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Abstract

The reuse of environmentally contaminated properties can present the opportunity for community revitalization in neighborhoods, towns, and cities across the United States. From urban to rural regions, people are impacted by abandoned properties that have real or perceived contamination. The town of Carlisle, Pennsylvania is currently undergoing steps for remediation and redevelopment of three former industrial factories. This study provides an in-depth exploration of one brownfield site included in the current redevelopment plan for Carlisle. This brownfield is a former tire manufacturing facility, previously owned by the Tire & Wheel Company, and is located in the middle of a residential area. As is common for brownfield sites, these former factory properties are located around low income communities and communities of color. Planning for the future of this brownfield site can involve decision-making that requires input from diverse community stakeholders. To facilitate genuine participation among residents and other stakeholders, it is critical to understand the limitations and possibilities of community participation. Identifying stakeholder perceptions within the local community that can impact public participation is vital to conducting participation with the goal of community revitalization. The perceptions of public participation, perceptions of the brownfield property, and perceptions that stakeholders have of each other are the main components in this case study that impact the ability for public participation to include a representative sampling of the community and address community needs. The impacts of perceptions were found to be significant on the results of public participation related to brownfield redevelopment in Carlisle, PA. Common community perceptions need to be understood and acknowledged in order for residents to engage in the redevelopment process.
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INTRODUCTION

What is a Brownfield?

Across the United States there are abandoned properties surrounded by neighborhoods and towns that stand empty and unused. Community members may have observed, pondered over, and potentially explored these mystery properties; curious to learn about the legacy they have left behind, and dream about their potential to become something new. The former uses of vacant sites that lay in neglect, often industrial or commercial, have the potential to leave behind environmental contamination. The complication of environmental pollution is the qualifier that identifies properties as brownfield sites. As defined by the EPA, “The term ‘brownfield site’ means real property, the expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of which may be complicated by the presence or potential presence of a hazardous substance, pollutant, or contaminant” (EPA, 2002). Brownfield contaminants may include gasoline, diesel fuel, asbestos, heavy metals, solvents, lubricants, acids, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), or a range of other hazardous materials. The term “brownfield” often conjures images of large-scale industrial properties, but brownfields can come in many forms, shapes and sizes. The spectrum of brownfields ranges from abandoned mining operations to abandoned gas stations” (APA, 2011). The companies responsible for contamination have often relocated or gone out of business. This creates a common occurrence of responsibility being taken on the new owners and public agencies, which then enter into the process of planning for cleanup. Due to the burden of contamination and the need to remediate properties before redevelopment can occur, brownfield sites can remain vacant for years. It is estimated that there are currently over 450,000 brownfields in the U.S. (EPA, 2011).

A Brief History of Brownfields

The brownfields term and coinciding EPA brownfields program is a relatively new concept for environmental contamination. The term brownfields came into use in the 1990s, in order to provide a separate designation for properties that had less contamination than Superfund sites. In the 1970s and 1980s legislation was created to address environmental contamination from former industrial sites. This legislation was well known for its strict liability provisions. The laws included the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) as well as the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act
(CERCLA) (APA, 2011). Initially, properties with any level of environmental contamination fell under CERCLA in order to be remediated, which was created in response to an increase in publicized incidents of environmental contamination, such as the Love Canal (Pippin, 2009).

These early laws for remediation of environmental contamination made it possible to hold owners liable for cleanup, causing many to abandon properties or declare bankruptcy in order to avoid the costs of remediation, and new investors were hesitant to incur that risk (APA, 2011). The CERCLA initially included all contaminated sites under the National Priorities List (NPL), until 1995 when the U.S. EPA administrator, Carol Browner, removed more than 20,000 sites from the list (Lange, 2004). The removal of these less polluted properties from the NPL was the beginning of the U.S. EPA Brownfield Action Agenda. Brownfields are not included on the USEPA’s NPL of severely contaminated sites (APA, 2011). In 2002 the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act was passed as an amendment to CERCLA, which doubled the annual budget for support of brownfield initiatives (Lange, 2004). Furthermore, this act broadened the definition of brownfields to include lands contaminated by petroleum or controlled substances, as well as mine scarred lands (APA, 2011).

Investing in the future of brownfield sites, similar to Superfund sites, can be difficult to promote due to fear and the uncertainty of contamination. Many of these empty lots have a history of industrial use, but the owners have since abandoned them. In the mid-1900s the industrial sector of the U.S. began shrinking (APA, 2011). Since this time-period industry in the United States has continued to move out of traditional industrial centers in the Northeast and Midwest, and has left behind a large number of brownfield sites (APA, 2011). As the US transitioned from a manufacturing economy to a service economy the number of vacant lots continued to increase (APA, 2011). Furthermore, the transfer of production abroad adds to the number of vacant properties, as manufacturing is sent to facilities in other countries with lower wages and other low-cost incentives (Lee & Mohai, 2011). The mid-20th century also experienced a loss of population in older city centers as residents moved into suburban neighborhoods outside of the city and into newer urban areas in the Southeast and West (APA, 2011). As de-industrialization and population shifts to suburban development increased, older cities were left with obsolete or surplus industrial and commercial properties.
(Lee & Mohai, 2011). The changes in these businesses have greatly contributed to the need to prioritize brownfield redevelopment in cities and towns across the country. It is critical to reinvest in these properties in order to strengthen local communities.

**Brownfields & Community Revitalization**

Many brownfield sites are located in urban environments where effective redevelopment can provide environmental, economic, and social welfare or quality of life benefits (Lange, 2004). Although brownfields are often associated with urban environments, they can be found across the spectrum of land use, including small towns and rural areas as well. Many of these abandoned properties are detrimental for the communities that live around them. Redevelopment of brownfields can support the process of community and specifically urban revitalization, thus reversing the negative affects of suburban sprawl, such as loss of pristine greenspace and increased traffic. Categorized more as the reverse of suburban sprawl, urban revitalization projects involve a mix of renovation, selective demolition, commercial development, and tax incentives in hopes of revitalizing urban neighborhoods without displacing existing citizens (Pippin, 2009). Brownfields development also promotes the goals of environmental justice, which concerns the fair treatment of all people with respect to development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations and policies (Pippin, 2009). Brownfields have the potential to become productive spaces for community needs and revitalize areas that have been impacted by a history of pollution, and subsequent economic downturn when these businesses left communities in their dust. Initiatives for the remediation, and consequent redevelopment of environmentally contaminated sites can provide hope for residential areas that have a history of environmental and social injustice.

Incorporating public participation in these processes can facilitate community growth, ease previous community tensions related to trust, race and class separations, and build collaboration among diverse community stakeholders. “The most basic definition of public participation is a means of political representation through set methods in which public constituencies attempt to influence governmental and private decisions” (Gallagher & Jackson, 2008: Arnstein, 1969). In order to implement public participation that is beneficial for brownfield-impacted communities, time must be taken to create strategies tailored to the unique community conditions in the area. Understanding of potential barriers that may
impact who will engage in this process will help insure that public participation becomes more inclusive for all community members. Once these are identified they can be addressed as pre-requisites to public participation and cultivate sustainable community revitalization. Mechanisms for facilitating community input in decision-making are key to redevelopment outcomes (Gallagher & Jackson, 2008).

**Literature Review**

**Evolution of Brownfield Scholarship**

When brownfields came into existence as a separate and distinct designation from Superfund sites in the 1990s, they quickly began to make their way into peer reviewed scholarship. Brownfields are applicable to a variety of academic disciplines, which is reflected in the diverse selection of journals that cover brownfield topics, including policy analysis, environmental studies, sociology, urban planning, and many other fields. In the 1990s brownfield literature was largely focused on policy surrounding brownfields, the concern of liability, how to incentivize the redevelopment of these environmentally contaminated sites, and the funding opportunities for the remediation and redevelopment processes involved with brownfields (Bartsch, 2006; Wernstedt, 2006, Wernstedt, 2010). There was a larger emphasis and concern on contamination and liability, which is probably carried over from the legacy of Superfund sites. Scholarly discussion focused on economic resources available for brownfield projects and how receptive government agencies and other stakeholders were at various levels (Bartsch, 2006). Discussion of economic and political barriers related to brownfields continues to be an important topic in scholarship, along with the emergence of the social challenges of brownfield redevelopment.

Beginning in the 21st century, brownfield literature topics expanded to look at the entire process, from clean up process to decisions on the end use of brownfield sites (Beierle, 2000). Since the creation of the EPA brownfields program, assessments of brownfield pilots have allowed for data to be collected and researched about varying aspects of brownfield redevelopment (Lange, 2004). Published literature began to provide clout to the value of facilitation of redevelopment through frameworks of environmental justice, urban/community revitalization, community or public participation, and sustainable development (Beierle, 2000; Solitare, 2005, 2012; Pippin, 2009; Lange, 2004; Lee, 2011; Greenberg & Lewis, 2000, Gallagher and Jackson, 2008; DePass, 2006). Furthermore,
environmental justice is an integral part of brownfield redevelopment because it often occurs in lower-income, urban communities impacted by economic despair and blight (Pippin, 2009; Lee 2011, Greenberg & Lewis, 2000; Gallagher & Jackson, 2008). Scholarship began to assess the goals of brownfield redevelopment and more frequently brought up the question of how to measure success (Lange, 2004; Pippin, 2009; Wernstedt, 2009). This began to broaden the goals of brownfield redevelopment to include the frameworks mentioned above.

