Madison State of Mind: Demographics and Urban Form on State Street

Abstract

The 500 block of State Street, in downtown Madison, Wisconsin, is currently undergoing a radical landscape change through the construction of a new high rise apartment complex called “The Hub”. This study seeks to discover why changes in the built environment of State Street occur and specifically investigates the relationship between the demographics in the immediate vicinity and the built environment of State Street. Demographic data provided by the census website Social Explorer, built environment data provided by the city directories of Madison, and survey data provided by a range of survey respondents reveal that contrary to what is typically found in literature, the built environment of State Street does not appear to be driven by demographics, or vice versa. Rather there are signs that time, and not demographics, seem to be the driving force for the built environment on State Street. As time passes, popular culture changes with it. In turn State Street business adapt to popular demand.

Introduction

State Street is an iconic street. Those who do not reside within Madison know about and visit State Street when they are in the area. Those who do live in Madison have unique perceptions of State Street. It means different things to everyone. The recent construction on the street that connects the University of Wisconsin Madison to the State Capitol, notably on the 100 and 500 blocks, have stirred up these emotions and brought about suggestions and subsequent changes to the construction plans. The most notable of these redevelopment projects is “The
Hub” on the 500 block of State Street. The project takes up the entire block and is bordered by Gillman, Francis, and State Streets.

Throughout the years State Street has changed in both large and small ways. One large change was the transformation of State Street into a pedestrian mall in 1974, rather than a thoroughfare. Smaller changes, such as the changing of businesses at individual locations, are constantly happening.

Five pictures, ranging from the 1910s through the 1970s clearly show the transformations of the built environment of State Street. Chronologically, the picture from the 1910s shows a few vehicles and, notably, cable cars on State Street. This picture (see Figure 1) assumes the view of State Street from what was then the “new” capitol (State Street from new State Capitol, 1917).

Moving ahead to the 1940s, many vehicles are visible along with The Capitol and Orpheum theatres seemingly staring at each other from opposite sides of the street. Also in the picture is what appears to be a standard grocery store (State Street at Johnson Street, 1940-1949, Figure 2).

When viewing the photograph from the 1950s, several things stand out including the continued vehicle access along State Street. Also in the frame are a Co-op, which, judging by its sign, sold books, supplies and sporting goods, Brown’s bookstore, an unidentified Drug Store and a steakhouse (State Street at Lake Street, 1950-1959, Figure 3). Judging by the picture from the 1960s, certain characteristics of State Street remained, including the maintenance of the street as a thoroughfare. Also appearing in this image are the Orpheum, Victor Music store, a liquor store, a sporting goods store and an electric shaver store (State Street at Night, 1965, Figure 4). Finally, in the 1970s photograph, State Street is under intense construction, presumably completing the transformation of the street from a thoroughfare to a pedestrian mall. Also in the photograph are
a coffee shop, a gift store, the “Brathaus”, a Wendy’s and a Rocky Rococo’s (State Street Construction, 1974, Figure 5).

With the information given by these images alone, it is clear that State Street is a dynamic part of the Madison Community. An important question to ask is why do these changes occur? Why did State Street change from a thoroughfare to a pedestrian mall? Why were certain businesses, such as the Capitol theatre, present in some pictures but not in others? What happened to these businesses and what forced them to change? The answer to these questions may lie in the demographic composition of the city of Madison, and specifically those areas around State Street. The question this paper seeks to address is: What is the relationship between demographic change and the built environment of downtown Madison, specifically State Street?

Methods

In order to answer our research question, a majority of our data came from census data and archival resources. For census data, we looked at demographic information in the area immediately around State Street. To obtain this data on such a small geographic scale we used the Census data website Social Explorer. We were most interested in the demographic variables of race/ethnicity, age and school attendance.

In terms of finding historical architecture and urban planning data, we used several resources, including the Madison City Directories. These detailed lists of buildings on State Street provided us with information regarding the types of buildings found on State Street throughout its history. In addition, we used photographs and images from the University of Wisconsin Digital Collection website to visually illustrate the dynamism of State Street.

Additionally, we designed and implemented a survey to study the knowledge and feelings of those who use State Street. Using McLafferty’s chapter in Key Methods in Geography as a
guide, we designed and reviewed these surveys using standard geographic techniques (Clifford et al., 2012). These surveys provided key insight into the feelings of the demography and were crucial to our study.

After gathering these two strains of data, we compiled a “double timeline”, with the demographic information making up one half of the timeline, and the historical architecture data making up the second half. The timeline will range from 1970 to the present. 1970 was chosen as a starting point due to the fact that in 1974 State Street became a pedestrian walkway, and this was the first point that the Street was most comparable to today. This timeline provided the crux of our research and enabled us to directly compare demography and the built environment at any given period throughout the history of State Street. Upon this comparison, we were able to answer our research question by determining what the relationship between demographic change and the built environment actually is.

In this paper it is relevant to mention the limitations faced as a research group. The study period for this paper is only one semester in length, and it is unfunded. Each member of the group is also enrolled in other classes and has additional activities outside of the University. With that in mind, this study should be viewed as more exploratory in nature, rather than a definitive paper.

Literature Review

Conducting a literature review was a crucial part of this project. Going through multiple articles helped us understand the relationship between housing and demography in several areas, and to conclude that there is, in most cases, a relationship at all. As discussed in Key Methods of Geography, a literature review is an important aspect of any research. Important for multiple
reasons, a literature review especially helps relate the research of any study to the “wider literature on the topic” (Clifford et al, 2012).

HOUSING AND DEMOGRAPHY

Housing is one of the most discussed and obvious aspects of the built environment that is affected by demography. Numerous architects, urban planners, geographers and demographers have commented on the role demography plays in creating the need for housing (Birch, Fishman, Hayden, Myers and Pitkin, Nelson, etc.). This literature is crucial to the central question of this paper. The fact that so many credible minds have commented on the effect of demography on housing structures means that there is in fact a relationship between demography and the built environment. With that in mind, the question posed above is one that can be, and deserves to be, answered.

Birch provides an interesting and valuable take on the effect demography has on housing, in her article focused on Downtown housing projects. In this article, she discusses how the growth of Downtown areas in recent years has created a high demand for housing. Birch goes on to say that population growth, which at its core deals with demographics, is directly linked with the development of housing structures, and is a key part of the built environment (Birch, 2002).

Fishman writes about nearly the same topic in his article “The Fifth Migration”. An addition to the “Fourth Migration” idea presented by Mumford, Fishman argues that a new, fifth migration is taking place, in which a large number of people are moving to urban areas. This article provides insight into how to deal with this growth, rather than with the effects of this growth already in existence. Fishman believes that large changes in housing and infrastructure will need to be made in order to accommodate this population growth. In taking a positive spin on the topic, Fishman emphasizes that these changes could provide an example of the positive
possibilities of reurbanization, and that this demographic change will clearly have an effect on the built environment (Fishman, 2005).

