

## Worcester Polytechnic Institute Digital WPI

---

Interactive Qualifying Projects (All Years)

Interactive Qualifying Projects

---

April 2009

# Worcester's Missing Political Voice and the Fate of the Auditorium

Hubbard E. Hoyt

*Worcester Polytechnic Institute*

Matthew L. Phillips

*Worcester Polytechnic Institute*

Tyler Howell Flaherty

*Worcester Polytechnic Institute*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.wpi.edu/iqp-all>

---

### Repository Citation

Hoyt, H. E., Phillips, M. L., & Flaherty, T. H. (2009). *Worcester's Missing Political Voice and the Fate of the Auditorium*. Retrieved from <https://digitalcommons.wpi.edu/iqp-all/1801>

This Unrestricted is brought to you for free and open access by the Interactive Qualifying Projects at Digital WPI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Interactive Qualifying Projects (All Years) by an authorized administrator of Digital WPI. For more information, please contact [digitalwpi@wpi.edu](mailto:digitalwpi@wpi.edu).

# **Worcester's Missing Political Voice and the Fate of the Auditorium**

An Interactive Qualifying Project Report

Submitted to the Faculty

of the Worcester Polytechnic Institute

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

Degree of Bachelor of Science

By

---

Tyler Flaherty

---

Matthew Phillips

---

Hubbard Hoyt

---

Professor John M Wilkes, Advisor

Date: April 29, 2009

Keywords:  
Neighborhood Association  
Urban Development  
City Politics

---

## **Contents**

Introduction.....	3
Political Overview .....	6
Observing the Charrette .....	11
The Administration and the Student Body (recruiting problems) .....	18
The Charrette .....	24
Preparing Students to Participate In Future Events .....	36
Mobilizing Students on a Single Campus.....	43
How to bring the student body together for common purposes in multi-college events and classes .....	45
Presentations .....	48
VHB Report .....	50
A Critical Review of the VHB Plan.....	53

## **Abstract**

The political activism of the 25,000 Worcester college students has been rare given the potential power of numbers. Even on issues that directly affect them they exert no influence. This paper reports a case study of our effort to recruit students to attend a city wide charrette with a focus on Lincoln Square. Prior research indicates that the college students of Worcester want a gathering place and one proposal for the Memorial Auditorium dominating Lincoln Square is to make it a "College Crossroads". The East Highland Neighborhood Association supports this proposal for the Auditorium and sponsored our effort to determine if the students will mobilize for this cause. We also assessed support for several other uses of the Auditorium that the adjacent neighborhood might support.

## **Introduction**

The purpose of this project was to build on last year's focus group study conducted by Ilesha (Memphis) Boyce of potential uses of a restored Worcester Auditorium and evaluate them from the perspective of the College students attending universities in Worcester. The city was involved in a charrette process, and "Memphis" had dearly wanted to study how the city made this decision and see if the students had a voice in the process, since the City seemed to want to redevelop the "North Main" street area with them in mind. Memphis seemed to think that this represented an opportunity to get students involved in city politics. However, her project ended before the twice delayed charrette occurred.

Hence, we set out to further her efforts at finding or creating a common political voice for the 30,000 students at 10 different Worcester colleges in order for them to have

a say in city decision making; so as to improve Worcester as a college town. However, in this second round of study the methodology shifted from her focus groups to a form of survey research of student and political figures' views coupled with a case study of the decision process focusing on the charrette. We would get a chance to participate and observe the charrette process that came too late for Memphis to witness.

Her project sponsor, and ours, was the East Highland Arena Neighborhood Association (EHANA) which hoped that the student voice would be in line with their vision of a suitable future for the Lincoln Square area that needed to be redeveloped. EHANA represents the adjacent neighborhood and its leaders felt that if this abutting area (with several stately public buildings and churches) was redeveloped so as to attract pedestrian traffic, and especially college students, it would ultimately improve the nearby residential neighborhood. They hoped it would become even more of an integrated residential area for people who needed services within walking distance. They wanted a "college town" feel as long as that did not mean that boarding houses and rented apartments, with no long term residents, dominated the scene. The goal was homeowners in large older homes that included apartments which the resident/owner of the house rented to college students. At present, Highland Street has started to develop the mix of restaurants, pizza parlors, artsy shops, used clothes and furniture, laundry, travel agency and dental services one might expect in an area that caters to college students.

If redevelopment was not done well this area would go into transition from residential to commercial use and deteriorate for decades before disappearing as a place to live, as opposed to a place to work or shop. This would be especially unfortunate for WPI students as this neighborhood was one of the few places that they could rent a place

to live within walking distance of WPI, without actually being on campus. It would also be unfortunate for Becker College Students as it is one of the better neighborhoods close to their campus.

Initially we were asked to find out what the students wanted to see happen in the largest and most important building dominating the square. The Worcester Auditorium is technically a war memorial built in the 1930's though in the past college basketball games (among many other events) were held there, before Holy Cross built its own stadium. Our project focused on the Auditorium because Memphis's study had revealed that the students at the three colleges where she collected data were interested in a "college crossroads", i.e. a place where they could meet students from other campuses informally and do things together.

The auditorium is a grand historic building, and we were asked to explore the range of potential uses for it by EHANA. The leaders of that group hoped that we would find a use for it that the students would support and speak out for that the neighborhood would be comfortable with or that might directly help the neighborhood stabilize. At the same time an appropriate use should leave the historical aspect of the building pretty much intact and attract a clientele that would help pay for the restoration of the building. At the least it should bring in enough money to maintain it once it was restored to the point that it could again be opened to the public.

There was hope that the auditorium might support events attractive to the younger population into the area and thus encourage supporting some surrounding "College Town" development on Highland Street and North Main Street that would cater to the college clientele. With the college students of Worcester so central to this whole

discussion it seemed wrong that they had no place at the table of decision makers. However, if they were to care about Lincoln Square and the Worcester Auditorium they had to know they had some stake in the outcome of this municipal decision. In order to make that connection clear, we planned to place this decision in the context of the city wide debate about PILOT.

## **Political Overview**

PILOT (payment in lieu of taxes) is a plan proposed in the city of Worcester to increase the revenue coming to the city from the universities. Currently, the universities of Worcester are not required to pay taxes to the city, but benefit from having services paid for by local taxes. Some people in Worcester, and probably a majority of city councilors, feel that this isn't fair. They want the universities and college to voluntarily contribute to the city's budget, especially during a time like this when the money in Worcester is barely sufficient to maintain vital services. By contrast, the colleges claim to contribute a lot to the local economy already. However, they might prefer to help fund new initiatives or possibly redevelopment projects, rather than putting money into the local schools, since the need for redevelopment is great and the look of the city affects the colleges directly. The quality of the local schools affects their ability to recruit faculty members who will live close to the campus. We feel that the money generated by this program could and should be used in a way that would benefit the city residents and the college students equally, but that there should be no taxation (of students) without representation.

If every student's tuition is to go up about one hundred dollars (which it essentially would if PILOT passes), it wouldn't be unreasonable for students to want to

have some say on how this money would be spent. It would have to go towards something that would benefit Worcester but there is no reason why a common facility couldn't be invested in that would both help the city's economy and improve Worcester as a place to go to college, directly benefiting the students. Students get no direct benefit out of money spent on roads, police and local schools, however worthy public education is. Recent discussion of using it to support public libraries is a bit easier to justify, but the colleges already have their own libraries just as they have their own campus police and unless the libraries all merged into a super system it is not clear how the average student would benefit. The college libraries in Worcester already cooperate. On the other hand, the college students are scattered over the city in pockets and rarely get to come together, which is a loss to their social lives and limits the quality of nightlife and public entertainment in the city. Thus, college students might be quite interested in a revitalized Auditorium if it was easy for them to get to and they had some influence over the program of events to be held there.

The initial plan for our project was to gather a few dozen students, 2-3 per college, to attend the Lincoln Square charrette and demonstrate to the city that the college community was a demographic that should be included in decision making and listened to because it was the intended user group and had good and original ideas. Prior City plans for redevelopment of this area that we had seen refer to the students as a market, not as community members. It was as though the student population was there to spend money and could contribute in no other way. The implication was that they were a politically insignificant demographic of non-voters with no interest in what happens in Worcester to be used rather than served. In short, they had no voice, no stake and could



be exploited unless their college administrations acted on their behalf. Unfortunately, what was good for each college (keeping its tuition money and students on campus) and what was good for the student population of Worcester, and the Worcester city population as a whole, were hardly the same thing.

However, there is latent power in a large block of city residents (and the students live in the city even if the college faculty and staff tend to live in the suburbs) that could vote and spends money locally, both directly and indirectly. The student voice would matter if it were mobilized and organized to speak through representatives. In principle, there is a Consortium of Worcester Colleges (COWC) that is supposed to give the universities one common voice in dealing with vendors and the city. It is a creature of the college administrations, but does have an implied mission of making Worcester a better place to go to college. Success in this area would benefit all of the colleges by improving their pool of applicants for admissions. If COWC allied with student representatives, instead of always relating to them through the college administrations, that would be a second path to local empowerment for the 30,000 students attending college in Worcester.

Unfortunately, as large as the student population of Worcester is, it does indeed appear at times that the students are politically apathetic in general and much less likely to care about improving the city of Worcester, than about national politics. Few of those attending the wealthier private colleges grew up in the city. Thus, finding those that do care proved to be a challenge, especially with limited or no cooperation from the various college administrative figures that we interacted with seeking charrette attendees.

“Memphis” had gotten to do 3 focus groups on different campuses with their help from the administrators at two of them. However, when we wanted to take the students off campus to a city wide event, we got no help from the individual colleges or COWC. In fact, COWC wanted nothing to do with this effort as it was heavily involved in another downtown redevelopment project and considered an initiative to redevelop the Auditorium with a student focus a potential threat to some of its other plans.

