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Abstract:

The Old Everett High School, located in the City of Everett, Massachusetts along the business corridor has been vacant for approximately five years. The successful redevelopment of this site has important implications for the future of the entire City. The Team’s objective for the project was to aid in the visioning process for the City of Everett, specifically by using the Old Everett High School site as a catalyst for community and economic development. Methods for data collection included interviews, a focus group and academic research. Reuse alternatives for the site were identified through an evaluation of each method in addition to the review of the literature, site analysis and stakeholder input. Nine reuse options were discussed, based on their suitability for both the site and the community at large. Three preferred options were identified and analyzed in greater detail according to their relevance in satisfying the widest range of community needs.
Executive Summary:
The Tufts Field Projects Team’s assignment was to assist the City of Everett officials and residents, in particular Mayor Carlo DeMaria, Jr., the Office of Community and Economic Development, and the Old Everett High School Reuse Committee, in exploring suitable reuse options for the Old Everett High School. That site is centrally located on Broadway, Everett’s main commercial thoroughfare. The school has been vacant since 2007, when it was deemed unsuitable for educational purposes. The City has maintained and secured the building during its extended vacancy. While this has spared the surrounding community of the consequences commonly associated with large vacant buildings, the upkeep costs have burdened the City budget. The City of Everett has taken the appropriate measures suggested by good practice and the literature on the subject, by establishing the Old Everett High School Reuse Committee, a group of twelve community members and City employees appointed by the Mayor. This Committee has been charged with a very daunting and challenging task of deciding the future of an entire city block in the very heart of Everett. In the end, all parties are well aware of the stakes, as the future of the Old High School could be the defining moment for the City moving forward.

Everett has long been a special place. It is the only city in the nation with a bicameral legislature that jointly forms the City Council, but meets separately. A gateway city for every wave of immigrants in this country’s history, Everett is a football town with a strong sense of identity, work ethic and pride. Part of the blue-collar belt that surrounds Boston proper, Everett has been hit hard by the post-industrial transition, as evidenced by a high unemployment rate and a low median income. Moreover, Everett is so densely populated that it does not offer the amenities of open and green space. While it is almost ideally located from the geographical standpoint, being five miles away from downtown Boston and its airport, it suffers a limited connection to Boston’s public transit system and harbor. These are only some of the elements that frame the reuse of the Old Everett High School. Many stakeholders believe that a suitable redevelopment of this site has the potential to catalyze the rebranding of the City of Everett, attracting new residents and businesses to Broadway.

Since the school’s closure, the Mayor’s Office has made two Requests for Proposals (RFPs) in order to find a suitable reuse option for the site. Responding to both RFPs, four nonprofit developers submitted proposals that were rejected by the Reuse Committee. The initial survey of the site and discussions with stakeholders helped pose the following research questions: (1) What is the current process for determining the reuse of the Old Everett High School? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the process and how can this process be improved? (2) How can the future process better address the economic, health, environmental, and social needs, values and priorities of the Mayor’s Office and the Everett community? (3) What are some alternative options for moving forward?

The Team addressed these questions through a series of interviews, a focus group and an extensive literature review, covering the economics of adaptive reuse, brownfield remediation and greening opportunities, and community health and wellness initiatives. The Team’s data collection and research produced a range of alternative reuses of the Old Everett High School, resulting in nine viable options based on their suitability for both the site and the community at large. Three of these options were subject to further analysis, and deemed “preferred,” because they expressed the needs of the largest number of stakeholders. In conclusion, the Team believes that the greatest relevance of this project does not consist of identifying specific choices, but in defining and proposing a possible solution path to the current impasse.
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Introduction:
The Old Everett High School is located at 548 Broadway, a prominent location in the middle of the business district and at the geographic center of the City of Everett, Massachusetts. Directly facing Broadway is the ornate façade of the original school building, built in 1921. In the 1970s, the building grew to include an addition of classrooms, an auditorium and a large field house. That enlarged building served the City for three decades until it became outdated, and was closed in 2007.1,2

Upon its closure, the City of Everett began to explore potential reuse options for the facility. A portion of the building is currently occupied by the Everett Boys and Girls’ Club on a limited basis, however further activation is desperately needed to offset the $500,000 estimated annual cost to maintain and secure the site.3 A first step in determining possibilities for reuse was the formation of the Old Everett High School Reuse Committee, consisting of community members appointed by the Mayor. Their role is to assist in the determination of potential reuse options. At present, there have been two rounds of RFPs, each producing several proposals for redevelopment, none of which was accepted. Until a reuse is determined, this vacancy will continue to drain the resources of the City of Everett without generating sufficient benefits. With this report, the Everett Field Projects Team (the “Team”) aims to assist the Reuse Committee in developing a strategy to find a viable use for this imposing and promising site.

0.1 The Research:

The City of Everett is in a difficult situation regarding the pending reuse of the Old High School on Broadway. A successful reuse for a very visible, centrally located site, could serve as a catalyst for further revitalization throughout the City. Nationwide, adaptive reuse projects have proven successful in, “kick starting local economies, leading to numerous public-private partnerships that provide a stable financial base for the revitalization efforts.”4 The rehabilitation of the Old High School would convey to residents and stakeholders that the City leaders are dedicated to both preserving the identity and history of Everett, and making the necessary improvements to ensure the City’s

---

1 Footnotes are re-numbered by section
2 Reasons for the school closing were explained by Marzie Galazka, Director of the Mayor’s Office of Community and Economic Development on March 5, 2012.
3 Ibid.
4 Ozik, “Reinvention through Reuse,” 40.
future success. However, the economic climate has been unfavorable for construction, especially costly renovations, making the execution of a successful adaptive reuse process challenging. In short, the Everett community is faced with a daunting project, heavy with constraints and implications.

This research aims to aid in the reuse process by first investigating lessons learned from past examples of adaptive reuse and best practices for reuse committees. Chapter one provides a brief site analysis and overview of suitable reuses based on neighborhood categorization and architectural features. Chapter two explores school building reuse committee best practices and ways to improve the reuse process itself. Next, chapter three looks at the economic benefits of adaptive reuse. Chapter four focuses on the reuse and rehabilitation of contaminated brownfield sites, with an emphasis on greening techniques. Although this site has not been designated a brownfield, there is a high probability of asbestos and lead contamination considering the time of building construction. Finally, chapter five discusses factors for increasing the public health and wellness through reuse. The final goal is to apply these research findings to a variety of physical building reuse opportunities and offer viable solutions to the City.

0.2 The Research Questions:

In order to understand how Everett could move forward with the successful reuse of the Old High School, the Team posed the following research questions:

- What is the current process for determining the reuse of the Old Everett High School? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the process and how can this process be improved?
- How can the future process better address the economic, health, environmental, and social needs, values and priorities of the Mayor’s Office and the Everett community?
- What are some alternative options for moving forward?

The Team addressed these questions through a focus group and a series of interviews, culminating in a two-part work product to facilitate a more successful process for the redevelopment of the Old Everett High School.

5 Ibid.
6 This is based upon personal communication with City of Everett officials throughout the semester and by direct observation of the site, which exhibits flaking paint and exposed pipes.
7 Early on in the process, Mayor Carlo DeMaria expressed the desire for the Old Everett High School to be repurposed as a health and wellness center for the community, during an informal meeting with two Team members on January 23, 2012.

8 The position of the Everett community was expressed by the Old Everett High School Reuse Committee during a focus group, and through informal phone interviews with various stakeholders.
0.3 The Product:

In this report, the Team provides the City of Everett and the Old Everett High School Reuse Committee with two interconnected components to facilitate a more successful reuse proposal process:

1. Recommendations for proposal evaluation focusing on:
   a. Economic impacts of adaptive reuse
   b. Environmental remediation and greening opportunities
   c. Health and wellness of the community

2. Potential reuse options for the site, based on feedback from the Reuse Committee and other key stakeholders. A list of the strengths and weaknesses of these options is also provided.

0.4 The Method:

Data was collected through interviews and a focus group with the Reuse Committee. The focus group lasted approximately two hours and was facilitated by two Team members. One Team member served as the primary facilitator and the other participant served as note taker. The primary facilitator used the interview/focus group guide to facilitate the session (see Appendix I: Interview/Focus Group Guide). At the beginning of the session participants were informed about the nature of the study, the potential use of data collected and the confidentiality policy. Committee members were also informed that they may refuse to answer any question and may choose to end their involvement in the study at any time.

Following a discussion prompted by a list of questions (Appendix I), the focus group was invited to participate in a spatial modeling activity. The Old Everett High School building floor plans were enlarged and reproduced. Participants were asked to write their preferred building reuse options (e.g. “daycare” or “garden”) on post-it notes to be attached to the floor plans. This helped the group brainstorm and weigh a variety of potential uses for the Old Everett High School. At the end of the session participants had the opportunity to ask questions and all were provided with pertinent City and Team contact information. The methods and all interview focus group questions were declared exempt from further review by the Tufts International Review Board.

Above: The Reuse Committee Focus Group Activity
Photo by Laura Jasinski
The Old Everett High School: A Catalyst to Reimagine the City

The Old Everett High School: A Catalyst to Reinvision the City

Of the nearly 42,000 inhabitants, about 21% are Latino and 63% white. Approximately 33% of the population is foreign born and 42% speaks a language other than English at home. Everett has a fairly young population, with a median age of 37. A detailed age breakdown illustrated in Figure 0.1 shows that almost half the population is below age 34. Everett is a low-income community, with a median property value of $235,000 and a median household income of just over $49,737 a year.

In Massachusetts, an Environmental Justice (EJ) community is defined as one that lacks environmental assets and has a resident population that is at least 25% minority, 25% foreign born and has a median annual household income at or below 65% of the statewide median income. Given these guidelines and its lack of green and open spaces, Everett qualifies as an EJ community. As such:

There is very little area that would be considered natural. The notable exception to that are portions of the Mystic and Malden River waterfronts, and to a limited extent, the acres of cemeteries found in the northeast part of the City. The parks in Everett are generally small, with the larger ones consisting of a playing field, a playground, a basketball court, and ancillary space.

This should not be a surprise considering the historic manufac-

9 IRB Study 1202045 Exempt status received February 27, 2012.
10 U.S. Census Bureau, “American Fact Finder – Everett.”
11 Massachusetts Department of Housing and Community Development, “Community Profile – Everett.”
12 U.S. Census Bureau, “American Fact Finder – Everett.”
13 State of Massachusetts, “Smart Growth/Smart Energy Tool Kit”
14 City of Everett, “City of Everett Open Space and Recreation Plan,” 1.
15 Ibid.
Everett industry contributes significantly to the economic well being of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Manufacturing accounts for about 31% of all jobs and around 35% of the total annual payroll, followed by services and retail. However, Everett has an unemployment rate of 9.1%, much higher than the state average of approximately 6.8%. Everett’s educational facilities include seven elementary schools, one junior high school, and one senior high school with a vocational component. City of Everett leaders have expressed an interest in using the vacant Old Everett High School as a catalyst for the rebranding of the City and a means to reinvigorate the local economy.

---

16 City of Everett, “City of Everett Open Space and Recreation Plan,” 1.
Chapter 1: Site, Neighborhood and Building Analysis
To begin the exploration of suitable reuses for the Old Everett High School site, it is prudent to start with observations of the building’s current state, condition and physical features. This section will explore the implications of abandonment based on literature research, as well as an assessment of the Old Everett High School’s neighborhood context and architectural elements of the building. In considering any redevelopment option, it is necessary to first understand the current state of the site and its surroundings.

1.1 The Implications of Vacancy:

Vacant buildings can lead to neighborhood deterioration and impede revitalization. They can attract crime, vandalism and other illicit activity. In fact, a city with abandoned or vacant buildings:

Needs to have a strategy for keeping potential migrants in the city by encouraging people to buy or improve their current home within the city instead of moving to another – if people feel positive about their neighborhood, they are more likely to stay. If the city is showing initiative in rebuilding a neighborhood, homeowners will see their home improvements as part of a whole instead of being made in a vacuum.1

If a vacant building is located in a prominent location, as is the case with the Old Everett High School, its effects can be particularly devastating to a community. While this has not yet happened in Everett, leaving the Old High School unoccupied creates a risk for the City.

The five-year vacancy of the site has stymied commercial growth and community engagement in the heart of Everett. Therefore, it is in the City of Everett’s best interest to expeditiously determine a new use for the building. While the structure is currently well secured and maintained by the City and partially used by the Boys and Girls Club, vacancy leaves it subject to decline and vandalism.2 The City may be able to delay these consequences at a significant cost to the municipal budget, but once the building’s disrepair begins, it is difficult to reverse. Even more alarming, the physical decline may spread throughout the neighborhood, a phenomenon known as the “broken window theory”:

At the community level, disorder and crime are usually inextricably linked, in a kind of developmental sequence. Social psychologists and police officers tend to agree that if a window in a building is broken and is left unrepaired, all the rest of the windows will soon be broken...One unrepaired broken window is a signal that no one cares, and so breaking more windows costs nothing.3

Conversely, as a redeveloped site, the Old High School has the ability to encourage current residents to reinvest in their city and attract new residents and businesses to Everett. In fact, “A city’s growth and prosperity hinge on the extent to which people and businesses conclude that it makes economic sense to settle in that city rather than any of the many avail-


2 Catherine Donaher and Associates, School Closing and Reuse, 19.

Thus, the best strategy for preventing future neighborhood decline and moving forward with repurposing the site is to create a decision-making body for the building reuse. Such a body must be informed of a variety of reuse strategies and their advantages and disadvantages, and must apply these strategies based on the current strengths, weaknesses and needs of the city. The City of Everett has made considerable strides in this direction by establishing the Old Everett High School Reuse Committee and entertaining two rounds of proposals. However, the lack of success in determining a future for the Old High School requires a critical assessment of the current approach.

1.2 The Site:

The negative consequences of vacancy and abandonment are particularly concerning for the City due to the Old Everett High School’s central location, as shown in Figure 1.2. The City has made a concerted effort to maintain the façade and property grounds, but the emptiness of the building is obvious to all that travel past.

Furthermore, as exhibited in Figure 1.1, the abandoned building significantly out-masses the surrounding residential properties, which enhances its visual and perceived burden. A reuse option that divides this large mass to match the surrounding proportions will aid its absorption into the neighborhood fabric. This diagram also shows that there is an obvious contrast between the traffic capacity of Broadway and the narrower residential streets that surround the site. Any reuse option will

---

“At the community level, disorder and crime are usually inextricably linked, in a kind of developmental sequence. Social psychologists and police officers tend to agree that if a window in a building is broken and is left unrepaired, all the rest of the windows will soon be broken...One unrepaired broken window is a signal that no one cares, and so breaking more windows costs nothing.”