In their article discussing demographic trends since 1950, Myers and Pitkin detail the effects that population growth has on the built environment, with an emphasis on housing. At the core of their article is the aging of both the baby boomers and their children. Myers and Pitkin argue that as the boomers age, they seek non-single family home residences within the city. They also argue that as their children reach adulthood, they are also attracted to urban areas for their “dynamism” (Myers and Pitkin, 2009). The result is that suburban single family home neighborhoods are in decline, and urban residences are on the rise. This of course creates the need for more housing in urban areas, which manifests itself in the construction of new apartment complexes, condominiums and townhouses, which reinforces the idea that demography has clear effects on the built environment (Myers and Pitkin, 2009).

A fourth article that discusses the relationship between the built environment, in the form of housing and demography, is “Leadership in a New Era” written by Arthur Nelson. In this article, he discusses the effects on housing caused by the decline in households with children. Nelson believes that a decline in households with children is causing alterations in the preferences of many households. Specifically, Nelson argues that people without children are more interested in attached homes on smaller lots rather than detached homes on larger lots, because there is less of a need for space without children to care for. He also believes that this shift in households with children will cause a higher demand for both residential and non-residential buildings, specifically in urban areas. Undoubtedly, this will greatly affect the built environment (Nelson, 2006).
This literature is extremely relevant to this paper. One of the major changes State Street is undergoing involves the construction of a large apartment complex geared towards students (Ivey, 2013). This apartment complex is going to take the place of the University Inn. “The Hub”, as the apartment building is to be called, will join Statesider and The Towers as student apartment buildings on State Street. At first glance, the high proportion of students within the area in the immediate vicinity of State Street seems to be driving the built environment, with specific regards to apartment buildings.

COMMUNITY AND UNIVERSITY RELATIONSHIP

State Street is not only a symbol of Madison as a city; it also holds enormous significance for the university that rests right at the street’s entrance. Not only does the street connect the campus to the capital in an intersection that can only be found there, the street shows signs of its relationship with the university at almost every corner. From the people walking down the street to the signs and posters in the store windows, State Street yells UW-Madison everywhere you look. This connection to the university is not unique to Madison Wisconsin, colleges all around the country and world have neighboring communities whose identities can only be understood with and understanding of their relationships with the college. State Street is one of these areas that to truly understand and study it, you must take a look into State Street’s relationship with the University of Wisconsin.

The city that a college is located in is very important to the university. Not only is it a backdrop to the school, it is the place that incoming students and staff will be living and spending several years of their lives. Often Universities are the largest private employer in college towns which makes people connected to the university, be that students or employees of the school, a significant portion of the city’s population (Hackney 1986). Especially for larger
universities, the large amount of people makes for a greater need in a strong relationship with the local communities. In order to have a solid relationship, schools need to make a lasting effect on the communities, because it is important to create a system where the city, community and university can all benefit from one another and create a sort of self-sustaining cycle. Not only do they bring in money, many universities create partnership initiatives with the local communities to enhance the living and address the needs of these communities (Cortes 2004). The schools also create jobs and are often active in helping the education systems around the campus. Along with all of this, universities often push hard to have a positive view by the citizens of the communities. They stay active in local politics and make sure that their image is one that not only brings to light the school but also the city that it resides in. However there can be the problem of city communities taking advantage of their relationship with the local colleges that should enhance the city and the school. For example many businesses generate around campuses that are geared directly toward students and faculty. This can be seen in Madison and is very prevalent on State Street. Clothing stores all down the street sell Badger apparel. Many bars are located on and near the street which are always very student friendly in order to take advantage of the high number of students in the area. These sorts of businesses and many more wouldn’t exist there if the street wasn’t located so close to a university of its size. The relationship between the communities and the school is vital for both of their well-being.

Not only are neighboring communities an area where students and staff find enjoyment, it is also a place where a large percentage of the school’s population lives. Most major universities do not create enough living spaces for their students, be that dorms or university apartments. In order to make up for this lack of living, private companies take advantage of this need and create living spaces outside of campus. It is a common trend for a city to build rentable houses for the
students, but in more recent years the trend has gone towards apartments where it takes more advantage of a smaller space. This trend is so significant that many studies have come out displaying these trends. One such study done by three geographers in Spain on a small to middle sized university showed how this trend has shaped the demographics of the city. Students that were once more spread out are now living in more condensed apartment blocks. They even coined the term “studentification” which is the concentration of students in a defined neighborhood which may or may not displace the current residents (Coronado 2011). Some create student ghettos and others become mixed housing of students and non-students. Madison and State Street in particular are great examples of how an area has embraced the student’s need of living. Most businesses on State house students above the first floor business. And in more recent years a trend has made entire apartment building where there were once just shops. Large apartments such as the State Sider have been built. It is important to note that this trend is more apparent on the blocks nearest the campus. As the school increases its population, the high rise trend will become even more visible. The University Inn, once a prominent hotel, is soon scheduled to be torn down to make room for an apartment building that, in regards to size, rivals any in the area.

PEDESTRIAN ACCESSIBILITY

Perhaps one of the most appreciated things about State Street in Madison is its pedestrian-friendly environment. With a lack of car traffic, wide sidewalks, and numerous shops and restaurants, people of all demographics can enjoy the entire length of State Street and its numerous attractions without the need for transportation. Factors such as walkability, safety, and business variability make State Street an ideal case of downtown pedestrian accessibility within a large city for local residents and tourists alike.
Today, many urban planners consider walkability to be very important when redevelopment occurs, whether or not it was present beforehand. Walkability itself is typically measured based on residential density, street connectivity, and land use mix (Sundquist, 1967). State Street and the surrounding residential areas represent the idea of walkability perfectly, which is likely why, in 2007, Madison was named the country’s most walkable city by the American Podiatric Medical Association and the healthy-lifestyle magazine *Prevention* (Reid). In a report published by the Liverpool University Press, eight factors were determined to be targets from improving downtown pedestrian environments: Widen sidewalks, discourage automobile traffic, climatisation of pedestrian environment, improve safety and security, increase attractiveness of walkways, increase quantity and quality of seating spaces, change existing zoning ordinances, and separate vehicles from pedestrians (Robertson, 279-280). In looking over this list, one could argue that an urban redeveloper could look to State Street for strong examples of a majority of these points.

The absence of non-transit automobile traffic and wide sidewalks also makes State Street a much safer downtown area for pedestrians. When a city area can decrease the interaction between people and cars, pedestrians immediately become safer. The number of vacancies in an area also increases safety because a lack of vacancies leads to more pedestrians in the area. When there are more people around, crime is less likely to occur and there are fewer blocks that have a reputation of being unsafe. This seems to be the case on State Street because real estate is considered very valuable, therefore, when business close down, they are typically replaced very quickly. Due to the numerous and wide-ranging business that exist directly on State Street, pedestrian traffic is at least moderately dense every day of the week and typically at any time of
the day, with the highest amounts of traffic finding its way to State during the night, especially on the weekend.