The emergence of a competing venue to the Hanover Theater was not something they wanted to encourage though we saw little to no overlap in programming plans. They were probably concerned about a competitive fundraising effort. Also, they were trying not to favor any particular commercial area of the city in terms of access to the “college student market”. Indeed, it served their political purposes to have the college students spread their business out over the city as a whole rather than concentrate in a “college town” designed to cater to them in one political figure’s district. Unfortunately that also meant that the students would not meet each other, be catered to by public transportation routes and schedules or be easy for the police to protect and monitor. In short, it left the students fragmented in their social life, economic impact and political influence. It is understandable that COWC did not want the students to develop a new a separate voice any more than the individual colleges did. They gained influence in the City to the extent that the city viewed them as speaking for the students and a marketing channel able to “deliver” them to street fairs and the like as a commercial clientele.

Based on these hurdles, the project evolved over time into a study of how decisions are made within the city and a survey analysis of how those in leadership positions within Worcester felt about the best ideas we considered to have emerged from

the charrette. It was not the same as Memphis' effort to find out what the students want and mobilize the students of Worcester so as to give them a political voice. However, we were interested in the question of how the alternative plans would benefit students, so perhaps through our first whisper on their behalf the students of the city might yet start to find their political voice. Also, our original goal, developing strategies for provoking student involvement in PILOT as a way to get them to care about civic issues and redevelopment plans was in line with Memphis' theme and became an important discussion theme in our meetings and in the presentation that we gave at an EHANA meeting.

There were several important factors that caused the project to evolve in the direction that it did during its current phase. The first came when we realized that trying to distribute flyers at other schools or attempting to speak to students about the charrette was futile without college administration cooperation. The colleges other than WPI essentially blocked our efforts to post flyers due to the fact that they were "not college related", but rather dealt with "a city wide" issue. The second and more important change in our plan came out of the city-sponsored, Lincoln Square charrette.

## **Observing the Charrette**

Our initial expectation was that the charrette would be designed to give residents a chance to react to presentations on the ideas that came out of focus groups. We expected to see well thought out ideas presented effectively by advocates or experts. With paid consultants present one hoped to hear expert assessments and recommendations with regards to practicality and budget concerns and that these ideas would be discussed as involving tradeoffs considered at a fairly detailed level. However, the city planners and architect consultants were too afraid of appearing to advocate for any plan to say much that was of use in telling what the tradeoffs were for each proposal. They really were there to hear proposals from interested parties even after already having heard from many interested parties in focus groups designed as brain storming sessions. This was a “last chance” for public input.

So, the charrette attendees were split into subgroups, like more focus groups, and shared comments off the cuff. We noticed that no well-developed ideas were discussed or even requested. It was simply another brainstorming session that was random with regard to whether there was an advocate for a given use present. Many unconnected ideas were contributed while the city employees who were moderating tried to find out if there was a consensus in each of the 4-5 separate groups that were meeting. The city representatives actually tried not to coach the attendees, and actively blocked our effort to distribute a write up of one or two ideas that EHANA people wanted us to throw into the mix. The organizer representing the city, Stephan Crane, expressed concern that too well prepared a presentation would bias “the process”.

Having been told in advance that we could not distribute detailed proposals of the ideas we had developed before the charrette, we asked for the organizer's cooperation in providing a copy of the attendees list, which would allow us to mail out a survey after the event was over. This mailing would cover half a dozen options that we knew were discussed in at least one group, but coherently presented at the same level of detail and development. People could then consider in detail and systematically what we as observers in each of the subgroups felt were the best ideas for the Auditorium that came out of the event. It was evident to us that these were not as fully explored as they should have been, and many were not even competently presented by the reporters from each small group to the larger assembly of about 50 people. Some of the ideas were butchered and others suppressed due to the lack of knowledge or biases of the volunteer presenters.

Unfortunately, we were denied access to the mailing list of the attendees, for reasons that sounded like the organizers wanted to avoid the impression that this was an "official" list of options in any sense of the word, especially before their paid consultants committed themselves to propose best or appropriate uses for these buildings. We got the idea that from the city's perspective, the group attending the charrette had already had its say. What it said had been determined by a process at the end of the meeting in which people "voted" on the ideas listed by the various subgroups. Actually, due to turnover during the day, about half of the people there to hear the discussions had left by the time the 'voting' occurred. Worse, people who showed up late and did not hear what was meant by these ideas got to "vote".

Since the charrette "process" was not as impressive in practice as it looked on paper, we had to adjust our project to find out which of the ideas taken into the meeting

by EHANA people, or suggested at the event, had the greatest merit and political support. There were several groups of influential people at the charrette including politicians, business leaders, neighbors of the area and (due to our efforts) a few students. Our plan was to “recreate” the charrette group by picking people representative of the people we knew had attended. We formed our political panels and mailed out our list of “scenarios” with space set aside for evaluations to elected officials. We then arranged to distribute a similar document to EHANA people at a monthly meeting and to college students as well. Our plan was to go to classes at several colleges, but based on the way things went at the survey of our first class at WPI, that plan was abandoned. Why we consider those results suspect and not as useful as the results of Memphis’ focus groups will be considered in the methods section of this paper.

Admittedly, we didn’t recreate the charrette group exactly for lack of local residents not in EHANA and business and church people, but we did recruit enough people in various roles to give us a good overview of what each of a few key constituencies liked best among the scenarios presented. Our goal was to find out if the college students and EHANA residents in the neighborhood were on the same page. We also wanted to see if there was a consensus among the politicians and if it in sync with the area residents. If this approach to gathering data showed promise, the other constituencies could be brought in later, by others, using the same instrument.

The final step in the project’s evolution was triggered when the City’s paid architects for the project, VHB, released their report of what they felt should happen at the various sites in the North Main St. area that they were asked to consider. At last, experts who had heard what we heard were going to propose appropriate uses for the

buildings in Lincoln Square that interested us and EHANA, among others farther down Main Street that did not concern us as much. They had approached the problem site by site. This resulted in a fragmented vision that did not center on the key question of the Auditorium as the hub of a newly redeveloped square that is a gateway to Worcester. Indeed, the Auditorium was too big to hand over to a developer and so that was the building that seemed to defeat them. The report was surprisingly lacking in imagination at the point we considered pivotal.

After reading the report, we met with Stephen Crane, the head of the North Main project in Worcester, and discussed how the report was produced based on the information that they received from the charrette. He compared our ideas to theirs to see if perhaps there was any consensus or overlap of ideas.

This was a potentially difficult meeting as he had frustrated us at various points, especially in denying us access to the charrette attendees list with all their addresses and phone numbers. However, in this meeting he essentially acknowledged that our efforts had produced a much better range of options for the Auditorium building than the experts had. He also acknowledged that the favored use of it to come out of the charrette was (the Quincy Market idea), from a professional's standpoint, completely unsuitable and unworkable (though no one said so at the time). It was also one of our options, but our least favorite as well. All of our other ideas were considered potentially workable by Stephen Crane if a coalition like that which had redeveloped Hanover Theater got behind them. He was actually complimentary about our efforts and ability to think out of the box.

Ironically, it had not been our idea to have this meeting. Brian O'Connell, a member of the Worcester School committee, had also responded very favorably to the list of options that we assembled, two of which had large implications for the public schools. He had called the meeting to see if the options were considered mutually exclusive by Crane and whether he considered the ones of interest to the schools to be viable.

Brian was late to the meeting and missed the answers to his questions. However, the answer Crane gave us was that some of them were compatible joint uses of the Auditorium, some could just as well be carried out in other buildings and yes, the ones of interest to the public schools were among the most promising.

We understand that another WPI team has formed this year to explore one of them, the one of the greatest potential interest to WPI (as it would enhance science and technology education in the city and region) with representatives of the Worcester school system. This involved and science and technology exhibit tied to the city science curriculum, specifically a simulated lunar base circa 2050 that would be self sustaining and cost effective to the point of profitability after about 20 years of development.. This was number two on the list of options preferred by the area residents (as represented by EHANA leadership), but the college students (even at WPI) did not warm to it. They were more interested in the idea that was first on the list of EHANA leaders.

So common cause between the residents and students around a "college crossroads" was a possibility if the students could get organized and find their voice. However, if not, EHANA's plan B would be cooperating with an organized college institution located close to Lincoln Square (WPI) might be willing to team up with the public schools to bring about something truly extraordinary at the site. It was even



possible that one or two of the other colleges, probably Clark University, would be interested in collaborating on the project if it memorialized Robert Goddard, a local hero to both colleges. Discussions of the lunar base idea initially focused on its potential for science education, but increasing moved toward the potential it offered for artistic expression. This is the kind of “exhibit” that could be the set for a play or movie and NASA has long appreciated artistic renderings of things one cannot yet witness in person. Candidly, the second option of two colleges and the art and science teachers of Worcester teaming up seemed more likely than PILOT money being gathered and going to this cause, since the Colleges were powerful and resisting PILOT. Such an outcome based on a common effort to get state or federal grant money seemed more in line with the way things get done in Worcester. In an ideal world we would have liked to see this issue of the fate of the Worcester Auditorium be the moment when the college students were politically empowered. However, we also liked the idea of seeing the students use their newfound power in a way that was not totally selfish, though it was partly self-interested. Hence, a cooperative project with the public schools was very interesting even if all the colleges were not involved.

If they were involved, via PILOT, it would be quite a precedent if they used their power to give a \$30 million gift to the city over the next ten years that would help all ten of their colleges make the city a better place to attend school and be a boost to the local economy. In the following pages we will explore the case for the “long shot” solution; we call the College Crossroad concept since it would probably be better for the City and its colleges in the long run. Further, it need not be at the expense of the other idea. They are, in principle, compatible even if they do not actually co-exist in the same building.

Our follow up team will look into the lunar base idea and see if it would be a good use of the basement of the Auditorium that is compatible with a “college crossroads” on the main floor.

## **The Administration and the Student Body (recruiting problems)**

As we understand it, there are four distinct groups that as a whole make up the college community of Worcester. The students, the student run clubs and groups, the school administration, and the Colleges of Worcester Consortium. Our original assumption about this college structure was that it works from the bottom-up. By this we mean that the students with common interests form student run groups, such as the WPI versions noted here. These would include the Legal and Social Issues (LSI) group that does moot courts and Model UN's, Amnesty International, Habitat for Humanity, Global Awareness of Environmental Actions (GAEA) group, Alpha Phi Omega ( APO) the service fraternity with ties to the Boy and Girl Scouting movements, WPI SGA (Student Government), SocComm (The social committee that hires entertainers and schedules movies) and many other professional, hobby, cultural and ethnic groupings. These student groups address certain issues and interests that they consider important, and if it pertained to the school as a whole, they would relay it to the administration. Then, if it was the subject of clubs and groups at more than one college, we hoped to find that the consortium would coordinate a larger effort through its political channels. Actually we found that the levels are not that clear and the subgroups not that interconnected and integrated.