Figure 1.2: Overview of the City of Everett

Date: April 18, 2012
Cartographer: Laura Fox
Source: MassGIS
increase traffic flow to the area, and therefore the condition and capacity of residential streets should be a primary consideration in the site redesign.

1.3 Suggested Reuses by Neighborhood Categorization:

In addition to the physical massing of the site and adjacent properties, observation of the surrounding neighborhood provides context for identifying suitable reuse options and direction for further research. The spectrum of physical reuse strategies for vacant buildings is wide. The most basic are converting the building into a residential, commercial or industrial use. Others options include lot redesign to improve public services and to provide space for parking, gardens and courtyards, or to simply decrease neighborhood density. When the structure or structures on a vacant site are completely demolished, the space may be used to realign existing streets to ease traffic congestion in high-density areas or to provide space for active and passive parks. In cases where the site is surrounded by similar vacancies, and development is not anticipated for the foreseeable future, urban gardening and land banking may be good strategies.

Of course, not all of these strategies apply to the Old Everett High School reuse project, and the identification of the best options will assist the City and the Reuse Committee in the decision making process. To help narrow down the appropriate reuses, *The Adaptive Reuse Handbook* provides a helpful framework to guide the decision making process, beginning with the evaluation of the surrounding neighborhood’s structure and market conditions.

Based on the descriptions in Figure 1.3, the Old Everett

---

Demolition

When considering demolition for the Old Everett High School site, it is important to plan for the site-clearing procedure and account for the significant related costs. First, the City needs to check the legal framework governing demolition needs for the approved methods for the area, timing, shoring procedures, weatherproofing, street closures and site security. Second, the site will need to be surveyed to determine the location of utility lines, soil conditions for shock waves, pedestrian walkways to be protected and to take inventory of items that should be removed before or salvaged after demolition. After these preliminary steps, the city can formulate a demolition strategy, such as hand demolition, pulling the building down with a wire rope, deliberately collapsing the building, or explosives. Finally, demolition can occur and the site should be secured. To prevent the now-empty property from inviting illicit acts or illegal activity, the City may also want to consider putting up fencing and signage or maintaining site landscaping. This will exhibit to the surrounding community and public that the City is still invested in the future of the site.


---


7 Ibid., 74.
**Figure 1.3: Generalized Scheme of Neighborhood Classification Using Structure Conditions and Structure Market as Sorting Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good Structure Condition/Strengthening Market</th>
<th>Good Structure Condition/Weakening Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good-to-excellent upkeep of structures and surrounding properties</td>
<td>Reasonably good upkeep of structures and surrounding properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low vacancy</td>
<td>Emerging structure vacancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few undeveloped land sites</td>
<td>Occasional vandalism to unoccupied properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggressive bidding in terms of rents and purchase prices paid for structures</td>
<td>Scattered parcels of surplus land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low turnover, high demand structures</td>
<td>Market demand decreasing for the neighborhood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor Structure Condition/Strengthening Market</th>
<th>Poor Structure Condition/Weakening Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Visible deterioration of occupied and unoccupied properties</td>
<td>Significant disrepair of most structures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate share of unoccupied structures abandoned and vandalized</td>
<td>Numerous structures vacant/abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible aggregates of surplus vacant land due to past structure demolition</td>
<td>Obvious vandalism and arsonous fires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speculation beginning to occur</td>
<td>Significant cleared contiguous land areas due to past demolition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventional mortgages and loans more common</td>
<td>Little or no private development activity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1.4: Physical Revitalization Strategies and Neighborhood Condition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Revitalization Strategy</th>
<th>Poor Structure Condition/Weakening Market</th>
<th>Poor Structure Condition/Strengthening Market</th>
<th>Good Structure Condition/Weakening Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonresidential conversion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensified public services: off-street commercial docks</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensified public services: off-street waste removal</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensified public services: transportation system upgrading</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood parking</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active/passive recreation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interior lots/Adopt-a-Lot programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable gardens</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land banking</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High School would be best described as “good structure condition/weakening market” or “good structure condition/strengthening market.” The City has made it a priority to maintain and secure the building to keep it in reasonable condition, and observation of the neighborhood did not reveal much surplus land or vandalism. However, based on a discussion with a local developer, increased neighborhood foreclosures are anticipated. Based on these neighborhood classifications, the list of appropriate reuses can be narrowed, as shown in Figure 1.4.

As this chart suggests, there are many options for “good structure condition/weakening market” sites, such as the Old Everett High School. In fact, these sites are often the most productive for physical revitalization. Based on the massing of the Everett site and its lack of immediate proximity to commercial uses, the relevant “intensified public services” options to provide loading docks and trash removal do not seem applicable. Likewise, the site is too large to annex to an abutting residence or to create an interior lot. However, this still leaves a long list of potential uses in residential conversion, nonresidential conversion, neighborhood parking, and active or passive recreation.

1.4: Compatible Reuses Based on Architecture

Additionally, A Guide for the Adaptive Reuse of Surplus Schools, provides another filter for the reuse of former schools based on the building’s physical characteristics. The architectural elements considered include: floor plan and massing; building size and arrangement; construction type, materials and techniques; fenestration; architectural details and the age of the building. These “types” of school buildings cover a wide range from single room schoolhouses from the 1840s to “open plan” schools from the 1970s, as described in Figure 1.5.

The Old Everett High School would best be described as Type C or D. While the building was constructed in two different time periods, the 1970s additions followed the existing 1920s segment in layout and aesthetic. Specifically, the building exhibits a large rectangular plan with double-barreled corridors that wrap around larger, multi-purpose spaces like types C and D (see Figures 1.6, 1.7 and 1.8). The Old Everett High School also has masonry bearing wall construction, wood flooring, high ceilings, three floors and a basement.

Research shows that building types C and D are the most flexible for reuse and favorable for private development. The interior corridor layout allows for separation of uses, such as separate residences, or offices. The large corridors can either be absorbed into these uses or provide communal gathering spaces. The structural system, with exterior load bearing walls, can also allow formerly separated classrooms to combine for larger uses. Likewise, auditoriums, such as the Rockwood Auditorium in the Old Everett High School, can be converted into community gathering spaces or serve some other public function. Centralized staircases allow for secure, vertical separation among floors,

---
8 "Good structure condition/strengthening market” does not lend itself to adaptive reuse. This is presumably because the building will be popular and attractive for developers, eliminating the need for a reuse process to determine what that adaptive reuse will be.”
8 The local developer was part of the Reuse Committee.
11 Giljahn and Matheny, A Guide for the Adaptive Reuse of Surplus Schools, 52.
12 Ibid., 54-74.
### Figure 1.5: Building Types Categorized by Architectural Features

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Type</th>
<th>General Description</th>
<th>Physical Characteristics</th>
<th>Physical Characteristics</th>
<th>Physical Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type D</strong></td>
<td>Jacobethan or Renaissance style building constructed between 1910 and 1940. Often with symmetrical, &quot;industrial looking&quot; exteriors.</td>
<td>large rectangular plan 2 to 3 stories masonry bearing wall construction with concrete floors flat roof double-hung wood windows many times collectively grouped high ceilings wide corridors plaster interior finishes basement</td>
<td>classroom along narrow single or double-loaded corridor wings joined at a central circulation space concrete block bearing walls, metal joists and deck and concrete slab floors 1 to 2 floors flat roof metal framed window-walls low ceilings narrow corridors painted concrete block interiors most without basements</td>
<td>large open plan without load bearing walls truss, space frame or post and beam construction, often exposed loosely defined flexible spaces unique shapes and locations of windows 1 to 2 stories predominantly flat roofs high ceilings wide corridors - if defined high ceilings bright colors and graphics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type E</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Finger-plan&quot; schools from the post-war baby boom characterized by low horizontal classroom wings and &quot;window-walls.&quot;</td>
<td>(information not provided)</td>
<td>(information not provided)</td>
<td>(information not provided)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type F</strong></td>
<td>&quot;Open plan&quot; schools built mostly during the 1970s with flexible spaces rather than partitioned classrooms.</td>
<td>(information not provided)</td>
<td>(information not provided)</td>
<td>(information not provided)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

making them good candidates for mixed-use projects. These best uses are summarized in Figure 1.9, showing residential, office and community centers as optimal options.

The matrix above is in part based on the assumption that school building types C and D are located on major streets with ample transportation options and many resources and amenities in walking distance. This is partially true for the Old Everett High School, as it fronts Broadway. However, transportation is primarily vehicle based as Everett is not directly connected to Boston’s subway system, and must instead rely on a limited public bus service. Additionally, the research notes that the areas surrounding building types C and D often lack development incentives for commercial and retail uses. This is the case in Everett, as the Old High School is somewhat removed from the more lively city square located approximately a quarter of a mile south. This may discourage building conversion into a shopping center or cultural arts facility, but it may still provide amenities to aid the neighborhood.

Given this analysis of the neighborhood as well as structural conditions and physical attributes of the Old Everett High School site, all indicators point to housing, office space or community organizations as best reuses. Housing is, “an increasingly popular reuse choice in the conversion of former schools…[and] by far the most common type for conversion is subsidized elderly housing.” However, as discussed subsequently, the Everett Reuse Committee has already received and rejected proposals for this type of reuse because those needs are met and the cost would be extravagant. Given this conflict between suggested reuses and the concerns of the Reuse Committee, a larger effort may be needed to determine how the reuse of the Old Everett High School can enhance the entire city. The following chapter examines the current role of the Reuse Committee and explores how it may be improved in order determine a reuse for the site that is in harmony with both the site’s physical attributes and the community’s needs.

Figure 1.9: Reuse Potential Matrix

Chart taken from Giljahn and Matheny’s A Guide for the Adaptive Reuse of Surplus Schools, 93.

14 Ibid., 37.
15 Catherine Donaher and Associates, School Closing and Reuse, 19.
16 This is based upon a discussion with the Old Everett High School Reuse Committee.
Chapter 2: The Reuse Committee and Process Recommendations
The site, neighborhood and architectural analysis presented in the previous chapter are important factors in determining an appropriate reuse for the Old Everett High School. The incorporation of community needs, priorities and values into the building reuse is just as important. To determine how effectively community feedback is being integrated into the reuse process, we turn to the first set of research questions: What is the current process for determining the reuse of the Old Everett High School? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the reuse process and how can it be improved?

2.1 What is the current process for determining the reuse of the Old Everett High School?

Shortly after the Old Everett High School closed its doors in 2007, the Old Everett High School Reuse Committee was formed to assist the City Procurement Officer in the preparation of a formal Request for Proposals (RFP), to review submitted proposals and to make recommendations for the best use of the site. This Mayor-appointed Committee is formally comprised of twelve individuals including: a community activist, two Aldermen, a City Councilor, an abutter, a real estate developer, a building inspector, a City engineer, the City Solicitor, a representative of the Department of Community and Economic Development, the Mayor and his Chief of Staff.1

1 “Everett is the only city in the nation with a bicameral legislature - The Board of Aldermen and the Common Council. Both branches make up the City Council, but meet separately.” – City of Everett website (http://www.ci.everett.ma.us/Everett_files/citycouncil/index.htm) accessed April 4, 2012.

On March 5, 2012 at the Everett City Hall, the Field Projects Team organized a focus group with eight of these twelve individuals, as well as two staff members from the City of Everett’s Department of Community and Economic Development. As described in “The Method,” the dialogue was facilitated by a series of questions designed to direct the conversation and help the Team gain a better understanding of the overall community and its site-specific needs.

Above: Board depicting each floor plan of the Old Everett High School, used for The Reuse Committee Focus Group Activity
Photo by Laura Jasinski
The focus group made clear that the Reuse Committee had been thorough in its previous discussions of future reuses of the site as well as potential barriers to implementation. For example, Reuse Committee members expressed the importance of using the site to increase employment opportunities in the area, but the cost implications of renovating the building for offices was daunting and potentially unfeasible. The Reuse Committee also voiced strong disapproval of a number of housing options, including affordable and elderly, while the Committee universally supported housing for young professionals and empty nesters. However, the Reuse Committee understood that the Broadway thoroughfare lacked the walkability, shops, restaurants and proximity to public transportation that often attract these types of residents. Although a health and wellness facility was a recurring theme, it was coupled with concerns related to the probable increase of traffic, noise, and congestion for abutters.

While each reuse option discussed was met with a list of concerns from fellow Reuse Committee members, there were some common themes. For example, the Reuse Committee collectively opposed an offer from a national pharmacy chain to acquire the site and redevelop it into a store and a parking lot. There was also shared dissatisfaction in the low acquisition offers from each proposal. Additionally, the following goals and concerns were repeatedly expressed:

**Goals:**

1) Attracting long-term residents
2) Appealing to professionals and business owners, particularly young professionals and empty nesters
3) Implementing traffic controls and noise reduction in residential areas
4) Increasing home-ownership
5) Increasing the vibrancy of Broadway
6) Transforming the building from a drain on public resources to a revenue-producing asset

**Majors concerns:**

1) Increased traffic
2) Inadequate infrastructure
3) Decreased property values
4) Increased foreclosure rates
5) Increased transient populations
6) Current overcrowding of public schools
7) Maintaining a mix of uses for the site

Overall, the Everett High School Reuse Committee was eager to identify the appropriate use for the site. Committee members stated that they were willing to compromise in order to appeal to the right bidder, even if that meant complete demolition of the site. Perhaps most notably, the Committee further stated the City’s need for an overall city vision or “10 year comprehensive plan” that would include the creation of a consistent “main street” and an enhanced Everett Square. The need for a vision of the future of Everett was a recurring theme. In fact, one Committee member said, “What we’ve needed for a long time is a 10 year comprehensive plan. We have lots of little things going on, but nothing’s coming together...we need a direction.”

Another Committee member emphasized the potential role of the successfully redeveloped Old Everett High School site in “re-
branding” downtown Everett, arguing that, “even if we lose some money on the site it needs to be a show piece for the City and attract people to invest here.”

Since the Committee’s inception, its members have received several proposals for the redevelopment of the Old Everett High School site. The Reuse Committee determined that the proposals were not aligned with its goals for redevelopment nor did the proposals adequately address the current social and economic obstacles in Everett. (For a full summary, analysis and comparison of the proposals, see Appendix II). For example, proposals from the Rockwood Residences, the Neighborhood of Affordable Housing, Inc. (NOAH) and the Women’s Institute for Housing and Economic Development outlined plans for affordable and elderly housing, both of which the Committee has directly opposed. A proposal from the Dakota Partners recommends using the site for luxury condominiums, but there may not be an adequate real estate market for these units. Furthermore, all four proposals would increase the housing stock and subsequently the number of school-aged children and demand on an already strained public school system. While housing may be part of a reuse option, the Committee has clearly conveyed that it cannot be the only option.