From the early 21st century to the present time there has been an increasing emphasis in brownfield scholarship on critiquing the impacts of brownfield redevelopment on surrounding communities. This critique focuses on participation in brownfield redevelopment from local residential communities (Powers, 2000). The great majority of brownfields policy has focused on providing incentives for developers as opposed to community-focused development (Pippin, 2009). Promises by developers and local officials will not translate into beneficial outcomes, particularly if residents have little say in planning for the remediation and reuse of the site (Pippin, 2009). Questions arise of who is participating in the planning process, what makes brownfield redevelopment successful, and who are the beneficiaries of brownfield redevelopment? (Wernstedt, 2009). The need to create a more inclusive and accessible process that promotes authentic or genuine participation among residents and diverse stakeholders comes to the forefront of literature (Solitare, 2005). Scholarship on public participation is not a new or recent development, but applying this concept to brownfields is an increasingly predominant theme in brownfield literature. Brownfield literature addresses pre-requisites and baseline data that should be conducted and collected in order to have successful brownfield redevelopment based on a more diverse goal sets (Solitare, 2005; Wernstedt, 2010, Greenberg & Lewis, 2000).

**Impacts of Perceptions on Participation**

Scholarship on more general public participation and how perceptions impact participation is also a vital component to this study. Many articles note the benefits of public participation include reflecting public values in planning processes and decisions, addressing conflict among community stakeholders, and building trust (Beierle, 2000). Public participation can also be counter-productive and detrimental to collaboration within a community if it creates anger and mistrust among stakeholders (Innes & Booher, 2004). Often times legally required participation methods do not achieve genuine participation,
satisfy the public, or involve a broad spectrum of the public (Innes & Booher, 2004). Although there are many challenges to implementing collaborative participation, the consequences of not using these methods can be much more costly and detrimental (Innes and Booher, 2004). Scholarship analyzing the relationship between perceptions and participation in brownfield redevelopment is incredibly limited. Although many of the scholarly articles touch on topics and discussions involving perceptions, they do not deeply analyze the impact of perceptions. Perceptions play a strong role in barriers to public participation in the brownfield redevelopment process. Perceptions involve a person interpreting something they are observing or experiencing into something meaningful for them based on a previous experience (Pickens, 2005). What an individual perceives or interprets may be substantially different from reality, because it is about their personal interpretations of their life experiences (Pickens, 2005). Perceptions are significant because they impact the actions of individuals and entire communities. This study will explore the relationship and connections between perceptions and public participation.

**Filling in the Gaps: A Brownfield-Inspired Study in Carlisle, PA**

Carlisle, Pennsylvania is one of many brownfield-impacted communities that exist across the United States. Published literature since the beginning of the 21st century emphasizes the need for public participation in brownfield re-development processes. This study is based on the collection and analysis of perceptions from the stakeholders in Carlisle, with a focus on residents living in the neighborhood where two major brownfield sites are located. When looking at brownfield redevelopment through a lens of community revitalization, there are many questions to still be asked about the success of participation in planning processes that involve and impact such a diverse set of stakeholders within a community. As brownfield literature continues to discuss the progression of public participation with these sites, the impact of perceptions was left largely unaddressed. This is a very opportune time to assess the perceptions of residents, as well as other stakeholders, to express their ideas and visions of the current redevelopment projects for the Borough of Carlisle, and their relation to a broader urban redevelopment plan. The public stakeholders leading the Carlisle redevelopment process have expressed goals of incorporating community needs and engaging the community in the planning process through various public participation methods. In order to explore the connection between perceptions and public
participation among brownfield redevelopment, the following primary question was created: *What are the current stakeholder perceptions of the brownfield redevelopment in Carlisle, PA, and how do perceptions impact community engagement in public participation efforts?* 

Along with the primary question, more specific secondary questions were formed to guide the leading question. The secondary questions include:

1. *How do past experiences affect present stakeholder perceptions?*
2. *What are the initial community perceptions of brownfield redevelopment?*
3. *What opportunities are available for community members to engage in the brownfield redevelopment planning process?*
4. *Do the community perceptions, feelings of empowerment, and engagement in the redevelopment change as the project progresses?*

This case study analyzes the perceptions and success of addressing community revitalization through public participation in brownfield redevelopment as it is occurring within the community. When this research began the borough of Carlisle, Pennsylvania was in the early planning stages of these processes, which provided the opportunity to collect perceptions and experiences of stakeholders in Carlisle before the process is completed. This study is gathering very early data on community perceptions and initial efforts to facilitate participation among diverse stakeholders. The information contained in this study documents, analyzes, and has the potential to influence the future of public participation before the brownfield redevelopment is completed. Since Carlisle has multiple major brownfield properties, and the borough is in the process of creating a greater urban redevelopment plan, this community-based study is significant to the ongoing redevelopment processes in Carlisle. The completion of this case study culminated in the following findings: *The current perceptions of diverse community stakeholders based on their past and present experiences with community decision making and public participation have impacts on the engagement of stakeholders, particularly residents, in public participation opportunities for the brownfield redevelopment process Carlisle, PA. Therefore community history and current perceptions must be identified, communicated, and addressed in order to create productive public participation that will encourage sustainable brownfield redevelopment.*
Methodology

This is an in-depth case study of redevelopment in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, with a focus on one brownfield site in one section of town. This case study focuses on the former Carlisle Tire & Wheel factory. An in-depth case study highlights the specific story of the Carlisle community while also providing the opportunity to apply it to the broader topics of brownfield redevelopment in Pennsylvania, and throughout the United States. An intensive review of literature was compiled on brownfield remediation and redevelopment, public participation in planning process of brownfields, and the role that perceptions play in the success of public participation. Since this brownfield is surrounded by residential neighborhoods, and is included in a greater redevelopment plan, which intentionally incorporates public participation, literature on the above topics is vital to an in-depth analysis of this brownfield-impacted community.

This case study involved gathering information on local interactions, history, and perceptions from individuals at the grassroots level, as well as other stakeholders. This study was focused on local perceptions around a specific brownfield site. Creating connections and building trust with local residents was necessary in order to conduct in-depth interviews in the neighborhoods around the brownfield. This study completed an Institutional Review Board (IRB) process through Dickinson College and was exempt. Even though the study received exemption, a consent form was created for interviews and can be found in Appendix D. The consent form for this study was reviewed and signed for all formal interviews, and verbal consent was provided in informal interviews. Whenever possible a voice recorder was used, and if this was not an option informal notes were taken. In order to gather historic information on the brownfield sites, identify stakeholders, and understand the current perceptions within the community, both individual and partner interviews were conducted. Interview questions were created for different stakeholder groups. The question sets can be found in Appendix C.

Over a period of 7 months, from October 2012 to April 2013, field interviews were conducted by contacting key stakeholders in the community to perform informational interviews and gather qualitative data. Initially, this study utilized a snowball sampling method to gather a representative sample of the diverse community stakeholders impacted by the brownfield redevelopment. However, this sampling method did not result in access to a
diverse representation of community members. Therefore, a reassessment of key informants began in November. A directed sampling method was implemented to access a diverse sampling of community stakeholders. The need to reach varying socio-economic classes and races within stakeholder representation may have otherwise not been achieved within the allotted time for this study. Outreach was then initiated to grass-roots community organizations and active community members. Contacting specific community members resulted in connecting to a more diverse representation of stakeholders within a relatively small period of time. With the continued use of a directed sampling method, interviews were completed in April 2012 of the spring semester. Throughout the time that interviews were conducted they were all transcribed. The transcribed interviews were then analyzed by using a code analysis. Common themes throughout the transcriptions were identified using various colors. The themes that were identified and coded in the transcriptions included:

- Perceived Community Needs
- Role in Community/Stakeholder Type
- Knowledge Community Meeting Info
- Perceptions and Interactions of Diverse Stakeholders
- T&W Perceptions and Experiences/Future of the Site
- Community Engagement and Participation in Process
- Historical Information

Altogether 20 stakeholders were interviewed during the time period of this study. The interviews are both formal and informal, many of which are recorded and transcribed with the permission of the interviewee. Although pre-determined questions were prepared, the interviews were open-ended in order to provide the opportunity for additional questions to be asked and new topics discussed as they were brought up. This interview method also allowed for a deeper relationship and a level of trust to be created between the interviewees and myself. As trust was earned and the interviews felt increased levels of comfort, perceptions could be more successfully documented for this study.

The entities and individuals impacted by the redevelopment of this brownfield site can be organized into five main categories. These stakeholder categories include government-affiliated entities, non-governmental community organizations; private companies involved with redevelopment, residents, and former Tire & Wheel employees. The breakdown of the stakeholders interviewed (Figure 1), shows that the majority of interviewees were residents in Carlisle. Interviewing and attending meetings with
representatives from all or a portion of these stakeholder constituencies is critical to provide documentation of varying stakeholder perceptions and how they interact and impact each other.

![Distribution of Stakeholder Interviews](image)

**Figure 1. Pie Chart of Stakeholders interviewed**

In addition to conducting interviews, community meetings were utilized as a resource to gather information about perceptions through stakeholder interactions, group dynamics and discussions, and observe the implementation of public participation opportunities. Organized community meetings focused around multiple topics including Tire & Wheel brownfield redevelopment, the greater Carlisle area redevelopment plan, and neighborhood association meetings. In total 7 meetings were attended for this study and are documented in Table 1. The Table in figure three includes the name of the meeting, the location, and the number of people who attended the meeting. Notes were taken during these meetings, and more formal meetings were recorded in order to complete an in-depth analysis. The community meetings were organized by various stakeholders in the community during the time period of this study and provided key insight to engagement in community participation opportunities in Carlisle. Community meetings were analyzed and incorporated into this study with the same methods used for the stakeholder interviews. Therefore, the transcriptions or meeting minutes, taken by a community member or myself, were analyzed for common themes and color-coded accordingly.
Along with interviews, a continuous review of current events and local blogs and articles related to the case study was conducted to stay informed with local updates on the redevelopment. Furthermore, as visits are conducted visual observations of the brownfield site and surrounding neighborhoods were recorded and documented using photography in order to stay up to day with the conditions of the site. Mapping of the community stakeholders was achieved through the use of photography and Geographic Information Services (GIS) mapping. The GIS maps were created using ArcGIS and ArcCatalog. The Census data for Carlisle was also incorporated in this study from the Census website. This additional data provides context for understanding the neighborhoods surrounding the brownfield properties as well as the greater Carlisle community.