One of the biggest factors of pedestrian traffic, especially on the weekends, is the number of people who do not live near State Street that want to experience pedestrian mall. Perhaps the biggest variable in attracting tourists is the amount of business variability. When a person walks down State Street, they will see almost every type of restaurant cuisine and just about any type of shopping business they could ask for. This is important because studies suggest that the biggest factors for strong tourist shopping experiences are proximity to restaurants and cafes, unique and local shops, and a high density of shopping businesses in one area (Kemperman, 214-217). With these variables quite apparent, any and all types of people can enjoy both the specific businesses and the overall atmosphere that State Street presents.

After reviewing various articles regarding the goal of increasing pedestrian accessibility during urban redevelopment projects, it is very apparent that State Street here in Madison is a very strong example of what cities strive for, even if they wish to replicate such an environment on a larger scale.

DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT

Downtown development has been one of the most crucial aspects of city planning and urban growth in recent decades. Creating an effective plan that takes community ideas, environmental concerns, transportation needs, social aspects, as well as many other variables into account. The development of a downtown can be a tedious process that must take the previously listed factors into account and try to ensure, as many sides are happy as possible. A fine line must be walked between creating a more vibrant and economically sensible plan while also staying true to the existing, positive, social and cultural pieces that make downtowns what they
There is also the chance that the rate of gentrification can increase and begin to dominate development and push out demographics that have been living there previously. This is a complex subject that many people have worked on solving and it is important to look at as many authors as possible when looking at it.

Jill Capuzzo looks at redevelopment in a more rundown urban center in Orange, New Jersey and what can be done to revitalize the area. A group of planners, ecologists, and developers were hired to re-envision the faltering city. What they came up with was a focus on the central train station and creating a half-mile radius around the train station. The group came up with the idea of a campus style urban village with an interconnected series of mixed-use buildings and came up with a more efficient infrastructure. There was concern about keeping through streets and newer plans were created to design a main road lined with mixed-use buildings and maintaining pedestrian walkability. Another concern about this type of downtown redevelopment is the impact it will have on people in lower socio-economic classes. The new housing options being planned may be out of the price range of a portion of the lower socio-economic classes that makes up 18.8% of the city’s current population. It became a give and take between developers and planners on how to most effectively redevelop the downtown while taking all of the communities concerns under consideration (Capuzzo, 2012).

Rosen’s article looks at the change in urban areas from an “edge” focus to one that is more center-oriented. The main point discussed in Rosen’s article is that condominiums are the main driver of new housing growth in the downtowns of cities and metropolises. This focus on condominiums has been termed “Condo-ism” and has led to a large number of urban changes in many facets of the city. It changes how people view themselves and others living in the city and also the role of the city government on future development, whether residential, commercial or
office. This idea of “Condo-ism” has led to new cultural and social ideas forming about what a contemporary city is.

Both of these articles are directly relatable to the development that has occurred in Madison, specifically State Street, in the past and also the new developments that are being proposed on State Street. The first article talks about how redevelopment of more run down areas can very beneficial for a city but can create a rift because of the effects it may have on lower income groups (students) and the previous social aspects that previously existed. The second article can be used in the context of “The Hub,” the new super-condo that will be built along State Street next to Francis and stretching to Gorham. The Hub will be one of the largest development projects State Street has ever seen. It is similar to the construction of Statesider and The Towers; these are across the street from the proposed site of The Hub. We believe The Hub will be on the scale as the redevelopment of State Street to primarily a pedestrian walkway and will have a major impact on the dynamic of the street and city as a whole, the impact will also not be solely from the building itself but also the precedent it sets for future developments.

Based on housing and demography, the university and community relationship, pedestrian accessibility, and downtown redevelopment, it is obvious that a distinctive relationship exists between demographic variables and the built environment of State Street. With that in mind, our goal for this project is to explore past and present State Street demographics and how it affects the changing landscape. Specifically, we will study the historical change using pre-existing acquirable information of the street along with proposed future changes using our own primary research. Upon completion, this study will provide insight into an ever-changing topic that was previously limited to geographic regions outside of the Madison metro area.
Results

CENSUS

The biggest source to gather information on the demographics of the state street area is the census data. Although the data is gathered only every ten years, the census data provides all sorts of comparable statistics to every decade. For this research we looked at the census years 1970 to 2010 because those years contain the same census tract (2010 has two tracts that make up the same area as the other years). We looked at general population statistics such as total population, population density, sex, and age. This data will provide an insight into the changing number of people in the area, as well as looking at the average person that resides in the area. Also, we looked at more specific statistics that are relevant to our research question such as housing, rent, and education which will provide information on the ever changing landscape of the state street neighborhoods.

The census tracts that encompass State Street are fairly small areas, totaling an area of 0.17 sq. miles. From 1970 to 2000, the census tract 16.01 of Dane County ranges from Langdon St. and Lake Mendota down to part of W. Johnson Street. This makes State Street right in the center of the region. For the 2010 census tracts we used census tract 16.03 and census tract 16.04 of Dane county. The two tracts are separated by State Street, but combined make up the same 0.17 sq. miles that tract 16.01 made up in the other censuses. Prior to 1970, the census tracts weren’t used as extensively, especially in Madison, making it impossible to compare the data to the other census years. Overall however, even though the data isn’t specific for just State Street it will give us accurate data for analysis because the tract is so small and State Street is right in the middle.
From 1970 to 2010, the population of the 0.17 sq. mile area slowly increased. In 1970 the population was at 6,585 and increased every year by at least 200 citizens to its 2010 number of 8,467 people. The same pattern is seen with the increase of the population density. In 1970 the area held a population density of 37,662.2 people per sq. mile compare to the density of 48,742.4 people per sq. mile in 2010. It is also noticeable to point out that in the 2010 census, tract 16.03 which is the area south of State Street has less area and less people than 16.04 but its population density is higher.

Other general population statistics don’t tend to follow the same increasing pattern. The sex of the inhabitants of the area fluctuate between having more males or females and besides 1970, male and females never deviate from +- 5% of the 50% mark. In 1970 there were more than a thousand more females than males making the difference in percentages over 16%. We cannot state if this year is an outlier year without seeing the years before it. Age is similar to the sex statistics, there doesn’t appear to be any pattern in the changing of the ages throughout the years. The population is evenly distributed between the 18-24 age groups. This group makes up about 85% every year, from 79.1% in 1980 to 87.8% in 2010. More specifically if you divide the age group up into 4 groups (18-19, 20, 21, and 22-24), each group have a fairly even number of people within it (each around 20%). The only exception to this is in the 2010 census, the age group 18-19 only has 14% of the population which is the only one of these age groups in any of these years that has less than 18%.

The race population statistics has more of pattern through the 5 decades. In 1970 this portion of Madison had a 97.2% white population, making just over 2% being in the minority. Jump ahead to 2010 and you will see that the white population dropped to only 82.3%. The remaining 18.7% is broken up into minority categories with the most common being Asian with
12.2% of the entire population. This means that there is at least a 10% increase in the Asian population of the state street area. Every year in our data shows this same trend, a decrease of the white population and an increase in the Asian population. Other minorities, such as black, also experienced an increase; however it was much smaller (0.8% to 2.5%).