The lack of progress thus far may indicate a problem. A stalemate in itself is destructive to the reuse process. Stagnation may suggest the need for the process to take several steps backwards and restart with new information and data, otherwise, “the value of the [Reuse Committee’s] role… [may be] questioned.”

In effect, doing nothing may be the most detrimental decision of all. This prompts further discussion and recommendations on how the reuse process can be improved to allow the Committee to move forward and act on informed decisions.

2.2 What are the strengths and weaknesses of the reuse process and how can it be improved?

Based on the March 5th focus group, conversations with City officials and stakeholders, as well as past research on other reuse committees, the Team has identified the following strengths and weaknesses of the Old Everett High School Reuse Committee:

Strengths:
1) Clear respect for all members’ positions and opinions
2) Committee welcomed discussion of all ideas and concerns
3) Committee had clearly discussed a wide range of options for the site
4) Dedication to citywide best interests

Weaknesses:
1) Lack of diversity
2) Lack of architects, urbanists, etc.
3) Lack of an appointed leader
4) Absence of baseline agreement for public or private disposition for reuse
5) Lack of coordination with other City agencies and organizations
6) Expectation of acquisition offer may be unrealistic
7) The lack of success suggests the challenges of redevelopment and revitalization extend beyond the Old Everett High School to the City at large
8) Lack of design guidelines
Notwithstanding the listed “weaknesses,” it should be noted that Everett’s stakeholders are in good company with their frustration for determining a reuse for their asset. A 1980 survey of 52 public schools across Massachusetts found that only half of the school buildings closed between 1970 and 1980 were reused, while the other half were “mothballed”, used for storage, demolished or remained vacant. This suggests that school building reuse has posed a challenge across the Commonwealth and beyond. This research on past reuse committee processes also provides insight into how the Everett Reuse Committee’s process for proposal review may be improved.

Three categories of recommendations are provided below: enriching the knowledge base and effectiveness of the Reuse Committee, creating a more efficient building disposition process, and effecting a more comprehensive approach to the review process.

Recommendations to enrich the knowledge base and effectiveness of the Reuse Committee:

1a) Reach out to other communities who have experience with school building reuse. The presence of excess school facilities is not new to the state of Massachusetts. The Baby Boomer generation engendered three decades of considerable expansion in school enrollment statewide, followed by a rather dramatic decline. Since then, fiscal cutbacks and necessary facility upgrades have left a significant stock of unused schools across Massachusetts. Despite the number of municipalities experiencing the same challenge of school building reuse, research finds, “little communication or sharing of common experiences.”

1b) Expand and diversify the Reuse Committee: It is important for the Reuse Committee to be comprised of individuals who reflect the diversity of the Everett community. Such a group may include a developer, a bank officer, an architect, an engineer, a municipal finance officer, and representatives from housing, public utilities and city agencies. While the list of potential reuse committee members may include many of these roles, it is not exhaustive. Based on our working session with the Everett Reuse Committee, and after hearing their concerns and desires for the site, the group could benefit from the addition of a local architect or designer who would provide basic feedback on the physical feasibility and limits of proposed reuses. In addition, given the strong Hispanic, Haitian and Brazilian presence in the City of Everett, the Committee is missing valuable input from members of those constituencies. Strong community support is essential to the positive outcome of the reuse project. It would be invaluable to have representation from population subsets that can both relay community concern to the Reuse Committee and garner support in implementing a successful project.

1c) Create and/or encourage clear leadership roles. Perhaps the most crucial ingredient for progress is strong leadership. A

---

7 Catherine Donaher and Associates, School Closing and Reuse, 7.
8 Ibid., 6.
9 Executive Offices of Communities and Development, School Reuse Survey, 13.
10 Catherine Donaher and Associates, School Closing and Reuse, 2.
11 Catherine Donaher and Associates, Report to the City of Newton, 17.
reuse process needs:

An active community leader or elected official, such as a mayor or city council member, who will champion the cause of redevelopment, apply funding sources, and galvanize support from disparate sectors, including the business community, residents and others.\textsuperscript{12}

This can be particularly challenging considering that many Reuse Committee members are already burdened with obligations and commitments outside of the group. However, encouraging clear leadership and well-defined mission and goals will help move the Committee process forward.\textsuperscript{13}

1d) Coordinate with other City agencies. Some of the reuse options discussed by the Reuse Committee, such as a health and wellness center, would benefit from early input with City agencies such as the health and recreation departments. This interface will help inform the feasibility of using the building for public use and, if the option moves forward, will make the end product more comprehensive and integrated into existing programming.\textsuperscript{14}

2a) Return to basic goals for building, determine if the final reuse should be public or private. Best practices suggest that one of the first questions the Reuse Committee must answer is: What benefits should the City receive in exchange for its asset?\textsuperscript{15} That is, should the City designate the building for continued public use or should it be sold to a private developer. This question often invites discussion and controversy because some community members feel that the building should continue to serve the general public, while others do not.

In making the public/private determination, it can be useful to look at advantages and disadvantages from the perspective of development. The first advantage of a private sale is that the expenses of maintaining the building are no longer burdening the municipal budget. The building is instead included into the tax rolls and generates revenue for the City. Additionally, the City has the power to determine the conditions of the sale, which may include that the historic façade be preserved, that a certain percentage of the reuse be open and accessible to the public, etc. With a private sale, the City can maintain some control over the new use without the responsibility of managing the development process.\textsuperscript{16}

However, the long-term impact of a private sale on a community is very difficult, if not impossible to establish. For example, a reuse committee may opt to bring in a large lump cash sum to a financially burdened municipality by selling an old school to a private developer for conversion into luxury

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{Recommendations for a more efficient building disposition process:}
\end{flushleft}
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condominiums. This, however, may accelerate the gentrification of a neighborhood and thwart efforts to provide badly needed affordable housing within that community.17

The difficulty of determining public or private disposition for school building reuse is a symptom of the larger challenge facing many school reuse committees: trying to balance the need for community investment and the limitations of municipal budgets. The lesson for the City of Everett is to ponder both the long and short-term advantages and disadvantages of private sale before proceeding, and to structure the sale agreement with conditions to protect future public interests in the site. Making this determination can be challenging, but establishing distinct goals for the building reuse will provide a springboard for progress.

2b) Be realistic about the Old High School’s value and lower expectations for acquisition offers. Considering the sizable structure and prime location, the Reuse Committee likely expects a high price for their asset. Often, there is also pressure from city leaders and community members to bring in the largest sum possible. In reality, many updates to the interior, amenities and utilities will be needed to bring the site back to working condition, regardless of the development plans. For example, wooden flooring present in most school buildings violates current fire codes and utilities need to be updated, before a building is converted into a residential use.18 These improvements will be costly to the developer and might constitute a disincentive. Many municipalities that have received high offers from developers for old school buildings have found that they have only led to, “indeterminable delays while the developer looked to inflation to make his proposal financially viable, or eventually abandoned the project.”19 The best way to determine a valid price is to have the Old Everett High School building and site appraised by multiple firms with local experience and to have realistic expectations for the final outcome.20

The Reuse Committee should also be aware that the acquisition price is directly linked to the preferred uses outlined in the bid documents or RFP. Generally, the greater the restrictions on reuse, the lower the acquisition price will be, whereas allowing for flexibility will provide the developer more operating income options and leverage a higher price for the City.21 The Reuse Committee may also use this to their advantage in achieving a specific reuse. That is, they may establish a lower asking price to incentivize a reuse for which there is not a strong market.22

2c) Consider a phased development approach to allow for future flexibility. It may benefit the Everett Reuse Committee to wait on determining the permanent reuse until after they have completed a citywide visioning process. In the interim, an option to be explored is phased development, in which a section or sections of the building are demolished, while smaller portions are utilized. Given the aforementioned negative consequences of vacant buildings, this approach would be strongly preferred over

17 Catherine Donaher and Associates, School Closing and Reuse, 19.
18 Giljahn and Matheny, A Guide for the Adaptive Reuse of Surplus Schools, 103-104.
19 Catherine Donaher and Associates, Report to the City of Newton, 46.
20 Ibid., 48.
21 Ibid., 45.
22 Ibid., 33.
leaving the site “as-is” until the visioning process is complete.

Recommendations for a more comprehensive approach:

3a) Initiate both a marketing strategy and revitalization plan for the City that encourages genuine participation from City stakeholders. Building on the feedback from the Reuse Committee focus group and the desire to “rebrand” the City of Everett, the reuse of the Old High School site could serve as the catalyst for this visioning process. In order for the City of Everett to make itself a better place to live and do business, it must develop both a marketing strategy and a revitalization plan for the City based on a visioning process that includes various stakeholders from across the community. A revitalization plan for Everett is important, as it can, “provide a clear direction for the city’s future, balance market forces with other community objectives, build a strong base of support for the community’s future, and give credibility to the community’s revitalization efforts.”

The City of Everett has many assets that make it a promising place to live and do business, but in a down economy the revitalization plan and marketing strategy must be feasible and, “realistic in terms of the funds, technical, and managerial capacity available for activities or improvements in the neighborhood.”

To initiate the visioning process, the City can start by answering some very basic questions. The State of Connecticut instituted a statewide Neighborhood Revitalization program that can serve as a reference for Everett during this process. For each of its “zones” that were part of the program, the revitalization plan began by posing and answering four guiding questions:

1) What does the neighborhood look like today?
2) What do we want it to look like?
3) How do we get there?
4) How can we measure our progress?

Establishing a vision and initiating a marketing strategy and revitalization plan that inspires and motivates, while remaining realistic, is no small task. The existing Reuse Committee can serve as the base for a new steering committee, but as the scope of the revitalization expands from the Old Everett High School to the entire City of Everett, the committee must also expand. This process should be thought of as a long-term investment, and ample time should be allocated for comprehensive community input, feedback and buy-in.

Once a wider community of invested residents and business owners is involved in this process, Everett will be in a better position to appeal to the types of populations that will further the social capital of the City, such as empty nesters and young singles. The City needs to, “identify the assets that make the community potentially attractive to the target groups and develop strategies to utilize those assets to attract the target group and then market the city to them.”

The Team has recently learned that the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) has partnered with the City of Everett

24 Ibid.
25 Mallach, Bringing Buildings Back, 204.
26 Ibid.
to undertake a visioning plan for the City with an emphasis on engaging disadvantaged communities that are not traditionally brought into the planning process. We encourage the City of Everett to capitalize on this opportunity to revitalize the Old Everett High School site specifically and the City as a whole. This appears to be an excellent opportunity to get an independent market analysis and real estate appraisal.

3b) Establish design principles for the City’s revitalization plan. In order to put itself on a positive trajectory, the City of Everett needs to establish design standards as part of the visioning process. These standards need to be legally enforceable and detail effective review and approval procedures. The design of a new building or redevelopment of an existing site, such as the Old Everett High School, in a community that is trying to rebrand itself is not an isolated event, but a catalyst for good or for bad development procedures. The visioning process for the City and the plans for redeveloping the Old Everett High School site will need to have a very dynamic interplay, as both planning processes will need to follow the same set of design principles and vision for the City, in order to ensure the best possible outcome. In both processes, appropriateness and sustainability should be guiding principles. In fact, “Appropriate reuse means reuse that is suitable for the site and its surroundings, taking into account the long-term plans for the area.”27 Thus, sustainable reuse becomes a supporting element that, “enhances the long-term social, economic, and physical vitality of the community.”28 By framing the plans for redevelopment within a visioning process for the site and the City, it is more likely that the stakeholders will reach a consensus about the suitable uses and design of the site.

The negative consequences of development projects that do not have clearly stated design principles and an explicit vision of the future of the surrounding community can result in disinvestment from community members and businesses alike. In reality, the planning and design of a given project will determine its role in the community as a vehicle for positive change within the surrounding neighborhood.29 If this does not happen and redevelopment projects in a community are allowed to, “perpetuate the unsatisfactory status quo,” it is difficult for this trend to be reversed without intervention from the local government.30

“Sound reuse decisions must be grounded in thoughtful revitalization planning, a solid understanding of market constraints and opportunities facing the community, and a strategy to overcome those constraints and use those opportunities as a basis for revitalization.”


“Enforcing strong standards from the beginning, […] will ultimately translate into significantly greater property values and tax rateables for the municipality.”


28 Ibid.
29 Ibid., 268.
30 Ibid.
When the local government establishes standards of appropriateness and sustainability for development projects, their design and development will benefit the whole community, fostering positive growth throughout the city.

**Citywide Marketing Strategy**

A citywide marketing strategy accompanied by promotional activities that attract visitors to the city and engage with community members can spur on further investments by non-government entities. A partnership between private stakeholders and city government could be a particularly successful strategy. A citywide marketing strategy includes:

1. Building further assets in the city such as improving the visual environment through streetscape, greening, and improving community services.
2. Supporting existing and new homeowners by providing information and encouragement as well as technical assistance and financial incentives.
3. Strengthening the city’s neighborhoods by supporting CDCs and neighborhood associations, and encouraging effective neighborhood revitalization planning efforts.

---


**REUSE PROCESS RECOMMENDATIONS**

To enrich the knowledge base and effectiveness of the Reuse Committee:

1a) Reach out to other communities who have experience with school building reuse.
1b) Expand and diversify the Reuse Committee.
1c) Establish and/or encourage clear leadership roles.
1d) Coordinate with other City agencies.

For a more efficient building disposition process:

2a) Return to basic goals for building: determine if the final reuse should be public or private.
2b) Be realistic about the Old High School’s value and lower expectations for acquisition offers.
2c) Consider a phased development approach to allow for future flexibility.

For a more comprehensive approach:

3a) Initiate both a marketing strategy and revitalization plan for the City that encourages genuine participation from City stakeholders.
3b) Establish design principles for the City’s visioning plan.
Chapter 3: Economic Benefits of Adaptive Reuse
The economic needs, values and priorities of the Mayor’s Office and the Everett community must be in sync with the vision established for the City, and enforceable design principles need to be defined. These are the preconditions for a full analysis of the economic costs and benefits of the reuse options available to the Old Everett High School site and beyond. This chapter provides an overview of the major economic benefits of preservation and rehabilitation according to the current literature.

