May 2012

Bancroft Tower Accessibility

James Eugene Pizzini  
Worcester Polytechnic Institute

Michael Alexander Pelissari  
Worcester Polytechnic Institute

Tanya Ann Thomas  
Worcester Polytechnic Institute

William Henry Wright  
Worcester Polytechnic Institute

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

Repository Citation


This Unrestricted is brought to you for free and open access by the Interactive Qualifying Projects at Digital WPI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Interactive Qualifying Projects (All Years) by an authorized administrator of Digital WPI. For more information, please contact digitalwpi@wpi.edu.
BANCROFT TOWER ACCESSIBILITY
Interactive Qualifying Project Report completed in partial fulfillment
Of the Bachelor of Science degree at
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA
An Interactive Qualifying Project submitted to the faculty of Worcester Polytechnic
Institute in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Science

Submitted by:

Michael Pelissari
__________________________

James Pizzini
__________________________

Tanya Thomas
__________________________

William Wright
__________________________

Submitted to:

Professor Guillermo Salazar (Advisor)
__________________________

Professor Frank DeFalco (Co-advisor)
__________________________
Abstract

This project explores the feasibility of making the Bancroft Tower accessible to the public. The study reviews the history of the facility and of its current status, collects opinions from different stakeholders and identifies possible actions that can be taken in order to have the Tower reopened. The study discusses the potential benefits and limitations of these actions.
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Executive Summary

Introduction

The Bancroft Tower, a two and one-half story stone structure situated in Salisbury Park, was built by Mr. Stephen Salisbury III in 1900 as a tribute to his friend, the locally distinguished George Bancroft. George Bancroft was born in 1800 at the foot of the hill on which Bancroft Tower is built. George Bancroft made numerous, generous financial contributions to the city of Worcester and was an active member of the community. In his 91 years of life, he amassed a long list of achievements including Massachusetts statesmen, politician, author, Navy Secretary, and founder of the Annapolis Naval Academy.

The Bancroft Tower is a unique structure that remained open to the public for the first 92 years after its completion, enjoyed for its quiet, isolated location and spectacular 360-degree view of Worcester from the Tower’s turret. Due to misuse and criminal activity, the tower was closed to the public in 1992. The facility doors were locked, window bars were placed, lights were added to the tower, and the public restrooms were removed. The Tower became property of the Worcester Art Museum upon Mr. Salisbury’s death in 1912. The Bancroft Tower earned the title as a historic landmark and, at 111 years old, is still structurally sound, mildly blemished by graffiti in the interior and weeds which have surfaced through the cracks.

This project is the brainchild of group member James Pizzini who noticed the uncommon sight on a jog with a friend and was intrigued as to why it was closed to the public.
Objectives

The primary objectives of the project are as follows:

1. Address the safety of the innerower and the top of the tower, and propose basic plans for future modifications.
2. Address the condition of the Tower, including vandalism, littering, and sanitation. Include recommendations for clean-up projects, if necessary.
3. Address safety in the park at night, as well as community safety in the surrounding area.
4. Address all other reasons discovered that prevent Bancroft Tower from being open to the public.
5. Investigate the public interest in the Tower’s re-opening.

The project was planned to be completed over the course of one academic year. Weekly meetings were scheduled to meet with advisors, and the group members met individually a few times a week.

Research

Most of the fall semester was spent completing the research element of the project. We used local resources such as the Worcester Historical Society Museum, which offered a wealth of articles, official papers, and photographs.

Once enough background information was gathered, we arranged a meeting with the Director of Worcester Parks, Robert Antonelli. He offered information regarding criminal activity, Worcester’s insurance policies, park security information, maintenance, and the economics of the Parks and Recreation Department and gave us access to the Bancroft Tower. During our two trips to the Tower, we took note of the tower’s stability
and made notes of its dimensions and potential safety hazards. We took extensive pictures of both the interior and exterior of the Tower.

**Community Contact**

In January 2012 our group attended a Worcester Parks Commission meeting to inform the committee of the purpose of our project and gather input. We were recommended to hold a Subcommittee Meeting for Worcester Land Use open to the public at a WPI facility to present our final report, gauge public support and interest, and collect abutters' opinions.

We sent out a survey via a mass email to the WPI student using Google Docs. Our survey generated over 500 responses which reaffirmed our hopes that many individuals would be interested in seeing Bancroft Tower re-open for public use.

We spoke with the abutters of Bancroft Tower about our project and recorded their responses. We left contact information for those who were unavailable. The majority of neighbors expressed their belief that re-opening Bancroft Tower would be problematic to the neighborhood unless certain measures were taken to impose limits on the Tower’s use and alleviate expected persistent problems.

We arranged a visit to the Hammond Heights Organization, a community group devoted to addressing the concerns of the neighborhood and surrounding area. At their February meeting, the members brought up concerns and recommended realistic solutions. We met with Hammond Heights again on April 1 at ATO’s Easter egg hunt at Bancroft Tower. Several members expressed security concerns and discussed potential lighting solutions with us.

We spoke with Mr. John Morawski of the Worcester Building Permit’s Office and were given information about the Board of Building Regulations and Standards, directed...
to look into the specifications of the Architectural Access Board and the National Fire Protection Association, and advised to speak with Preservation Worcester and Jordan O’Connor’s Architectural Office.

We contacted Jordan O’Connor’s Architectural Office and were provided with information about modern code.

We contacted Preservation Worcester whose spokesman directed us to the Massachusetts Historical Commission’s website for the Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information System (MACRIS). In April, we met with executive director of Preservation Worcester, Deborah Packard, who gave us information about other organizations who may financially support the costs of necessary modifications and procedures.