Education is a harder topic to study via the census data because every year had different ways of tracking data on education. For several of the years, the number of people enlisted in school could be found (1970, 1980, and 2000). These three years show an increase attendance of school by the population, from 78.1% in 1970 to 89.1% in 2000. In all of these years, the people attending school are almost exclusively attending college, with over 99%. This correlates with the high percentage of college age people in the tract. For two of the years (1980 and 1990) we were able to track down the percentage of people age 18 and over that have completed each level of education. Similar to the attendance of school statistic, a majority had at least had some college with over 85% of the population 18+ having some college. Most of this 85% only had some college which also correlates with the number of people attending college still, meaning that they are still working on their degree.

The only housing statistic that was attainable every year of our data was the number of housing units and the tenure of the people within them. The number of households increased from 2,271 units in 1970 to 3,687 units in 2010. This correlates directly to the increase of the total population. The tenure of the housing units stayed at a very similar number through all of the years with near 100% of the units being renter occupied. Also, at least 90% on every year are households with nonfamily members, meaning that the occupants of the household are not related. For the year 2010, the number of members in each household was obtained. Although it is just for one year, you can see that close to 50% of households are single person households.
With each addition of a person, the number of units reduces almost in half, so 2-person households make up about 25% and 3-person households make up about 13% and so on. Another statistic that was obtained about households was the cost of rent. This statistic wouldn’t be very useful due to the high amount of inflation from year to year. After inflation adjusted to the 2010 dollar, the price of rent stayed pretty consistent. In 1980 the average rent was $723 in 2010 dollars which was pretty equivalent to the rent of today.

We have gathered a lot of information from the census thus far which gives us a nice scope of the region and how it has changed in the last 5 decades. The detailed tables of this data can be found at the end of the document.

BUILT ENVIRONMENT

An important tool used in constructing the “built environment” portion of the double timeline was the Madison City Directory. These directories provide the names and addresses of everything within the city during a given year. For State Street, the names of the businesses are given in the order of lowest address to highest address. In other words, those businesses first listed were found on the 100 block, that nearest to the capitol, and those listed last were found on the 800 block, that nearest to the University of Wisconsin. This listing of businesses provides an incredible resource as easy comparisons can be made between those businesses found on State Street in 1950 and those found on State Street in 2010. We were able to find and use these archival sources thanks to the Wisconsin State Historical Society, which, as a library and archival collection, is among the resources Ogborn mentioned in his chapter in Key Methods in Geography (Clifford et al, 2012). After a detailed browsing of these directories, several patterns emerge regarding the built environment of State Street and its changes over time. Since Census
data is only available on a decadal basis, only the City Directories from 1950, 1960, 1970, 1980, 1990, 2000 and 2010 were used in order to make clean comparisons.

Rather than listing all the businesses found on State Street in a given year, the businesses were divided into groups for efficiency. A full listing of the businesses, organized by block, can be found at the end of the paper, but for this section the businesses were divided into: general shopping (eg drug stores, department stores, etc.), clothing stores (eg Men’s clothing stores, Women’s clothing stores, children’s clothing stores, etc.), restaurants (eg restaurants, food stores, bars, etc.), academic stores (eg book stores, technology stores [ranging from typewriter stores to pen stores], etc.), entertainment businesses (eg movie theaters, music stores, etc.), professional (eg banks, insurance companies, dentists, etc.), residence businesses (eg realtors, paint stores, etc.), personal products (eg salons, perfume shops, gift shops, etc.), and apartments. These groups are by no means final and are subject to change but for the initial research these divisions made sense to better organize the data.

In 1950 there were 10 general shopping stores, 48 clothing stores, 30 restaurants, 15 academic stores, nine entertainment businesses, 16 professional businesses, six residence businesses, 41 personal product businesses and 11 explicit apartment buildings on State Street. Some interesting aspects of these businesses include the presence of three stores geared specifically towards children (Kiddie Corner Children’s Furniture, The Cradle Children’s Wear and Klad-Ezee Children’s Clothing) and several businesses geared towards automobiles (Shell Station and City Car Company).

In 1960 there were seven general shopping stores, 41 clothing stores, 35 restaurants, 19 academic stores, 11 entertainment businesses, 28 professional businesses, nine residence businesses, 49 personal product businesses and 12 explicit apartment buildings on State Street.
As in 1950, several businesses specifically for children were still present on State Street (Juvenile Children’s Company, Cradle to Teen Clothing) along with several businesses geared towards automobiles (Shell Station and Pyramid Motor Company’s car lot).

In 1970 there were six general shopping stores, 35 clothing stores, 26 restaurants, 12 entertainment businesses, 15 professional businesses, seven residence businesses, 48 personal businesses and 16 explicit apartment buildings on State Street. A few details are of note from this data, including the presence of two wig shops (William’s Wig Salon and Kathleen’s Wigs) and the loss of all automobile related businesses except for the Shell Station.

In 1980 there were six general shopping stores, 27 clothing stores, 38 restaurants, 15 academic businesses, 13 entertainment businesses, 12 professional businesses, two residence businesses, 52 personal businesses and 18 explicit apartment buildings on State Street. Noteworthy in this data is the continued increase of apartment buildings on State Street (18 had increased from 11 in 1950) and the continued increase in personal businesses (52 had increased from 41 in 1950) with a specifically noticeable increase in gift shops on State Street.

In 1990 there were three general shopping stores, 39 clothing stores, 43 restaurants, eleven academic businesses, 21 entertainment businesses, 38 professional businesses, two residence businesses, 57 personal businesses and 24 explicit apartment buildings on State Street. Of note here is the large increase in professional businesses from 12 in 1980, only ten years earlier, to 38. Also, 1990 is the first time, within these selected directories, that there were over 20 buildings on State Street that served as nothing more than apartments.

In 2000 there were three general shopping stores, 23 clothing stores, 43 restaurants, ten academic businesses, 13 entertainment businesses, 32 professional businesses, one residence business, 38 personal businesses and 19 explicit apartment buildings on State Street. Here the
decrease in personal businesses from 57 to 38 is noteworthy. Also the presence of 19 apartment buildings is still a large amount of housing on State Street.

In 2011 there were two general shopping stores, 27 clothing stores, 67 restaurants, 14 academic businesses, twelve entertainment businesses, 32 professional businesses, two residence businesses, 40 personal businesses and one explicit apartment building on State Street. Interesting here is the drop in apartment buildings to one, although individual apartments are present above a majority of State Street businesses. Also interesting is the apparent explosion of restaurants to 67 on State Street. For each of the years described, there is an accompanying bar graph at the end of the document.

An important side note is a description of how apartments are listed in the City Directories. Certain addresses are solely associated with apartments whereas others are listed as a similar address to a separate business. For instance, a building may be listed as 104 State Street, and separate apartments may be listed as 104 ½ State Street. All of the apartment buildings listed above are addresses that were solely associated with apartments, and not a shared address. This is an attempt to show how much of the built environment on State Street is dedicated to only apartments.