CASE STUDY: CARLISLE, PENNSYLVANIA

Carlisle in Context

Carlisle is the seat of Cumberland County, Pennsylvania and has a population of 18,862 (Borough, 2012). Although Carlisle has experienced about 4% growth in the past 10
years, this is currently being hindered by the recent closures of industry that had a long history in Carlisle. Two of the factories, Carlisle Tire and Wheel (CTW), as well as the International Automotive Corporation (IAC) known in the community as Masland, first opened up around 1910. These two sites, as well as another factory owned by Tyco, have all closed within the past 5 years (Borough, 2012). The Masland factory closed in 2008, followed by the Tyco plant in 2009, and the CTW factory in 2010. This has left about 50 acres of real estate unused and over 500 people recently unemployed (Borough, 2012). These recent developments within the community have lead to the facilitation of large planning and redevelopment projects by the Carlisle Borough to revitalize the urban core of Carlisle. The current state of this community is dictated by its history, which remains significant in the hearts and minds of community members.

**History of Carlisle**

Carlisle has a rich history, from the Civil War to industry, which still remains very significant to the residents of the Borough. Carlisle is just over 255 years old and has been the location of many historic events. This town has received confederate fire in the Civil War, hosted American Presidents, and became a renowned center for education (Elm Street, 2006). More recently, industrial development around downtown Carlisle impacted the surrounding neighborhoods, mainly on the western quadrant of town. As well as industry, the interstate highway system, impacts the history of development in Carlisle. The Borough of Carlisle is a regional transportation hub because it is located in-between Interstate 76 (Pennsylvania Turnpike) and Interstate 81 (Elm Street, 2006). Since Carlisle is also the seat of Cumberland County, there are many human services located within the Borough boundaries (Elm Street, 2006). Key institutions and destinations in the Borough include Dickinson College and Dickinson Law School, The U.S. Army War College, and Carlisle Automotive Events.

**Evolution of Industry in Carlisle**

Carlisle has been the location of many different types of industry since the early 1900s. Two of the oldest factory buildings in Carlisle were the former Masland and the Carlisle Tire and Wheel (CTW) factories. The CTW plant functioned as a tire tube and tire manufacturing operation from the early 1920s until 2010 (RE Invest, 2012). In 2010 the plant was shutdown and moved to a new location in Tennessee. The factory was also previously
known as Carlisle Tire and Rubber. Before the tire company acquired the 621 N. College Street property, this site has had a long history of various industrial uses. Some of the industrial operations that took place on the main 10 acre property date back to the 1800s and include silk, textile, carpet, clothing, shoe, bicycle, and paper box manufacturing (RE Invest, 2012). There are several other small properties that surround the factory and were historically used for industrial purposes including a machine shop and warehouse, tannery, and a silk ribbon-manufacturing mill (RE Invest). The Carlisle Tire & Wheel site expanded in the mid 1900s. This expansion closed off a portion of B Street as well as C Street, and the new factory development caused local families to leave their homes and relocate. The majority of the employment opportunities at the plant were blue-collar jobs for residents within Carlisle, as well as the surrounding areas.

The former Masland site is located on Carlisle Springs Rd. and was acquired by Carlisle Events in 2011. This property is about 48 acres, making it the largest of the three major brownfields in town (Ryan, 2012). Different industrial companies owned the factory and many people in the Carlisle area have knowledge of this history. This factory has been a major source of employment for Carlisle residents and the surrounding residential areas for many decades. Masland & Sons, a well-established carpet manufacturer from New Jersey, purchased the site in 1919 and expanded the property multiple times (Ryan, 2012). At one point the factory employed over 1,000 people (Ryan, 2012). In 1996 Lear Corp. acquired the property from Masland & Sons, and then IAC, a Michigan-based company, that made interior components for auto-manufacturers, bought the site from Lear (Ryan, 2012). The plant was closed by IAC in 2008 after failed Union talks in 2007 and a major decrease in auto-sales during the recession (Ryan, 2012). The factory’s workforce was about 630 in 2006 and decreased significantly to 152 employees by the time it closed (Ryan, 2012).

Along with these large industrial factories, there were also other industries scattered throughout Carlisle. One of the most well known historic industries in Carlisle is crystal production. In the mid 1900s there were crystal factories scattered throughout Carlisle that employed many Carlisle residents. Currently, Carlisle industry is mainly logistics, as the borough has become a well-trafficked transportation hub. Carlisle now functions as a key-trucking terminal to the major surrounding cities, with many terminals and warehouses in the outskirts of town.
RE Invest Solutions: A Public-Private Partnership

The Tire and Wheel plant was acquired by a private Brownfield development company, RE Invest Solutions, in November of 2011. RE-Invest Solutions is a real-estate investment firm with specialized skills in environmental assessment, remediation, and risk management. RE-Invest Solutions specializes in brownfield remediation to prepare sites for future redevelopment. Part of their business plan includes selling scrap metal and other valuable materials left at the sites they acquire to help make a profit. RE Invest is based out of New York State and has a connection to the community through the Director of Project Development and Risk Management, Brad Maurer, who is a Dickinson alumnus.

Since RE-Invest Solutions acquired the Carlisle Tire and Wheel site in November of 2011 they have been partnering with public stakeholders to implement the remediation and redevelopment process. Environmental assessments must be conducted for the factory site and these are occurring simultaneously with de-commissioning the building, which includes dismantling and remediating the factory site. Areas of the plant property where environmental remediation work will focus on the results of a Phase 1 environmental site assessment (RE Invest, 2012). Phase 1 includes a review of historical records, interviews with former plant employees and contractors, review of government files and database surveys, as well as a physical inspection of the plant (RE Invest, 2012). Demolition and remediation began in 2012 and will continue until sufficient data is collected to secure a release of liability under the PA DEP Act 2 land transfer program (RE Invest, 2012). The State Act 2 program provides “innocent landowners” and successors with the title of the property a covenant from the State not to sue for environmental issues, which are adequately identified and addressed (RE Invest, 2012). Phase 1 of the environmental assessment has been completed at the Carlisle Tire & Wheel site, but Phase 2 is still in progress (Gaito, 2013).
The planning stages of redevelopment for the former CTW site are occurring simultaneously with the environmental assessment, remediation, and demolition of the plant (RE Invest, 2012). The zoning for the site has already been altered to accommodate mixed-use development, which includes residential, commercial, and retail (Brad Maurer, 2012). The redevelopment plan will include continual dialogue with community stakeholders and an evaluation of government subsidies and funding opportunities (RE-Invest, 2012). RE-Invest Solutions is working with the Carlisle Borough, Redevelopment Authority of Cumberland County, and other public entities as a part of the larger Carlisle redevelopment plan, which includes three large-scale brownfield sites in Carlisle, along with other components of the community such as transportation, infrastructure, and recreation (Gaito, 2013).

The Carlisle Redevelopment Plan

Since the closing of three large factory sites mentioned above, two of the factories have been bought by private companies and have expressed interest in redevelopment. Since the acquisition of two out of the three major brownfield sites, the Borough of Carlisle and the Cumberland County Planning Commission created and sent out a Request for Qualifications (RFQ) in 2012. This RFQ was sent out to receive proposals for a professional consultant
group to facilitate the Carlisle Borough Redevelopment plan. The Borough stated the consultant group will develop a scope of work that integrates land use, transportation, and economic development planning to create a comprehensive urban redevelopment strategy for the northern part of the Borough (Borough, 2012). These largely based on the three former manufacturing operations, which were located very close to each other in the northwestern region of the Borough (Borough, 2012). Over the past decade Carlisle has prioritized efforts to rejuvenate itself through multiple projects including bringing businesses back into the downtown commercial district, beautification projects, and calming traffic with the help of a ‘road diet’. Reusing former industrial sites is also critical to their goal of revitalization (Ryan, 2012).

COMMUNITY DESCRIPTION

The Elm Street Plan

A specific project for community revitalization in the northern region of Carlisle was created in the mid-2000s. The Redevelopment Authority of Cumberland County and Downtown Neighborhood Connections submitted an Elm Street Report for Carlisle in 2006 to be reviewed by the PA Department of Community and Economic Development (Elm Street, 2006). The goal of the Elm Street plan is to provide strategies to sustain viable neighborhoods adjacent to the downtown business district (Elm Street, 2006). Since 2006 Carlisle has held the Elm Street Community designation, which allows for additional funding opportunities through grants for projects such as community development, land and buildings, housing, and infrastructure. Figure 3 shows how the neighborhoods around the Carlisle business district were broken up into four different quadrants.
This program stems from Pennsylvania’s Main Street Program, which provides grants to municipalities to help the downtown economic development of a community by establishing a local organization dedicated to downtown revitalization and downtown management by a full-time professional downtown coordinator. The Elm Street program provides grant funds for planning, technical assistance and physical improvement to residential and mixed use areas in proximity to central business districts (PADCED, 2012). Carlisle Eddy Kaplaniak is the current Carlisle Elm Street program coordinator. Both of these grant programs, as well as many others, have now been consolidated into the Keystone
Communities Program largely due to a decrease in state funding. After this plan was submitted, the Elm Street district was established in the Northern region of Carlisle. Figure 4 shows an image of the extent of the Elm street boundary. Both sides of the street boundaries are included in the Elm street district, and there are about 800 properties within its boundaries (Kaplania, 2012).