As previously discussed, there are many economic benefits of adaptive reuse. Vacant buildings can contribute to neighborhood decline and hamper efforts of revitalization. When empty buildings become reoccupied, there is a tendency for property values to increase, crime to decrease, and neighborhood revitalization to occur. With rehabilitation there are:

- Obvious public benefits – such as increased values of surrounding properties, decreased cost of construction, job creation, higher tax revenues, mitigated sprawl, conservation of resources, neighborhood revitalization, and preservation of green space.¹

- It is generally known that rehabilitation costs are roughly the same, if not less, than new construction costs. Moreover, “Razing a building eliminates any and all investment that has gone into the property.”² One expert claims that if no demolition is required, major rehabilitation costs are between 9 and 12 percent less than building anew.³ If the construction of a new building requires demolition of an existing structure, the cost savings from preservation and rehabilitation is between 3 and 16 percent.⁴ Another study demonstrates that:

  The cost of rehabilitating old structures generally runs 25 to 33 percent less than comparable new construction, and in the cases where the costs were equivalent, the preservation project provided greater amenities including time saved in construction, more space in either height or volume, or the right location.⁵

Furthermore, while the life span of new buildings is often only 30 to 40 years, for historic buildings, like the Old Everett High School, it is often counted in centuries.⁶ In general, adaptive reuse is a prudent investment because it reduces the cost and amount of building supplies, saves time by allowing construction to proceed indoors during bad weather, reduces overall construction costs, and requires less energy during the construction and life of the building.⁷ Rehabilitation expenses are also less because of available financing.

---

¹ Brachman, “Turning Brownfields into Community Assets,” 70.
³ Rypkema, The Economics of Historic Preservation.
⁴ Rypkema, The Economics of Historic Preservation.
⁶ Rypkema, Economics, Sustainability, and Historic Preservation.
⁷ Giljahn and Matheny, A Guide for the Adaptive Reuse of Surplus Schools.

---

“Many groups recognize the potential that adaptive use has for kickstarting local economies, leading to numerous public-private partnerships that provide a stable financial base for the revitalization efforts. Through these partnerships, neighborhoods are able to maintain their own unique identity, history, and richness of place while providing future growth.”

- Ozik, “Reinvention through Reuse: Strategies for the Adaptive Reuse of Large Scale Buildings.”
for preservation, including, “matching funds and grants that are usually obtainable from state and federal levels.”

Adaptive reuse should be particularly appealing to Everett because it has shown to be a great vehicle of job creation.

---

**Smart Codes**

Specific building codes vary jurisdiction to jurisdiction, but their general purpose is to “ensure a certain level of safety, health, welfare, and property protection for building occupants and for the general public.” They do this by regulating aspects of the design and construction process such as plumbing, mechanics, energy conservation, accessibility, disaster mitigation, historic preservation and even affordability. Though building codes are well-intentioned, they can also be a barrier for the redevelopment of buildings like the Old Everett High School. Updating the building features to meet code requirements is expensive and may make a project unattractive or infeasible for developers. To ease this burden and to encourage urban infill projects, many municipalities have begun adopting “smart codes” for adaptive reuse and historic preservation projects. Smart codes allow for flexibility in the conversion of a building from a previous use, such as a school, to a different category of use, such as residential or commercial. They are “based upon the notion that historic buildings do not need to imitate new construction in every detail in order to be safe and accessible.” This approach has found to cut costs of redevelopment by up to 50%. However, buildings need to be listed on the National Register of Historic Places for smart code eligibility. Historic designation can bring it’s own challenges and benefits. For more information, see “Historic Preservation: Costs and Benefits.”

---

Preservation and rehabilitation tends to be very labor intensive. In fact, according to one study, “rehabilitation projects are as high as 75% labor intensive, compared to 50% for new construction projects.” Another study echoes this exact argument stating, “rehabilitation projects create more jobs than new construction because they are 75% labor intensive, meaning more money to local residents.” Based on the reviewed literature, it is evident that these types of projects have the tendency to create comparatively more jobs than new construction. While new building costs are roughly evenly split between labor and materials, 60 to 70 percent of the cost of rehabilitation projects is labor. In fact, $1 million spent on building rehabilitation creates on average:

> Twelve more jobs than $1 million spent on manufacturing in Michigan, 20 more jobs than $1 million spent mining coal in West Virginia, 29 more jobs than $1 million spent pumping oil in Oklahoma, and 22 more jobs than $1 million spent cutting timber in Oregon.

More telling is the case of Nebraska where, “22 jobs are created for every $1 million spent on historic preservation, which supported 3,869 jobs in the state in 2009.”

One study claims that rehabilitation projects create 2 to 5 times as many jobs as new construction. This is especially important when considering that older buildings tend to be located in city areas like Everett, plagued by high rates of underemploy-
ment and unemployment. Furthermore, these rehabilitation projects can often serve as training opportunities for the unemployed within a given community. According to the National Park Service, the federal historic preservation tax incentives program, “continues to be a significant stimulus for economic recovery in older communities with the estimated average number of local jobs created per project being 47.” This type of job creation has a multiplier impact on communities, as workers are usually hired locally, and they in turn spend their money locally, supporting local businesses, which create 75% of all new US jobs.

In a place like Everett, preservation, rehabilitation and adaptive reuse can spur greater investment and attract more visitors. This helps to reinvigorate the local economy, while revitalizing entire neighborhoods and increasing property values. Simply by reoccupying a vacant building, abutters experience an increase in their property values. For those living within historic districts, this trend is even clearer. Historic designation of neighborhoods and city areas enhances property values. According to a study of National Register districts in Philadelphia, “homes in historic districts received a sales price premium of 131 percent more than comparable properties in undesignated areas of the city.” This is confirmed by another study of nine Texas cities, which found that local historic designation increased property values between 5 and 20 percent. While the neighborhood surrounding the Old Everett High School may not be eligible for historic designation, the Massachusetts Historic Commission should be consulted about the building itself.

**Historic Preservation: Costs and Benefits**

With a historic designation, not only do surrounding property values increase, but the site becomes eligible for a number of funding opportunities from the state and federal governments. Two of these are the state and federal historic rehabilitation tax credits. They promote historic preservation and reinvestment in existing areas, and provide a financial incentive for adaptive reuse of existing structures. Moreover, these state and federal tax credits allow developers to raise equity by leveraging the tax credits to convince lenders to provide conventional financing, making the rehabilitation of historic buildings much more affordable. Federal historic tax credits, first authorized by the Tax Reform Act of 1976, allow for a credit of 20 percent of the total cost of rehabilitation. State historic tax credits offer a rehabilitation tax credit of up to 25 percent depending on the age of the building.

The one major barrier to historic tax credits is the design requirements. To be eligible for the tax credits, the project must comply with strict regulations and standards for historic rehabilitation which can be time consuming and costly.

---

15 Ibid.
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18 Rypkema, The Economics of Historic Preservation, 23.
19 Ibid.
Although the Reuse Committee has expressed opposition to affordable housing as a reuse option of the site, a consistent outcome of adaptive reuse projects is in creating affordable housing. In fact, one study demonstrates that in 2005 in Nebraska, 1,101 units of affordable housing were developed in historic buildings using the federal rehabilitation tax credits. An added benefit is that historic structures, like the Old Everett High School, tend to be located close to services and public transportation (in Everett’s case a public bus line), helping low-income residents by reducing their transportation costs.

From an environmental standpoint, preservation and rehabilitation are the optimal choice as they conserve resources. An author notes that about 25 percent of the material sent to landfills is demolition and construction waste. This is not the case with rehabilitation, which is also more efficient, as it takes much less energy and materials to remodel than to build from scratch. In fact, a study found that, “rehabilitation construction uses 23 percent less energy than new construction, the primary reason being that the work is more labor intensive than material intensive, depleting fewer natural resources.” Furthermore, rehabilitation and preservation are sustainable practices as they make use of existing public investments as opposed to demolishing and rebuilding them. Historic preservation thus funnels development into areas where infrastructure already exists. In general, adaptive reuse also helps preserve open space by repurposing a site with existing infrastructure rather than seeking a greenfield for new construction. Additional environmental impacts and considerations relevant to the Old Everett High School site will be discussed in the next chapter.

**ECONOMIC RECOMMENDATIONS**

1. Adaptive reuse would be a better option than new construction as it is less expensive than demolition and starting from scratch.

2. Adaptive reuse is a more energy efficient option as it conserves resources and utilizes already existing public structures built with public money.

3. Seek historic designation for the site to increase surrounding property values and make the rehabilitation eligible for state and federal historic tax credits and grants.

4. Use adaptive reuse to create more jobs. This is particularly important for a low-income community with a high unemployment rate, such as Everett.

---

20 Lahr, et al., “Economic Impacts for Historic Preservation in Nebraska.”
21 Rypkema, Economics, Sustainability, and Historic Preservation.
Chapter 4: Environmental Considerations of Brownfield Redevelopment
In addition to the economic considerations of redeveloping the Old Everett High School through adaptive reuse, demolition, or some combination of the two, it is also necessary to consider the environmental effects of the site on the surrounding community.

4.1 Land Revitalization of Brownfield Sites

The Old Everett High School site has possible contamination issues that must be properly understood before redevelopment options are seriously considered. The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) defines brownfields as, “a property affected by real or perceived contamination that inhibits redevelopment.”

Due to the breadth of this definition, we are classifying the Old Everett High School site as a brownfield. Much of the current literature on brownfields in the United States is notably linked to attempts at revitalization of vacant or under-used land. The EPA enforces and monitors the remediation of contaminated sites to encourage the restoration of brownfield sites to productive reuse. Furthermore:

While the typical brownfield site is an industrial property, many other historic uses also leave behind environmental contamination after the property has been abandoned, including service stations, retail establishments such as dry cleaners, and even some residential properties.

Research suggests that the perceived contamination of a site leads to the assumption of high cost remediation, thus diminishing interest in redevelopment. Based on information provided by representatives from City Hall, the presence of lead paint and asbestos is highly likely. In addition, there is great potential that the site also contains underground petroleum storage tanks, which pose health and environmental hazards, yet the precise extent of contamination remains unknown. As technology improves and brownfield remediation continues, the perceived and actual costs of remediation should diminish. Until then, it is prudent to factor in all possible remediation expenses to the overall redevelopment budget, but site reuse should still be pursued for the good of overall community and economic health.

The literature suggests that remediation of a brownfield site has consequences that extend far beyond the site’s boundaries. Remediation can therefore be a catalyst for revitalizing the greater community. The EPA has documented the positive community benefits of land revitalization (to learn more about EPA supported brownfield redevelopment sources, see Appendix IV).

Moreover:

“There are hundreds of examples where the clearing of environmental concerns at one distressed

1 United States Environmental Protection Agency, Building Vibrant Communities, 1.
2 Mallach, Bringing Buildings Back, 279.
property paved the way for the property to return to productive reuse. We see dozens of examples where blight is reversed with regeneration—where one property’s reuse spurs community-wide revitalization. Sidewalks and streets are improved. Trees and flowers are planted. New lighting is installed. A community center gets refurbished. Businesses and residents return to the area. The ripple effects can spread through the community—fear and crime rates fall, access to services and healthcare improves, property values increase, a tax base is restored.³

Through redevelopment, the Old High School site has the potential to engender progress throughout the City of Everett. There are, however, many challenges that must be addressed before this currently under-used site will have the power to transform Broadway.

There are two essential conditions in successful brownfield redevelopment. The first is the conformity with the state’s laws on brownfield remediation and liability determination. The second is authentic community engagement by both the developer and the local government. The successful incorporation of these elements will increase the likelihood of the implementation of the development plans. To satisfy the first condition, the developer must receive approval from the state environmental agency for the remediation plan. This protects the developer from future liability, “should environmental contamination be discovered after cleanup is completed.” In addition, “financing and partnerships with other private-sector investors or develop-

3 United States Environmental Protection Agency, Building Vibrant Communities, iii.

ers may hinge on these state-authorized liability releases.”⁴ Documentation of Phase I or Phase II Environmental Assessments (EAs) is often also needed for financing from conventional sources.⁵

Homan Square Case Study

On Chicago’s Westside Homan Square has become the model of successful brownfield redevelopment in economically unviable urban communities. As a public-private partnership between a private developer, the City of Chicago, and Sears, Roebuck, and Co. (the former tenant and owner of the site), the site was cleared of asbestos and PCB, with funding help from the state. The development strategy included new affordable housing, job training and community economic development resources. The purpose of this strategy was to attract middle-class residents back into the community while improving the services available to the existing community. As a result of countless meetings between stakeholders and the developer, a three-component development plan was created, incorporating housing, commercial, and community service elements. Once remediation and development of the site was underway, other developers were inspired to invest in the area. Today, Homan Square is a success in terms of environmental justice, economic development, and neighborhood revitalization. Although the scale of the Homan Square site is beyond that of the Old Everett High School site, the success derived from the community engagement efforts and public-private partnerships are valuable.

1 Espinosa, “Building on Brownfields.”

5 Ibid.
nisms available to them in mitigating future liability claims on the site after remediation, in order to encourage future brownfield redevelopment projects. In addition to “fear of the unknown,” another source of inflated perceived costs and risks for developers dealing with potentially contaminated sites is the EA process. In reality the Phase I EA is not invasive of the site and is necessary in designating whether a site is in need of a Phase II EA. A Phase II EA involves actual soil borings, testing, and additional on-site analysis. The results of a Phase II EA, “will lead to a remediation plan that will help determine the redevelopment timeline and the configuration of a site reuse plan.”

Instead of viewing the Environmental Assessment process as a penalizing step in the redevelopment of a brownfield site, stakeholders involved in redevelopment should view it as a tool to guide them towards the most appropriate reuse options for the site.

The redevelopment of a brownfield site can offer many public benefits to the surrounding community, “such as increased values of surrounding properties, job creation, higher tax revenues, mitigated sprawl, preservation of green space and pollution remediation.” It is essential that the development of the site be supported by the surrounding community. Although state environmental agencies and the EPA are progressing their policies to encourage and support the responsible and just remediation of brownfield sites, there are still considerable potential costs and liabilities for a developer in redeveloping a contaminated site in comparison to a greenfield site. As a result, demand for brownfield sites from private-sector developers can be low. In addition, “all too often brownfield sites are located in weak markets, so that even remediated sites may not be particularly marketable.” Although the public benefits of brownfield redevelopment are significant, the developer does not see a return on investment from them, thus decreasing the likelihood of a developer taking on such a project.