SURVEYS

We collected 90 responses to our survey, most of which are students. While that may seem generally biased, we believe that this speaks to the demographics of state street occupants being mostly students as well. The few alumni that we have collected responses from have somewhat echoed the opinions of the current students. In looking at the overall data, it appears as though most people are not very aware of the current State Street construction projects, but they
do know that they do not like so much construction going on in this area. It appears as though most people really enjoy the street as it is and has been for years and they don’t want to see that change. The detailed results of our survey can be found at the end of the paper.

Analysis
DEMOGRAPHIC AND BUILT ENVIRONMENT ANALYSIS

Due to the fact that the decade census changed the tract size in the 1970 census, we decided to only look at the years from 1970 to today in our case study. Although this may seem like a small set of years for an area that has been around for much longer, it will still give us a strong interpretation of if the built environment is connected to the demographics of State Street and vice versa. 1970 is also a good starting year for our analysis because of the transformation of the street to a pedestrian walkway in 1974. Our analysis will look at if there are any small or large changes in the demographics that might have an impact on the built environment of the Street. Also we will look if there are any changes in the demography that might have arisen because of changes in the built environment. Lastly, we will take a look at people’s opinion of current changes to State Street via our surveys. Using all of this information we should be able to determine if there has been a correlation with the built environment and the demographics.

The census tract 16.1 of Dane County, which holds State Street right at its center, had a total population of 6,585. Although not all of these people lived on State Street, it will be pertinent to what we are trying to analyze because the tract is only 0.17sq. Miles. Out of the 6,585 people, 3,832 were woman and 2,753 were males. This means that there were 58.2% females and 41.8% males. Along with that the population was over 97% white with just under 200 people nonwhite. 83.7% of the population was in the age bracket 18-24 and 78% are
enrolled in school. The only surprising information from this data is that there is a significant higher amount of females. Nothing we collected could explain why this would be.

The same year saw a wide range in types of buildings on State Street; there were 35 clothing stores and 26 restaurants, along with many academic, entertainment, and professional buildings. 48 buildings were personal and there were also 23 residence/apartment buildings. This wide range of buildings on the street would suggest it’s a shopping street with a lot of foot traffic, yet still a place people live. 1970 was 4 years before the street was transformed into a pedestrian zone, but the kinds of buildings suggest it already had characteristics of a walking area.

The census data shows a fairly strong correlation to the buildings on State Street for 1970. Out of the 2,271 households in the area 90% were nonfamily households, meaning that the residents are unrelated, and almost 97% were renter occupied. This is information that you would see in any college neighborhood and would explain the existence of apartment buildings. The high number of enrollment in school would explain the high number of academic based buildings. Because of State Street’s close vicinity to the school, many of these buildings might even be University of Wisconsin buildings. Other than the academic buildings, without know what is sold at the businesses, it is hard to determine if there is a connection to the type of people in the State Street area.

1970 to 1980 saw not only an increase in total population, but also a decrease in the white population and a slight increase in the percentage of people enrolled in school. Not only was 83% enrolled in school in 1980, over 99% of that subset were in college. Despite this the number of academic buildings decreased by 4 in this time and the only area with a significant increase in the number of buildings was restaurants. It is important to point out that by 1980 the street was
entirely a pedestrian walkway which might explain why the number restaurants increased. Restaurants might have tried to capitalize on the change to the street by taking advantage of the walking aspect to attract customers. Other than that the census data does not show a statistic that would explain this increase in restaurants. Even though the number of households increased in 1980 and the percentage of nonfamily households increased to 94%, the number of total residence/apartment buildings on State Street decreased to 20. However, that statistic is a little misleading because the number of apartments did increase by two and we do not know if there was an increase of residential buildings around State Street. Residential building might have moved away from the street because of change to a pedestrian street, but we cannot determine this and the change in residence buildings doesn’t suggest a significant switch.

From 1980 to 1990 the census tracts immediately around State Street reveal certain demographic changes. At the most basic level, the population of these tracts increased from 6,762 to 7,445. Also of note is the slight change in population proportion for those between 18 and 24 years old. In 1980 this proportion was 79.1% and in 1990 it was 85.9%. Further, the majority white population decreased from 93.9% of the total in 1980 to 90.4% in 1990. This was accompanied by an increase in the Asian and Pacific Islander population from 2.3% to 6.9%. The largest of these changes is the 6.8% increase in the proportion of the population between 18 to 24 years old. This increase does not appear to be extremely significant, and as such this demographic data should be described as relatively unchanged, unlike the built environment data.

Of all the categories of business types on State Street, only one, General Businesses, saw no change from 1980 to 1990. Apart from this, each category saw a change of at least one in the number of businesses on State Street. Most significantly were the changes in the number of
clothing stores and restaurants. The amount of clothing stores on State Street increased from 27 in 1980 to 39 in 1990. Professional businesses found on State Street increased from 12 in 1980 to 38 in 1990. These changes appear to be of above average significance, as changes of over ten of any type of business would certainly be noticeable.

It would therefore appear that the changes in the demographics of the area near State Street were not as significant as the changes in the built environment from 1980-1990. If demography had a direct effect on the built environment, or vice versa, it can be assumed that the changes in each would be of similar significance. This would lead to the conclusion that demographics did not have much of an effect on the built environment, or vice versa, from 1980-1990 of State Street.

From 1990 to 2000 there again were certain changes in the demographics of the area in the immediate vicinity of State Street. In 2000, there was an increase in this population, from 7,445 in 1990 to 8,088. Accompanying this population growth was a very marginal increase in the proportion of the 18 to 24 year old segment of that population, from 85.9% in 1990 to 86.3% in 2000. Also of note was the decrease of the proportion of the white population from 90.4% in 1990 to 86.5% in 2000. Along with this decrease was an increase in the Asian and Pacific Islander proportion from 6.9% in 1990 to 7.7% in 2000. The most significant of these changes is the decrease of 3.9% of the white population, which is not an extremely high change in demographics. Again, the built environment of State Street saw much more significant change during this time period.

During the period from 1990 to 2000, much change occurred regarding the built environment of State Street. Two categories, General Businesses and restaurants, saw no change in number during the period, but every other category saw change. Of most significance was the
decrease in clothing stores from 39 in 1990 to 23 in 2000. The number of personal businesses also saw a huge decrease from 57 to 38 during this period. Both of these changes, the largest of any group of businesses during the period, exceeded a difference of 15, which would lead to a very different State Street.

As with the period from 1980 to 1990, this period saw minimal changes in the demographics of the area around State Street and large changes in the built environment of State Street. This would lead to the same conclusion: during the period of 1990 to 2000, the demographics had little effect on the built environment, and vice versa, of State Street.