Former Worcester mayor Jordan Levy interviewed two group members on his radio talk show. The purpose of this interview was to ask for his and the public’s input on our project. We discussed the progress of our project and gave him our contact email, which he repeated on the air in hopes that it would generate public input.

**Findings**

**Finding 1: Bancroft Tower is a Carefully Constructed Decorative Building Made for Recreation**

Bancroft Tower is classified as a folly, which is a building used primarily for decoration to be used for leisure. The construction involved quality materials and fine attention to detail. Each material used for construction was carefully selected to make Bancroft Tower both sturdy and attractive.
Finding 2: Worcester Citizens Want to See Bancroft Tower Reopened with Strict Supervision

Our presentation at the Worcester Parks Commission Meeting exposed that there is strong, positive sentiment towards the Tower. Several members of the commission have used and enjoyed Bancroft Tower in the past. Each member who commented on the possibility of reopening Bancroft Tower offered opinions on what could be improved to make this goal possible.

We spoke with Tom Morris, a park security guard of 37 ½ years who specifically tends to Salisbury Park. Asserting that the tower should be used more often, he offered his opinion on how public access to Bancroft Tower could be made possible. Referencing his experience with criminal activity at the Tower, Mr. Morris proposed some potential solutions to deter crime.

In February, our group sent out a survey to the entire WPI undergraduate email list in order to assess the students’ opinion of Bancroft Tower, gauge how well-known it is, measure interest in regular park clean-ups and a possible reopening of the Tower to the public, and determines how safe students feel about Worcester parks at night. Over 500 students participated in our survey, and we found that despite Bancroft Tower’s closure, the majority of students have visited the tower at least once and are interested in a possible reopening.

In our pursuit of the community’s opinions and input, we spoke with former mayor and radio talk show host, Jordan Levy. Mr. Levy claimed he would like to see the Tower reopened and used for community events, neighborhood activities, school projects, and leisure. Mr. Levy believes it is an important landmark because it is a “monument that
identifies Worcester’s past.” He stated that he is sure others would be interested in a reopening of the Tower as well.

**Finding 3: Bancroft Tower is Unlit at Night**

There is no lighting around the tower except for a single spotlight on the southwest side. However, this spotlight requires constant maintenance since the light bulb is subjected to regular burnt out. A recent random drive to Bancroft Tower one night reported that Bancroft Tower and Salisbury Park was completely unlit at night, making the area attractive and ideal for crime.

**Finding 4: Bancroft Tower Needs Cosmetic Adjustments**

In our group’s visit to Bancroft Tower in November, we were able to explore the interior of the tower. Though the structure itself is sound, there were some areas that require improvement that could not be ignored. The interior of the tower had a lot of sand on the floors which could potentially be hazardous to walk on. There were also weeds growing out of the cracks on the roof. The most noticeable physical issue with the interior of Bancroft Tower was the graffiti. We found graffiti on the roof, interior walls and ground, and on the front door of the Tower. Some of the graffiti contained offensive images and words.

**Finding 5: Bancroft Tower Needs to be Inspected for Reopening**

Through our communication with the Worcester Building Permits Office, our group learned that Bancroft Tower would first need to be examined by an architect or an architectural engineer to approve it for public use. The Tower must adhere to the International Existing Building Codes Massachusetts Building Code CMR 8th Edition and the Book of Amendments as part of the International Code. The Architectural Access Board will also need to either inspect the Tower itself or approve of its current condition.
**Recommendations**

- Safety improvements should be made to Bancroft Tower as follows:
  
  1. Lighting should be installed with perhaps a motion sensor to deter criminal activity using minimal amounts of electricity. The lighting could work with a possible future installation of video monitoring.
  
  2. The thin, shallow steps on the roof of Bancroft Tower could be hazardous, especially when wet. Railings and nosing could be added at an inexpensive cost and provide a permanent solution.
  
  3. The spiral staircase in the main turret should be adjusted, fixed or replaced. The steep, narrow steps combined with the staircase’s current shakiness are potentially dangerous and could also be a hazard when wet.

- Superficial adjustments should be made to improve the appearance of Bancroft Tower. These include:
  
  1. Removal of weeds and mold on the roof
  
  2. Graffiti cleanup by muriatic acid treatment
  
  3. Cleaning the floors to remove sand and rocks
  
  4. Landscaping around the Tower

- An inspection should be made by the Architectural Access Board to determine if it can be opened for public use, even though it doesn’t have wheelchair access.

- If approved, a second code review should be made to deem the Tower safe for public use.

- A new policy should be installed to regulate entry. These conditions can include:
1. Entry to groups or individuals on certain dates, perhaps a few times a month to host community and neighborhood events
2. Supervision during hours of operation
3. Locking and closing the tower during days and hours when not in use
4. A type of physical notification to provide contact information to find hours of operation

**Summary**

Bancroft Tower can indeed be reopened to the public through the necessary improvements listed above. The community response has been mostly positive and encouraging, as long as certain restrictions and regulations are put in use. Those who are skeptical about the practicality of reopening the tower gave us the reasons for their qualms. These problems can easily be surmounted through supervision of the Tower when in use, closing the tower at an appropriate time, installing proper lighting, and consistent patrolling by the Worcester Police Department.

There are many potential funders for this plan to cover the costs of safety installments, beautification, architectural analysis, renovation, maintenance and patrol costs. These funders include the City of Worcester itself, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Hammond Heights Neighborhood Association, Preservation Worcester, Park Spirit, the Wheeler Trust, and the Worcester Garden Club. No estimates of a potential cost for renovations is available at this time.