For successful brownfield redevelopment, multiple solutions are needed from the private and nonprofit sectors, as well as an approach that involves multiple government entities. Based on a study surveying developers and public sector employees involved in brownfield redevelopment, Heberle and Wernstedt found that the completion of a brownfield redevelopment project was dependent in part on the type of investment it received:

Direct financial support appears a significantly more important factor when offered as a reimbursement of environmental investigation costs rather than as a subsidy to construction activities, even when the dollar value of the construction subsidy exceeds the dollar value of the reimbursement. This likely reflects that, in any project, environmental assessment costs are borne upfront and are more likely to put a project at risk of being abandoned than construction costs.

Beyond financial contributions, local governments and quasi-public development groups can play a role in facilitating the visioning process for the site and gathering community support. They can:

---

7 Ibid., 71.
8 Brachman, “Turning Brownfields into Community Assets,” 70.
9 Ibid.
Gather information on the properties, such as ownership and environmental data, to identify prime redevelopment prospects and create a brownfield site inventory. Preliminary title searches or EAs (Environmental Assessments) conducted by local entities are helpful to a buyer, as these activities provide information that decrease the risks associated with unknown conditions and thus make the properties more marketable. Local governments are also well-positioned to apply for public brownfield grants and loans, thereby relieving the parties of some financial risk.  

As part of the overarching visioning process for the Old High School site and the City of Everett, as described in Chapter 2, genuine resident engagement will be key in the redevelopment of the site and the revitalization of the City. This assures, “the long-term success of the project for the entire community.” The establishment of the Reuse Committee for the Old Everett High School is a positive step towards genuine participatory planning, but further public involvement must be brought into the visioning process for creating the City’s revitalization plan. Beyond the City government’s actions to include residents in the planning process, the government and the community can both benefit from the establishment of partnerships with local Community Development Corporations (CDCs) and other neighborhood associations. CDCs and other local neighborhood organizations are an underutilized resource that could prove very useful to a city government wanting to redevelop a potential brownfield site. In addition to acting as a liaison for residents and the government during the visioning process and providing technical support for real estate acquisitions in a community, CDCs can also act as partners in a redevelopment project. By bringing CDCs into the process of brownfield redevelopment, the assets and social capital available to the project increase exponentially. CDCs involvement in such projects:

In cooperation with private investors and developers will foster and strengthen partnerships across public and private sectors that are beneficial to a variety of other contexts and can open up potential leveraging and pooling of skills and resources.

Since a primary function of the redevelopment of the Old High School is to act as a springboard for positive redevelopment and growth in all of Everett, a CDC is well equipped to, “reach beyond the site itself to positively impact neighborhood revitalization, such as improvement in the quality of life, health, walkability, aesthetics, and service to local residents.” By including a CDC or neighborhood organization as a full partner in the redevelopment project, chances increase that public participation and community engagement will be meaningful, rather than superficial. Additionally, “the prospect of helping to plan for the cleanup and reuse of a single site can serve as a ‘hook’ to build community interest in revitalization generally and foster local leadership.” Given the potential contamination of the Old Everett High School site and the need to establish a visioning process for the entire
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12 United States Environmental Protection Agency, Building Vibrant Communities, 2.
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City, introducing energy efficiency and greening techniques into the programming of the redeveloped site is an opportunity that should not be overlooked. The site can act as a model for future development projects in Everett for not only design standards, but energy efficiency and greening techniques as well.

**Chapter 4.2 Energy Efficiency & Greening Opportunities**

The revitalization plan for the City of Everett and the Old High School site is a great opportunity for a greening initiative that would produce both improved energy efficiency and a comprehensive open space strategy. In thinking of new development or redevelopment prospects for the Old Everett High School site, it is important to consider the impact of the project on the entire community:

In terms of lowered health risks, reduced environmental burdens, and increased economic opportunities. It is not enough that a particular project simply is built, it must also satisfy the greater health, safety, and environmental goals of those who will be most affected by its construction.¹

Currently, the vacant Old Everett High School costs the City of Everett roughly $500,000 annually in maintenance costs, incurred mostly in heating the very large, outdated building. Regardless of the redevelopment strategy chosen by the Reuse Committee, energy efficiency must be a central part of the redevelopment process. An energy efficiency program will lower overall heating and cooling costs of both new and existing buildings. If the redevelopment strategy adopted by the Reuse Committee

---

involves preserving some of the existing structure, the City, the developer, and other stakeholders should pursue applying for state and federal grants that fund energy efficiency programs for existing structures.

First, the City of Everett should apply to become a recipient of the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources’ Green Communities Grant Program. Everett is one of the few cities in the Greater Boston region without this designation. Furthermore:

The Green Communities Division offers educational, technical, and networking support to the state’s communities. ... [it also] offers funding for communities investing in energy efficiency upgrades and policies, renewable energy technologies, energy management systems and services, and demand side reduction programs.17

In considering possible programming uses, the developers may consider using the site for showcasing renewable energy approaches, becoming the “face” of the new, green Everett. Transforming the site would be a source of jobs for the community and the overall theme would work well with the mission of Energize Everett. Furthermore, “The Green Communities Division provides several model ordinances and guides and is staffed with energy experts to help communities take these steps to earn designation.”18 As of December 2011, there were 86 officially designated Green Communities in Massachusetts. The process for working towards “Green Community” designation is on going and grant solicitations for the program open and close periodically.

Mass Save is an initiative sponsored by Massachusetts’ gas and electric utilities and energy efficiency providers that offers, among other services, financial and technical support for energy efficiency retrofits of commercial buildings. The developer of the Old Everett High School site should consider applying for both the Commercial Retrofit Program for Gas Utilities and the Commercial Retrofit Program for Electric Utilities. After all, “The[se] programs are available to all customers that have a facility that buys its power from one of Mass Save’s member companies.”19

In keeping with Everett’s need to shift its focus towards planning for future prosperity and innovation, it seems appropriate for the City to adopt higher standards of energy efficiency and clean energy for its government buildings. In 2007, Massachusetts Governor Deval Patrick approved an energy reduction plan for state buildings, titled “Leading by Example: Clean Energy and Efficient Buildings,” that sets energy targets and requirements for state buildings. The plan includes an initiative to decrease energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions, while also mandating that all large renovations or new developments be LEED Certified.20 It seems logical that those mandates be applied to all public buildings, and Everett could assume a leading and proactive role in this process, setting benchmarks and guidelines for its greening initiative.


18 Ibid.


Finally, the Mass Renewable Energy Trust Fund provides ongoing grants to many different sectors with funds collected from a surcharge placed on all customers of electric utilities in the state. In fact, “The Fund may provide grants, contracts, loans, equity investments, energy production credits, bill credits and rebates to customers.”

The second principal way in which The City of Everett can make a greening initiative part of its revitalization plan is to use a portion, or the entire Old Everett High School site, as the starting point for implementing a new open space strategy. The City is currently lacking open space for its citizens to freely use, and as previously mentioned, is considered an environmental justice community. As Figure 4.1 illustrates, the majority of the current open space is the Woodlawn Cemetery in the far northeast corner of the City. The second largest open space is the 7 Acre Park, located in the far southwest corner. Open space in the more central sections of the City is lacking, thus depriving many community members of the benefits of a nearby park. Based on its central location, incorporating open space into the Old Everett High School site would be an additional bonus to the entire community.

There are many advantages for both the community and the environment in turning a vacant building and a potential brownfield site into open space. Adding open space can, “improve stormwater management, reduce the ‘heat island’ effect, improve air quality, and provide recreation space for residents. It can also provide a venue for increasing physical activity through more exercise and recreation.”

By converting the Old High School site into either an active or passive park, the City would be supporting the efforts of Energize Everett in making its citizens healthier and more active. The presence of a public park in such a prominent section of the City may encourage community engagement and strengthen ties between neighbors and nearby business owners. The addition of an open space to the Broadway section of Everett could also contribute to the value of adjacent properties. In fact:

“The International Economic Development Council’s 2001 examination of the off-site impacts of a half-dozen brownfield-to-open space projects estimates that property values in neighborhoods surrounding these projects have increased more than two times those in control neighborhoods lacking conversion efforts.”

If the City shows pride in maintaining a park, nearby residents
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and business owners may be more apt to invest in their properties as well, thus spurring local economic development.

For such a densely populated urban area, the addition of open space on Broadway could aid in mitigating environmental issues as well. First, open space is beneficial to urban areas for stormwater management. When rainwater flows off of impervious surfaces in urban areas, it picks up pollutants that may directly affect waterways that cause ecological problems. Second, “Parkland reduces stormwater management costs by capturing precipitation and/or slowing its runoff. Large pervious surface areas in parks allow precipitation to infiltrate and recharge the groundwater.” 25 Third, air pollution is a significant health and environmental issue in Everett, due to its congestion and industry. Air pollution can also cause the need for costly clean-ups and repairs to buildings. These costs can be mitigated by the addition of open space, as:

Trees and shrubs remove air pollutants such as nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, ozone, and some particulates. Leaves absorb gases, and particulates adhere to the plant surface, at least temporarily. Thus, vegetation in city parks plays a role in improving air quality and reducing pollution costs. 26

It is apparent that there is a need for accessible, open space in the center of Everett for environmental and health and wellness reasons alike.

---

26 Ibid., 13.
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Open Space Strategy

“An open space strategy should be integrated into the educational, economic, and cultural life of the community. Open spaces should contribute to the economic development of the city by making it more attractive to homebuyers and investors or by enhancing specific economic development strategies. Open spaces offer opportunities for educating a community’s children and providing job training and work for teens and adults.”

“Key steps in assembling the resources to carry out the open space strategy are:

- Identify and include projects that require only modest amounts of money and which can be carried out with help from nontraditional sources (tree planting, playgrounds).
- Assemble financial and workforce resources for small-scale projects from nontraditional sources (donations of money or supplies, volunteer efforts).
- Assemble corporate and foundation support for larger elements of the open space strategy “major foundation or corporate support is far more likely to be forthcoming if the funder sees it as part of a comprehensive strategy rather than an isolated initiative (299).”
- Enlist state or county support for major open space initiatives (when urban parks are scarce, can press state agencies to create new urban areas that will be developed and maintained by them).
- Communicate clearly to private contributors. They will be more likely to give if the city shows a commitment to the open space strategy and defines if is meant to be an interim use, permanent, or potentially permanent.”

2 Ibid., 301.
ENVIRONMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

1. View the redevelopment of the Old Everett High School site as a catalyst for citywide positive change and development opportunities.

2. Include local CDCs and neighborhood organizations in the redevelopment process to capitalize on their knowledge and investment in their community.

3. Encourage the future developer to utilize energy efficiency funds in order to set the standard for greening in Everett.

4. Dedicate a portion of the Old Everett High School site to open space due to the unmet environmental and health and wellness needs in the center of Everett.

“Greening lies at the heart of the concept of sustainable reuse, reflecting the growing recognition that good planning does not demand that reuse projects develop every possible square foot, particularly in cities with a surplus of housing and commercial structures. Open space and greening address many individual, group, and community objectives, including the following:

- Enhancing a community’s quality of life
- Enhancing a community’s marketability and its attractiveness to residents
- Building community cohesion and empowerment
- Providing active recreation opportunities for all age groups
- Providing opportunities for adult activities and passive enjoyment of open space
- Creating opportunities for economically productive activities
- Facilitating temporary land banking”

Chapter 5:
Community Health and Wellness
As we look toward establishing scenarios for redevelopment, the integration of the City’s focus on health and wellness must be considered. As previously mentioned, the Old Everett High School site is along the City’s business corridor. Overall design decisions regarding potential reuse will therefore have long-lasting implications, not only for the corridor itself, but for the City as a whole. Strategic approaches to community design are critical in the creation of a “healthy place” and should be prioritized in the visioning of the Old Everett High School site. The City of Everett’s commitment to the health and wellness of its residents could be reflected in the repurposing of the built environment. In public health and planning literature, there are consistent reports of the relationship between mixed land use and social capital. Research in land use, transportation, and design indicates a direct connection between form, function and health outcomes. The size of the Old Everett High School site could allow for a mix of uses, and the thoughtful integration of open space and streetscape design elements on the site could encourage health and wellness. During the redevelopment process, one of the City’s goals should be to increase social capital through the built environment. Two specific mechanisms that can facilitate this outcome in and around the Old Everett High School site are the inclusion of nature and open space, and the encouragement of health-oriented initiatives. Both mechanisms will enhance the site and provide additional benefits to the surrounding community.

5.1 The Built Environment and Social Capital

Social capital is defined as the “time and energy” that residents devote to, “community improvement, social networking, civic engagement, personal recreation and other activities that create social bonds between individuals and groups.” Design approaches to the built environment directly impact how residents engage with each other and thereby provide, “opportunities for formal and informal social interactions…promoting investment in a shared space.” The use of space and the interactions within a space create a feeling of belonging and ownership, which can enhance a sense of community. Open space and pedestrian and bicycle friendly environments foster “bonding” and connection between various groups within the community. Connectiveness has a particular role to play in such a densely populated environment, such as Everett. As is the case in any city, constantly shifting demographics can create a disconnect between residents. It is within the layout of the streets, the width of sidewalks, the placement of park benches and in open areas that connections between residents can form. The design of the Old Everett High School site has the potential to increase the social capital of the community and actively connect different groups of people. This can be accomplished in part by fostering cooperation between public health and design professionals and implementing a collaborative approach to integrate community health and wellness needs into the site design elements.

1 CDC, Designing and Building Healthy Places.
2 Leyden, Social Capital and the Built Environment.
3 Dannenberg, Howard and Jackson, Making Healthy Places, 123.
4 Morris, Integrating Planning and Public Health, 3-5.
5 CDC, Designing and Building Healthy Places.
6 Dannenberg, Howard and Jackson, Making Healthy Places, 118.
7 Ibid., 117.
8 Ibid., 118.
9 Ibid., 122.
10 Ibid., 3.
5.2 Utilizing Open Space

As discussed in the previous chapter, the inclusion of open space in the reuse of the Old Everett High School would provide environmental benefits to the City. In combination with health and recreation programming, open space can increase the health and wellness of a given community. Open space creates an opportunity for both “planned and spontaneous activities” and are a luxury for cities like Everett that have limited space for growth.11,12 These formal and informal encounters are critical in facilitating and maintaining social capital.13 Well-maintained open spaces are seen as community assets and thereby stimulate a heightened level of investment, both from residents and the City itself.14 Flexibility is paramount. Open spaces can take form in both traditional and non-traditional ways and the integration of a “pocket park” or open courtyard serves the same needs, while offering enhanced opportunities for activities and social interaction.15

The City has already invested in one such initiative, Energize Everett, which is dedicated to the promotion and support of an environment where all citizens have access and opportunity to take part in physical activity.16 Widening and enhancing this initiative would strengthen the sense of community and positively impact the overall health and quality of life, and conversely, the inclusion of Energize Everett in the planning discussion would keep health and wellness issues on the forefront of the visioning process.