This project is significant to the redevelopment plan and public participation opportunities in Carlisle because the Elm Street Plan is an additional community entity and organizing body in neighborhoods close to the brownfield sites. This program initiated the creation of neighborhood associations, which are small groups of residents who meet to address community needs within their own neighborhoods, and also share and collaborate these needs on the larger town level. This project illustrates the varying levels of communities within Carlisle, from small neighborhoods, community organizations, the four quadrants, and the big picture of the entire town of Carlisle. The area of the Elm Street designation also signifies action to focus resources to north western and eastern portions of Carlisle.

Figure 4. Geographic Boundary of the Elm Street District (Kaplania, 2012)
Northwest Quadrant of Carlisle

Of the multiple different sections of town in Carlisle, the neighborhoods surrounding the old factory sites have experienced some of the biggest and most recent changes in this community. The Northwestern quadrant of Carlisle is the location of the large-scale brownfield sites and is the region of focus in this study (Figure 6). This region of the town is comprised of diverse land uses and community stakeholders, with demographics that are unique from the other quadrants or regions in Carlisle. This area is also considered more urbanized and contains the major brownfield sites in Carlisle; therefore it is more vulnerable to the impacts of these blighted areas (Elm Street, 2006). The Elm street plan identified this part of town as one that could benefit from additional resources. For the purpose of the Elm Street report the urban core of Carlisle is broken up into four main quadrants (Figure 3). The Elm Street report provides some property analysis of Carlisle using the 2000 census data. The results of this analysis are critical to better understanding the Northwest quadrant of Carlisle and the statistics represented in Figure 5, with number 4 on the X-axis representing the northwest quadrant. The Northwest quadrant has the most housing development, about 1030 housing units, which is almost a half of the housing units in Carlisle (Elm Street, 2006). Of these housing units, more then 700 of them are rentals, which is over half of the available housing in this quadrant (Elm Street, 2006). Furthermore, owners occupy only about 18% of the housing, and 12% of the units are vacant.

![Distribution of Housing Units](image)

Figure 5. Distribution of housing demographics analysis from the Elm Street Plan
These housing demographics provide the necessary evidence to gauge the socio-economic status of residents in the Northwest region. The average rent in the Northwest region is $300.00, the lowest of the four quadrants reviewed in the Elm Street plan. Furthermore, the average home value, average per-capita income, and average household income are the lowest in the Northwest when comparing the four quadrants. Using the statistical analysis of 2000 census data provided by the 2006 Elm Street plan, it is evident that the Northwest quadrant of Carlisle is on average is experiencing a lower socio-economic well-being than the other three quadrants. As depicted in this Carlisle neighborhood, many brownfields across the US are in the poorest neighborhoods of once vibrant industrial regions, in areas associated with dilapidated infrastructure, high unemployment, and lower property values (Solitaire, 2012). The demographics from the US census data and the Elm Street study help to portray the state of the Northwest quadrant, and how it compares to the other neighborhoods surrounding the Carlisle business district. It is important to note that the US Census data gathered and analyzed for this demographic information is from 2000. This was collected before any of the factories had closed down, although all of them had been experiencing economic difficulties for some time. Therefore, this specific area of Carlisle has been experiencing increasing economic difficulties for over a decade. Along with unemployment from the former factories, this community faces a series of unique challenges involving race, class, and crime. Furthermore, abandoned factories and vacant areas in the community are associated with increasing neighborhood challenges within a community. With a concentration of lower socio-economic neighborhoods that are located in the northwest quadrant, and a multitude of varying community needs, there are important connections to be made between residents and other stakeholders.

**Identifying Community Stakeholders**

Since the northwest quadrant has already been established as an area of Carlisle that can benefit from community revitalization efforts by the Elm Street Plan, it is logical to continue utilizing this framework in the brownfield redevelopment process. In order to address the framework of community revitalization and public participation in brownfield redevelopment a diverse representation of community stakeholders needs to be involved in order to collaborate in participation efforts. Stakeholders identified in the Carlisle community each play different roles that can facilitate the success of brownfield redevelopment. The
main stakeholder categories in Carlisle brownfield redevelopment for the former Tire & Wheel factory include government-affiliated entities, non-governmental community organizations; private companies involved with redevelopment, residents, and former Tire & Wheel employees. These 5 categories were created to identify stakeholders and their role in this project.

The stakeholders identified in this brownfield-impacted community represent a variety of different interests and priorities. Public stakeholders include the Borough of Carlisle, Cumberland County Planning Commission, Redevelopment Authority, and the Elm Street Project. Community-based organizations include Carlisle West Side Neighbors, Religious groups, and other community organizations. Stakeholders that function as private entities include RE Invest solutions, and Dickinson College. Other stakeholders include local residents and former employees of the factory. At one time many Carlisle residents worked at Tire & Wheel, but recent employees estimate that less than a quarter of employees over the last few decades were residents of the Borough, and the rest came from surrounding towns. Now that the opportunity has been created to redevelop former industrial sites, all of these entities can effect and be affected by this process. The actions of all the aforementioned stakeholders can facilitate or impede the participation process for brownfield redevelopment. This study focuses in particular on the inclusion of community stakeholders at the grassroots level and how that is impacted by other stakeholder entities.

Within the West Side neighborhood of Carlisle there are many grassroots level community organizations that residents support and participate in. This neighborhood is the location for many service organizations and community spaces including Carlisle CARES, Hope Station, the Project Share Farm Stand, Sadler Health Care, the YWCA, and the Stewart Community Center. Along with these non-profits, there are multiple active churches in the neighborhood including Shiloh Baptist Church and the Quaker Meetinghouse. Some of these stakeholders can be located on the map in Figure 6. Many of these places are venues for community organization and participation. These organizations are stakeholders for the future of Carlisle redevelopment and it is important to understand their physical relationship to the industrial sites and other stakeholders within the greater Carlisle borough.

The map creates a visual of the relationships between community stakeholders and their physical relationship with the former Carlisle Tire and Wheel factory. Google Earth
resources were imported as a base map for the borough and then each location of significance for the Carlisle community was tagged and labeled. As can be seen from the map provided, there are many community services are in the northwest quadrant. However, a key player in the brownfield redevelopment planning, the Carlisle Borough, along with other government buildings, are located in the southern end of the Carlisle, on the other side of the train tracks and south of High street. There is a distinct physical separation between the northwest quadrant and the community stakeholders most immediately and directly impacted by the brownfield redevelopment, and the public stakeholders that hold key responsibilities in this process.

Within the Borough of Carlisle there are many levels of community that must be considered and integrated in order to understand community stakeholders, interactions, and public participation. Immediately around the Tire and Wheel factory there are the adjacent residential properties. Then there are larger quadrants of Carlisle with defined neighborhoods, including the West Side neighborhood, which is the location of the CTW and Masland brownfield sites. The factory sites affect different sections of the Carlisle community in varying degrees. The stakeholders who feel the most direct impact are community members in the most immediate area. This includes residents, neighborhoods, community organizations, and businesses directly adjacent to the sites. The impact will then affect the larger West Side neighborhoods that encompass the factories, and finally the borough of Carlisle as the broadest level of community.
ANALYSIS OF PERCEPTIONS AND PARTICIPATION

Triangle Relationship of Perceptions

There are many perceptions that exist among stakeholders of brownfield-impacted communities, which are significant to the potential to incorporate community revitalization in these processes. Perceptions are formed by past experiences, and therefore are not necessarily reality. The utilization and purpose of perceptions is not their ability to depict the accuracy of past interactions, but how individuals and communities interpret their experiences to be
significant to them. In Carlisle, the perceptions of three key variables were found to be most important to the Tire & Wheel brownfield site. The information from stakeholder interviews and community meetings lead to three main categories of perceptions: stakeholder perceptions of the Tire & Wheel brownfield site, stakeholders perceptions of each other, and stakeholders perceptions of public participation. All of these perceptions are connected and related to each other, which is why they are formed together in a triangle of perceptions. None of these perceptions are working individually or exclusive of the others in the triangle, but are acting in conjunction with each other. Figure 7 depicts the visual organization of the three main categories of perceptions discussed and analyzed in this study.

![Figure 7. Triangle of the Three Main Categories of Perceptions](image)

**Carlisle Tire & Wheel Brownfield History**

This brownfield site is located in the middle of a residential neighborhood since the early 1900s. The long history between this site and the surrounding area has created a series of historic interactions between the residents and the factory. This site has provided both benefits and negative consequences for the neighborhoods and communities around it for over a century. It is well known as a place of employment for hundreds and at one time over a thousand people. There are many memories and associations to this property as a place for working-class employment. Both of the factories in the immediate neighborhood, the Tire & Wheel and Masland, were some of the most well known employers in the area (Anonymous, Palm). Multiple residents described the memory of seeing Tire & Wheel employees walking home from work at the end of their shifts (Weirich, Hodge). They were covered in soot, “
(because) of the blackness of the tire, you didn’t even know whom the people were when they came home” (Hodge). There is a long history of this factory being a source of pollution to the community. “The lady across the street would put her clothes out (to dry), and then they’d be black by the end of the day and she would have to wash them again” (Weirich). One resident expressed their neighborhood, which is impacted by both of these residential factories, as very carcinogenic (Weirich). The pollution emitted from this factory was a daily occurrence that the residents had no control over. The residents surrounding this former factory lived with the pollution emitted from the smokestacks for decades. Within the factory employees were aware that they were using very powerful chemicals on a daily basis (Mitchell). Former employees expressed the idea of now knowing how the chemicals may have impacted their co-workers and if their job was detrimental to the their lifespan (Mitchell). Throughout the lifetime of the factory the community members did not feel they had a voice or power to change the environmental conditions they were being subjected to (Anonymous, Hodges, Weirich, Reed).