In conclusion, Bancroft Tower is a unique tourist attraction and a symbol of Worcester’s rich history. Bancroft Tower could be a financial asset to the city and a center for community cohesion as well. More local residents would like to see it open
than not, and a reopening could be easily done at a minimal cost by taking advantage of the fact that the many diverse Worcester residents, clubs, and organizations are willing to do some of the required labor for free or at a reduced cost.

By following our project's plan, Bancroft Tower can be operated in a way that caters to both tourists and neighbors. Safety of Salisbury Park and the surrounding neighborhood can increase. The costs would be minimal. Bancroft Tower can go from being an inaccessible, crime-attracting burden to source of local pride, community cohesion, and enjoyment. Bancroft Tower can once again be used as Stephen Salisbury intended.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Historical buildings and monuments are a great part of our country. They have history, meaning, and can evoke emotion. This however, is not necessarily how some individuals view beautiful old buildings. This has led to the present problem facing some of these buildings’ suffering destruction and neglect. There have always been citizens and organizations with a mindset of conservation and preservation of our architectural history. The act of preservation as described by Merriam Webster is to keep safe from injury, harm, or destruction. With this, on October 15, 1966 the United States Congress passed the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), which was last amended in 2000 that has promoted a renovated effort to preserve these facilities and through them preserve our history.

The Bancroft Tower, a two and one-half story stone structure situated in Salisbury Park in Worcester MA is one of these historical buildings. Originally built 111 years ago, the Tower still stands tall and strong today but has far fewer visitors than it once had. (Salisbury Park, 2011) In 1992, a strong iron gate was placed at the entrance, barring access to the public. Mistreatment of the Tower in the 70s and 80s led to it becoming a stain on Worcester Parks and a tremendous burden for the surrounding neighborhood. Visitors would often leave trash or even urinate inside the Tower. This was especially difficult to clean due to the location of the Tower being not close to any fire hydrants, and the problem would often be amplified during the summer midday as the heat intensified the stench. There was once a bathroom located in the park, but it has since been removed. (Interview with Abutters on Feb 17, 2012)
The overall problem with Bancroft Tower that led to its closure was mostly a criminal element. We found a newspaper article from 1985 in the archives of the Worcester Historical Museum that described these problems in detail, and later we confirmed these with Parks Department officials. Lax security due to city budget problems and the relatively isolated location allowed the park to become a popular location for drug trade, gang violence, and illicit sexual activity. Once the Tower had become so dirty that citizens and their families stopped visiting, the location was used almost exclusively for these unfortunate purposes. The park once had lamps that kept the Tower well lit at night to prevent this sort of activity, but the lights have since gone out of operation. Even then, however, the most pervasive problems happened in broad daylight. Allegedly, the Tower became a meeting spot for secret hook-ups. During certain times of the day, one would see suspicious cars circling the Tower. (Crocket Jr., 1985) Eventually it became enough of a problem so that barricades had to be put up to prevent cars from driving to the far side. This wasn’t enough of a deterrent, however, and the closure of the Tower was inevitable. (Interview with Robert Antonelli on Nov 10, 2011 and Tom Morris on Jan 26, 2012)

Bancroft Tower today is only opened a couple of times a year. Some organizations, such as the Boy Scouts of America, rent the key to take tours of the inside and hold events there. (Tom Morris, Jan 2012) During Halloween, the local neighborhood organization hosts a haunted house. (Abutters, Feb 2012) Besides some offensive graffiti on the interior, the Tower is very clean. One would never guess the Tower’s checkered history by observing it today.
Twenty years have passed since the Tower was closed off to the public. A whole generation of Worcester citizens has been excluded from the enjoyment of the Tower and its magnificent view of the city. This, and later generations should be given the same opportunity to experience the Tower as those of the past did. There is a lot of potential for re-opening the Tower. However, it is not clear how this can be done. The primary objective of this project is to research the feasibility of reopening the Tower and identify how this could be done in a fashion that can benefit the different stakeholders potentially involved in this venture.

In this project, we investigated the history of the Tower and compiled a timeline of its history. We have personally inspected the Tower after receiving permission from the Worcester Parks and Recreation Department. We did this to determine the level of safety within the Tower and the physical condition the structure. We found that the graffiti on the interior needs to be cleaned and that the stairs on the roof may need to be altered or adjusted in order to meet modern building code. We have also taken survey data of the Worcester Polytechnic Institute student population in order to get a good measure of the public desire for the Tower’s eventual re-opening.

We also personally spoke with several of the immediate neighbors to Salisbury Park and gathered their opinions on what needs to be addressed before the Tower can be re-opened. They are, after all, the most directly affected by the activity that goes on there. Security is a major problem and will need to be addressed one way or another before any sort of public re-opening can occur. Otherwise, we can expect criminal activity to increase in Salisbury Park. We have spoken with several institutions involved with this and compiled a section of the report directly addressing different solutions and
the connotations of each. We have compiled this report of all of our findings and references to become part of the public record. It is our aim that when the potential of the Tower is re-evaluated, that our research will be taken into consideration by the Parks Committee and by any other institutions involved.
Chapter 2: Background

The two main people who were factors in the Tower's construction are Messrs. Stephen Salisbury III and George Bancroft, who lived in the late 1800's to early 1900's. Both were very distinguished and esteemed gentlemen known throughout the state of Massachusetts. Today, Bancroft Tower still stands as a tribute to their friendship. (Salisbury Park, 2011)