In order to recruit students to attend the City of Worcester charrette on North Main Street, all the student organizations in Worcester Colleges that seemed capable of rallying interest on their respective campuses were contacted. Although it was only Clark and WPI that responded back out of the six emails sent, some students and administrators in student affairs helped us get in touch with the people that would be able to field our

request to help gather student representatives. In addition, emails were sent to Sociology professors on the various campuses. One professor at Worcester State was of particular help. He was interested in urban studies and managed to get a few students known to share that interest to attend the charrette, albeit briefly. The WSC students seemed overwhelmed by the scene they found at the charrette, which was held at the Unitarian Church directly facing Lincoln Square. They did not stay long. We are not sure what they expected, but when it became clear they were not to observe but to participate and represent the students of Worcester they decided not to sign in.

In actually visiting the campuses and handing out information to the students directly, we discovered that any issues or events not dealing with that college specifically were blocked from distribution via their normal channels. We were not allowed to use any bulletin boards in prime locations to post announcements. The only thing we could do was hand them to passing students ourselves or put them up among notices about people selling things. Needless to say the direct approach didn't work too well as we received many blank looks and people were just confused about the content of what we were giving them. When we attempted to explain what it was about no one seemed interested enough to stick around and listen. The postings were simply ineffective.

We thought that perhaps the problem was that the first fliers we tried to hand out used the wrong strategy. These dealt with the concept of PILOT and noted that students should know that their tuition might soon be increased as a way of pointing out that what happened in the city did matter to them. We placed our email contact information on the flyers and asked for people to contact us with questions. Our hope was that enough people would get curious or riled up and contact us in which case we could point out that

the real issue was representation, and mention participation in the charrette as a possible venue to start changing the relationship between the city and the college student population. It soon became clear that students in Worcester weren't versed enough about the issue to have any kind of response other than confusion.

Several weeks later we tried a second attempt in which we asked permission to post fliers about the charrette specifically, since there would be an orientation portion of that meeting. Three of the colleges, Clark, Becker, and Assumption requested that they be given time to evaluate the appropriateness of the material and post it only if they deemed it okay. Since we were never contacted back about it, and no one appeared from those colleges, we assume they did not approve it for posting, or simply delayed until it was too late and the event had passed. Only Clark allowed the distribution of the fliers, and a graduate student from that school did appear at the charrette as a result. The four other colleges that we tried contacting prevented us from posting our material anywhere on campus. The product of our two attempts to inform the student body resulted in only three undergraduate students from one college attending the charrette (from Worcester State, due to the urban studies professor's assistance).

The official resistance to student to student information flow was revealing. Through the process, we found that the college administrations want to "represent" their students to the city, and resist efforts of the students to mobilize as an independent entity. Part of the motivation for this administrative attitude may be financial. Colleges invest in student housing and have operating costs so they have to be sure it is filled. They invest in food services and want to be sure that operation pays for itself. They secure their own campuses with a private police force. They hire people to manage the student government

and allocate the portion of tuition that is given to the Social Committee. They have their own auditoriums and other infrastructure and even support theater clubs, outing clubs and debate clubs. They tend to be fairly self-contained. Students coming to college in Worcester are indoctrinated to think of themselves as part of a college community that includes alumni, faculty, and the administration, as well as each other. The students are not encouraged to see themselves as part of the larger community of Worcester while attending college.

By contrast, the city wants the students to get off campus and join local churches and clubs if for only 3-4 years. Even if they are just attending events they strengthen the arts and entertainment industry and to meet students from other campuses. Hence, one has to consider the possibility that there are substantial conflicts of interest between college administrations determined to keep their students on campus and the goals of the community organizations. Thus colleges have policies at odds with the interest of the college students in meeting students from other colleges and the city of Worcester's hopes to have a district that caters to college students. This would not be a major problem if the colleges thought of themselves as allies rather than potential competitors. As Allies they would pool their resources to improve the city, which is their common setting and impacts their image, admissions and marketing programs, and long term well being. However, it is a problem in the short term, as one more building on campus will always seem like a better investment than a common facility located in downtown Worcester that they run jointly.

In terms of keeping the money on campus, the colleges have been fairly effective. From food to school supplies and books, all of the student's needs are generally met from

sources accessible on campus and college administrations seem to want to keep it that way. There is nothing like the Harvard Coop bookstore with a clientele that extends beyond the school in Worcester. Clearly, a large bookstore that served several campuses would be quite possible. Instead, book companies have moved onto the campuses. The tendency for each school to be their own entity that has relatively little interaction with other schools and no real cooperation on multi-institute events or projects is the reason that Worcester has failed to be a college oriented city with a youth culture like Boston. It's relatively large college student population is far less visible than that of Boston.

When a focus group made up of college administrators was assembled to discuss Lincoln Square, our advisor was present, as was Mark Bilotta of the COWC. Mr. Bilotta could see why the colleges should care about the "look" of the city as one exited the I-290 highway and passed through Lincoln Square en route to visiting a college. However, the representatives of Clark and Holy Cross could not be persuaded that they had any interest in what happened in the part of the city including Lincoln Square. In their eyes, that was a matter of concern only to nearby WPI, which should have a relatively free hand in the matter, but should not expect any help from the other colleges on what could be a \$30 million renovation for the auditorium alone. None of them could see a case to financially back a plan to redevelop this area even if the expenditures would be split between several institutions, and the concept was to have this part of the city serve the college population as a whole. Instead, the schools were focused on projects associated with their specific institutions such as Gateway Park, in the case of WPI. There was great concern about getting overextended and trying not to do too much at any one time. The

idea that their combined resources were great and would spread the risk was not part of the prevailing mindset.

The Consortium gave us mixed messages all the way through the process from focus group to final rejection of any involvement in Lincoln Square. At first COWC seemed like an ally interested in hearing the students' opinions. Mr. Bilotta even read Memphis's report on the focus groups from last year, but seemed to not follow up on the idea that the students of Clark, WPI and Assumption all wanted to get together. The COWC had little enthusiasm for the idea of a college town in the Lincoln Square area because of heavy commitments elsewhere in the city. We had heard that there was interest at COWC in doing something elsewhere in the city, and that turned out to be the Hanover Theater project was not really their project, as much as something Clark University was supporting.

What appealed to COWC about it was that it was an example of something a college was doing to help redevelop the city, a political plus when dealing with the city and arguing against PILOT. Our plan was doubly problematic. They liked the idea of the colleges cooperating on a big visible redevelopment project, but we were talking about tacitly accepting the idea of PILOT and trying to control what was done with the money. That was not the position the colleges presidents were taking in city politics. This project was big, and was a continuing commitment and we even suggested that they move their offices to the Boys Club building so as to be central to where the students would be gathering. They did not see themselves as providing class and meeting space, as the colleges already had that and they were happy with their offices located near the City Hall and were buying centrally located buildings. . The whole idea was out of sync with



their existing plans and normal operating procedures. They had ample office space downtown in a central office building and could see no reason to undertake a renovation project to be more visible and accessible to the student population. . The prevailing view was that Lincoln Square and the “Gateway” area was on WPI’s turf, and any initiative with a chance of getting COWC support would have to come from that college.

In short, balkanization is holding the COWC back from operating on the scale or in the way that Boston colleges in the Fenway cooperate on classes, dorms and transportation and the colleges in Amherst Mass. cooperatively market themselves as a larger educational community and college town. In Worcester the whole is not larger than the sum of the parts, and the City has not yet taken advantage of this organizational weakness, but is considering doing so.

## **The Charrette**

As briefly touched on, a charrette is a collaborative meeting where designers of a redevelopment plan hope to receive input and find out which options have the most public support out of those they are proposing or consider reasonable.. In our case, the design problem was the future of Lincoln Square and the feedback they wished to receive was from any Worcester resident that made the effort to turn out for the event. We were initially hoping to have a large student population attend to express their opinions. Since the college student focus group had not materialized, we felt that because the charrette was during the academic school year, this would be a good opportunity for the student population to get into the process and express some opinions. If the students could make their voice heard, our project would be a research effort to follow the city’s process and later determine if the student body of Worcester was a constituency that influenced those

in power or at least was actually listened to. However, as outlined by the problems we faced in the earlier section, the role of the charrette in our project changed when recruiting students became next to impossible because the students did not follow city politics, could not see why this should matter to them and were not being encouraged by their college administrators to look into the issue of PILOT even while they were documenting what students spend locally and mobilizing student groups to do volunteer activities in the City as part of a campaign to resist this local political initiative.

Aside from the difficulties we had distributing material, we feel there were other reasons it was difficult to get a strong expression of a student voice separate from the college administrators represented at this event. . First, the Charrette was scheduled for a Saturday from 8 am to 4 pm. Clearly, not many college students want to get up early on a Saturday to spend eight hours discussing possible plans for Lincoln Square or any matter in which they are not passionate about. However, we feel that the problems went beyond scheduling and that we would have had almost as much trouble finding students to attend even if it was not scheduled for a Saturday morning. Had we had the means to find the students that lived in the city already and cared about it, it may have been easier, but the average college student would have not have attended regardless of the time. The early time only made it harder to get those on the fence to go. Our problem was getting people on the fence to begin with. We invited upwards of fifty students to attend, but only six actually came. Four of those students only stayed for about twenty minutes, and ducked out the back door before the focus groups even started. This was an improvement over the previous Worcester charrette held a decade ago when zero students turned up. However, we and one Society- technology policy (STP) major from WPI interested in

how local and national policy interact and the one Clark graduate student were not enough to make any kind of significant impact. The STP major was interested in the lunar base idea and tried his best to explain it in this setting, but said it was too complicated to get across in sound bites.

