of buildings

Developer Issues (cont)

- Could only lease land, option to buy after 10 years at appraised value
- Full control of tenant selection, but would use "best efforts" to choose tech
- Target of 80,000SF built in first 2 yrs
- Must start new bldg when last is 85% occupied within 18 months

Early Success with Developer

- Builds and fills two tech buildings (100,000SF) with tech tenants
- University leases most of first building for faculty business
- Warehouse rehabbed for incubator
- Positive national publicity
- Talks begin with large users

Technology Innovation Center

55,000 SF; 35,000 SF for incubator



Presentation to Pacific Northwest National Laboratory by Ron Kysiak, January 14, 2009

Decline and Fall

- Real estate melt-down of the 90's
 - Major slowdown in real estate leasing
 - Inability of developer to finance spec multi-tenant buildings
 - Pressure on developer to reduce rents
 - Large corporate users back away
 - Park loses big tenant for lack of space
 - Developer in default cannot build

The Plan Changes

- City demands "commercial development" to fill site
- University agrees, but forces a land swap, parking concessions
- City claims lower half of Park for parking and hotel
- University exits project

Current Situation: Commercial Development

- 80,000 SF cinema with 100,000 SF retail. 18 screens, 6 arts screens
- Hilton hotel: 180 rooms
- 1400 space city-financed parking structure (thru TIF)
- 200 unit high rise condominium
- 30 Town homes
- 190,000 SF corporate headquarters

"Downtown II"



Presentation to Pacific Northwest National Laboratory by Ron Kysiak, January 14, 2009

Borders Condo Theatres Retail Parking Structure Hilton Hotel **Tech Buildings** University Research Restaurants

Current Situation: Research Park

- Six technology buildings (400,000
 SF, 25 companies,700 jobs)
- University DOE research lab returned to university uses, some companies
- For-profit Park mgmt company shut down
- All sites spoken for but one
- Incubator privatized; moved out of park

 Presentation to Pacific Northwest

400,000 SF Tech Buildings



Technology Innovation Center, 55,000 SF 1033 University, 56,000 SF Basic Industry Research Lab, 130,000 SF

Final Result

- Increase in EAV: \$1.8M \$135M
- Final \$11.8M from TIF used to pay down 1400 car parking garage
- Revitalized downtown; One million visitors to theaters per year
- 80 restaurants
- First "new urbanism," mixed use technology park

Why Did the Partnership Fail?

- Wrong focus on corporate R&D
- Project oversold to City Council
- University unable to attract large R&D "signature" company into park
- No city elected officials on board: little communication with City
- Changes in university & City Council leadership
- No plan when real estate market died

Lessons Learned

- Do not oversell the project: it took the RTP 10 years to get its first tenant
- Prepare for the long haul: Science Center in Philadelphia founded in 1965
- Keep lines of communication open between partners - always
- Encourage participation in decisionmaking
- Be prepared to change horses when economic climate changes

Lessons Learned

- Emphasize politics, organization & communications over land use plans and market strategies
- Don't ask local government to do what they do not know how to do, e.g. lend their credit to real estate developers
- Focus your attention on building new companies – they are your future