5.3 Encouraging Active Transportation

The Old Everett High School occupies an entire city block within the heart of the City. Although the historic façade and main entrance are located on Broadway, the field house is bordered on three sides by narrow, residential streets. In a case like this, the design and capacity of the surrounding streets should be evaluated.17 Standard considerations include lane spacing, curb diameter, parking availability, sidewalk access and overall traffic management. These factors are essential elements in form and function and will not only influence the “sense of place” projected by the streets bordering the field house, but will also impact the entire transportation network. The ideal revitalization scenario will support efficient use of Maple Avenue, and Linden and Pleasant Streets, while promoting modes of transportation alternative to motor vehicles. A critical analysis of existing streetscape and traffic flow could better define regulatory and design strategies.

The research on designing and building for health, well-being, and sustainability indicates that pedestrian-oriented environments are directly correlated with a, “stronger sense of community.”18 The prioritization of automobile use decreases the opportunities for community involvement, civic engagement and general neighborly encounters.19 As a compact city with access to a public bus system, Everett has the opportunity to de-
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13 Dannenberg, Howard and Jackson, Making Healthy Places, 122.
14 Ibid., 123.
15 Ibid.
17 Frumpkin, Healthy Places: Exploring the Evidence, 1,453.
18 Dannenberg, Howard and Jackson, Making Healthy Places, 123.
19 Ibid.
sign innovative policies that encourage and implement the use of active and alternative modes of transportation, from walking and bicycling, to Zip Cars and Hubway stations.\textsuperscript{20}

The City of Everett can further implement on the Old High School grounds:

Land-use and transportation policies that promote health [and] include changing the rules of development to favor smart growth... [by] adopting pedestrian-friendly site and building design standards... adopting a complete streets policy, making routes to schools safer; giving funding priority to compact, transit-served areas; and redirecting transportation funding from roads to pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities.\textsuperscript{21}

Initial discussions with City officials regarding the redevelopment of the Old Everett High School site were devoted to the transformation of the field house into a health and wellness center. Although a facility of this type would serve existing community needs, the location of the field house could create trade-offs that would result in burdens to the community, such as increased traffic and noise.

\textsuperscript{20} Hubway is a bicycle sharing system used in the City of Boston.

\textsuperscript{21} Dannenberg, Howard and Jackson, \textit{Making Healthy Places}, 149.
Chapter 6: Conclusion
Deciding a course of action for the Old Everett High School is not a simple task. Everett public officials are well aware of the relevance of the site, both in terms of public treasury and the City’s future. For a city that has suffered severe budget constraints, an allocation of half a million dollars per year is a serious commitment. After all, this site may well be one of the most valuable assets of the City and certainly a pivotal one in its future rebranding.

Through this report, the Team has presented a number of recommendations grounded in current literature review, site and neighborhood analysis, interviews with key stakeholders and a focus group with the Reuse Committee. In chapter 2, we highlighted the need for the enrichment of the knowledge base and effectiveness of the Reuse Committee, calling for a more efficient building disposition process and a more comprehensive approach to the Old Everett High School site redevelopment. In chapter 3, we have explored the advantages of adaptive reuse, focusing our attention on the site as a catalyst for economic and employment growth. Chapters 4 and 5 produced some environmental and quality of life recommendations, geared to brownfield remediation, greening opportunities, promotion of social capital and overall wellness.

Furthermore, we have identified some of the tools that could facilitate a more informed decisional process. Market analyses, real estate appraisals, structural engineering evaluations, traffic patterns, and a census of available public and private financing sources would help define the operating parameters of the planning process. In the meanwhile, the City of Everett and the Reuse Committee could use a more diversified input, including a broader representation of the local stakeholders.

Whatever the solution, Everett appears to have four basic needs: to unburden the City budget from a $42,000/month unproductive drain; to prudently manage its real estate assets and to develop a comprehensive plan for their reuse; to create additional green and open space in a very congested and densely populated community; and to promote the health and wellness of its citizens. The fulfillment of these needs has been framed in the context of a visioning plan that should lead to the rebranding of the City of Everett. There is no doubt that the Old High School site will become an important catalyst of this transformation. On our part, we have developed three possible scenarios that try to take under consideration the largest number of stakeholders and options for the site, which will be presented in the following chapter. At this junction, one thing is certain – no matter what is done with the Old Everett High School site, any option is less detrimental than doing nothing.
Summary of Recommendations

**REUSE PROCESS**

*To enrich the knowledge base and effectiveness of the Reuse Committee:*

1a. Reach out to other communities who have experience with school building reuse.

1b. Expand and diversify the Reuse Committee.

1c. Establish and/or encourage clear leadership roles.

1d. Coordinate with other City agencies.

*For a more efficient building disposition process:*

2a. Return to basic goals for building: determine if the final reuse should be public or private.

2b. Be realistic about the Old High School’s value and lower expectations for acquisition offers.

2c. Consider a phased development approach to allow for future flexibility.

*For a more comprehensive approach:*

3a. Initiate both a marketing strategy and revitalization plan for the City that encourages genuine participation from City stakeholders.

3b. Establish design principles for the City’s visioning plan.
### ECONOMIC

1. Adaptive reuse would be a better option than new construction as it is less expensive than demolition and starting from scratch.

2. Adaptive reuse is a more energy efficient option as it conserves resources and utilizes already existing public structures built with public money.

3. Seek historic designation for the site to increase surrounding property values and make the rehabilitation eligible for state and federal historic tax credits and grants.

4. Use adaptive reuse to create more jobs. This is particularly important for a low-income community with a high unemployment rate, such as Everett.

### ENVIRONMENTAL

1. View the redevelopment of the Old Everett High School site as a catalyst for citywide positive change and development opportunities.

2. Include local CDCs and neighborhood organizations in the redevelopment process to capitalize on their knowledge and investment in their community.

3. Encourage the future developer to utilize energy efficiency funds in order to set the standard for greening in Everett.

4. Dedicate a portion of the Old Everett High School site to open space due to the unmet environmental and health and wellness needs in the center of Everett.

### HEALTH & WELLNESS

1. Make changes to the built environment that foster social capital.

2. Identify barriers and considerations that impact the viability of possible modifications to the built environment through traffic analysis.

3. Integrate open space and ways to encourage the use of various forms of active transportation.

4. Embrace health and wellness as goals of the visioning process for Everett and include Energize Everett in the planning discussion.
Chapter 7: Reuse Scenarios
7.1: Foundation for Options

The following reuse options are provided to show the wide range of choices for the site of the Old Everett High School as well as to identify the strengths, weaknesses and overall suitability of each. Three preferred options have been highlighted as particularly strong alternatives for both the community and the City. This analysis is supported by feedback from the Old Everett High School Reuse Committee and stakeholder interviews. It also reflects the Team’s site and architectural surveys and our analysis of the economic, environmental, health and wellness aspects of the issue. Since the Team strongly recommends that the City engage in a larger visioning process for a citywide revitalization plan, the scenarios reflect “big picture” options rather than specific programming. They aim to aid the Reuse Committee in determining a redevelopment strategy that will fit into the larger community vision.

It is also important to note that these options are not suggested within a site-specific vacuum. The Team looked citywide at open space locations to examine how the Old High School site could connect and add to the existing network. As shown in Figure 7.1, and discussed previously, there is a great need for additional open space within the City limits. In fact, the largest area shown in the northeast corner is a cemetery, which does not offer the same health and wellness benefits to Everett residents that an active park could. Furthermore, the second largest open space is located on the edge of the city and may not be accessible to a large percentage of residents. Thus, examination of this map suggests that the Everett community would greatly benefit from an additional park space in the center of the City, such as the one that could be created on the Old Everett High School site (shown in red).

Likewise, when considering the discussion of a national pharmacy chain to acquire the Old Everett High School and turn it into a retail location with parking, the Team looked beyond the immediate site to the needs of the greater surrounding neighborhood. Figure 7.2 shows that the City is not in need of additional pharmacy locations at this time. A Rite Aid Pharmacy is within a quarter mile of the site, with Walgreens and Prescription Shoppe, Inc. within a half mile. Target and Costco also have pharmacies and are located approximately one mile away from the site. Target and Costco are well connected by bus lines to the rest of Everett and are common destinations for the community. Placing an additional pharmacy chain on the Old Everett High School site would therefore not be the best use of the Broadway location. An alternative reuse of the site provides the City with a great opportunity to fulfill an unmet community need or desire. The following preferred reuse options aim to do this by providing the community with open space and/or a health and wellness center, while transforming the site from a liability to an asset. The Team also provides a summary chart of additional reuse options that were explored.
Figure 7.1: Open Space in Everett

Date: April 12, 2012
Cartographer: Laura Fox
Source: MassGIS
Figure 7.2: Pharmacies in Everett
7.2: Preferred Reuse Options

OPTION 1: Demolish the 1920s building and the 1970s addition and keep the field house for a public health and wellness center. Subdivide the parcel and actively try to sell the demolished site, but create a potentially permanent park in the meantime. The park would mainly be passive and the City of Everett should forgo large investments in infrastructure because it would be lost once a more permanent use is determined. However some investment in seating, lighting and landscaping would provide a place for the public and those using the health and wellness center to gather. It would also create a noise buffer for the surrounding neighborhood, and show active investment in the site, discouraging illicit activities and after-hours loitering. The front of the site abutting Broadway would also need to include a driveway and parking to help mitigate additional traffic that the health and wellness center will attract.

**STRENGTHS:**

**Site & Architectural:**
- The massing of the segmented building assimilates better into the surrounding residential neighborhood

**Economic:**
- Eliminates sunk costs of maintaining a vacant building
- Takes advantage of previous investments in existing field house facilities
- Offers a “clean slate” along Broadway that would be more attractive to private developers

**Environmental:**
- Addresses the need for more open space in the City

**Health & Wellness:**
- Fulfills a public need for an accessible health and wellness center
- Focusing on one section of the building may allow the City to expand public and private programming (nutrition and parenting classes, renting out the facility to recreation leagues, etc.)
- The potentially permanent park encourages physical activity and increases social capital

**WEAKNESSES**

**Site & Architectural:**
- Loses historic architecture and City landmark by demolishing original 1920s building section
- Broadway loses historic character and value due to the substitution of an ornate façade with a parking lot

**Economic:**
- High cost of demolition
- Loss of all previous investments in original 1920s section and 1970s addition
- High expense of facility updates, which are necessary to justify keeping field house for a community health and wellness center
- Additional building maintenance and security will be necessary for a public health and wellness center, adding costs to the municipal budget

**Environmental:**
- Demolition and facility updating will likely require some environmental remediation

**Health & Wellness:**
- Increased traffic congestion and noise pollution in the surrounding neighborhood
Small investments for temporary passive park:

- Park benches
- Picnic tables
- Landscape buffering
OPTION 2: Convert the 1920s section of the building into City Hall and sell the field house to a third party developer. Ideally, the sale of the field house would include an agreement that turns it into a private but affordable health center, which includes some free public wellness programming. The City should seek historic landmark designation for the 1920s section and update the building to be more energy efficient. The 1970s addition should be demolished and used for parking. Because this scenario would greatly increase traffic to the area, the design of the parking lot and connections to Maple Avenue, and Linden and Pleasant Streets would need to include a variety of traffic calming methods. Packaging the sale of the current City Hall would make this scenario more attractive and feasible to the developer. While the multi-parcel real estate transaction would be complex, it would simultaneously address the problem of the vacant Old High School building and the outdated, inefficient City Hall. In their current state neither building adds to the appeal of the active Broadway thoroughfare. However, their co-transformation could invigorate the City of Everett’s public image.

STRENGTHS:
Site & Architectural:
- Preserves the 1920s historic architecture
- The massing of the segmented building assimilates better into the surrounding residential neighborhood

Economic:
- Opportunity to designate the 1920s architecture as a historic landmark, thus making its renovation eligible for historic preservation funds and likely increasing surrounding property values
- Shared costs of facility updates among City and developer
- Use of the City Hall building as a financial incentive to rehabilitate the field house
- Eliminates sunk costs of maintaining a vacant building
- Takes advantage of previous investments in existing 1920s building and field house facilities

Environmental:
- Opportunity to transform 1920s infrastructure into an energy efficient, green building with state and federal funds

Health & Wellness:
- Addresses a need for a health and wellness center (more so if the facility is public)
- Directly promotes health and wellness among City employees by having a facility next door to City Hall

WEAKNESSES:
Site & Architectural:
- Requires a transition period for moving City services

Economic:
- High cost of demolition
- Loss of all previous investments in the 1970s addition
- Field house may not be attractive to a private developer
- High expense of facility updates for 1920s building
- Increases the complexity, timeframe and managerial expenses of development because of dual-site construction

Environmental:
- Demolition and facility updating will likely require some environmental remediation

Health & Wellness:
- Potentially causes the loss of a public recreation center (would now be private)
- Increased traffic congestion and noise pollution in the surrounding neighborhood
Traffic calming methods:

- Differential surfaces
- Landscapes medians
- Speed bumps

Traffic calming strategies provided by “Traffic Calming 101” from Project for Public Spaces (http://www.pps.org/articles/livememtraffic/)
OPTION 3: Convert the 1920s section of the building into City Hall, like option 2, or sell this section to a private developer, safeguarding the façade. Demolish the 1970s segment and the field house and turn the back of the site into an active park. To promote health and wellness, install playground and outdoor gym equipment to serve the new City Hall/private development and the surrounding neighborhood. Additionally, if City Hall is moved, the current City Hall building could be sold to a private developer or otherwise reflect the overall goals and vision for the City. To address the concerns of abutters and to accommodate the increased traffic and need for parking, additional spaces should be offered along Broadway and traffic calming methods should be incorporated into the site design. While this option has the additional advantage of dual-site transformation along Broadway, if City Hall is moved, in any case, it fulfills a community need with an active public park.