It is not that we didn't anticipate this problem. That is why we developed several detailed, well thought out scenarios and had them ready to be distributed at the charrette, once we decided to try to speak on behalf of the college students of Worcester. These ideas included an arts and cultural center, outlined by Nat Needle, an executive member of EHANA, a college crossroads idea developed by us and based on the idea that the area could be an academic focal point with a college town around it, an underground moon base, proposed by another WPI IQP group studying the possibility of a cooperative science education between the city and the colleges, and an idea based on Boston's Quincy Market, which came up multiple times, including in Memphis's focus groups, and by another WPI student working on the history of the auditorium who favored commercial development of this type. All the ideas had something connecting to the interests of the students or the universities. Furthermore they were designed to give the charrette a focus. We even answered questions such as where would funds come for each idea even though the charrette instructions were to ignore finance issues at this point in the process.

When we arrived at the charrette we were forced to change our plan of action when we were refused permission to distribute descriptions of the alternate scenarios for the Worcester auditorium. The rationale of Stephen Crane's (the city official in charge of organizing and moderating the charrette) decision not to allow us to distribute these

materials was that the charrette was a time for people to vote on ideas not already endorsed by city officials. Allowing us to hand out our materials (especially with his consent) could in his mind, turn people away from the impartial openness to the voice and will of the people by their public servants which the charrette was supposed to be all about. We were allowed to enter our ideas into the discussion on the day as individual and even advocate strongly for them, but not distribute any formal previously prepared documents.

As noted earlier, this went against our initial understanding of what the charrette was supposed to be like and our expectations were based on things he had said previously trying to motivate people to come to the event. . The city of Worcester had conducted prior focus groups in which people had the opportunity to present ‘unfocused’ ideas in hopes that whatever was generated could be developed by experts into coherent ideas. Our impression of the charrette (which came from an EHANA meeting where Stephen Crane himself addressed the group) was that these developed and focused ideas were what would be discussed at the charrette. People then could actually vote for an idea that had been thought through and some meaningful case to be made for it. We were led to expect that an idea presented here would be considered reasonable by the experts. The focus groups should have been the time to throw out preliminary ideas and the charrette should have been the time to hear those that had survived scrutiny. Despite being denied the right to hand out our documents we still had hope that the focus groups had been used wisely and the ideas discussed in the charrette would be good ones and it wouldn’t be a wasted opportunity.

The actual charrette that occurred was much different than we expected and raised a slew of new questions which required different approach to answer. To say the least we were disappointed that we were not able to receive feedback on the ideas we had developed but we later found other ways to explore the feasibility of our ideas and the level of public support they were likely to receive.

The charrette began with a brief presentation on Lincoln Square, outlining the various buildings to be considered in the North Main Street region and other concerns such as parking or the flow of pedestrian traffic. Over lunch we would get a far more useful presentation on the history of Lincoln Square and how it came to take its current form. In the morning session everyone was then split into small focus groups consisting of about ten people that were led by a facilitator who was a city employee trained to moderate the groups. A map of the area was given to each group, along with a poster sized paper for ideas to be written down on. Each group put forth suggestions for each of the sites being considered in the area and a 'reporter' was selected to take notes on the poster paper and explain the ideas to all the charrette attendees at the end of the day. We had four students there, our project group, and one student from another project group, and our advisor was also there. We decided to split up, and have each person sit in on a different focus group, in the hopes of being able to get a broad sense of how all the groups worked and whether or not they developed different patterns of ideas. By being split up like this we felt it put us in a fair position to judge the overall process.

At the end of the day a consensus in our team was reached about the charrette process having more potential than was actually realized that day. The groups were either dominated by one particular person or had entirely the opposite of that, people that had

no developed ideas or little interest, threw out simple, easy fixes such as, “Throw a food court into the auditorium.” There was no theme to speak of and people expressed random ideas that didn’t seem to mesh or have any sort of cohesion. Many were not feasible and should have been dismissed by the professionals who were being quiet so as not to influence the proceedings.

The people designated to report back to the whole charrette from each subgroup were presented with a difficult task. They had about ten minutes to summarize two hours of disjointed ideas that were not well thought out. As expected, not all the information presented in the focus groups made it back to the charrette in the afternoon presentation and many of the ideas were poorly summarized by people who did not understand them or believe in them. One such example was the moon base. It was explained that the Lincoln square tunnel would be perfect for setting up a mock moon base since such a facility would have to be underground. Its educational and research value were also spoken of in the small groups. The report back however described it as an underground airplane museum which the newspapers then got a hold of and ridiculed as one of the sillier ideas to come out of the charrette. Admittedly, it is an out of the box idea but it was explained well enough in the small group that had everyone heard it in the same way the reaction to it would have been more that is was intriguing rather than to be mocked. The degree of information loss between the small groups and the big group was appalling and it led to the publication of an article in the newspaper that criticized an idea from the charrette that was never proposed or advocated by anyone.

The problems were understandable, since even a small charrette with a disappointing turnout such as this one is not an easy thing to manage. Due to the fact

that there had been prior focus groups and discussion of potential uses of the area, there should have been a coherent set of options to discuss comparatively and with other ideas that emerged from the discussion as opposed to starting from scratch on charrette day.

In retrospect, handing out our prepared idea sheets would not have really shown any favoritism, as most of them were just better developed versions of the things that came up in the charrette anyway, though in a cruder form. Everyone was given equal opportunity to develop and bring their own ideas (just like we did) and we felt penalized for having been the only ones that did so. Had more people come as prepared as we were, and there proved to be a consensus, the discussions could have moved on to tackle the harder issues at hand such as feasibility and funding.. Suggesting appealing things for the sites was the easy part, being able to show the city that they could work as self supporting entities was the hard part. No one seemed to be there to take part in the critical part of the discussion we were told was the point of a charrette which was to find out which ideas were feasible and actually had public backing.

Another reason that the charrette was such a letdown was the fact that Stephen Crane had initially hyped it up to us as something different and exciting, something that the city had never really done before. The previous focus groups were suggested by Nat Needle and conducted last summer so Stephen and Nat had close ties going into the charrette. Many different interest groups turned out to give their opinions in scheduled focus groups and it led to a feeling that this charrette could be different.

We had a special problem since it was the college students' focus group fell through with no attendees since it was held after the end of the academic year. However, we tried to rectify that error by bringing up the college crossroads idea. On the whole we

felt that we spoke pretty strongly on behalf of students and expressed their interests, but we were hampered by our official role as observers of the event. We were asked to be support staff and help run the event, even train as facilitators and take over groups, but are glad that we did not end up doing that. We ended up as critical edge participant-observers. In hindsight, it is unfair to say the charrette was run poorly as it seems to have been run the way others have been and in the fashion its sponsor wanted it to run, with no professional influence. In our opinion that was a mistake and a poor use of the professional talent present for an 8 hour day.

Given the priming of the VHB staff through the focus groups, something different than a 'charrette' could and should have taken place. It wouldn't have been a problem to change the name to something else and allow a new format to be tried. The best ideas from each focus group could have been presented in a well developed and professional format and discussions could have been based around those. This was really a second time through the focus group process for us due to the fact that Stephen Crane attended an EHANA meeting, which itself turned into a focus group. (Our advisor went through this 4 times including the resident's focus group and the college staff's focus group.) The key thing we recall from the EHANA event was the fact that Stephen interrupted the neighborhood association meeting to tell everyone that the charrette was supposed to get past the point of just throwing ideas out. The EHANA meeting turned into a member's discussion of things they would like to see and Stephen and his partner Julie told us that the charrette was intended to be something more in depth than what he was seeing in the focus group type meeting. Having gone through the entire process more than once, we can only conclude that the City wanted the professional to have a free hand and not to



mobilize any organized opposition to a plan that they liked. The goal was to go through motions of openness and public participation but not put up any targets that a potential opponent representing an interest group could take a shot at until it was too late in the game to mobilize public resistance. Of course, that also meant giving up the possibility of public support. . Stephen Crane seemed open to an in depth discussion and seemed interested in the ideas we were encouraged to develop only to back down at the last minute and limit the discussion to what came out of the charrette. Since he changed his position before our eyes, it is important to remember that he was a new hire to Worcester city government doing this for the first time. It is likely that his superiors warned him that his course was risky and persuaded him to do things the way they had been done in the past.

Admittedly, there was one key mistake that perhaps prevented us from having some impact on how the charrette went. Stephen, at the EHANA meeting, invited us to become moderators or at least have some part in the day's event. It required some training which due to our classes we weren't able to attend so we stuck with our plan of being there to observe in no official capacity rather than moderate the groups. If we had said yes this could have made a key difference. In moderating the groups we might have had the opportunity to focus the discussions a bit more. The actual moderators there sat back and told everyone not to concern themselves about the practicality of ideas but to share whatever came to mind. Perhaps as moderators we could have argued during the training process to take the discussions to the next level and avoided a repeat of the focus groups. Secondly, the moderators should have been the ones to report back to the main group since picking someone that expressed their own ideas in the group is always going

to lead to a bias or skewed report back. If we had had the opportunity to express these concerns beforehand, while the plans were still being made, the charrette might have been a very different and more useful experience.

The last step of the charrette was ‘dot voting’ which again was handled poorly. The poster board that each group filled out with their ideas was placed on a large table for all charrette attendees to see. Everyone was given three dots and could place those dots on any of the poster boards next to the ideas they liked best, including putting all three dots in one place. Some people were able to vote without hearing all the ideas and others who did get a feel for all the alternatives available often left without voting. It is unfortunate to lose votes from informed people but worse to allow someone who does not really understand an idea cancel out someone else’s well thought out vote.

The reality we observed was that an idea emerged in a focus group discussion and was later reduced to one line to be reported out of group. The reports were compared in hopes of finding a consensus around a few ideas expressed in similar ways. The ‘reporter’ for each group summarized the discussion as best they could but some very similar ideas looked different on paper and some similar lines were evocative of rather different visions. The Quincy Market idea had a variety of versions though most people had experienced the same model in Boston. Things were much harder to share when only one person in 25 had been to a place with a use that was being proposed.

There is no doubt in our minds that the charrette would have gone better had several highly developed ideas been presented on and discussed in a pro/con format. With all the prior focus groups it would have been a much more effective usage of the day and

given Nat's and ours ties to Stephen Crane and the expectations we developed leading up to it we were even more disappointed that that wasn't the case.