This factory was viewed as an entity that did not allow for public participation or input. The neighborhoods around the factory were oppressed by this pollution source and did not perceive that communicating their needs or desires for the quality of the environment in their own backyards to be improved. Both residents and former employees described the factory as an environmental and health concern when it was still operating, and also after its closure (Landis). At a West Side Neighbors community meeting in the Stewart Community center, some residents expressed concerns of how the factories previous emissions and current pollution as a brownfield site was impacting the health of their children. During this conversation, a woman from the neighborhood spoke up and said, “We have lived with it (the Tire & Wheel) for 50 years, and at that point we couldn’t do anything about it. Had we been able to change it then we wouldn’t have had that industry in there, but it wasn’t up to us, we didn’t have enough money”. This resident expresses the perception that many residents share in this neighborhood. This statement includes the perception that those with money make the decisions for the community, and those without money do not make decisions.

Another historic interaction between local residents and the Tire & Wheel factory that is brought up by residents is the expansion of the property and subsequent relocation of local families. The Tire & Wheel factory expanded over sections of B and C Street, which used to
run through the properties, segmenting the factory (Palm, Hodges, Speed). The residents perceive this as a decision made by the factory owners, and it did not involve or engage the surrounding neighborhoods. The expansion of the factory closed segments of both B and C Street, which impacted the residents that had to relocate as well as the traffic patterns of the entire community. This is a case where the factories needs and interests were exercised seemingly without consideration of the residents. A local resident who grew up in Carlisle, Mr. Speed, explained that his family lived in a row house on B Street when he was growing up. The factory owners gave his family notice in 1963 that they were being displaced due to factory expansion and they have one month to move out of their home. This notice was given to all the other families in that segment of B Street as well. Their properties then became part of the factory. As described by residents who grew up in Carlisle during this time period, there was no option or choice for the residents who were being displaced.

Although the negative impacts of the factory are apparent to the residents living in the northwest quadrant, there are also benefits of the factory from stakeholder perspectives. The original owners of the factory, the Warell family, and the role that the factory played in the community was looked highly upon by those who can remember or experienced the successful times of the business. The Warell’s were known for hosting many events for the employees to be which provided entertainment for the local community (Speed). “Every time they opened a new section of the plant, they had a big party for all of the employees” (Speed). It seemed to facilitate a lot of social community events including sandlot baseball teams, bowling events, and picnics in Hershey, PA. (Speed, Mentzner). There were a lot of community activities to participate in throughout the 1900s. The factory owners provided entertainment and social opportunities for families and community members who were associated with the factory through employment. The factory was a source of community integration and interactions that employees were given the opportunity to benefit from for many years.

**The Shutdown**

When the Tire & Wheel factory closed down one resident described the impact on community members with the old phrase of ‘Marry Go Sorry’, which means there are coinciding feelings of happiness and sadness. Multiple residents expressed the sentiment that working class community members viewed the Tire & Wheel factory as an important source
of job security. There was a common sense of pride and dedication associated with Tire & Wheel employment that was shared by the employees this company (Mentzner). Over the years residents have observed a very significant loss in manufacturing jobs that used to be available. “Although Tire & Rubber puffed black soot, they still employed a number of people, and we depended on that”. One resident explained that the older generation has a greater sense of mixed feelings about the recent factory closing than the younger generation, they will move on (Mitchell). It is a difficult adjustment for older generations of employees because they have been working at this factory for so long, and now they have to look for new employment (Mitchell). Mitchell, a resident and former employee described the current community conditions as follows; “We need something that is going to get the morale back up, everyone’s morale is shaking from that place closing down”.

There are strong emotional ties for former employees of the factory, and the population of community members whose employment was directly impacted, harbor unique barriers to public participation. Former employee, Ms. Mentzner, states that many former employees feel as though “That phase of their lives is over”. The visual demolition of the factory is emotional for people to see, the rubble of property that used to be their source of employment (Mentzner). This included the negative consequences of unemployment within the area, as well as a fear of a large blighted property. The negative associations of abandoned buildings among residents in the community are the fear of what blight attracts including crime (Palm). One resident referred to the broken window theory when expressing her concerns related to a vacant factory sitting in the middle of the neighborhood. Explaining the idea that the appearance and quality of life of a whole neighborhood could be brought down. It only takes one broken window to be left unfixed. The presence of blight could lead to an unmaintained community.

**Perceptions of Diverse Stakeholders**

Among community members there are many perceptions placed on varying entities including organizations and groups of people. The historic interactions between stakeholders have led people to interpret their experiences based on a series of common and reoccurring variables. The impact of identified perceptions among stakeholders is apparent in subsequent stakeholder interactions. Understanding these perceptions sheds light to on the feasibility of addressing community needs identified at the grass-roots level.
Race & Class

In the process of interviewing local stakeholders for this study it became evident that the community socializing and interactions were often separated by race. One resident described the northwest quadrant as a more racially diverse area then the rest of Carlisle. This diversity of race as well as class has lead to unique community dynamics and perceptions that are not as prevalent in the other quadrants of Carlisle. Adult residents in the community, many of whom were raised in Carlisle, remember the history of racial segregation and tension that held a strong presence in the Carlisle community. Not only is race a tension and conflict of the past, many community members state that it continues to impact the community presently (Anonymous, Reed). The community itself seems to be both physically and social segregated by race. As one resident described it, there have been areas in the community that are traditionally known as the black neighborhoods.

Although the Carlisle public schools were integrated by the 1960s, there was still geographic segregation between race and class. It is perceived by residents that this geographic separation continues today because of subsidized housing. The residential separation by race and class, which is described by many residents who were interviewed, also permeates through community organizations such as religious spaces, non-profit organizations, neighborhood associations, and other groups. As one couple described it, “The black community took care of the black community, and the white community took care of the white. That’s the way it was. We took care of our part, and they took care of theirs. Now we don’t really take care of our part, to be truthful”. This is reflected in the various religious groups in Carlisle, which are predominately racially organized, and the ministers of their congregations do not interact or often cross over racial lines. “So when your churches are that way, its no surprise that your communities are that way too”. Although many African American residents described the continued racial separation in the community, Caucasian residents often did not discuss a racial divide. However, at community meetings racial tension was sometimes brought up as a barrier to community projects, such as a neighborhood clean up event. A racially charged interaction was directed at Dickinson students who were participating in the event. Generally, residents have observed that the younger generations are integrated more within race, class, and cultural designations then the generations before them.
Town-Gown Perceptions

There is also a juxtaposition of an institutional entity perceived as a privileged class, which is Dickinson College, and a concentration of low-income population in the Carlisle community. As one resident described, the Hope Station neighborhood and subsidized housing have a higher incidence of single female head of household, and other family structures that divide one wage among multiple family members. The presence of Dickinson has an impact on the history, present, and future of these neighborhoods. As one resident described it, for better or worse, Dickinson College is also located in this quadrant of Carlisle. The area that is now Dickinson property was previously residential neighborhoods. The College also creates a separation in the neighborhood according to the perceptions of many residents in the northwest quadrant. In the Hope Station area and other neighborhoods in the northwest quadrant there is not a lot of higher education, while Dickinson College students anticipate high paying jobs because they receive college degrees. Comments were made at multiple community meetings about the perceived disconnect between Dickinson students and the surrounding communities. Many residents observe that the majority of students seem to be unaware of their surroundings outside of the campus perimeter. This is a contentious topic for local residents and other stakeholders as well. However, many community organizations provided positive feedback on their interactions with Dickinson students.

Renters v. Homeowners

In many interviews and community meetings perceptions of residents based on their housing was discussed. Negative changes that community members observe in their neighborhoods are often attributed to renters and residents who do not own their properties. The high amount of rental properties has created significant difficulties from the existence of absentee landlords. There is a common perception that neighborhoods in this area have a high occurrence of landlords who do not reside in the local neighborhoods. This perceived lack of ownership and pride in the community has created a dynamic of resentment. One resident states, “because you’re not invested in the neighborhood, therefore they are not invested in their properties”. Another conflict within the community is the judgment of people who were raised in Carlisle and have lived in the community for multiple decades. In other words, there is a separation between people who have ‘roots’ or a family history here,
and those that do not. Those who have not grown up here cannot understand the community because they do not know the significance of history here. This separation includes placing blame on the renters or new residents for the changes in the community, especially crime related concerns.

**Neighborhood Crime**

There is an acute awareness of crime in this quadrant of the borough among the residents of these neighborhoods. There is a perception of crime and violence associated with the northwestern quadrant and the residents of this area are very aware of this. Many feel that the neighborhoods in this area still hold an impression or reputation of an unsafe area with drug activity and other crime. Within the town local residents still refer to this area of Carlisle as ‘Carlem’. While the current state of criminal activity in this area is up for debate among residents, most would agree that drug activity and other crimes have existed in the community in the past. Blame is placed on renters in the area who are also viewed as a lower socio-economic class. One resident expressed the following viewpoint; “One of the reasons why the drug traffic was so prolific at one point in time in this neighborhood was money, it brought in money”. These community perceptions are provided as the reasoning for crime related activities.