STRENGTHS:

Site & Architectural:
- Preserves the 1920s historic architecture
- Increased efficiency among City departments because 1920s building layout is more conducive to collaboration
- The massing of the segmented building assimilates better into the surrounding residential neighborhood

Economic:
- Opportunity to designate the 1920s architecture as a historic landmark, thus making its renovation eligible for historic preservation funds and likely increasing surrounding property values
- Use of the City Hall building as a financial incentive to rehabilitate 1920s building section Eliminates sunk costs of maintaining a vacant building
- Takes advantage of previous investments in 1920s building
- Eliminates ongoing costs of maintaining a vacant building
- If sold to a private developer, the costs of demolition and reuse can be absorbed if sold to a private developer
- If sold to a private developer, the 1920s building will return to the tax rolls and generate revenue for the City

Environmental:
- Opportunity to transform 1920s infrastructure into an energy efficient, green building with state and federal funds
- Addresses a need for more open space

Health & Wellness
- Inclusion of open space will create a more enjoyable work atmosphere for City employees and neighbors and encourage them to include activity in their workday
- Open space encourages physical activity and increases social capital

WEAKNESSES

Site & Architectural:
- Requires a transition period for moving City services

Economic:
- High cost of demolition
- Loss of all previous investments in the 1970s addition and field house
- High expense of facility updates for 1920s building
- Increases the complexity, timeframe and managerial expenses of development because of dual-site construction

Environmental:
- Demolition and facility updating will likely require some environmental remediation

Health & Wellness
- Loss of a public recreation center (most of programming could be transferred to old City Hall site if a public-private facility was pursued, but it would be difficult to replace basketball courts, track, etc.)
- Increased traffic congestion and noise pollution in the surrounding neighborhood
Ways to increase health and wellness in an active park

Outdoor lunch space for City Hall

Playground

Outdoor gym
## Figure 7.3: Preferred Options Summary Financial Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Costs</th>
<th>Savings</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
<th>Financing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Status Quo</td>
<td>Approx. $500,000 per year in maintenance and security</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Minimal rent from Boys &amp; Girls Club</td>
<td>Municipal budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Demolition of front 2/3 of building for passive park, wellness center green + wellness center</td>
<td>Demolition and renovation costs</td>
<td>$500,000 per year (prorated) saved from maintenance of vacant building</td>
<td>Potential to rent out health and wellness facilities for youth and adult recreation and leagues (eg. AAU tournaments, BSSC etc.)</td>
<td>Municipal budget and health programming grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 2: Sale of field house and conversion of 1920s building into City Hall</td>
<td>Demolition and renovation costs</td>
<td>$500,000 per year (prorated) saved from maintenance of vacant building and fixed costs of maintaining old City Hall</td>
<td>Market value*</td>
<td>Municipal budget, revenue from sale of field house, energy efficiency grants and financing, historic preservation monies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 3: Demolition of the 1970s addition and field house to turn into an active park, preservation of 1920s building</td>
<td>Demolition and renovation costs; active park infrastructure</td>
<td>$500,000 per year (prorated) saved from maintenance of vacant building and fixed costs of maintaining old City Hall</td>
<td>None if City Hall is moved. Market value if the building is sold to private investors</td>
<td>Municipal budget and/or sale revenue, energy efficiency grants and financing, historic preservation monies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If sold to a private bidder, the City should use a competitive bidding process with clauses that are pro-local business, minority owned, women owned, etc. to help stimulate local economy*
### 7.3: Other Reuse Options

#### Option 4: Demolish site

**Major Strengths**
- "Clean slate" site is attractive to developers
- Addresses a need for more open space

**Major Weaknesses**
- Loss of all previous investment in site
- High cost of demolition, security and maintenance

**Suitability**: LOW

#### Option 5: Sell site to private developer

**Major Strengths**
- Reactivates the vacant site
- Increases property tax revenue

**Major Weaknesses**
- Loss of long-term reuse control of the site
- Increases traffic congestion and noise pollution

**Suitability**: MODERATE

#### Option 6: Sell site to nonprofit developer

**Major Strengths**
- Reactivates the vacant site while showing investment in public needs

**Major Weaknesses**
- Loss of long-term reuse control of the site
- Increases traffic congestion and noise pollution
- Lower property tax revenues than with private development

**Suitability**: LOW
Option 7: Sell front to developer, keep back for public health and wellness center

**Major Strengths**
- Preservation the 1920s historic architecture
- Increases property tax revenue with partial private sale

**Major Weaknesses**
- Field house alone may not be attractive for private developer
- Loss of long-term reuse control of the site (developer may demolish field house)

**Suitability**
MODERATE

Option 8: Demolish front, keep middle and back for public use

**Major Strengths**
- Maintains both public amenities of the theatre and field house
- Addresses need for more open space in the City

**Major Weaknesses**
- High cost to renovate and maintain both theater and auditorium
- Little opportunity to bring in private revenue

**Suitability**
LOW

Option 9: Do nothing, maintain status quo

**Major Strengths**
- Allows reuse committee to wait for market recovery and determine more suitable use in future

**Major Weaknesses**
- Cost of maintaining and securing site continues to drain city budget
- Implications of abandonment
- Role of reuse committee may be doubted

**Suitability**
LOW
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Appendix I: Interview Guide
Interview & Focus Group Discussion Guide

Primary investigators:
Anita Morson-Matra
Adrian Madaro

Pre-introduction:
Coffee, informal discussion, where we are from, etc.

Introducción:
Thank you for taking the time out of your schedule to join us. As you know, we are graduate students from the Department of Urban and Environmental Planning at Tufts University. We are currently enrolled in a Field Projects course. Our team is working to analyze the range of potential reuse strategies for the Old Everett High School. We are interested in understanding your opinions about the Old Everett High School and related areas.

This interview/focus group will take approximately an hour and a half. We are excited to hear your perspectives and look forward to this session. Please think of this interview/focus group as a discussion. We will lead the discussion with guiding questions, but please feel free to share what you are thinking. Information provided during this session will be used to assist the Field Projects Team in understanding diverse perspectives on the range of potential reuse strategies for the Old Everett High School.

We are really interested in understanding your opinions. We will be taking notes to the interview/focus group. The notes will serve as a way for us to document your opinions. We don’t want to miss anything. We are primarily interested in documenting recurring themes and key perspectives on the Old Everett High School.

We value your open and honest feedback. These sessions are confidential. We will not attach any names or any other identifying information to any statements that are made. Our primary goal during this interview/focus group is to better understand your perspectives. We will attach a random number to each participant and that number will be used to help us determine whether certain themes or major points of view are expressed by an individual participant or a number of participants. Assigning a number to each participant will also help to understand the overall opinions from each participant. Please keep in mind that you may refuse to answer questions that are uncomfortable and that you may choose to stop participating in the interview/focus group at any time. During the end of the session, you will have an opportunity to ask the team questions. We look forward to this discussion. Let’s get started.
Written survey administered at the beginning of the focus group:

1) How long have you either worked or lived in the City of Everett?

2) What are your favorite places in the city of Everett? Why?

3) What do you see as the greatest assets of the City of Everett? Why?

4) What do you see as the greatest needs of the City of Everett? Why?

5) In your opinion, are there populations in Everett whose needs aren’t being adequately met? If so, which populations? Please explain.

Discussion Questions:

Population/Service Needs:
We understand that there are constant changes in communities. These next few questions are an opportunity to understand those changes and the possible impacts.

1. In your opinion, are there populations in Everett whose needs are being adequately met?
   a. If so, which populations? Please explain

2. In your opinion, are there populations in Everett that are underserved?
   a. If so, which populations? Please explain

3. In your opinion, are there services that are needed in the city? What services are needed in the city?
   a. Probe: Police, Fire, Satellite College Campus

4. In your opinion, do you feel that the Old Everett High School building site could house any entities that may assist in fulfilling the unmet needs of certain populations?
   a. If so, what?
   b. Why?

Reuse Activity:
We have created an activity that should help us in understanding how you interpret the ideal use of the Old Everett High School site. We will distribute diagrams of the building. We ask that you use the materials provided to assemble a visual depiction of how you think the site should be used. We would like you to break into 3 – 4 groups. Take a few minutes to discuss what you are suggesting and why. We are providing 15 minutes for this activity. Please remember to select one member of the group to report back to the larger body. Thank you.

General Reuse:
1. What do you think is feasible in the Old Everett High School location?
   a. Why?

2. What do you think is not feasible in the Old Everett High School location?
   a. Why not?
3. Do you envision that the historical integrity of the building remain intact? Would you prefer redevelopment or preservation?
   a. If yes, why and what does that mean to you?
   b. If not, why and what does that mean to you?
4. What do you think of affordable housing in this space?
   a. Tell me more.
   b. Please explain
5. Do you have any ideas for the use of the field house?
   a. What are your ideas?
6. What are your thoughts about the Boys and Girls Club, currently occupying the field house?
7. How do you feel about the integration of the arts (art, dance, music, theatre) in the Old Everett High School space?
8. What do you think about a vocational school or college satellite school in this location? (detail: A satellite school similar to what is offered by Bunker Hill Community College.)

**Health/Wellness:**
1. Do you think that Everett has a need for a public health and wellness center?
2. Are you familiar with the Energize Everett initiative?
3. What do you know about the Energize Everett initiative?
4. Do you think that the Energize Everett initiatives could be incorporated into the reuse of the Old Everett High School building?
   a. If so, how?
   b. If not, why not?
5. In your opinion, how can Energize Everett become a more integral part of the community?

**Reuse Committee Questions (only):**
1. Why were the 2010 proposals voted down?
2. What were your specific concerns about the 2010 proposals?
3. What is your opinion on the ideal use of the Old Everett High School building and/or property?
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Appendix III: Previous Proposal Analysis
Dakota Partners, Inc.

Basic Program

- Preserve front HS to create 101 luxury apartments to be rented at market rate ($1,400 – 1,700 based on comparable nearby sites) and with a gross square footage of 130,000. Units will be of varying sizes, but all will be one and two bedrooms.
- Demolish entire 1976 addition to construct 48 pre-fabricated townhouses with a gross square footage of 59,800, most units will be two bedrooms.
- The parking lot in between the two residential buildings will have a ratio of 2:1 and will consist of two levels, one with 130 spaces and the other of 170 spaces.
- “As rental units, $225,000 in new annual taxes are predicted. When and if the units become condominiums for sale, the taxes should rise to $450,000 – 500,000 per year.”

Development Proforma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Price to City</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Interest</td>
<td>$26,400,000</td>
<td>$13,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs</td>
<td>$1,700,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS</td>
<td>$33,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Suggested Sources of Financing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$ amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Equity</td>
<td>$4,500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Credit Equity</td>
<td>$7,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Loan</td>
<td>$20,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRENGTHS:

- **Preservation**: historical section of the Old Everett High School preserved for adaptive reuse
- **Tax Base**: Once units were sold outright, tax base would rise to $450,000 to 500,000 per year
- **Parking**: the 2:1 parking ratio would not add parking congestion to the neighborhood
- **Green**: would strive for LEED Certification

WEAKNESSES

- **Aesthetics**: unsightly modular construction of rear building does not have character nor does it mesh with the surrounding residential units
- **Financing**: no elaboration of grant opportunities or potential tax credits
- **Poor Use of Space**: large parking lot in the middle of the site is unsightly and a poor use of space
- **Acquisition**: low bid price for the site
- **Unrealistic**: projected rents for the one and two bedroom units seem unrealistically high
NOAH, Neighborhood of Affordable Housing, Inc.,
Option A

**Basic Program**
- Preserve front HS and convert to 71 elderly housing units
- Preserve auditorium (retain option to convert to 17 additional units in the future)
- 5 Separate Townhouses for 15 families (including parking)
- 117 parking spaces (lot)

**Development Proforma**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Price to City</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition &amp; Haz Mat Remediation</td>
<td>$2,378,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>$1,543,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs for 86 Units</td>
<td>$15,855,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Development Costs</td>
<td>$4,162,475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>$490,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Fees</td>
<td>$2,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$28,230,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Proforma**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Gross Income from 86 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINHTC Equity (2 rounds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State LINHTC Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Tax Credit Equity (half state/half fed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett CDBG Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Stabilization Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Trust Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHP Permanent Mortgage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOAH, Neighborhood of Affordable Housing, Inc.,
Option B

**Basic Program**
- Preserve front HS and convert to 71 elderly housing units
- Preserve auditorium (retain option to convert to 17 additional units in the future)
- Preserve field house (renovate & maintain as Boys & Girls Club/fitness center)
- 50 parking spaces (open air garage under field house) + 60 elderly housing-designated spaces (lot)

**Development Proforma**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition Price to City</td>
<td>$1,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demolition &amp; Haz Mat Remediation</td>
<td>$802,471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>$659,366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs for 71 Units</td>
<td>$12,913,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Development Costs</td>
<td>$3,320,286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserves</td>
<td>$394,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Fees</td>
<td>$1,950,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS</strong></td>
<td><strong>$21,240,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Proforma**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Gross Income from 71 Units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Operating Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINHTC Equity (2 rounds)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State LINHTC Equity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Tax Credit Equity (half state/half fed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everett CDBG Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Stabilization Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Trust Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHP Permanent Mortgage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOAH, Neighborhood of Affordable Housing, Inc., Options A&B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Suggested Sources of Financing:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Tax Credits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINHTC for residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Loans and Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Funding Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMTC for field house (Option B only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Needs to first be listed on National Register of Historic Places
- More likely awarded associated with elderly housing and if combined with Chapter 40R/Chapter 40V
- Affordable Housing Trust Fund (state loans and grants)
- HOME (state loans and grants)
- Housing Stabilization Fund (state loans and grants)
- PWED, CDAG, HOME applications with City (especially for infrastructure costs, demolition, remediation, streets/lighting/utilities/open space)
- Community facilities in MA and New England have been funded - including B&G Clubs and YMCAs

**STRENGTHS:**
- **Flexibility:** Provides the city with options for Reuse: field house preservation/community center option (B) and townhouse option (A) with commercial addition option for either and willing to work with the city & residents further
- **Development team:** have worked together on similar projects
- **Graphics:** Renderings and plans clearly portray vision
- **Preserves field house** in Option B (important to the Mayor)
- **Provides needed housing for growing population** of elderly as shown in the proposal’s market analysis
- **Thorough market analysis**
- **Massing:** Both options make building more consistent with surrounding neighborhood, particularly with the townhouses
- **Universal design:** aims to make building flexible to accessibility in addition to updating with elevators, etc.
- **Potential for Historic preservation** and listing on National Register of Historic Places

**WEAKNESSES**
- **Did not adequately address programming:** B&G Club will probably need additional partners for successful operation & economic viability of community center/fitness club
- **Additional hardscape/impermeable surfaces:** particularly Option A adds a lot of hardscape with the proposed parking lot
- **Did not address connection to Broadway corridor:** how will the building serve as a catalyst for revitalization?
- **Lack of variety in HS housing units:** only two 2-bedroom units planned for elderly housing
- **Low contingency:** only 2%
- **Low acquisition price:** city felt $1.2 million was inadequate offer
- **Reduced future tax revenue to city:** majority of unit rents are affordable
- **Long development timeline:** 4 year time table for construction may be realistic, but seems to concern City of Everett
- **Rezoning/Zoning Overlay necessary:** though likely approved, could extend project timeline and costs
- **Likely to receive community resistance:** community may disagree with need for additional housing units
Rockwood Residences