In hindsight however, it was a valid concern by Stephen Crane that since our project sponsor is EHANA and one of the ideas in our scenarios was developed by Nat Needle, people may have seen the meeting as being taken over by one organized group if we had been allowed to structure the alternatives and were not on the city payroll. . In this case we would have preferred that the professionals at VHB had developed ideas based on what came out of the focus groups. Nat Needle had certainly described his arts center concept in the focus group and even written it up for a local newspaper article. We would have liked to hear what a professional did with that idea. . Since they chose not to have the city consultants or employees present ideas from the focus groups and other sources, those that came prepared should have been allowed to bring whatever documents they considered necessary to make their case and any concern about EHANA taking over the meeting could have been addressed beforehand by making it clear that this was an open forum. Scheduling presentation time by an advocate need not imply endorsement of their idea, and the professionals could be allowed to take part in vetting the ideas that were presented. Advocates to speak at the charrette should have been recruited out of the focus groups.

Overall, the charrette organizers made two major mistakes. The first was that they did not take full advantage of the prior focus groups and the second was that they allowed a volunteer who was not unbiased from each sub-group to report back the ideas. Both could have easily been fixed and it is our hope that Stephen Crane or someone else

involved in the process can learn from the North Main Street charrette experience and produce a better public participation process, whether or not it is called a charrette. .

## **Preparing Students to Participate In Future Events**

Two methods of collecting student feedback were developed and deployed to identify the overall will of college students on what the city should develop on their behalf at Lincoln Square. In the previous project led by Ilesha Boyce, a focus group of students was gathered from three local colleges; Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Assumption College, and Clark University. She attempted to use a questionnaire at Worcester State College but decided that the results were not comparable, and her report was based on the focus group data.

In the focus groups, students were primed on the city process and the issues raised by having several buildings at Lincoln Square vacated at about the same time. She decided to focus their attention on the Worcester Auditorium. They were then allowed to suggest possible solutions of how to develop this building and area with students in mind as the main beneficiaries and economic base. Since it was done at the end of the school year not as many students participated as predicted. However, about 6- 8 students per college spun off ideas that were raised again at the charrette and assessed by other students in our project.

Testing a different method, that we hoped would reach a broader more representative sample of college students in Worcester, we developed a survey that incorporated six popular ideas identified at the charrette. Respondents were asked to read each 1.5 page scenario and then assess it. We requested a response and a rating of each scenario from 1 to 6 on four specific questions using a questionnaire form. Our study team looked for classes from each college. We favored those in areas of study that best matched our project; such as urban studies or something related to the social sciences. At

WPI, due to time conflicts we were only able to obtain feedback from an introductory sociology class. In this class we were given 15 minutes to discuss the survey and offer a quick overview of the reasons for conducting it. Any extra time was given to students to look at the survey and fill it out. Those who did not finish during the class period, were given the option to hand it in to Professor Wilkes anonymously at the next class meeting. Out of the 20 students present that day, 19 returned a filled out survey with all but one finishing it in class.

The result of this questionnaire study was mixed and multimodal in many cases, in other words, there was no consensus and few students held strong opinions. On the other hand some of the results mimicked the feedback from Ilesha's focus groups, despite the fact that the class was not primed on the issues. The number one pick by the students on the survey was the Quincy Market Vision, obtaining an average rating of 4.94 for economic promise and a 4.32 average for their likelihood of visiting. This was similar to the general public's reaction as that was the most popular idea from dot voting at the charrette. However, this was different from what Memphis reported, since her college students liked the college crossroads idea. The next highest rated scenario was the Performing Center written by Nat Needles, scoring on average a 3.57. For economic promise the students rated it a 4.26 and for visiting it a 2.89. The third best choice was the college crossroads where it got a lower economic promise at 3.2 but a higher score on the chances that the respondent would actually visit it at 3.26. Slightly lower and at the bottom of the list was the Peace Studies program involving a model UN run by the colleges for the local high school students, with an average score of 3.15.

The relative rating of each scenario raised two questions. 1). How much priming of students is necessary to make students active participants at the level of the focus group members Memphis worked with and even at this level are they involved enough to care about the issues facing Worcester? 2). Is it possible to get students with no background interested and primed enough in a 30 minute class to give meaningful and thoughtful responses that are not simply the result of having been persuaded to agree with the speaker? Overall however, the randomness of the survey response pattern concerned us and we decided that it was not producing answers of comparable quality with those of Memphis's focus groups. We decided not to continue the survey study on other campuses.

The team did not have enough faith in the quality of information produced by the questionnaire to continue investing time in that kind of data collection. However, we thought it could be effectively used on a population that had already been primed enough to follow the issues, such as a group that had been to a focus group, charrette or had been called upon to testify about or debate the question.

In short, local politicians and community leaders who were hard to get together could be approached in this way, but college students with no background should not be.

In all of the responses that we received from the students we tried to recruit to attend the Charrette and fill out the survey we got the message that college students in Worcester are not particularly interested in off campus issues like Lincoln Square and PILOT. However, is this the case generally no matter what the city or is this the attitude that has been developed by the college faculty and administrators working with them in Worcester, whether by design or by accident? Some cities seem to have

connected with their colleges to the point that the city is considered an urban studies laboratory and everyone expects to do internships in local government agencies. This is not the tradition in Worcester, though there are exceptions that can usually be traced to the initiative and contacts of a faculty member.

Still, Ilesha was able to produce focus groups with motivated students from different colleges and was able to get coherent and useful responses. We started out critical of her study based on the responses of 18-20 students. However, we came to respect the value of it after we saw that the city gathered only 50 people from all constituencies to the charrette. When we tried to outdo Memphis by getting 100 responses from 4 classes at 4 colleges we abandoned the effort for reasons described above. In terms of information yield she had done very well indeed, learning more from spending real time with 18-20 than we were likely to learn contacting 5 times that many in a cursory way. When we tried to recruit students to the Charrette we had problems finding motivated students. Some ideas about how to get students to participate were proposed but due to time restraints, we were unable to test them.

We discovered in briefing the WPI sociology class that many of the students had never seen the Auditorium or incorrectly identified the building. If students were allowed to tour the Auditorium, or at least see pictures of it such as the ones we have included in the appendix, it might inspire them to think of creative uses for this lovely building and instill a desire to see this tangible asset donated by the city to the colleges to be used by them collectively. Yes, it would cost them something to get this gift but the results would be worth 5 times what they paid for it.



We consider it a myth that Lincoln Square is not reliably accessible by all students, since it is within walking distance from WPI and most of the Consortium schools have bus service to the center of Worcester. The furthest college is only 3.5 miles away so a single van or bus devoted to this run could get students back and forth on 30 minute schedule very easily.

Although the Auditorium is currently closed to the public, we found that there is a trustee group that operates like a city department answering to the City Manager that runs it. City employees can take groups to tour the building, and the city spends about \$120,000 per year maintaining it even now when most of it is closed. Hubbard was able join a tour being given a potential user by Stephen Crane enabling him to take the aforementioned pictures.

Since Worcester has not had much to offer to college students in terms of attractions or social life, many stay on campus. Those that live in the city save money but some are not in very safe areas. The average WPI student rarely sees other students on other campuses, though some encounter Becker and WSC students who live near Highland Street, the closest thing Worcester has to a college town district. Going to other campuses in Worcester for social events is quite rare. We think that students will attend events that cater to the college age group if they are advocated by a group on campus and the logistics are straightforward or taken care of by the sponsor.

One way to get the kind of multi campus contact that Memphis' focus groups indicated that the college students want is to have comparable groups on 4 or more campuses jointly hold an event that is off campus for everyone at a convenient central site. Then one if meeting likeminded people in terms of interests or social concerns who

nonetheless have a different college experience and perspective on the common interest. This is the kind of activity that encourages the students to get off campus and come together with good odds of having an enjoyable time and wanting to do it again with some regularity. Since a restored Auditorium could easily house many small events at the same time or one big one for thousands of people it is likely to spark an interest among the students to do more things together and to congregate there even when nothing special is planned.

We thought that PILOT was a promising issue to promote as a way in which to get students to care about Worcester politics, and the Auditorium (as well as the general situation in Lincoln Square) was an interesting way to think about how PILOT was compatible with mutual self interest and major benefits for the college community. . If the PILOT proposal passes through the Worcester City Council or ends up in the courts, we saw an opportunity for the students to compromise with the city, giving up the money in return for the ability to control the allocation of their money to city uses. With PILOT bringing in an estimated 3 million dollars annually, and the need of a common area for college students to gather together, the Auditorium is project that would be a worthy undertaking that few other groups in the city could undertake.

PILOT would be presented as a local tax in disguise if students are forced to pay more tuition and can't see any benefits coming to them as a result. The idea is to inspire them to think of themselves as citizens and start to care about where they live, not provoke resentment and a resistance to all ambitious redevelopment projects. If the students took over the Auditorium project they would probably also want to reshape the public transportation system to make the crossroads accessible. Public transportation is

an issue many other city constituencies and social demographics feel strongly about too. Those groups trying to avoid cutbacks would welcome the additional of profitable routes that converge downtown at the North end of Main Street and then link with other cross-town routes.

The next question is how to present the possibilities and complicating issues to students effectively in the context of a 30 minute presentation suitable for a class or club meeting? Our presentation to the WPI class was insufficient to get someone ready to vote, but in the right setting it might be enough to get someone to “checkout” the new scene if they were part a group that saw benefits in joint activities with people from other campuses.

## **Mobilizing Students on a Single Campus**

We found that each campus was a unique community and insiders were needed to know how to reach the right students, and know how to approach them. Each campus had certain programs or organizations that were more active on campus and in the Worcester community than others. Additionally, WPI, among other colleges, is soliciting community service opportunities to qualify students for certain types of government funded financial aid.

Another promising way of rallying and organizing students is through classes or for academic credit projects that cover the issues of the day, ranging from environmental degradation to racial discrimination. If there were going to be an annual debate about how to spend \$3,000,000 that came from student going to college in Worcester, there would be a reason to get a cross-campus dialog going about priorities that come up in classes and that student groups passionately care about. For those with political ambitions, there would now be city level student offices to aspire to win by election. Since the academic programs are not the same and the structure of the administration is not the same the process of emerging to leadership and influence of the budget will vary from campus to campus.