The last period of change of relevance to this paper is from 2000-2010/11. It is important to note that the census data for this period came from 2010, but the accompanying Madison City Directory was not available, so the 2011 directory was used. The changes in the demographics of the area from 2000-2010 included an increase in population from 8,088 to 8,467. Also different was the proportion of those aged 18 to 24 in the area. In 2000 this proportion was 86.3% and in 2010 this proportion was 87.9%. Changing from 86.5% in 2000 to 81.3% in 2010 was the proportion of whites among that population. This was accompanied by an increase in the Asian and Pacific Islander proportion of the population from 7.7% in 2000 to 12.2% in 2010. These are the most significant changes found in the data and the largest of these is a 5.2% difference in the white proportion of the population. This data is again less changed than the built environment data.

From 2000 to 2011, all categories of businesses, except for professional, were changed. The largest changes occurred in the number of restaurants and apartment buildings. In 2000 there were 43 restaurants on State Street and this increased to 67 by 2011. In terms of apartment
buildings, in 2000 there were 19 on State Street and only one by 2011. Again, each of these changes is in excess of 15, which would certainly be noticeable.

As with the previous two periods, from 2000 to 2011, the changes in the built environment appear to have been far greater than the changes in the demographics of State Street. This would again lead to the conclusion that there was no significant relationship between the built environment and demographics, or vice versa, of State Street during this period.

Several things about the demographics of State Street remained relatively constant throughout the entire range of this study. There were no extremely large changes in the high proportion of those people from 18 to 24 years old living around State Street. Also, there were no large changes in the majority white proportion of the population. Based on the literature reviewed at the beginning of this paper, these two pieces of data alone would lead to an assumption that a similar lack of change occurred in the built environment. However, the opposite is true. State Street changed significantly in each ten year period of this study. Therefore, it can conceivably be concluded that, in the case of State Street, there is little to no relationship between the built environment and the demographic profile of the surrounding area.

Perhaps the changes in the built environment of State Street are not caused by changes in the demographic profile, but in a constant factor of the demographic profile. In each of the years 1990, 2000 and 2010, the amount of non-family households living in the vicinity of State Street was a huge majority. 96.3% of this population constituted non-family households in 1990, 97.1% in 2000 and 96.8% in 2010. Whether this single factor of the population led to the rapidly changing landscape of State Street remains unanswered. Future research on the subject would do well to question whether demographic changes or demographic consistencies led to the ever changing landscape of State Street. If demographic changes lead to changes in the built
environment, as the literature review of this project would suggest, then in the case of State Street, it would appear that there is little to no relationship between demographics and the built environment. However, if certain factors related to a high proportion of non-family households lead to an individual, immediate consumption type of economy, perhaps this explains the rapid changes seen in the history of State Street.

SURVEY RESULTS

When we set out to get results for this survey, we were very interested to not only find out the type of people who were visiting State Street, but to also find out what they know about the construction projects and how they feel about them. The conclusions that we reached were (1) not many people know a whole lot about the construction projects and (2) people don’t want State Street to change. The following statistical results support those points.

We were able to collect 90 responses to our survey, most of which (82%) are current students. While that may seem generally biased, we believe that this speaks to the demographics of occupants on State Street and the surrounding area being mostly students as well. As expected, this was the group that held the most knowledge of the construction projects, but they still didn’t know very much:

- How much do you know about 100-block construction?
  - 4% A lot
  - 24% A little
  - 72% Nothing
- How much do you know about 500-block construction?
  - 16% A lot
  - 31% A little
  - 53% Nothing
- How much do you know about Library Mall construction?
  - 14% A lot
  - 47% A little
Perhaps the most telling part of the survey was the additional comments that were made, as comments included, “I think it’s absolutely stupid that the complex between State and Gilman was allowed to be built. More high-rise apartments are not necessary on this campus and certainly not on State St.” Also, many comments echoed the sentiments of the old saying, “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it,” as one respondent stated, “I think it was fine the way it was.”

The few alumni and non-students that we collected responses from have somewhat echoed the opinions of the current students. In looking at the overall data, it appears as though most people are not very aware of the current State Street construction projects, but they do know that they do not like so much construction going on in this area. It appears as though most people really enjoy the street as it is and has been for years and they don’t want to see that change. Alumni and students seem to have the same attitude, as one alumni member stated, “What makes State Street are the variety of shops and restaurants. It's unfortunate that the 500 block apartment gets rid of places that had a long history on State and will be replaced with "student housing" which many students will not be able to afford.” Based on the lack of knowledge, it appears as though those who visit State Street less frequently will be in for quite the surprise once the 100 and 500 block construction projects are finished within a year or two.

Whether its students who have only been here for a semester or older alumni, one point is obvious: State Street is a cherished place among any and all generations of UW-Madison students, and drastic changes are commonly unwelcomed. These were our initial thoughts before our survey was conducted, but the data we gathered certainly supports those opinions.

*The rest of our data and additional comments can be found at the end of our document.*

**Conclusion**
With respect to the existing literature on the topic, it is clear that in most situations a strong relationship exists between demography and the built environment. After using multiple resources and undergoing much deliberation, this study would seem to suggest something different with regards to State Street. The built environment of State Street was found to be extremely dynamic, as opposed to the relatively constant features of the demography in the area immediately surrounding State Street. With this in mind, if would appear that in this case the built environment is not driven by the demography or vice versa. This should serve to reinforce the perception of State Street as an incredibly unique location that is without equal. Perhaps this explains why survey respondents are so opposed to changing State Street. Regardless, this study provides valuable information regarding the demography and the built environment of a rapidly changing archetypal Madison corridor.

Future Research

This study experienced several shortcomings due to the fact that it was undertaken in only one semester, received no funding, and that all group members had multiple obligations outside of the study. With that in mind, future research should focus more on time and changes in American culture as driving changes in the built environment of State Street as opposed to demography. Future research should also improve the classifications of the businesses, as several problems emerged, including classifying both bars and restaurants under the category of “restaurants” in addition to other classification issues. The future research should include the entire history of the street, instead of just the pedestrian walkway era. Finally, the study should be performed anew once all current construction projects on State Street are completed.
Appendix

Figure 1
List of Businesses On State Street

1970:

**100 Block:** Commercial State Bank, Findlay Building (Beauty Shop, Women’s Clothing Store), Pacos Restaurant, Apartments, Dyer’s Shoe Store, Collector’s Shop (Stamps/Coins), General Finance Loan Company, Gersbach Voice Studio, Ziegler Music Shop/School, Army Surplus Store, Leath Furniture Company, Youthful Shoes Company, Smith’s Flowers, Apartments, Smith’s Jewelry, Art Mart Inc., Castle & Doyle Building Materials, Castle & Doyle Coal, Goldora Beauty Salon, Easter Seal Home Gift Shop, Whitney Jewelers, Blum’s Trophies, Foot-So-Port Shoe Shop, Gent’s World Barber, Murie’s Jewelers, Potato Brothers General Store