Some neighborhood groups have been motivated to form because of these community concerns. The only consistently active neighborhood association in the northwestern quadrant is ABC Crime Watch group, which was started by local residents. This community group meets at the police station in the western quadrant. They have formed a relationship with the local police in an attempt to serve as watchdogs for the community and cut down on crime in their neighborhood. A police officer present at the ABC meeting stated he felt that drug related crime has decreased, although there were a few shootings in 2012 in the area. There continues to be interest among active residents who are a part of neighborhood organizations to decrease crime and create safer neighborhoods.

**Perceptions of Public Participation**

**Public Participation: What’s the Point?**

When interviewed, many residents in the northwest neighborhoods have expressed interest in the brownfield redevelopment and the future of the former Tire & Wheel property. Although many had their own thoughts and interests to share, there is a significant portion of
residents who did not feel motivated to engage in public participation opportunities. Many felt that their individual contribution would not be significant enough to make a difference. One resident stated, “We are just the people in the neighborhood, we don’t have any clout”. Many active residents echoed similar statements expressing this sentiment. Another resident explained, “It is hard to believe that we as people living in this neighborhood will have an impact of what goes on in these spaces. Whoever owns these spaces is going to decide. I don’t think they care whose house it will affect. Because when Masland and Tire & Wheel was going full bloom, they didn’t care that the soot and so forth from the smoke stacks blew right over this area” (Reed).

Government, institutional, and business stakeholders are perceived by grass-roots level community members as having a long history of hegemony within the Carlisle community. This is a dominant perception among residents and other community stakeholders in the northwestern quadrant. Big industries and institutions are seen as the main influences behind community planning and decision-making that impact residents. It is the common perception that money dictates whose interests are heard and implemented at the government policy level. Residents and other community stakeholders often refer to stakeholders who are involved at the planning and decision making level collectively as ‘they’. Many local residents interviewed for this study do not perceive a significant difference between them because they view them as using the same top-down methods and strategies in various community decisions, whether it is brownfield redevelopment or something else.

**Perceptions of Marketing and Outreach for Public Participation**

The Sentinel, which is the local newspaper, is a very common source for community information. The majority of residents interviewed stated that they read the newspaper and were knowledgeable about opportunities for participation and community meetings for redevelopment through this local media source. A few also mentioned talking about it with their personal social circles including local churches, such as the Shiloh Baptist Church. Within the sampling of residents interviewed most were aware of the opportunities to participate. Active community members and leaders also conduct advertising and outreach to their neighbors and constituents for various community meetings. Pastor Keys, the Reverend of the Shiloh Baptist Community church announced community meetings when he was
aware of them and encouraged members of his congregation to attend. Brenda Landis, a local resident, distributed fliers to hundreds of residents in the neighborhood directly around the factory site. She also advertised the events and blog posts describing the events on her blog site: http://carlislewestside.wordpress.com/. Along with the blog, the redevelopment consultant group created a facebook page and website for community members to access https://www.facebook.com/CarlislePlan and http://carlisleplan.com/. This only includes the known sources of outreach and advertising for the spectrum of community meetings that have occurred in the past 7 months.

Although there were multiple ways for information to reach residents, a number of residents generally felt largely left in the dark when it came to the process of remediation and redevelopment of the Tire & Wheel site. Many had questions and curiosities without the knowledge of where to direct them. There was a perception that the private company and public stakeholders were not communicating directly or being transparent with the residential neighborhood. However, as the process continued and the consultant group was hired to facilitate the planning process and organize public participation there was wide spread marketing and communication with a variety of stakeholders. The disconnect between an attendance of a diverse set of residents and public participation seemed to occur later on when it actually came time to attend and engage in the community meetings.

**RE-Invest Solutions Community Meetings**

Two meetings were held in the summer time to provide communication between the residents in the Tire & Wheel neighborhood and the new owner, RE-Invest Solutions. Residents who took the initiative to check the company’s website were disappointed by a lack of updated information for months at a time (Weirich, Landis). Once the announcement of the new private ownership of the Tire & Wheel, there was miscommunication between residents and the stakeholders with the knowledge of how this information would be relayed to the surrounding neighborhoods. The Elm Street manager, Eddy Kaplaniak, initiated the community meeting and Landis expressed interest and assistance in advertising in her neighborhood. Community meetings to be held by RE Invest were cancelled and plans were changed, which began to create negative perceptions of the company from residents and local community stakeholders. However, eventually two separate community meetings have been held at the Stewart Community Center to discuss the redevelopment of the Carlisle Tire and
Wheel site (Landis, 2012). Brenda Landis, who is an active resident of the Carlisle West Side Neighborhood, provided insight into these community meetings. There was a significant turn out at both of the meetings. The first one included about 70 community members in an overflowing room, and the second had about 90 community residents. In contrast, according to local knowledge, the new owner of the former Masland factory, Carlisle Events, has not taken any initiative to include the surrounding neighborhoods in the redevelopment process. There have been no community meetings to involve the surrounding neighborhoods or any outreach to communicate with Carlisle residents. Even the residents who attended this meeting still perceived the community meetings as insignificant attempts to deeply involve the residents in the planning and decision making process of the brownfield redevelopment. Many residents perceived these community meetings to be informational sessions for the local residents, and not so much an equal discussion or genuine consideration of the people’s interests. Although multiple residents voiced their questions and ideas at this meeting, the belief that local interests and needs will be implemented in the redevelopment is not something they feel confident in.

**Neighborhood Meetings**

These were smaller more intimate settings that involved predominately residents and maybe one other stakeholder, such as Eddy Kaplaniak from the Elm Street Program or the Carlisle Police. Attending these meetings assisted in understanding the community dynamics of who is present in various community spaces. Within neighborhood associations that are formally organized there is a lack of diverse class and race representation from the various Carlisle neighborhoods. These organizations are impacted by community tensions and perceptions within the community. They were created to encourage community revitalization, but they have not been able to bridge community perceptions and divides, and many are struggling to sustain participation. At a neighborhood associations committee meeting, there was a strong perception that the same residents always are the ones participating in various community groups. Those in this circle of people do not want to take on any more responsibilities and are feeling burnt out and overbooked. A community representative stated, “That’s one of the biggest things in Carlisle, is that you see the same circle. You see the same people coming and going. Once your seen as a shaker and mover your in it”. There is a fairly consistent group of active residents to pick from if you want to
engage someone from the local community. Even people who do participate and attend still perceive that their input and engagement will not come to fruition. Therefore, in many participatory events the same connections are made with the same residents and other active stakeholders. Since the same residents are consistently tapped into as a resource for community engagement, there is a lot of evidence of burnout among active community members.

**Dickinson Carlisle Project Meetings**

During the beginning of the redevelopment plan, Dickinson also began holding meetings to discuss a related project involving the creation of a sustainable future for the town of Carlisle, inspired by David Orr’s Oberlin Project in Ohio. All together there were three meetings that invited stakeholders within the Carlisle community. These meetings were most accessible for the Dickinson community, but a lot of outreach was done to active community members and stakeholders to represent a diverse set of interests within Carlisle. Although this project is not solely about the redevelopment plan or the brownfield sites, it encompassed both of these processes. Many of the stakeholders included in this discussion overlap from the Carlisle redevelopment process as well. Through brainstorming sessions many comments and suggestions were made, with the other planning projects in mind. These meetings provided an opportunity to see the varying interests and priorities among stakeholders, as well as the perceptions of community leaders and active members within various community and government organizations. Among multiple stakeholder groups the perceptions of apathy was expressed as a significant barrier to participation at the grassroots level. This perspective was echoed from the voices of multiple public officials and stakeholders. This provided insight that some local public stakeholders equate a lack of participation to apathy, and not as aware of other possible constraints or limitations to public participation.

**Redevelopment Meetings**

There was a Redevelopment kick-off meeting in Borough Hall to introduce the greater Carlisle redevelopment plan and the consulting group that would be working on the planning and visioning for the future of the brownfield sites in Carlisle as well as other aspects of community planning. At this meeting it was announced that a four-day workshop series would take place to facilitate participation among residents and various stakeholders in
the Carlisle Community. The workshop included open house forums as well as topic specific meetings. The workshops were held at the expo center, which is located at the far end of the Northwest quadrant, to allow for larger groups to comfortably participate. This is also where the consultant team set up the design studio to create visuals of the plans as they brainstormed (Gaito). Residents who participated in the meeting felt that there was a larger representation of residents from the other quadrants of Carlisle than the northwestern quadrant. This perspective is reflected in the image created by the consultant team showing the locations where participants are from in Figure 8. Residents who initially had expressed interest in attending did not follow through with their intentions. Many who did not attend cited reasons that reiterate perceptions described earlier.
Redevelopment Plan from Consultant Group

At the end of the four-day workshop organized by the consultant team Stromberg/Garrigan and Associates, the group proposed a draft plan for the future redevelopment of Carlisle. Figure 9 is a picture of the draft plan for the former Tire & Wheel factory. The visioning and planning process for this site, according to the research done by the consulting team and input from residents and other local stakeholders, has resulted in the following decisions. The future plan shows retail buildings including a grocery store. The
The rest of the site is designated as housing as well as green space. Visions for the two other brownfield properties were also presented in the conclusion of the workshop. On May 20\textsuperscript{th}, 2013, the Consultant team will present their proposed plans for redevelopment and provide opportunity for public comment at the Expo center. This event will occur after this study is complete.