In addition, each effective student mobilizing organization will be shaped by what the students want encouraging ideas from the students to be developed and deployed as they see fit. Insiders who know each college community, but share an interest in an issue or activity from Contra dancing or canoeing to Habitat for humanity with group on other campuses will need a place to meet and coordinate their activities across the campuses. The students of Worcester will be much less invisible when they take the lead in

organizing activities to celebrate events like Earth Day, Chinese New Year, or Yuri's Night on a city wide scale and have a place to which they can invite hundred's of interested people from the general community to join in the celebration.

## **How to bring the student body together for common purposes in multi-college events and classes**

It was shown in the focus groups conducted by Memphis that students at all three campuses were interested in meeting students from other schools, and the idea of multi-college events was appealing to them. However, when we surveyed a social science class from Worcester Polytechnic Institute, we didn't see the same enthusiasm. The class we studied was an Introduction to the Psycho-Sociology of Science. We chose this class because we felt that a social science class that was not required had a good chance of containing students that were more engaged in current affairs and hopefully more likely to be interested in the happenings of their community. However, this class was not specialized in such a way that it connected with the topic understudy as well as an Urban Studies or City Planning class would have.

We distributed copies of five different scenarios along with a questionnaire asking various questions about the desirability and feasibility of each scenario. The information we got back was all over the place, but we certainly didn't see a strong desire for a multi-college area or event. The differences in opinions between the class we surveyed and the focus groups that Memphis organized could be caused by a couple of factors. One difference between Memphis's study and ours were the students that participated. Memphis's focus groups consisted mostly of opinion leaders from the different campuses selected by cooperating administrators active in student affairs. While ours wasn't a true random sample, it also was a more typical group of students than those serving in student government, or another group working closely with college administrators. The other difference was the method of gathering information. In Memphis's groups, they had

plenty of time to discuss the issue and become knowledgeable about the different possibilities and form a group position. Our participants were given about four pages of information on the different scenarios. It is possible that our material didn't include all the information needed to make an informed decision, and it is also possible that many participants didn't read the material. However, the important difference is that they did not have a chance to talk about it and come to consensus. Hence, Memphis reports strong opinions and clear patterns, whereas we picked up confusion, tentative expressions and logical inconsistencies. We have to take into account that this survey was administered at 4:30 PM on a Friday afternoon, so they were not nearly as interested and motivated as the participants in Memphis's focus groups, but it seems that the students really did not know what to think of it until they had a chance to compare notes and figure out what was at issue.

What we've learned from this is that it takes a strong effort to get students knowledgeable enough about an issue to be interested in it, even when decisions about those issues will affect their lives quite directly. . Perhaps an event similar to the charrette, but much shorter in duration, would help raise awareness. As we personally witnessed the process of recruitment we had a chance to examine ourselves and try to understand how we came to feel that it was worthwhile to commit eight hours on a Saturday to talking about possibilities for redeveloping Lincoln Square. It struck us that we went through several stages of consciousness raising before we got into the issue enough to see why it matters tremendously to students whether they stay on the margins of city life or move to the center and get control of common facilities. Candidly we would have not stayed engaged long enough for this to happen if this was not a project

being carried out for academic credit. On the other hand we ended up volunteering to help EHANA out in several ways that were not for credit once we started to care about the fate of this little corner of the city and the need to make city government responsive to the neighborhoods.



## **Presentations**

Towards the end of our project, we had two chances to present our findings. Our first presentation was at the College of the Holy Cross for the 23<sup>rd</sup> New England Undergraduate Sociological Research Conference (NEURSC). Although our audience was small, there was an interest among the students in a multi-college area built up around Lincoln Square if it was accessible to students from all ten Worcester colleges. Our second presentation was to our sponsoring group, EHANA. As expected, they were very interested in what we found and pleased that we had represented them effectively at the Charrette. Many of the members were very interested in both the World War I memorial idea and a simulated lunar base idea. They felt that both ideas would be greatly beneficial to the city school system and the area colleges. They welcomed the idea of their area taking on the character of a “college town.” The EHANA members were more interested in the war memorial as it was highly consistent with the original dedication of the building, as a war memorial, but aware that the idea had to pay for itself, so the experience of similar museums was of interest to them. We found that a Civil War museum in Harrisburg PA was self supporting, and fairly near the Army War College in Carlyle, PA. There were some connections but the basic support came from visitors from the general public and school history class groups.

There does not seem to be another museum of this kind devoted to the period of World War I and the troubles history of the League of Nations, though it is a crucial period if one wants to understand the drift toward WW II and the current situation in the Middle East. There was a short discussion of possible funding plans, ranging from small groups in Worcester contributing what they could, fundraising events and finally to

asking federal and international agencies for grants. All in all, they were very pleased with our study and very excited about the possibilities moving forward.

We also had a chance to sit down and talk with Brian O'Connell from the school committee as well as Stephen Crane from the North Main Street Redevelopment Team in the City Planning Office. We discussed the report by the architects detailing possible uses for each of the buildings, and talked specifically about the lack of suggestions made for the Worcester Auditorium. The report said that it would be too costly for the city to renovate the auditorium and get it back into a usable state. They suggested putting ads on local television stations to look for private investors. We mentioned our scenarios for possible uses for the auditorium. Stephen Crane said that they were all possible except the Quincy Market vision. He said he talked to the architects about that since it was popular at the Charrette, and they said it simply was not economically viable in that location. Other than that, he said that nothing is easy, but with enough effort all the other scenarios could become a reality if a group formed along the lines of the groups that redeveloped the Hanover Theater.

## **VHB Report**

The report by the architects, VHB, on the redevelopment of Lincoln Square was interesting. They outlined three development timeframes for the area. The first was a near term timeframe that would last approximately five years. This would include specific renovations of several sites. They suggested renovating the Old Courthouse into high-end office space. The Boys Club would be renovated to a health and fitness club on the first two levels with loft-style residential units on the upper floors aimed at young professionals and empty nesters. They said the Main Street West parking lot could hold distinctive, independent, and possibly ethnic restaurants and shops, again with residential units on the upper floors. This would total to 99,000 square feet of new or renovated office space, 51 additional multifamily residential units, and 24,000 square feet of new retail space. In addition to these site-specific renovations, work would be done to add green space to the area. They suggested demolition of the underpass and significant sidewalk and street improvements around the auditorium and Boys Club to create a boulevard-like character.

After the near-term development period, there would be an interim development timeframe that would bridge the gap between these early improvements and long term plans for the area. During this time, which they said would last about ten years, more of the same would be added, depending on market conditions of the time. They mentioned the emergence of a research and development market that would immerge as the biotech and life sciences industry expands. VHB suggested development of mixed-use projects with ground level retail and upper-level lab space. They said this development should begin later in the interim timeframe as these mixed-use projects would require a critical

mass of residents, businesses and employees. Depending on the nature of the developing economy and real estate market in the area, the lodging market could expand with the need for more meeting and convention space. An expanded lodging development could include new hotel rooms serving diverse markets (business, convention/meeting, tourism) and price points (budget, value, extended stay, corporate, boutique, luxury).

After this interim period, the long-term timeframe would aim to establish different themes for the area. They talked about three major themes that were developed through technical analyses, public input and deliberation with the project team. The first theme was an urban village or downtown connector. This would center around the south end of Lincoln Square, focusing on the West Parking Lot, the East Block at Exchange St., and the AT&T building. The goal of this theme would be to create a “twenty-four hour” neighborhood with high street activity and vibrancy. Although this area would not be a dedicated entertainment district, the neighborhood night life could be enhanced by the presence of live music venues and performing arts theaters.

The second theme is a cultural and academic district located in the northwest area of Lincoln Square. This would include the Old Courthouse, the Salisbury Mansion, the Worcester War Memorial Auditorium, and the former Boys’ Club. They said the proximity of this area to Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Institute Park, and Salisbury Pond provides untapped opportunities to connect with significant academic and recreational resources. The goal of this “Study Area” would be to create connections between WPI, North Main, and other proximate areas. VHB noted that high-end condos and office space in the Courthouse, a science-related museum or academic center reuse for the War Memorial Auditorium and a health club or recreation center in the Former

Boys' Club could provide living, shopping, cultural, and working opportunities for this "College Town" population.

The last theme was that of an "Idea Central / Gateway to New Economy" for the north/northeast area. The three sites planned for this theme, the Police Station, Crowne Plaza, and the Morgan Construction site, have ideal locations, large acreage, and significant redevelopment potential. Although these sites presently have other active uses, there exists the long-term potential to redevelop and reuse these sites for large developments that incorporate biotech/life science R&D uses with office space and potentially residential units, as well as expanded hotel and convention space at Crowne Plaza.

## **A Critical Review of the VHB Plan**

While there is some overlap between our ideas and their report, the idea that the courthouse should become something that is vaguely “office space” not associated with what is going on across the street seems odd. The idea that all these parcels being available together at the same time is a once in a century opportunity seems lost on the VHB team.

This is not a good area for residential space compared to other nearby areas of the city unless it is designed around the idea of urban living without an automobile. The architects are clearly not willing to promote so radical an experiment as that, so the theme should be set by the dominant structure’s use so as to get some synchronicity.

If your goal is a “college town” 24-hour activity district with some performing arts going on, you have to face the fact that Mechanics Hall and Hanover Theater have already taken the high end of that economic niche and located it toward the middle of Main Street. All that is left for the Auditorium is amateur theater of the type of college theatrical units and high school units can produce. Most of these have adequate facilities already, but it might make sense to bring the best of the area amateurs to a larger, better venue toward the end of each academic semester. That would provide about a month of low cost entertainment per year that appeals to a different audience than the more professional performing arts down the street. It would also fit with the “college town” theme.

The idea of a science related museum for the auditorium is carefully chosen language. We think it is a reference to the efforts to move the Higgins Armory downtown, but it could also encompass a relationship with the Ecotarium or even our

own proposed lunar base and space robotic exhibits. Worcester's Goddard legacy with rocket technology could co-exist with a WWI or WWII museum. However, it is not clear that these uses can be considered if there is limited parking available. Our idea of a college crossroads was tied to the notion that public transportation would be available. Hence, freshman and sophomore students living on campus could gather without having cars. Later on, if they wanted to leave campus as juniors and seniors, they could live in the area served by EHANA and could easily get to any college in Worcester from this "College Town" area if the Auditorium became a public transportation hub.