**500 Block:** Stop & Shop Grocery, University of Wisconsin Administration, Property Managers Real Estate, Jones Office Equipment, University of Wisconsin Music School Annex, Wehrmann’s Leather Goods, Apartments, Meuer Art & Picture Frame, Block Cleaners, Bresler’s 53 Flavor Ice Cream Shop, Reef Restaurant, Apartments, Gentry House Wigs, Kingsley Apartments, Chesty’s Restaurant, Nedrebo’s Formal Wear, Hare Jack Apartments, Stemp Typewriter Company, Hershleder Furs, Gino’s Restaurant, One Hour Cleaners, John Charles Hair Designs Beauty Shop, Pic a Book Store, Michael’s Shoe Service Repair, Spud Nut Restaurant, African House Gift Shop, Kazik’s Jeweler, Pub Tavern, Yarn Bar, Olson Men’s Clothing, Apartments, Jeffrey’s Women’s Clothing, Manchester Campus Women’s Clothes

700 Block: University Book Store, Calvary Chapel and Student Center, Kollege Klub Tavern, Kollege Klub Apartments, St. Paul’s Chapel, University of Wisconsin Music Annex 2, Memorial Library, Presbyterian Chapel and Student Center

800 Block: University Club, Wisconsin Historical Society

1980:

100 Block: Marine Trust Company & Bank, Alyce’s Hat & Bridal Shop, Findlay Building (Apartments, Razzmaton Boutique), Pacos Restaurant, Apartments, Cinnamon Girl Women’s Clothing, Collector’s Shop (Stamps & Coins), State Street Arcade Adult Amusements, Commercial State Bank, Gentry House Hairstyling, Bittersweet Restaurant, Dyer’s Shoe Store, Apartments, Office Building (Fudge Shop, Fine Gifts, Restaurant, Spa), Indian Crafts, Cupid’s Corner Women’s Apparel, Castle & Doyle Fuel & Building Materials, Goldora Beauty Salon, Easter Seal Gift Shop, Blum’s Trophies, Hair Unlimited Hairstylist, Murie’s Jewelers, Winter Lawyer, Potato Brothers General Store


Pond Crafts, Suburpia Restaurant, Apartments, Matterplay Jewelry, Gent’s World Barber Shop, Dannon Yogurt Store, Kingsley Apartments, Chesty’s Restaurant, Inca Traditions Imports, Hare Jack Apartments, Casa Di Vino Liquor, Stemp Typewriter, Jade Palace Restaurant, Gino’s Restaurant, Gino’s Restaurant, Peppino’s Restaurant, Music City Records, Lake Street Station Records, Michael’s Shoe Service, Husnu’s Restaurant, Oriental Gifts, Kaplan Test Center, Film Box Photo Equipment, Pub Tavern, Yarn Bar, Cornelius Rupert Men’s Clothing, Apartments, Glemby Hair Salons, Manchester Women’s Clothing

600 Block: Brathaus Restaurant, Rupert Cornelius Clothing, Perfume Shop, Tobacco Bar, Copper Rivet Men’s Clothing, Apartments, Sweet Potato Gift Shop, Captain’s Chair Barber, Mitchell Optical, Cardinal Beauty Shoppe, Yost’s Campus Shop, Grotto Restaurant, Busch Building (Sunprint Photography, Dentist, Badger Herald), Apartments, Blumen Center Flowers, Boot Barn, Record World Records, Apartments, Petrie’s Sports, Rengstorff Book Store, DeLonge Photography, College Barber Shop, Rocky Rococo, Taco Grande Restaurant, Discount Records, Apartments, Wendy’s, Antoine’s Women’s Clothing, Goodwill, College Barber Shop, WSA Pharmacy, Warner-Medlin Photography, Paul’s Used Books, Brown’s Books, Rennebohm Drug Store

700 Block: Calvary Chapel & Student Center, University Book Store, St. Paul’s Chapel, Memorial Library, Community Law Office

800 Block: University Club, Wisconsin Historical Society

1990:


Printing, Photo Express, De Woskin Investments & Campus Rentals, Braun’s Ladies Clothing, Casa de Lara Restaurant, Id Boutique Clothing, WSA Pharmacy, Hot Potato Clothing, Mane Hair & Tanning, Kaplan Education Center, Schanel Optometrist


700 Block: Calvary Chapel & Student Center, University Book Store, St. Paul’s Catholic Center, Memorial Library, Community Law Office, Pres House, Center for Conflict Resolution, Geneva Ministry, Madison Peace Cooperative, Community Action on Latin America, Madison Committee on South Africa

800 Block: University of Wisconsin Building, University Club, Wisconsin Historical Society

2000:


300 Block: Triangle Market, Tutto Pasta Restaurant, Jewelers Workshop, Karen Women’s Clothing, Marmalade Skies Gifts, Alternate Realities Books, Apartments, Zorba’s Restaurant, Parthenon Restaurant, Bull Ring Restaurant, Himal Restaurant, Soap Opera Toiletries, Shakti Bookshop, Fur Fin & Feather Pet Shop, Apartments, Ragstock Clothing, Sedona & Razzmatazz Women’s Clothing, Jazzman Men’s Clothing, Benjamin Management, Casa de Lara Restaurant, Dalar Restaurant, De Woskin Investments, Mane Attraction Beauty Shop, Pegasus Games, Photo Express, Apartments, Schanel Oprometrist


600 Block: Fraternity Buyer’s Business Services, State Street Brats, Urban Outfitters, Munn’s Optometrist, Milan Restaurant, Famous Footwear, Mediterranean Café, Regis Hairstylists, City Bar, Steve & Barry’s Apparel, Sun Room Café, Boot Barn, CD Exchange, Apartments, Indian Weaving Apparel, Fine Posters, Espresso Café, Active Sports Shoes, Discount Records, Pizza Hut, College Barber Shop, Paul’s Books, Walgreen’s

700 Block: Calvary Chapel, University Book Store, St. Paul’s, University of Wisconsin Libraries, Au Sable Trails Civic Association, Catacomb’s Coffee, Foundation of Francis Wayland Apartments, Geneva Campus Church

800 Block: Social Action Collection, Wisconsin Historical Society, Wisconsin History Foundation

2011:

Wisconsin Educational, Italian Language School, State Senate Democrat Org., Working Capital for Community Org., Gleason Law Office, Davis Nelson Optometrist, Mango Boutique Women’s Clothing, Shangri La Novelties, Cinnamon Girl Clothing, Vic’s Corn Popper, Tigerlilly Women’s Clothes, Blum Trophies, A Action Lock & Security, Mary’s Tailoring


400 Block: Jamba Juice, Badger Liquor, Tellus Mater Cooking Utensils, ReThreads Clothing, Land’s End Clothing, Madison Sole Shoes, Sacred Feather Hats, Fair Trade Coffee, Yellow Jersey, Chin’s Restaurant, Hawk’s Bar & Grill, Cold Stone Creamery, Taste of Tibet Restaurant, B-side CDs, Reprise Hair Studio, Princess of India Women’s Clothes, Gumby’s Pizza, Scooter’s Coffee, Wasabi Restaurant, A Dobra Tea, Pita Pit Restaurant, State Street Cash Mart, Artist & Craftsman Supply, Asian Kitchen, Tropic Jewel Gifts, Subway, Chocolate Shoppe Ice Cream