2.1 Mr. George Bancroft and Mr. Stephen Salisbury III

Bancroft Tower was erected by Mr. Stephen Salisbury III in 1900, in honor of his father's lifelong friend, and his childhood friend, Mr. George Bancroft. In the early 19th century, Mr. Salisbury and Bancroft used to play in the hills and fields near what is today Bancroft Hill and Institute Park. (Dietrich, 1991) The two boys built a raft together and sailed it along Indian Lake. They grew up to be good friends, each making important contributions to society. (Murphey, 1978)

Mr. Salisbury generously supported the city of Worcester. He financed the city's cultural development, notably in 1896, when he founded and endowed the Worcester Art Museum. Mr. Salisbury owned a large portion of northern Worcester and enjoyed improving upon his land. In 1887, Mr. Salisbury became a member of the Parks Commission. He had Institute Park donated and developed south of Salisbury Pond. (Murphey, 1978)

Mr. Bancroft, who lived from October 3, 1800 to January 17, 1891, was born at the foot of the hill Bancroft Tower is built on. He became a Massachusetts statesman,
politician, and writer with a long list of achievements. He left Worcester and became nationally significant as a Navy Secretary and founder of the Annapolis Naval Academy. Some of his other accomplishments include being a eulogist at President Lincoln’s funeral, cultivator of the American Beauty Rose and author of a ten-volume history of America. (Salisbury Park, 2011)

2.2 Bancroft Tower History

During Mr. Salisbury’s lifetime, he had the Tower opened to the public. They enjoyed trips to the tower, picnics in Salisbury Park, and the beautiful 360 degree view of Worcester at the Tower’s peak. Residents of the neighborhood participated in the few park cleanup projects, which were held by the Greater Hammond Heights Neighborhood Association. (Crocket, 1985)

Some modifications to the tower have been made over time. Safety measures included new locks and lights when the Tower used to be lit. There were once restroom facilities in one of the rooms. Outside of the park were well-kept lawns and gardens and nature paths throughout the area. (Abutters, Feb 2012)

When Mr. Salisbury died, the property was passed on to the Worcester Art Museum, which then turned it over to the city in 1912. (Salisbury Park, 2011) It remained open to the public until its eventual closure in 1992 when the city decided it was better off closed, due to the unsavory events that occurred within and outside of the Tower’s walls. (Antonelli, Nov 2011) Despite its publically restricted access, the Tower
remains a historic landmark. Historic sites such as this are important to the public as well as the city itself.

According to a form on Bancroft Tower from the year 1977, its present use was park observation. The city of Worcester was the present owner. The style is “Romanesque Revival.” The architect is Earle & Fisher. The exterior wall fabric is boulder stone. There are no outbuildings. Other features include a central arched passage way, rectangular and circular plan towers, crenellations, and the fact that it faces directly north and south. It is over one acre. The approximate distance of the building from the street is 30 feet. The original owner was Mr. Stephen Salisbury III. The themes are architectural and recreation. (Pfeiffer, 1977)

**Historical Significance**

The Bancroft Tower is a two and one-half story structure built of boulders and cobbles, trimmed with rock-faced granite. Asymmetrical in elevation, the tower has an open arch at its center, which is flanked by two square-plan towers which rise to observation platforms surrounded by crenellated parapets. Rising from the top of the western tower is a smaller, circular-plan tower which rises to crenellations. In excellent original condition, the Bancroft is the last of three stone observation towers built in Worcester parks in the late nineteenth century. (The other two were the Davis Tower in Lake Park and the Institute Tower in Institute Park, both demolished). Of the three, the Bancroft Tower was by far the most elaborate. (Pfeiffer, 1977)

Situated at the crest of Bancroft Hill in Salisbury Park, one of the highest points in Worcester, the Bancroft Tower was designed by the important local firm of Stephen Earle and Clellan Fisher. The tower was constructed in 1900 for Mr. Stephen Salisbury
III at a cost estimated to have been $15,000. Both the tower and the hill on which it stands are named in honor of the historian, Mr. George Bancroft, a Worcester native. During his lifetime Mr. Salisbury retained ownership of the parkland and tower, which were given to the city by the terms of his will in 1907. (Pfeiffer, 1977)

2.3 Condition of the Tower Today

Bancroft Tower, now 111 years old, is still structurally sound. Most of the physical issues to be addressed are the graffiti and the foliage that has grown inside. The following are photos from our personal trips to the Tower. All pictures were taken by Michael Pelissari and James Pizzini. Figure 1 shows Tower from the front, it's most recognized position.

Figure 1 – Bancroft Tower when viewed from the front
The Tower is very stable considering its age. Sitting at the top of its hill, it is visible from all around when the trees have lost their foliage. Figure 2 shows the Tower’s North side.

![Bancroft Tower viewed from the back](image)

Figure 2 - Bancroft Tower viewed from the back

The only information available at the Tower is written on the plaque shown in Figure 3. This plaque sits in front of the archway symmetrical with the Tower on its South side.
The two doors are locked to the public during the year, except for special events. Both are held with iron chains and a bolt lock, which are unloackable only by the City. One of the doors is made of heavy iron, further preventing access. Figure 4 shows these two doors.
Figure 4 - The gate to the East side single room and the heavy door at the main entrance
As shown in Figure 5, all of the windows are barred to restrict access from the outside through ascending the walls (in order to access the main building, a trespasser would have to ascend to the roof).

Figure 5 – Window

The interior is noticeably dusty and could use a cleaning, and there are some weeds growing out of the crevices on the roof, but there is nothing that would appear to be difficult to remove with proper equipment. Figure 6 shows an interior view of the Tower, and Figure 7 shows a view of the roof.
Figure 6 – View of interior

Figure 7 - The middle of the roof
As shown in Figure 8, the stairs on the roof are stable, but upon inspection, do not meet modern building code. More detail about this is found in our Findings section.