What is clearly missing from the VHB notion of how to cater to college students is the idea that the colleges should be holding classes in Lincoln Square that draw together students from several colleges, each of which alone could not support classes in a specialized subject. The colleges of Worcester could have majors and classes normally found only at major universities of ten or twenty thousand students if they cooperated.

Hence, the Courthouse should be academic offices and classes and a library serving an extension of the colleges collectively. It already has a university feel. Graduate students and advanced undergraduates should live nearby. Some will work in companies at nearby Gateway Park on research and development activities. The Auditorium would serve the broader college community as a place to gather large audiences for conferences, entertainment activities, art festivals, and science and technology fairs and competitions. This is compatible with temporary exhibits on the main floor and semi-permanent exhibits on the lower floor.

The old vocational school shops then become a natural place for a new company startup incubator where students and faculty members with an entrepreneurial side have

the first corporate lab and office space. This is not prime, expensive space. It would be done on the cheap. Finally, the former Boys' Club should be an administration center for the whole district and include some nice concessions where restaurants, shops and some health club facilities can be found.

In short, the VHB theme is not bad, but the vision of Lincoln Square is too fragmented. The key to the area is Lincoln Square, not all those distracting parcels on North Main Street, or the Salisbury Mansion. Tell the students of Worcester why they want to be there and how they will get back and forth to their campuses, or drop this 15 year dream of a North Main St. district that supposedly caters to college students, but really just wants to have them as a customer pool.

The student pool of resources is also being sought by the administration of their college, which currently sees them as a "captive" audience for houses, food, etc. If Worcester wants to have students come to college here in order to make the scene in the city, they will have to help the students liberate themselves, find their political voice, and have them become citizens, a visible and influential part of the city life, if only for four years, as well as valued customers and consumers. Hopefully they will also want to stay some will start businesses here.

Oddly enough, PILOT could be the catalyst to a political awakening of the college student population. This would benefit both the city and the colleges if it results in the colleges pooling their resources to revitalize and colonize Lincoln Square. There would be no resistance by the abutting neighbors in EHANA. They would welcome the development.



## **Appendix A - Scenarios**

### **College Crossroads**

Matthew Phillips, Tyler Flaherty, Hubbard Hoyt

Our vision for the auditorium of Lincoln Square is to use it as a place for college students to connect and we feel that the best way to achieve this is to use it as an academic hub for students in Worcester. We believe that there should be a social scene in the vicinity but in order for students to connect and get to know each other, we feel the best way is to get them in classrooms together. With appropriate transportation most, if not all of the colleges in the consortium should be able to get their students to the auditorium to participate in classes not offered at each individual school. With a common education it is our belief that students from the other colleges would be more inclined to interact rather than turning Lincoln square into an area full of students from different schools with no common interests. We have several ideas for classes that could be offered at the auditorium and we will outline them below. Another idea to incorporate into the plans is to also involve high school students in several events hosted by the auditorium because it would make students aware of their choices for higher education in the area and perhaps give them more of an incentive to stay here for college rather than to move on elsewhere.

In our meetings with our advisor from WPI we have come up with three possible class ideas:

**A:** Political science primarily focusing on the property rights in space: This idea came up because we feel that it would draw an interest from other schools as well as appeal to students at WPI. The idea of farming and building bases on the moon has been discussed for a long time and we feel a class that focuses on the technology involved as well as the societal issues would be a beneficial and interesting class for all kinds of people.

**B:** A woman's study class: The reason for this idea stemmed from the fact that WPI has a much lower female population than male and by opening up such a class to other students of the consortium colleges a large participation for such a class would not be unreasonable.

**C:** Urban studies program: There are several other colleges that offer urban studies programs and we feel it would be a good idea to bring all the students together into one place. Admittedly you can take classes at any college in the consortium but bringing the class to one common place that is not owned by anyone college would be beneficial to the idea of bringing student life to Lincoln square.

As well as these classes it is our belief that the students of Worcester should have a joint college government organization that could help decide on future events in the auditorium and to host its office here would make perfect sense. As stated at the beginning, it should not primarily be an academic zone but we feel that it is the first step in bringing students together as one group, a group that represents Worcester as a whole and not any individual college.

### **Quincy Market Vision**

Large retail outlet chains have swept the American landscape in the last century, especially since 1950. As time has gone on, fewer small local shops have been able to compete and those that can rarely compete for prime locations and last for long. Especially in large cities, small shops that give the city flavor are hidden among the chain stores and fast food outlets. In Worcester family businesses held on longer than most places, even in the

large food stores, but now the Iandolis are gone and Price Chopper and Stop and Shop have taken over. Many smaller establishments and specialty shops have failed, but some still exist and there are even some recent startups. That's why it's fitting that the Worcester Auditorium becomes a gathering of small craft and specialty outlets in prime space surrounding a space that features varied live entertainment. This would be one step better than the crowded Quincy Market with floor space so expensive that there is not room for entertainment and displays in the center of the buildings and certainly no massive stage that could be devoted to it.

Many towns and cities still hold outdoor markets, some more permanent such as Quincy Market, others lasting only a day and operating out of doors. Our goal would be to make the atmosphere of the outdoor market semi permanent inside this massive public building. There would be a changing cast of characters the average one setting up for a month, but others there for a season and still others coming and going in a week.

The slow pace and relax shopping experience with local dealers is what makes it a unique and popular experience. All age groups are satisfied with actives such as jugglers and magicians and with the shops from candy shops to blown glass shops. The Auditorium has a unique floor plan that makes the indoor market a practical idea. With a large footprint and high ceilings, it gives a more open feeling. This would allow for small semi-permanent stands to be dotted around the edge of the Auditorium with the center used for musicians, demonstrations, political gatherings, informational displays and other entertainment. People could walk around the small retail shops mixed with local craft shops that express the diversity of Worcester. During warmer months it would spread outdoors along the streets and green space in front that would give Worcester a livelier feel.

In particular, we think ethnic groups with different holidays should be encouraged to take over the center stage and be given a large proportion of the stalls and retail space surrounding the hall at specified times of the year. Yes, the Auditorium should pay for itself, but it should also be a splash of color, local color, in Worcester, that changes like a kaleidoscope, a bit at a time, but in the end is in constant flux and transforms from one form to another.

**Worcester Memorial Auditorium:  
Culturally Diverse Local Arts and Performance Center**

A vision based on recommendations by Nathaniel Needle, Ed.D.

This proposal is roughly based on an arts center built in the town of Middletown by Wesleyan University. Called the Green Street Arts Center, it was opened in 2005 through collaboration between the university and the city. It hosts a number of art-related activities and events for people of all ages. It now serves as a vibrant cultural and educational center, combining the resources of Wesleyan and Middletown.

Unlike the Green Street Arts Center, the scale of the Auditorium will clearly require political commitments at the state and federal level for restoration, based on its status as a major historical war memorial with unique and irreplaceable philosophical and architectural/artistic elements. That political effort, of course, will be aided by a broad consensus on how the facility will sustain itself as well as the cultural life of the community, once it is restored.

No single Worcester College should be expected to take on the role that Wesleyan takes on in Middletown. To the extent that Middletown is a "college town", it is so only because of Wesleyan. Worcester, by contrast, is blessed with a network of institutions that could play a collaborative role in programming, using the whole institution as an incubator for supervised hands-on student practica in fields ranging from engineering to history to the arts to education, and more.

While allowing time for student use gives the Universities the reason to develop the auditorium it should be used on it's off time as an arts and cultural center. Worcester has its fair share of arts, crafts and cultural diversity and using a building as prestigious as the auditorium would make for a perfect setting to bring this out. Local arts and crafts vendors would have a great opportunity to sell their unique stuff and cultural events could also take place here. It is to historical of a building to go to waste as a commercial center and would be most fittingly renovated as somewhere to enjoy the crafts and culture that Worcester has to offer.

### **The Main Floor of the Auditorium (peace studies vision)**

The Goddard Memorial Moon Base was given only one small room on the main floor of the Auditorium to serve as a small museum display devoted to rockets and the inventor honored by the Moon Base below. The main floor is shared by a variety of groups and is both a crossroads for the 20,000-30,000 college students of Worcester and a facility that is run by the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Intercollegiate Peace Studies program of the COWC. These two groups, one conservative and the other liberal, both agree that this is first and foremost a War Memorial and should be devoted to honoring the millions that died during World Wars I and II by keeping the Peace.

What they want to do is spend half of their time looking backward to remember those evil days. They also want to look forward to try to prevent another World War and nuclear wars of all kinds. The college crossroads part of the mission is that the main floor of the Auditorium is a bus station and gathering place. Buses arrive from every college in Worcester on the half hour so a student can go from one college to another in a short time by changing busses at the Auditorium.

However, students from all over the city can also rapidly gather at this site for a meeting, event or a class. There is also a restaurant in the building as well as a small theater for people who are waiting around for things to happen or between events. Busses also go from the Auditorium to the train station, several malls and Shrewsbury street from this location, but it is really Highland Street and North Main, easy walking distance from the crossroads, that is emerging as the college town strip of Worcester.

The job of the Peace Studies dept. is to run consciousness raising events about threats to the Peace and encourage diplomacy and negotiation as the way to manage international conflict. It all came about because the college students of Worcester gave a present to the City in the form of a restored and renovated Auditorium and the city in return asked the students how they would like to see it used. The college crossroads and the peace studies department was their answer.

Peace studies has made a reputation for itself in the region by developing model UN events and role playing games that feature international diplomacy about global issues ranging from the Nuclear Proliferation and Global Warming to the Asteroid threat to World Civilization and Global Inequality. They try to concentrate on the World Peace issues, such as the threat of Weapons of Mass Destruction.

Teams from the colleges play the Model UN style games first, and those that look promising are run for the HS students after they are revised to fit the Social Studies curriculum. The continuing cooperation between the social studies and science departments of the Worcester Public Schools and the college social science and history departments has been a good thing, as expected. What no one expected was the flourishing group of science fiction writers pouring out of the English departments of colleges in Worcester writing popular novels and plays and movie scripts. The special effects departments of the local college theater groups are getting quite impressive and alumni often bring new works to Worcester to try out in a class or on the stage. The best college play in Worcester is almost certainly going to play in a downtown theater and the best high school play in the region will play the Auditorium for a general audience with lots of college student audience.