![Figure 9. Image of draft plan for the future redevelopment of the Tire & Wheel site (Landis).](image)

**Envisioning the Future: Perceptions of Community Needs**

When asked about individual and personal thoughts and ideas for the future of this brownfield space, the dominant initial response from residents was to repeated rumors and ideas that had been presented by local news, media, or interactions with representatives from RE-Invest Solutions. Almost every resident required further probing before they began to share their own personal ideas separate from what they had read or heard from some other source. When people began to talk about what changes would benefit or impact them, there were many common threads among the residents. Residential stakeholders at the vast majority of meetings and interviews expressed interest in opening the streets that had been closed by the factory back up (West Side Neighbors). This is a great example of how local knowledge can reflect shared vision within the community. This is one residential interest that was reflected in the visioning plan created by the consultant team. Many residents
remember when the streets used to be open and how they were lined with residential housing. There was a lot of concern about what the impacts would be of non-residential development, including environmental pollution, lighting, traffic, etc.

**Uplifting Current Economic Conditions**

Both residents, as well as public and private stakeholders placed an emphasis on needing to increase the tax base with this property. Another common economic need was employment for residents that pay a decent wage and includes benefits. Not only has unemployment been a challenge within the community, but also inconsistency in available programming for low-income neighborhoods. “Hope station has had predecessors that have came and went, and the neighborhood is a little disillusioned”. Pitt Street and other neighborhoods in the northwest quadrant are included in this perception. A lot of community organizations have been struggling for funding and their programming has been impacted by a lack of resources. Non-profits are competing for the same funding and not able to continue their usual programming, while other organizations like churches are running into debt. During this time period many community organizations are experiencing a decrease in funding and are particularly constrained by economic variables.

**Community Facilities**

One community need and interest that was often discussed by residents was the need for additional community spaces to address dominant needs among adults and youth. A common need that was voiced among residents is for a health facility in the area. Due to a lack of health insurance and a large elderly population in the community the interest in more local health facilities was also a common theme throughout interviews and meetings. Many stakeholders in the community have discussed the overwhelming demand on Sadler Health Center, which is a health clinic for uninsured community members. There is a dominant perception among the community that local health facilities would be utilized by the surrounding neighborhoods and provided needed resources for many residents.

In individual interviews and community meetings many people voiced the concern for the youth of the community. The need for more activities and free spaces was repeated time and time again. Many residents said that children in the neighborhood are lacking things they can get involved in before and after school in their local neighborhoods. A place to provide recreational facilities for youth as well as entertainment was suggested by multiple
residents. Without more engagement of youth in the neighborhood there is a fear that the young generation will turn to selling drugs and other illegal activities. Residents have many ideas of how to increase quality of life for everyday activities and create safer environments within their neighborhood. Many residents agreed that community spaces where there are role models for youth and guidance from adults would be very beneficial for the community.

**Environmental and Health Concerns**

Residents did not often discuss overall, environmental pollution and health concerns. However, there are some incidents where residents were directly impacted and environmental pollution and health concerns would be vocalized. One of the first incidences that residents shared was the story of a fire in the other factory, Masland, over the summer months (Hodge, Weirich). Many residents had ash and fire debris in their yards, and many knew of others in the community whose houses were in danger of the fire. Some residents near the Tire & Wheel factory expressed the concern of that happening at this factory.

Another environmental topic that was brought up a number of times was contemplating the amount of contamination that would be found at the Tire & Wheel site. Many people talk about the chemicals used in the factory and express belief that there are lots of chemicals underground (West Side Neighbors). Many heard rumors and suspected that more contamination than previously anticipated would be found in the remediation process. The smokestacks, which are one of the few parts of the structure, which are left still standing, are looked upon with suspicion. Many suspect they are filled with contamination (West Side Neighbors). Residents express suspicion and concern as to how clean the site will be and what level it will be cleaned up to. One resident declared at the West Side neighbors meeting, “They will never get it all out”.

The stages of remediation are very visual for the residents who can see the site from the windows of their houses or drive by the property everyday. Visual observations play a big role in their perceptions of the site along with their past experiences and knowledge related to the factory as they interpret the current remediation process. Some have expressed concern of debris escaping from the property and being blown around town. One resident took action to pick up bags of debris, which has blown into his area of the neighborhood (West Side Neighbors). Residents wonder if anyone is monitoring debris leaving the site. Recently a neighbor has expressed concern that particulate matter has been getting into their home since
demolition and did not know who to contact about it (Landis). This is where community leaders can play a role. When there is a lack of clear communication or transparency between residents and public stakeholders, community leaders can connect the two entities.

CONCLUSIONS

Pre-requisites to Public Participation

The residential location of the former Tire & Wheel factory allows for an intimate relationship between the past, present, and future of this brownfield property. The diverse stakeholders within the Carlisle community have formed many perceptions overtime related to this brownfield site, which are both directly and indirectly connected to their perceptions of other stakeholders in their community, and public participation processes. Common perceptions that were discovered in this study are based on community tensions that are deeply rooted within the history of Carlisle. These tensions include feelings of distrust among stakeholders, separation of community based on race and class, crime and violence being blamed on new residents and renters, and an unbalance of power dynamics in community decision making.

Many of the perceptions documented can be identified as barriers to engagement in public participation from local residents. Lack of awareness or opportunities to participate were not nearly as prevalent among residents as perceptions impacting the decisions to disengage from participation. Perceptions had been formed based on interactions with stakeholders and previous opportunities to participate in community decisions. In order to improve public participation as a goal for community revitalization in Carlisle brownfield redevelopment, there needs to be an understanding of what influences public participation. Figure 10 represents the relationship of variables within a community that impact the outcome of public participation. This study highlights how the historic experiences within communities influence the perceptions of stakeholders, mainly at the grassroots level, and then dictates the success of participation in meeting the needs of Carlisle and serving as a catalyst for community revitalization. This process of causes and outcomes must be understood within the specific Carlisle context and then acted upon in public participation methods. Taking the time to understand the significance of perceptions in Carlisle, and
communicating the observation and acknowledgement of common perceptions should be a pre-requisite to the implementation of public participation.

Figure 10. Diagram of relationship between community variables and outcome of participation

Acknowledging History: Race, Class, & Empowerment

A pattern of oppression, exclusion, and inauthentic participation have been repeated, however unintentional throughout the lifetime of this community. There are many community interactions, documents, and information to provide evidence of a lack of acknowledgement of the current state of community and the perceptions associated with the composition of the neighborhoods. A key consideration to make when analyzing the Carlisle community, with a particular emphasis on the west side neighborhood, is spaces of race and socio-economic status. This study has found that minorities and lower socio-economic residents are largely under-represented, if at all, in certain community groups and organizations. The places and spaces within the Carlisle community for the diverse residents living within the borough boundaries are largely divided.

While the upper class white residents participate in neighborhood associations, the Elm Street Plan, and downtown neighborhood connections, minorities and lower-class residents are not present. Currently, race and class largely separate the community participation in Carlisle. In order for a community to progress from the past and build a stronger connection and safe inclusive spaces, perceptions that are common among community and needs that are not being address must be communicated. By establishing diverse representation of community residents to opportunities for public participation, people who have been historically excluded can be empowered. The interviews conducted in this study also provide evidence of the impact of story telling as a method of empowerment, education, and raising awareness to promote public participation from residents. Taking the time to facilitate communication of current community perceptions will provide many
benefits to brownfield redevelopment. Perceptions involving race and class in Carlisle should be communicated and discussed with truth, honesty, and a straightforward delivery in order to gain the respect and trust of local residents.

The Role of Local Leaders

Identifying community leaders who can serve as representatives in the community is key to successful public participation. Local leaders can serve as ambassadors and communicators of common perceptions among their unique groups and neighborhoods. Even if an increasingly diverse sampling of residents engages in participation, there will still be a need for overarching representation. As one local leader put it, there are some people who are not going to stand up and speak in this community. However, they can make their ideas known to others who will stand up and represent them, and that is the kind of role I am playing (Pastor Keys). Leaders in the community who are often representatives of community organizations and neighborhood associations are already undertaking this act of representing community voices. These leaders play an important role to stand in for individuals, whose perceptions, as well as other variables, prevent them from engaging in the participation opportunities for brownfield redevelopment.

A Progression of Perceptions

The perceptions that serve as barriers in the Carlisle community have a lot of room and potential for growth in the future of redevelopment, public participation in planning, and other aspects of community decision-making. The perceptions that exist in this community, and other areas that are impacted by brownfield sites, can be altered and transformed. New experiences with stakeholders and public participation, open communication of change, and implementation of public participation results has the power to progress and transform a community. New experiences will create new perceptions overtime. History will not be forgotten, but communities comprised of diverse stakeholders in each unique area can facilitate healing and growth for future community building.

Importance of Local Knowledge & Collective Action

As one representative of a community organization explained it, community engagement is important because it allows for information sharing through various types of stakeholders. In brownfield redevelopment it allows for communication between public entities and grass-roots level community members (Kaplaniak). Residents in the
neighborhoods around the brownfield site know more about the day to day status of the site, the conditions of their environment, and the changes that occur better than anyone else can attempt to observe or foresee. Residents and neighborhoods can provide valuable local knowledge to the planning and redevelopment process. They can provide ideas and foresight based on years and lifetimes of experience to public stakeholders who are creating the plans that will one day be implemented on these brownfield sites. One resident in the northwest quadrant stated that organization and collaboration among residents and other community stakeholders is a powerful tool for public participation (Anonymous). Although some residents share this belief, it is not common for residents within this community to organize in order to impact community decision making, and even more unlikely that a group of the residents larger then the usual active participants could be organized collectively. Multiple community leaders have pointed out that residents should use their political influence to further the needs and interests of this community (Keys). Residents have more influence then they perceive because of their past experiences. Organizing collectively through venues such as the West Side Neighbors, and then engaging in participation as a group of interested residents can promote significant influence in the planning process. If residents believe their input will have an effect, than they are much more likely to engage in the process.