![Figure 8 - The stairs on the roof](image)

There is graffiti inside the Tower, such as on the roof as well as on the interior walls and there are etchings on the front door. Some of it contains obscenities and offensive imagery, such as swastikas and other symbols. Detail about addressing these issues are covered in our Analysis section.

As shown in Figure 9, the stairwell to the spire is in decent condition but should be evaluated by a professional. Notably, one of the fasteners appears to be unhinged. This, and the depth of each step, requires inspection. More detail about this can be found in our Findings section.
Despite significant blocking from trees on most sides, the view of Worcester is still as inspirational as it always has been and has significant potential to be enjoyed by future citizens. Many sites are visible from the top of the spire in all directions. The only place significantly obscured by trees is the WPI campus, which is barely visible. An example of the view from one direction is shown in Figure 10, and a full panoramic view is available in our Appendices, courtesy of group member Michael Pelissari.
As shown in Figure 12, the two turrets in front of the Tower are in surprisingly good condition as well, and while they do not greatly enhance the view from the hill, they do provide a nice sitting area with a circular table in the center for each. There is not any reason to believe that they are dangerous, as far as we can tell.
The road that encircles the Tower is blocked from traffic access due to problems that the Tower had several decades ago. If they were to be driven on again, one might consider it in poor condition, but there is no issue for people walking on it. The roads leading up to the Tower, however, are in dismal condition. Due perhaps to the difficulty of renovating at an incline, the roads are full of cracks and crevices. There have also been some potholes noticed, but most of these have been filled in by the City. The remnants of these repairs leave the road bumpy and rough.

There is limited parking in front of the Tower. The designated area marked off by the waist-high stone wall can hold at most a dozen cars. This has been a problem in the past for large events, as visitors resort to parking in front of the near neighbors’ driveways, dangerously breaking the accessibility of the road. There is no lighting.
around the Tower at night, creating a dangerous environment for potential criminal activity. There was once a spotlight that illuminated the Tower, but it has since disappeared due to negligence.

The grassy area around the Tower is surprisingly well kept, and is a fine example of the quality of Worcester Parks. There is currently no significant landscaping in the vicinity of the Tower, but is a lot of room for it. There is one trash can by the parking wall that is bolted down to prevent being picked up by the wind. The area behind the wall is notorious for attracting public trash dumpers and has to be cleaned regularly. There are currently no outhouses or public bathrooms in the park and there is no public access to electricity.
Chapter 3: Methodology

The material presented here chronicles the events that led to the project’s completion. This includes all major meetings, surveys, and investigatory research done over the course of the year. A record of our meetings throughout the year was carefully compiled by member Tanya Thomas and is included in our Appendices.

3.1 Pre-Project

This project began as a curious inquiry by the group member James Pizzini. When jogging with a friend, he was shown an uphill route that goes by Bancroft Tower. He was wondering why it was closed to the public and started asking around. He called the Worcester Parks and Recreation Department and received information from the receptionist on how to go about applying for permission to enter the Tower. The process involves applying for special permits that weigh your competency and the purposes of your visit. The permit is only good for a limited time, and costs a fee of $60 per day to visit if you are a local resident ($120 if you are visiting). Protocol says that a representative of the city must also be present to escort you in and out of the Tower. James thought that all of this seemed rather excessive, and he began making inquiries into making a school-sponsored project to explore the Tower and investigate the cause of the closure.

James talked to Dean of Students Philip Clay about the idea. Dean Clay thought that the project had potential, and suggested that it become an Interactive Qualifying Project (IQP). James was redirected to Institutional Review Board (IRB) Secretary
Ruth McKeogh to make the necessary contacts. After sending her a brief description of the project, Mrs. McKeogh sent notice to potential project advisors. After a couple of days, Interdisciplinary & Global Studies Division (IQSD) Associate Professor Scott Jiusto responded and agreed to meet to discuss the project. After discussing the parameters, he agreed to advise the project if a more suitable advisor were not found. He then sent James to gather information about the legal aspect of the project by talking to Finance and Operations representative Michael Curley. At this point, James learned about some of the heavily political connotations about the Tower. After a healthy talk about the scope of the project, James was further redirected to Assistant VP of Government and Community Relations Linda Looft to discuss how the project would take off concerning the city of Worcester. Ms. Looft, in conjunction with Community Project Center Director Robert Krueger, gave James a list of requirements to fulfill in order to get the project officially approved by the school. All of this happened over the course of March 2011.

James pitched the idea to many of his classmates and quickly found three group members willing to participate in the project, these being William Wright, Tanya Thomas, and Eben Curtis-Maynard (later replaced by Michael Pelissari, due to Eben’s transferring schools). Robert Krueger gave a list of names in the Civil Engineering Department to speak to about the project. After pitching the project to several professors, James and the group recruited Professor Guillermo Salazar and Professor Emeritus Frank DeFalco as Advisor and Co-Advisor, respectively. At that point, the group registered the project on the WPI Registrar’s website, and began the wait for
approval. The project was officially approved at the end of July and began on the first day of A Term 2011.

### 3.2 Scope

At our first meeting, we laid out the primary objectives of the project. This was a more extensive list of the purposes of the project was presented to the IGSD and advisors before the beginning of the year. They are listed as:

1. Address the safety of the innerower and the top of the tower, and draw up basic plans for future modifications.
2. Address the condition of the Tower, including vandalism, littering, and sanitation. Include recommendations for clean-up projects, if necessary.
3. Address safety in the park at night, as well as community safety in the surrounding area.
4. Address all other reasons discovered that prevent Bancroft Tower from being open to the public.
5. Investigate the public interest in the Tower's re-opening.
The activities of this project were carefully planned out to expand over the school year between the September 2011 and April 2012. Weekly meetings were held with advisors, in addition to meetings between group members 2 or 3 times per week. The specific tasks laid out in the beginning of the year are shown in the Work Breakdown Structure and the Gantt Chart, shown in Figure 12 and then Figures 13 and 14, respectively.