In fact, the auditorium is now a multimedia entertainment center and for a few months of the year it is set up for school tours in which people can emerge out of part of the cellar area through the facilities under the stage and it is like they came up out of bunkers built for trench warfare on the Western Front of WWI at the Somme or Verdun. One year it

was like coming out of a London Bomb Shelter into the “Blitz”. You always see a visual image of what you would have seen on a famous battle field projected onto several screens on the first floor. The images are powerful and getting more and more professional and thus are drawing a wider audience. The high school social studies class tour audiences are about half of the viewers of these displays and the plays that use the display as a set are drawing wider and wider audiences. Work is underway to create more famous WW II images simulating not only London but Stalingrad, Bastogne, Guadalcanal, Dresden and Hiroshima. Several peace conferences are considering holding their annual meetings and political organizing meetings in Worcester due to the draw of these exhibits.

## **The Simulated Moon Base as a Cooperative Education Project**

It was when I visited Lincoln square in 2012 that I first caught a glimpse of this new future. By then the students of WPI, Clark and RISD (RISD students designed the Lunar Lander for NASA) had finished building a proposed mockup of what the Lunar base would look like.

It was set up “temporarily” 2010-2020 in the basement of the Worcester Auditorium- though as the building was renovated and got busy again they planned to move the simulated Moon Base to the old tunnel that went under Lincoln square, connected by a tunnel to the Auditorium basement.

I went with a group of 8<sup>th</sup> grade students on the “Goddard-Kennedy moon base” tour with a college student tour guide. A Clark student named Jennifer welcomed them to “a space station orbiting the Moon”. Soon we were loaded into a mockup of the RISD Lunar Lander (built into a freight elevator) and told to “suit up” properly for the airless, one 6<sup>th</sup> Earth gravity into which they would soon be arriving. Jennifer had told them that the Moon was going to be as important to Earth economy in the 22<sup>nd</sup> century as the Persian Gulf is in the 21st.

The group and I went down two floors and stepped out into a panoramic view of what the surface of the Moon would look like at the South Pole. We were told that cosmic rays require that the habitat part of the base must be buried deep underground. We transferred from the “lander” to the pressurized tunnel car that takes you on a visual tour of the underground moon base. During this time we are going through a side lit greenhouse illuminated by solar energy. Our guide told us we could not breathe that air as it was optimized for plants that like a lot of CO<sub>2</sub>. The animal optimized atmosphere was the next stop.

The college students tending the plants in the greenhouse all wore protective suits with oxygen systems to breathe in a place where vegetables grew twice as big and twice as fast. Then we passed into the human habitat. We were told that the oxygen in this area was produced from the plants we had seen and the plants made oxygen from the CO<sub>2</sub> in the human habitat. There were several interesting exchanges going on between the plant and animal units such that nothing was wasted. The 8<sup>th</sup> graders learned that there were some animals in with the plants, earthworms mostly, but that the “farmers” mostly kept track of the microorganism world in the plant unit. Potential plant diseases and nitrogen fixing bacteria were the key to managing a plant habitat.

I was really impressed with the unexpected ecology/biology lesson, and the illusion was complete. We were in a moon base designed for 30-50 people complete with underground agricultural unit designed by students at WPI in 2008 and built by some of the college and high school students in 2009-2010. Our tour guide let us look through a window at 6 students who volunteered to live in this unit. They were part of a study by the Biology Dept at Holy Cross, the Psychology Dept at Clark U and the U Mass. Medical School on the effects of isolation and stimulus deprivation funded by NASA. We could peek in at them, but they could not see us. The other 4 WPI students were the people who “delivered” tools and supplies to them for their work- their only “in person” links to the outside world and they showed up only once a month.

The 8<sup>th</sup> graders had all kinds of questions about how long you stayed and what one 6<sup>th</sup> gravity felt like. The tour guide seemed ready for such questions and had a variety of visual examples such as the one that simulated being in 1/6<sup>th</sup> gravity. An hour

had flown by and soon the teacher was dragging them toward the exit staircase back up one level to where their bus was waiting.

Our tour guide said that she knew all their questions had not been answered but if their class in school wanted to stay involved they could set themselves up as another science base at another point of the moon, or in a space station and communicate with the students living in or running the Space base. In particular, the Interdisciplinary Space Studies Majors of the Worcester Consortium were looking for “the other 90%” of the lunar work force. She explained that in a lunar factory taking advantage of the near vacuum conditions for production only about 10% of the work force would be on the Moon. The other 90% would be on Earth manipulating semi autonomous robots via radio control with instructions. Enough problems were anticipated that 10% of the “workers” would be on the moon at any given time, but most of the time, you would be able to live in Worcester and be employed by Luna-Corp as a factory worker

Once they were “part of the lunar economy” they could ask questions of any of the 3000 other people in the network. As a “sister” site, they would be given a job to figure out how to do and put in Email communication with Goddard Base in Worcester. Then the COWC students in Worcester would be accessible to them and answer all their questions about science, work and life on the Moon. The teacher asked if a WPI or Clark student would be sent to Fitchburg to help him get set up to do that. He was assured that that was possible but that he could also recruit some Fitchburg State students to come to Worcester for lunar production training in a special evening course set up at Worcester State College for the purpose.

## **The Business Incubator**

As a result of all this ferment, Worcester was way ahead of the game in moving into the emerging space economy. Several college alumni started new businesses designed to bring down the cost of access to space or travel in space. The most famous of these was Paul Klinkman (WPI Class of 1976) who invented an in orbit refueling system. This innovative satellite system gathered most of the gases necessary to make rocket fuel locally in Low Earth Orbit so they did not have to be lifted from Earth. It is estimated that this system will be worth \$2 billion to NASA on just the 20 planned trip to the trips to the Moon (2 per year from 2020-2030), in which the Moon base will be built. There is no question that the invention allowed mission planners to take two and a half times as much weight of equipment to the moon to build the base on those 20 missions.

Klinkman decided to set up his business in Worcester, so as to be near WPI and employ its student's part time. He was short of cash, but there were unoccupied buildings in Lincoln Square in 2008. So, he offered to renovate part of one of them if he could have the space for 5 years tax free and rent free. (Three other start up firms offered to renovate the rest of the building under the same terms.) The city took the deal, and now two of those companies have major new facilities built in Worcester. One of the others is renovating some city owned space in a large old factory. The last went bankrupt.

The Boys and Girls Club building renovated by those 4 startups is now the home of the new Worcester Consortium of Colleges IISS program, (Intercollegiate, Interdisciplinary and Integrated Space Studies). This college major is world famous. Students can take the major by being accepted into any one of the colleges in Worcester. The Worcester High School students that went to Worcester State College to study business and economics have created a powerhouse program leading to non-technical careers in the aerospace industry. The emerging space hotel and tourism industries are the special strength of a similar program at QCC.

Aerospace engineers are pouring out of WPI into a field that lost 25% of its manpower due to retirements from 2007-2012 and needed a massive infusion of talent into a starving job market. The space science effort grounded in biology and focused on life support is centered at Holy Cross in collaboration with the U Mass Medical School. Clark University, where Goddard taught, is emerging as a major center for lunar geology, geography, chemistry and the psychology of living and working in space. The College of Pharmacy is collaborating with NASA to take advantage of the fact that a micro gravity environment speeds up the production of cultures of certain types of medicine. Whether the same will happen in the 1/6<sup>th</sup> gravity of the Moon is now of interest to NASA. Space has an impact on the human body similar to an accelerated aging process. Biotech firms in Worcester under contract to NASA are working hard on medicines that would counteract that effect. Estimates of the spin-off impact of this work on mitigating the effects of aging on the general population are optimistic. Privately, some insiders say that this field is going to be a goldmine given the aging US population and the edge that the space contracts have given Worcester over competing biotechnology and medical centers.



# Appendix B - Surveys

## College Cross Roads

Economic promise to the city  
(No promise)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very great promise)

Feasibility to construct  
(Not feasible)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very feasible)

Attractiveness  
(Unattractive)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very attractive)

Likelihood of personal use or visitation  
(Very unlikely)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very likely)

### Opinions/Additions to Scenario

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Quincy Market**

Economic promise to the city  
(No promise)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very great promise)

Feasibility to construct  
(Not feasible)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very feasible)

Attractiveness  
(Unattractive)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very attractive)

Likelihood of personal use or visitation  
(Very unlikely)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very likely)

Opinions/Additions to Scenario

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Culturally Diverse Local Arts and Performance Center**

Economic promise to the city  
(No promise)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very great promise)

Feasibility to construct  
(Not feasible)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very feasible)

Attractiveness  
(Unattractive)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very attractive)

Likelihood of personal use or visitation  
(Very unlikely)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very likely)

Opinions/Additions to Scenario

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Peace Studies Vision**

Economic promise to the city  
(No promise)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very great promise)

Feasibility to construct  
(Not feasible)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very feasible)

Attractiveness  
(Unattractive)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very attractive)

Likelihood of personal use or visitation  
(Very unlikely)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very likely)

Opinions/Additions to Scenario

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Lunar Base Vision**

Economic promise to the city  
(No promise)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very great promise)

Feasibility to construct  
(Not feasible)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very feasible)

Attractiveness  
(Unattractive)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very attractive)

Likelihood of personal use or visitation  
(Very unlikely)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very likely)

Opinions/Additions to Scenario

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Business Incubator Vision**

Economic promise to the city  
(No promise)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very great promise)

Feasibility to construct  
(Not feasible)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very feasible)

Attractiveness  
(Unattractive)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very attractive)

Likelihood of personal use or visitation  
(Very unlikely)      0      1      2      3      4      5 (Very likely)

Opinions/Additions to Scenario

---

---

---

---

---

---

## Appendix C – Auditorium Pictures



Figure 1 : A view of the basement



Figure 2: The main floor of the Auditorium



Figure 3: One of three murals in the Atrium





Figure 4: The center WWI mural in the Atrium



Figure 5: The third WWI mural in the Atrium facing south



Figure 6: Basement hallway