Basic Program
- 75 units of affordable housing for “active adults, age 55+
- Historic renovation/Adaptive re-use & development of Old Everett High School
- Demolish 1970s field house
- 150 parking spaces / 2:1 parking to unit ratio
- Site will include: property management, on-site storage, on-site laundry, & social areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acquisition Price to City</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Per Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>$17,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRENGTHS:
- **Mix of Housing:** for active adults 55+, 75% affordable housing (under 60% AMI), 10% (less than 30%), 15% market rate.
- **Development team:** Experience with similar projects, have worked together previously
- **Size:** this plan would reduce the building’s footprint by 1/3
- **Preserves historic façade**
- **Residential Neighborhood:** sensitivity to the adaptive re-use within residential neighborhood (timing, site security & noise)
- **Creates more open space for community**
- **Community Building:** provides space for community gathering
- **Plan creates parking for Rockwood Residents**
- **Energy Efficiency & Air Quality considered**
- **Green:** Green Building Rating System will be used as a guide in design, system selections, and construction
- **Benefit to City:** plan would reduce the City’s operating expenses, Investment in downtown infrastructure
- **Eliminates cost of vacant building**
- **Potential for Historic preservation** and listing on National Register of Historic Places

WEAKNESSES:
- **Lack of options:** group is familiar with transforming mixed use development but did not provide this as an option
- **Graphics:** lack of Renderings specific to this site
- **Finances:** lack of any financial information/proformas
- **Did not address connection to Broadway corridor:** how will the building serve as a catalyst for connection?
- **Reduced future tax revenue to city:** majority of unit rents are affordable
- **Lack of market analysis**
- **Lack of community mitigation proposals**
- **No mention of contingencies**
- **Cost of environmental remediation**
- **Long development timeline**
- **Rezoning/Zoning Overlay necessary:** though likely approved, could extend project timeline and costs
- **Likely to receive community resistance:** community may disagree with need for additional affordable housing units

Suggested Sources of Financing:
- LINHTC Equity & “various other programs”
- State LINHTC Equity
- Construction Loan (TD Bank)
- Housing Stabilization Funds
- HOME Funds
- Affordable Housing Trust Funds
- Permanent Loan (Eastern Bank)

*Amounts not given*
Women’s Institute

Basic Program
- Preserve front HS and convert to 40 units of affordable housing for individuals and families
- Preserve basement and auditorium (available to lease by civic or community based organizations - Boys and Girls Club)
- Demolish 1976 addition and field house
- 8 units targeted to homeless families, four units targeted to persons with disabilities (these 12 units would be serviced by Heading Home)
- 80+ parking spaces (lot)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggested Sources of Financing:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Historic Tax Credits</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs to first be listed on National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Loans and Grants</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Trust Fund (state loans and grants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME (state loans and grants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Stabilization Fund (state loans and grants)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Funding Resources</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PWED, CDAG, HOME applications with City (especially for infrastructure costs, demolition, remediation, streets/lighting/utilities/open space)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Fees</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$9,500,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT COSTS</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STRENGTHS:
- **Mix of Housing Housing**: housing would be for families, homeless, and disabled (a unique proposal for this site)
- **Adequately address programming**: good plans for preserved Rockwood Auditorium and B&G Club
- **Development team**: Experience with similar projects, have worked together previously
- **Size**: this plan would reduce the building’s footprint by 1/3
- **Preserves historic façade**
- **Preserves auditorium**: can be used by community groups
- **Community Building**: plan provides space for community rooms, etc to be used by local civic associations
- **Plan creates more parking for community**
- **Green**: building would have many “green” elements and be environmentally friendly and sustainable
- **Eliminates cost of vacant building**
- **Universal design**: aims to make building accessible update with elevators, etc.)
- **Potential for Historic preservation** and listing on National Register of Historic Places

WEAKNESSES:
- **Lack of options**: group is familiar with transforming mixed use development but did not provide this as an option
- **Graphics**: lack of Renderings specific to this site
- **Finances**: lack of any financial information/proformas
- **Did not address connection to Broadway corridor**: how will the building serve as a catalyst for connection?
- **Reduced future tax revenue to city**: majority of unit rents are affordable
- **Lack of market analysis**
- **Lack of community mitigation proposals**
- **No mention of contingencies**
- **Cost of environmental remediation**
- **Long development timeline**
- **Rezoning/Zoning Overlay necessary**: though likely approved, could extend project timeline and costs
- **Likely to receive community resistance**: community may disagree with need for additional affordable housing units
## Previous Proposal Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dakota Partners</th>
<th>NOAH A&amp;B</th>
<th>Rockwood Residences</th>
<th>Women’s Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Submission:</td>
<td>below expectations</td>
<td>above expectations</td>
<td>below expectations</td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking bases on completeness, overall presentation, thoroughness, compelling graphics</td>
<td>Poor renderings with unrealistic asking prices for apartments/condos</td>
<td>Full renderings of two design schemes - A &amp; B</td>
<td>Many images of previous work, limited images of proposed development</td>
<td>Good and novel concepts; good experience; fairly thorough;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Experience:</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>above expectations</td>
<td>above expectations</td>
<td>above expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on number of years experience, number of relevant projects completed, depth of &amp; diversity of project team</td>
<td>Recently formed development team with considerable past experience</td>
<td>Diverse, knowledgeable, experience with adaptive reuse &amp; mixed use (several schools)</td>
<td>A lot of experience with developments and adaptive reuse; practice of partnering with other developers, architects and non-profits</td>
<td>above expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financing Strength:</td>
<td>below expectations</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>below expectations</td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on guaranteed sources listed vs. potential sources listed &amp; inclusion of estimates per funding source</td>
<td>No detailed description of the security of the sources of funding</td>
<td>8 potential funding sources with amounts, but payout would not be immediate and sources are not guaranteed</td>
<td>Although sources were mentioned amounts were not provided</td>
<td>A few potential investors; payout would not be immediate and sources are not guaranteed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehab Cost Estimate:</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>below expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List number provided (if applicable)</td>
<td>$33,200,000.00</td>
<td>$28,230,000 (A); $21,240,000 (B)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$14,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer to City:</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>below expectations</td>
<td>below expectations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List number provided (if applicable)</td>
<td>$2,000,000.00</td>
<td>$1,200,000 (both)</td>
<td>$1,300,000</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Tax:</td>
<td>above expectations</td>
<td>below expectations</td>
<td>below expectations</td>
<td>below expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on estimated potential payback for the city</td>
<td>As rental units $225,000, as condos $450,000 – 500,000</td>
<td>Inclusion of mostly affordable units will not yield a large tax revenue</td>
<td>Inclusion of mostly affordable units will not yield a large tax revenue</td>
<td>Inclusion of mostly affordable units will not yield a large tax revenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profit Percentage:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on estimated potential payback for the developer</td>
<td>Net operating income of $471,400 (A) and $346,250 (B)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixture of Unit Sizes:</td>
<td>below expectations</td>
<td>below expectations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>above expectations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranking based on diversity in 1 bedroom units, 2 bedroom units, etc. (e.g. a great diversity of unit type would receive a ranking of “above expectations”)</td>
<td>All 1 and 2 bedroom apartments in varying sizes</td>
<td>Both A &amp; B options were mostly 1 bedroom units for elderly</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>5 1-bedroom; 28 2-bedroom; 7 3-bedroom (8 units will be targeted to homeless families; 4 units will be targeted to persons with disabilities; the rest of the units will be for family housing)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Mixture of Affordable Units:
- Ranking based on diversity of affordable units (e.g. a great diversity of 40% AMI, 60% AMI, market rate, etc. would receive a ranking of "above expectations")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Dakota Partners</th>
<th>NOAH A&amp;B</th>
<th>Rockwood Residences</th>
<th>Women's Institute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>below expectations</td>
<td>above expectations</td>
<td>average</td>
<td>above expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site Design:
- Ranking based on inclusion & treatment of landscape and urban design, alterations & additions to the building façade, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>below expectations</th>
<th>above average</th>
<th>above average</th>
<th>above expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Large parking lot and modular construction of townhouses do not fit in with surroundings</td>
<td>Includes parking, open space, 2 new entrances and drop-off area, 2 new &quot;short streets&quot; to fit residential character</td>
<td>Includes parking, professionally maintained open space, original building façade</td>
<td>Mixed-use development; will keep much of the same layout; basement will be used by a nonprofit; classrooms turned into housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interior Layout:
- Ranking based on inclusion & treatment of circulation, collocation of compatible uses, preservation or improvements to interior fixtures & built-ins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>below expectations</th>
<th>above average</th>
<th>above average</th>
<th>above expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No detailed circulation pattern included in proposal and no detailed description of improvements to existing structure</td>
<td>Will keep &quot;School Theme,&quot; hallway layout which provides ample circulation</td>
<td>Maintaining hallways, doorways, wood work and walls</td>
<td>Mixed-use development; will keep much of the same layout; basement will be used by a nonprofit; classrooms turned into housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Amenities:
- Ranking based on accessibility, inclusion & treatment of lighting, security, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>above average</th>
<th>above average</th>
<th>above expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Propose to make the building fully accessible and use universal design principles</td>
<td>Considerable upgrades and focus on efficiency</td>
<td>Propose to make the building fully accessible and use universal design principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Use Concept:
- Ranking based on mix of uses (e.g. all affordable housing would be receive a ranking of "below expectations")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>below expectations</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>average</th>
<th>above expectations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All luxury apartments with the expectation of ownership</td>
<td>Housing was not diverse (all affordable), but offered flexible options for keep the field house &amp; auditorium</td>
<td>Housing was not diverse (majority affordable), but offered flexible options for open space</td>
<td>all housing was affordable, but the housing is all geared towards families; some units set aside for homeless and other units for disabled persons; basement will house a nonprofit that will serve the homeless and disabled individuals living in the building units</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Contingencies:
- Ranking based on inclusion of contingency (e.g. 10% - 15% of construction costs would receive a ranking of "above expectations")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>below average</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reserves of 2% seem low for risk of project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This evaluation was based on an example given in Executive Offices of Communities and Development’s Establishing a School Building Reuse Process. The matrix was filled out to the best of the Team’s abilities.
Appendix IV: Green Resources
Resources

Community Development Block Grant
This U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) program gives grants to cities across the nation to assist communities with all the challenges addressed earlier in this section—affordable housing, vulnerable populations, and viable urban centers. For more information, visit www.hud.gov/offices/cpd/communitydevelopment/programs/index.cfm.

Habitat for Humanity
Founded in 1976 as a nonprofit organization seeking to eliminate poverty and homelessness, Habitat has provided affordable housing for more than 1.5 million people around the world. Volunteers help construct or rehabilitate homes for low-income families that apply for the program, and Habitat plans to build 5,000 green homes for low-income families. Habitat’s experience building new structures on idle land or refurbishing dilapidated structures in low-income neighborhoods makes it an excellent resource for Brownfields grant recipients. For more information, visit www.habitat.org.

Rebuilding Together
This nonprofit helps preserve communities through safe and affordable housing. The organization focuses on properties that are most affected by our nation’s housing challenges, such as seniors, veterans, the disabled or victims of natural disasters. With a focus on revitalization and green building, Rebuilding Together is making a difference across the country. To learn more, visit www.rebuildingtogether.org.

The Center for Inclusive Design and Environmental Access and the Rehabilitation Engineering Research Center on Universal Design at Buffalo
The Research Center on Universal Design at Buffalo makes environments and products more usable, safer and healthier in response to the needs of an increasingly diverse population. For links to a variety of development-oriented tools and organizations, visit www.ap.buffalo.edu/idea/Links/index.asp.

EPA’s Smart Growth Program
The program seeks to “expand economic opportunity, protect public health and the environment, and create and enhance the places that people love.” The EPA Smart Growth Program provides research, grants, technical assistance, and information to help local communities employ smart growth principles as they shape the communities of tomorrow. For more information, visit www.epa.gov/dced/index.htm.

Smart Growth America
Member organizations share the common goals of historic preservation, revitalization, and maintaining affordability in our nation’s communities. Smart Growth America provides various resources to coordinate development, transportation, revitalization of older areas and preservation of open space and the environment. To learn more and find resources, visit www.smartgrowthamerica.org.

Policy Guide on Smart Growth
The American Planning Association offers recommendations for planning transportation and land use, social equity and community building, and environmental protection and land conservation. Find the recommendations at www.planning.org/growingsmart/index.htm.
Resources

Project for Public Spaces
Founded in 1975, Project for Public Spaces is a nonprofit organization dedicated to helping people create and sustain public spaces that build stronger communities. For more information, visit www.pps.org.

U.S. EPA Greenscapes
EPA offers resources to help communities make cost-efficient and environmentally friendly solutions for landscaping. Access the resources at www.epa.gov/waste/conserve/mn/greenscapes/index.htm.

Greenspace Planning Toolkit
Communities can receive guidance on planning greenspace from the University of Georgia. A toolkit for the evaluating of land parcels for greenspace planning can be accessed at www.rivercenter.uga.edu/publications/pdf/toolkit.pdf.

The Excellent City Park System: What Makes It Great and How to Get There
A resource developed by the Trust for Public Land which proposes seven measures of city park excellence. See if your community measures up at www.tpl.org/download_excellent_parks.cfm.

Ecological Revitalization: Turning Contaminated Properties Into Community Assets
This report is designed to support ecological revitalization, address technical considerations of ecological revitalization at contaminated properties, and present general planning and process considerations. The report can be accessed at www.clu-in.org/download/issues/ecotools/Ecological_Revitalization_Turning_Contaminated_Properties_Into_Community_Assets.pdf

Land and People
The Trust for Public Land produces a semi-annual free magazine which documents the activities by people to protect land. Access it at www.tpl.org/freemag.

Increasing Physical Activity Through Community Design

The State Role in Urban Land Redevelopment
State legislation and programs can boost capacity to redevelop vacant and abandoned properties. Find the Brookings Institute study outlining these initiatives at www.brookings.edu/es/urban/publications/leighvacant.pdf.

Local Initiatives Support Corporation
The Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC) is dedicated to helping community residents transform distressed neighborhoods into healthy and sustainable communities of choice and opportunity—good places to work, do business and raise children. Access additional information at www.lisc.org.