The main tasks were divided into five sections, as shown in Figure 13: “Define the needs of the client,” “Project Management Activities,” “Gather Information,” “Investigate Solutions,” and “Document Project Process.” In this chart, the “client” is an umbrella term for both the Worcester Parks and Recreation Department and the residents of Worcester, particularly the abutters of Bancroft Tower who are most
affected by policy changes and renovations concerning the Tower. The “Define Major Problems” subsection is one of the center points for the paper. It addresses the colorful history of the Tower, the many reasons for its closure, and all of the potential benefits we found for over the course of the year for reopening the Tower. The “Interview with the Client” subsection presents the adaptability of these objectives based on our meetings with the Worcester Parks representatives and the Worcester residents.

Figure 13 - Timeline of Tasks (Gantt Chart), Created October 9, 2011
As is evident from the rest of this report, much of what we originally plan did not pan out. We did visit the American Antiquarian Society, but their records proved to hold no useful information for our research. Most of our proposed “Scheduled Interviews” ended up being simple phone calls. Many of our contacts never met us face to face. We simply left them a message on their answering machine or secretary and waited for a friendly call back. Many never did call back, such as the representatives with Gillette Castle, the Boy Scouts of America, and the Autobahn Society. It should also be noted that we initially planned to send our survey using the online service Survey Monkey, but we promptly switched to using Google Documents when it became apparent that it was superior in every way for our purposes. We also made the innocent mistake of grouping the Friends of Institute Park with the members of the Parks Commission, when in fact they are two separate entities. We also decided against visiting Higgins Armory once we reached a certain point in the project. It was evident that a visit would yield no more useful information could be gained from such a visit.
3.3 Research

A big part of A and B term was the research element of the project. We had gathered sparse information online before the project, but only enough to get us started on the origin of the Tower. Once the Tower moved into the hands of the City in 1912, as far as the internet was concerned it was still open and had not changed. A look through the history books in WPI’s Gordon Library was equally useless. Seeking more in depth information, we went as a group to the Worcester Historical Society Museum. We called in the week before, and the museum set aside a folder of all of the newspaper articles and official papers concerning Bancroft Tower that they had. This proved to be the most fruitful information gathering expedition of our entire project. We had a chronicle of events spanning every decade of the twentieth century, and at this time we finally learned the Tower’s colorful history from the 70s and 80s. With the permission of the museum, we made copies of all of the documents that we found useful, and we even copied several old photographs of the Tower and its view from early in its life. These photos revealed that the hill on which it stands was once free from trees and shrubs, making the Tower stand out much more from the surrounding area.

We had two other information gathering sessions. While we were visiting the office of Director Robert Antonelli, he allowed us to look through his official records of the Tower. Some of them proved very useful, and we gained permission to copy those as well. In addition, we took a trip to the American Antiquarian Society, conveniently located near WPI. We hoped to find some useful information about the purchase of labor and materials, or even blueprints of Bancroft Tower in the Salisbury Family Papers. After applying for permission to enter and getting in, we looked through all of
the papers from the relevant years of Mr. Stephen Salisbury III’s life. Unfortunately, the Tower was not mentioned once in any of the papers, and we left without having gained any useful information.

3.4 Director of Parks and Recreation Meeting and visit to Bancroft Tower

The first big thing on the menu was to get in contact with Robert Antonelli as soon as possible. The sooner that the group could get in contact with him, the sooner that we could get some hands on data. We tried several avenues to get in touch with him, including a typed letter, emails, phone messages, and using Professor DeFalco’s contacts in the administration. Eventually, at the end of October, the Director called us back and gave us a time to meet. This occurred at the beginning of B Term. At this meeting, we filled him in on what we had found so far, what we hoped to accomplish, and we asked for his input on the situation. He gave us the following information, based on our notes from the meeting:

- There has been little criminal activity beyond vandalism and attempted entry in the past 20 years, since it was closed.
- There was once a single spotlight that illuminated the Tower at night, but it has since been out of use.
- The city is a self-insured entity; there is no blanket insurance policy.
- There has not been significant effort on the part of the City to clean the Tower since its closure. The grass in the park is very well maintained, however.
• The wall next to the Tower has been damaged due to vehicular impact and been repaired by the City twice in recent memory.

• Night security is light. Occasionally, Worcester Police Department will swing by to check for delinquency.

• The inappropriate activity that happened in the Park before the closure still happens to this day in other Worcester Parks. Particularly, it has become a problem in Green Hill Park.

• Unless significant vandalism occurs, the budget for maintenance to the Tower is relatively light.

• There is no specifically organized timeline available for the history of the Tower.

• All budget plans for the parks go through Antonelli’s office, and capital budget for the City fluctuates from year to year.

• The Parks Commission meets once per month on the 4th Thursday.

• The Parks Department is funded by property tax, excise tax, state allocations and grants.

• No official blueprints for the construction of Bancroft Tower exist.