**Methods of Public Participation**

Varying levels of public engagement may be implemented in planning processes. There are historic methods of community involvement that use strategies including community meetings to raise awareness of the project plans and provide a space for public questions and comments. However, often times brownfields are located in disadvantages communities due to their industrial history, therefore it is difficult to implement broad public involvement in redevelopment decisions (Powers, 2000). Traditional forms of community engagement along with enhanced tools for community participation are necessary in socio-economically disadvantaged communities for successful redevelopment (Gallagher, 2008). Although private interests are not required to involve community members in the planning and redevelopment process, many do implement some methods. Brownfields programs use traditional methods of public-private partnership that do not require substantial community involvement (Pippin, 2009). These traditional methods can lead to a redevelopment outcome
that is very removed from local needs of the community, and has potentially negative side effects, such as gentrification (Pippin, 2009).

Newspaper articles and information from other media sources can be a method of informing residents and community members about a redevelopment project. Subsequently, community meetings may be organized in order to further inform community members about remediation and redevelopment plans, as well as taking the time for comments and questions. These tend to be common forms of community-interactions with public-private companies. However, in order to address needs of the local community and neighborhoods through brownfield redevelopment, and prevent negative consequences such as gentrification, it is necessary to further engage a diverse representation of community members. Participation methods should be implemented in community identified spaces such as churches and other community organizations. Intimate group meetings where people can feel more comfortable to share their thoughts and opinions will create effective communication and deepen relationships between stakeholders. Public participation that works in conjunction addressing perceptions can foster ownership and dedication to the redevelopment plan on behalf of residents. Perceptions are a key aspect to incorporating goals of community revitalization into brownfield redevelopment.
**Recommendations for Future Study**

In order to utilize public participation to its utmost potential and benefit the diverse variety of needs within brownfield-impacted communities perceptions must be documented and understood. Taking the time to collect the perceptions that exist within a community should be a pre-requisite to public participation. Further studies collecting and analyzing perceptions could be implemented to supplement and continue the data collected in this study. Since this study was conducted during the initial stages of the local brownfield redevelopment process which will continue until the redevelopment is complete. Another fascinating study could involve analyzing the future participation and organization of community members at the grassroots community level. Community stakeholders and people identified as leaders have been invited to join a steering committee for the redevelopment of Carlisle. The success of this public participation could be studied, along with the ability for this project to be a source of community revitalization.

Remediation of two of the brownfield sites is still underway, and the third site has not been acquired by a new owner and therefore still exists vacant and unused. Since remediation, redevelopment, and opportunities for public participation will continue with this project for future months, and probably years to come, studies of these processes and their impacts on the local communities could be conducted. Another piece of information to study in depth is the environmental assessments of the Carlisle brownfield sites. Phase 1 is probably now complete for the Tire & Wheel site, but phase 2 is still in progress and will not be completed for months to come. It would be interesting to evaluate the contaminants found, what remediation strategies were used, and to what standard of clean the site was remediated. Overall, there is potential for many different studies in the future that Dickinson College faculty and students could take on individually or in a collaborative study. I hope that this brownfield and the surrounding community continue to receive resources from the College and that future connections are made to strengthen the town-gown relationship.
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Appendix C: Interview Questions
I. Community Organization Employee Interview Questions

Do you live in Carlisle?

How long have you been working in Carlisle? How long have you held this position?

What role does this position play in the Carlisle community?

Have you had other experience working in Carlisle in the past?

How did you first learn about the redevelopment of the Carlisle and Wheel and the International Automotive group?

What do you consider to be your responsibility or role in this project?

What is your past, present, and future experience with these sites?

What is your vision for the future of these sites?

How do you think these sites have impacted and will impact the community in the future?

How do you think the residents feel about these redevelopment plans?

Are there any tensions in the west side community surrounding these sites?

How can the community benefit from these sites?

What do you think of the current strategies that have been used to engage the community?
  - Do you think these are sufficient?
  - Do you think the communities around the sites support their redevelopment?

Do you know of any other people who I should contact

II. Active Community Members

Name:
Address:

What neighborhood association are you a part of?

Have you always lived in the west side neighborhood?

What is your role in the neighborhood association?

As an active resident, what projects or initiatives have you been a part of?
How has the neighborhood changed overtime?

How did you first learn about this project?

What is your knowledge of the history of this site?

How have you been working with Re-invest or other stakeholders?

How have community members been involved in the redevelopment process?

Do you think all the members of your community are aware of this project?

How much of your community is an active participant in this project?

Are people in your community interested in the site? Do they care?

Do you think the community should have a role in the future of the Carlisle and Wheel?

How do you feel about the future of the site?

What do you see as your role in this project?

What is your vision for the site?

What do you see as the needs of your community?

Any important contacts that you think I should be aware of?

III. Neighbor Interview Questions

Name:
Address:

How long have you lived in Carlisle?

Have you always lived in this neighborhood? This house?

Are you a homeowner, renter, landowner or business owner?

What do you see as the successes and challenges of your community?

What do you see as the needs of your community/neighborhood?

What do you know about the Carlisle T&W site and its history?
What is do you know about the history of this site?

Do you think this site has impacted/affected the neighborhood? How?

What happened to the employees of the factory? Are they still in town?
- Did this lead to a change the population of the neighborhood?

How have the abandoned factories impacted the community over time?
How did the shutdown of the factory impact neighborhood dynamics?
Do you have concerns about the empty lot?

Do you know that it is a Brownfield?

Did you hear about the plan to redevelop the site?
- How did you hear about it and what do you know?

Do you think your neighborhood is interested in the redevelopment project?

Do you think many of the neighbors are currently engaged in the redevelopment process?

Have you attended the community meetings about T&W?
- How did you hear about them?

Do you think there is potential for the community voice to be heard more in this process?

How do you feel about the redevelopment process?

Would you like to be involved or have a say in the site?

What is your vision for the future of this site?
- What would you like at this site in the future? Why?
- What don’t you want at this site?

Do you think any issues/tension/or needs can be addressed through this redevelopment?

Do you think this redevelopment can/will benefit the neighborhood?

Do you think your voice will be heard?

Is there anyone you can suggest to participate in this study/ to talk to?

Who else do you suggest I contact to meet with? Events to attend?

IV. Local Public Government Interview
Which stakeholders have been in direct communication with Re-Invest?

Are there consistent meetings between the private companies who own the brownfields and other stakeholders?

Have you thought of creating a brownfield advisory committee or anything similar?

Are there other ways in which local residents and business owners can get involved?

Have you ever thought about targeting local community members to ensure that a diverse representation of residents is heard?

What do you see as the benefits of involving local community members in the redevelopment process?

Has any research been done on this topic of community engagement and participation?

Are there concerns and considerations of gentrification and other potentially negative repercussions from redevelopment?

Appendix D. Consent Form
Interview on Community Perceptions and Participation in Brownfield Development

CONSENT TO PARTICIPATE IN A RESEARCH STUDY

Below are a description of the research procedures and an explanation of your rights as a research participant. You should read this information carefully. If you agree to participate, you will sign in the space provided to indicate that you have read and understand the information on this consent form. You are entitled to and will receive a copy of this form.

You have been asked to participate in a research study conducted by Taylor Wilmot, a student in the Department of Environmental Science at Dickinson College in Carlisle, PA. The faculty supervisor for this study is Professor Beevers, a professor in the Department of Environmental Science at Dickinson College.

WHAT THE STUDY IS ABOUT:
The purpose of this research study is to collect data from residents and other local stakeholders about their perceptions of the current Brownfield sites in Carlisle. This data will then be analyzed to see how past and current community perceptions impact community engagement in redevelopment projects.

WHAT WE WILL ASK YOU TO DO:
Participate in an interview conducted by Taylor Wilmot. Information gathered during the interview may be cited in the paper for this study and may be referenced during any presentations or discussions about this research.

POTENTIAL RISKS AND DISCOMFORTS:
We do not anticipate any risks or discomforts to you from participating in this research. If you wish, you may choose to withdraw your consent and discontinue your participation at any time during the study without penalty.

BENEFITS:
You will receive no direct benefit from your participation in this study; however, the possible benefits will include sharing redevelopment methods and strategies with other communities experiencing similar situations and possibly influencing community involvement methods of current or future redevelopment in Carlisle.

PRIVACY/CONFIDENTIALITY:
Do you wish to remain anonymous in this study? Please circle: YES or NO
Anonymity will include the following procedure: Any data you provide in this study will be kept confidential unless disclosure is required by law. In any report we publish, we will not include information that will make it possible to identify you or any individual participant.

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF THE STUDY:
Your participation is voluntary and you may refuse to participate without penalty. Furthermore, you may skip any questions or tasks that make you uncomfortable and may discontinue your participation at any time without penalty or loss of benefits by emailing wilmott@dickinson.edu. In addition, the researcher has the right to withdraw you from participation in the study at any time.

AUDIO RECORDING:
Is it ok if I record the audio of our interactions for my records and analysis? Please Circle: YES or NO

OFFER TO ANSWER QUESTIONS:
Please ask any questions you have now. If you have questions later, you should contact the principal investigator: Taylor Wilmot at 908-938-8426 or wilmott@dickinson.edu. If you have questions or concerns
about your rights as a participant in this study, you may contact the Dickinson College Institutional Review Board at (717) 245-1309. Additional contact information is available at: http://www.dickinson.edu/academics/resources/institutional-review-board/

I HAVE READ THE ABOVE INFORMATION. ANY QUESTIONS I HAVE ASKED HAVE BEEN ANSWERED. I AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS RESEARCH PROJECT AND I WILL RECEIVE A COPY OF THIS CONSENT FORM.

_________________________________________  __________________________
PARTICIPANT’S SIGNATURE                  DATE