700 Block: Calvary Chapel, University Bookstore, Badger Catholic, St. Paul’s Church, Subway, Center for Humanities, Memorial Library, Music Library, Community Action on Latin America, Intervarsity Christian Fellowship, Pres House
Survey Results
- 90 Responses
  - 60% Male
  - 38% Female
  - *Not all respondents answered this question

  - 82% current students
  - 9% Alumni
  - 9% Neither
  - *Not all respondents answered this question

  - 81% White
  - 0% African American
  - 4% Hispanic or Latino
  - 7% Asian
  - 0% Native Indian/Alaska Native
  - 2% Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander
  - 3% Multi-Racial
  - 0% Other
  - *Not all respondents answered this question

Students
- 5 Freshman
- 15 Sophomores
- 20 Juniors
- 30 Seniors
- 3 Grad Students

- 73% live within a few blocks
- 23% live within a few miles
- 4% live within the city

- 42% on State DAILY
- 45% WEEKLY
- 11% MONTHLY
- 1% RARELY

- Most often on State in the…
- 4% Morning
· 40% Afternoon
· 29% Early Evening
· 27% Late Evening

· Could you see yourself living in the new apartment complex?
  · 26% Would
  · 46% Wouldn’t
  · 28% Not Sure

· How much do you know about 100-block construction?
  · 4% A lot
  · 24% A little
  · 72% Nothing

· How much do you know about 500-block construction?
  · 16% A lot
  · 31% A little
  · 53% Nothing

· How much do you know about Library Mall construction?
  · 14% A lot
  · 47% A little
  · 39% Nothing

**Alumni**

· Age
  · 63% are 20-29
  · 25% are 30-39
  · 0% are 40-49
  · 13% are 50+

How far from State St. do you CURRENTLY live?
· 38% within a few blocks
· 13% within a few miles
· 13% Within the Midwest
· 38% Outside the Midwest

· How often do you return to UW-Madison?
  · 38% Weekly
  · 50% Annually
  · 13% Rarely
Could you see yourself living in the new apartment complex?
- 0% Yes
- 63% No
- 38% Not Sure

Could you see yourself living there at another point in your life?
- 100% Yes, earlier in life

How much do you know about 100-block construction?
- 0% A lot
- 25% A little
- 75% Nothing

How much do you know about 500-block construction?
- 13% A lot
- 25% A little
- 63% Nothing

How much do you know about Library Mall construction?
- 13% A lot
- 50% A little
- 38% Nothing

Neither
- Age
  - 0% are 18-20
  - 43% are 21-22
  - 29% are 23-30
  - 29% are Over 30

How far from State St. do you live?
- 14% a few blocks
- 0% a few miles
- 14% within the city
- 71% Farther

How often do you visit State St.?
- 14% Daily
- 29% Monthly
- 43% Annually
- 14% Rarely

Could you see yourself living in the new apartment complex?
57% Yes
43% No

Of the two respondents who responded to whether or not they could see themselves living there at a different time, BOTH said yes, earlier in life.

How much do you know about 100-block construction?
100% Nothing

How much do you know about 500-block construction?
0% A lot
17% A little
83% Nothing

How much do you know about Library Mall construction?
0% A lot
50% A little
50% Nothing

**Student Comments**

Be careful putting apartment/student housing directly on state street. Parents DO NOT want their children located on a main street. They value quiet, study friendly housing like Ogg.

Dumb

Hurry up and get it done already. I miss the fountain!

I didn't even know there was supposed to be construction

I think it’s absolutely stupid that the complex between state and Gilman was allowed to be built. More high rise apartments are not necessary on this campus and certainly not on state street.

I think it was fine the way it was.

It sucks that the construction forced many of the smaller, locally owned ethnic restaurants to close.
I want my fountain back!

Library Mall is actually a thing? It's been open for like a month in my four years here.

Make it pretty

More advertising surely helps

**Alumni Comments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When will it be done?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What makes State Street are the variety of shops and restaurants. It's unfortunate that the 500 block apartment gets rid of places that had a long history on State and will be replaced with &quot;student housing&quot; which many students will not be able to afford.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There were no additional comments made by respondents who were neither a current or former student*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Census Tract 1801</th>
<th>Census Tract 1801</th>
<th>Tract 1801, Dane County, Wisconsin</th>
<th>Census Tract 1801</th>
<th>Census Tract 1801</th>
<th>Census Tract 1804</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET11. Total Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>6,148</td>
<td>6,792</td>
<td>7,445</td>
<td>8,088</td>
<td>3,414</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>8,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET12. Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>6,092</td>
<td>6,750</td>
<td>7,415</td>
<td>8,025</td>
<td>3,360</td>
<td>5,005</td>
<td>8,487</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>5,144</td>
<td>5,355</td>
<td>5,412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Eskimo, and Aleut</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>5,055</td>
<td>5,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian and Pacific Islander</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>10,083</td>
<td>10,103</td>
<td>10,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Other Race</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>10,083</td>
<td>10,103</td>
<td>10,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Age</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Count of Persons 25 Years Old</th>
<th>Enrolled in School</th>
<th>5,142</th>
<th>78.1%</th>
<th>5,609</th>
<th>89.9%</th>
<th>7,207</th>
<th>99.1%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARENTS - high school</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>college</td>
<td>3,557</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,158</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>5,161</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more years</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>398</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college, no degree</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td>444</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Years Of School Completed for Persons 25+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons 25 Years Old And Over</th>
<th>8,703</th>
<th>78.1%</th>
<th>7,196</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (0 to 8 years)</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>through high school</td>
<td>848</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school, 4 years</td>
<td>5,741</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>5,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 3 years</td>
<td>4,036</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>4,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more years</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>834</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specified renter-occupied housing units with kitchen (includes Ma 2010 US census)</th>
<th>2,107</th>
<th>81.1%</th>
<th>2,740</th>
<th>81.1%</th>
<th>2,900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $300</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $300</td>
<td>2081</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than $600</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>70.9%</td>
<td>1,091</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>1,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300 to $499</td>
<td>487</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>1,056</td>
<td>33.8%</td>
<td>1,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 to $749</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800 to $999</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 to $1,249</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250 to $1,499</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 or more</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3768</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfamily households</td>
<td>2,042</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>2,648</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>3,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family households</td>
<td>1,228</td>
<td>49.5%</td>
<td>1,444</td>
<td>48.9%</td>
<td>1,417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner occupied</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter occupied</td>
<td>1,297</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td>1,284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-person household</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-person household</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-person household</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-person household</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-person household</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-person household</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-or-more person household</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Businesses on State Street: 1970**

- General Stores
- Clothing Stores
- Restaurants
- Academic Stores
- Entertainment
- Professional Businesses
- Residence Businesses
- Personal Businesses
- Apartments

**Number of Businesses**

**Businesses on State Street: 1980**

- General Stores
- Clothing Stores
- Restaurants
- Academic Stores
- Entertainment
- Professional Businesses
- Residence Businesses
- Personal Businesses
- Apartments

**Number of Businesses**
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