   We also borrowed the key to Bancroft Tower from him, which we returned on the last day of B Term at our second meeting with him. After completing the official paperwork for entering the Tower and having the fee waived by the department, we set two days aside to go inside the Tower. The first trip was mostly exploratory. Not knowing the
interior of the Tower and its stability, we borrowed construction hats from the civil engineering department. We ended up not needing them, however, because we found that the Tower is impeccably stable. The interior is completely safe and all of the windows are barred to prevent passage, in or out. The wall barriers at the roof of the Tower are two feet thick. The only way someone could fall off of the Tower would be to intentionally attempt to do so or to walk on top of the outer edge of the wall. The only safety threats we noted were the stairs on the roof and the spiral staircase up to the lookout. We took extensive pictures of the Tower, including these risks, and paid particular attention to all of the graffiti on the interior that would need to be cleaned before the Tower is opened again. Michael also took careful measurements of all of the Tower’s inner and outer dimensions in order to make a digital model of the Tower later. At our second trip to the Tower, we brought Guillermo Salazar with us in order to show him around. We also brought gloves and trash bags to clean up the interior of the Tower to the best of our ability.

3.5 – Parks Commission Presentation

At the suggestion of Director Antonelli, we made a brief presentation to the Worcester Parks Commission at their January 2012 meeting. We informed them of the purpose of our project and at the end simply asked for their input on the entire ordeal. Several of the members were optimistic about the project, commenting that Bancroft Tower had been a pleasant memory in their youths. They proposed that we hold a Subcommittee Meeting for Worcester Land Use, where we could present our final report and gauge public support for the project. This meeting was to be free to the public and
would have all of the Bancroft Tower abutters specifically invited to give their input on the matter. Due to the convenience of the location, they asked about using a WPI facility to hold the meeting. After we returned, a dialogue was begun with Linda Looft in order to reserve the Higgins House building on campus for the event (Results pending).

Immediately after the Parks Commission meeting, we were stopped at the door by the head security guard at the Department. He had been working for the department for 37 years, and vividly remembered all of the issues involving the Tower during that time. We had a long conversation with him and his first hand testimony was incredibly informative. He brought up several issues that we had not even considered up until that point. He was of the professional opinion that the only way to completely solve the problems with the Tower, a security guard should be on duty at the park during all hours of operation.

3.6 – Surveys and Community Contact

In C Term, the first thing we did was send out a survey to the WPI students via a mass email. The survey was originally going to be via Survey Monkey, but upon review Google Docs proved to be more efficient and, more importantly, free to use. After being approved by the student government, the email was sent through, and over 500 responses were recorded. The results are listed in the Results section.

Afterward, we went to talk to the abutters of Bancroft Tower. Six of them answered their doors, including former Mayor of Worcester John Anderson. We talked to them about our project and recorded their responses. For those that did not answer
their doors, we left a letter with our contact information, and we received our first email response later that day. The general consensus of the neighbors was that re-opening Bancroft Tower was a bad idea, unless great measures are taken to alleviate its problems. The responses are listed in greater detail in the Results section. Notably, they told us to get in contact with the Hammond Heights neighborhood group through the WPI fraternity ATO, which does events with Bancroft Tower.

3.7 – Meeting with ATO and Hammond Heights Neighborhood Group

We got into contact with the Hammond Heights Organization through our group member Bill, who used his contacts with the fraternities to meet with the ATO President. He gave us the email of Mrs. Sheila Killeen, one of the higher members of the Hammond Heights Organization. We sent her an email asking to meet, and soon enough, she invited us to their February meeting. Two members of our group attended the meeting, which had about a dozen members in attendance, including the ATO president, Mrs. Killeen, and Mr. Anderson.

The main three issues brought up were: liability to the city, safety/falling off the top and the noise at night. Several members were of the opinion that the City would never agree to open the Tower due to the legal allegations involved in potential accidents. They claimed that even today, the noise from activities at the Tower bothers them at night. They highly advocated repairing the flood lamp at the base of the Tower, saying that it would greatly improve the safety and security of the place at night. Furthermore, it should be reinforced so that it isn't as easily breakable.
One member suggested that we take a traffic study of the Tower. This would involve setting up near the Tower and counting the number of people who drive by, people who park, and people who actually go up to the Tower in a day. Before doing this ourselves, they recommended we contact the Worcester Traffic Department to ask for any of their information on it.

There was a consensus of the group that adding a bathroom up there would be a bad idea, at least until the place becomes more functional. That said, they would like electrical access available for having events with music at the tower, maybe band concerts, or other interesting events. Parking must also be improved. This means either adding more space, or improving the quality of the road, or both.

The group did not like the idea of simply "having it open all the time." They more agreed with the idea of having it open on one Sunday afternoon a month. This creates a much more romantic and communal feel to the Tower, where monthly events can be held. This would reduce the cost to the City, as they would only need to hire one or two people from the department for 4-6 hours once a month at ~$18 per hour. They would open it in the morning, or as late as noon, and lock it up at dusk.

The group invited us to present again what we have at their annual neighborhood group meeting sometime in April, and emailed us the details of that a few weeks later (pending). In the meantime, we gave the group our contact information for in case they thought up any other comments or concerns.

We met with the group again on April 1 for an Easter egg hunt hosted by ATO. We spoke with several of the members, who expressed their continued concern for the
security around the tower. We discussed possible lighting solutions and other regulations involved with the eventual reopening.

3.8- Speaking with the Building Permits Office and Related Contacts

We took a trip to the Building Permit’s Office across town, in order to gather information on what would be needed to arrange a cleaning of the Tower and who to consult about possible changes. We also needed to know if the building would still meet today’s code standards, considering that the stairs on the roof seemed shallow in their depth. The office representative gave us the contact information of Mr. John Morawski, the building inspector for our area. After calling his office for a week, we got in contact with him. The following is from our notes of speaking with him:

1) Mr. Morawski gave us some information about the Board of Building Regulations and Standards. This is listed under our Findings section.

2) Mr. Morawski also mentioned looking into the specifications of the Architectural Access Board and the National Fire Protection Association. He went on to say that the Architectural Access Board might be a great barrier for the Tower’s reopening due to complications with access to the disabled.

3) Finally, he suggested that we speak with Preservation Worcester, an organization that keeps notable buildings from being altered or torn down.

4) Mr. Morawski was optimistic about the idea of the reopening, and he requested a copy of our final report once the year is over.

At Mr. Morawski’s suggestion, we called Jordan O’Connor’s Architectural Office, and he called us back on the following morning. He gave us a wealth of information that
filled in some of the holes that remained from speaking with Mr. Morawski. The following is from our notes from the conversation:

1) Mr. Jordan O’Connor gave us extensive information about modern code review. This is all listed in our Findings section.

2) For optimizing the usefulness of the Tower, parking and lighting must be improved. On a more ambitious note, the Tower could become a more popular spot if perhaps an accessory building were added and maintained. This could include things such information for tourists, and a bathroom. The Tower could become a "communal observatory,” and we could collaborate with the charter schools and the elementary schools in the area to make a program out of it.

3) Projects like this have been successful in the past in Worcester, and since Salisbury Park is one of the oldest landmarks of the city, it is definitely doable. An example of a recent successful project is the West Boylston Botanical Garden.

4) We should talk to a man named Chris Salter in the Facilities Department to get more information about projects like this involving WPI.

   We also called Preservation Worcester, at Mr. Morawski’s suggestion. We wanted to find out, first of all, if Bancroft Tower was protected from making any significant changes, and if they had any further information about the Tower. According to their spokesman, the Tower is not exclusively protected by their organization and making modifications to the Tower would not concern them much, (though the Tower is included in one of their guided tours). They also directed us to the Massachusetts Historical Commission’s website for the Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information
System (MACRIS). The information gathered from this site is listed in the Findings section (pending).

3.9 – Jordan Levy’s Talk Show

On March 28, we called Jordan Levy’s radio show on WTAG to ask for his input on the project. We prepped beforehand by sending him and his producer, Mike Messina, an email introducing us and our project. The morning of the show, Mr. Messina called us to discuss timeslots, and we set up the call to begin at 3:30pm. We talked about the inspiration for the project and about how we had already spoken with the Director of Worcester Parks and Recreation and the Hammond Heights Neighborhood Group, and that the project was near completion. He was also optimistic about the possibility of reopening the Tower to the public, and he expressed his personal interest in the idea of today’s youth and future generations enjoying the Tower as it was in his youth. We also gave him our contact email, which he repeated on the air in the hopes that it would incite public input before the research paper’s conclusion.

3.10 – Preservation Worcester and the Final Weeks

At the suggestion of Mrs. Killeen and Mr. Levy, we arranged a meeting with Preservation Worcester Director Debra Packard. We explained the details of our project and showed what we had accomplished so far, while asking for her input. Now that the report was near completion, we were specifically looking for contacts with interested parties that may support the idea of opening Bancroft Tower to the public. Mrs. Packard stated that Preservation Worcester may be able to help set up a fundraiser to support the project. She gave us a list of parties to contact, specifically ones to do with
landscaping and park tours. We received the contact information of members of the Autobahn Society and the Worcester Gardening club, who may have an interest in the idea. She also turned us towards the Park Spirit of Worcester Volunteer Group and the Wheeler Trust, which had been mentioned before by other parties.

At the end of the year, we presented to the Parks Commission once again, explaining our progress, and discussing further action after the project’s completion. The commissioners decided that holding a Subcommittee Meeting for Worcester Public Land Use would be necessary only after the completion of the code review, and that it would probably not be necessary for approving the installation of new lighting or for approving the code review. We promised to deliver the completed version of our report the following week, and make contact once again the following semester for an update. At the time of our submitting this report, we are also waiting on a reply from Mrs. Kathy Mickey of the Worcester Gardening Club concerning possible renovations to the area surrounding the Tower.
Chapter 4: Findings

4.1 Building Classification

Throughout the United States and the rest of the world there are many wonderful old stone structures, stone masonry is one of the oldest building methods used by mankind. Some dated to their original time period and others are more modern, appearing around the 19th to 21st century. These newer building were classically called follies. A folly was a building primarily used as decoration. Typically the buildings were surrounded by gardens and used to leisure or recreation. But later on the term became known for highly decorative buildings that served other purposes, such as theaters and businesses. (Folly Fellowship)

Bancroft Tower was built to resemble a miniature feudal castle. The contracted builder took great care in constructing the tower. He has his men find the best materials to be used in its construction. The fieldstones used were meant to look weathered and old. The granite sills, lintels, copings and steps were quarried from Leominster because of the great precision in which was taken. The floors of the Tower are large flagstones of size 4.5 feet by 13 feet. Portland cement was using to bind all the stone, for it was said to turn the Tower into almost solid rock. (Radler, 1975)

The twin towers each face North and South. Each of the towers is exactly 18 feet square and rising slighting as they go up 40 feet. There is a 12 foot wide archway that connects the towers, whose dimensions are 18 feet by 48 feet. On the North Tower there is a circular turret rising 15 feet from the top, making the tower almost 60 feet high. At the very top there used to be support for a large flagpole.
4.2 Past use of the Tower

A visit to the Worcester Historical Museum yielded many newspaper articles and official city documents chronicling the City’s use of the Tower since its construction. These documents were photocopied with permission of the Worcester Historical Society and can be viewed in our official records with this report.

We found further records of events and financial concerns surrounding the Tower from the records of the Worcester Parks and Recreation Department, courtesy of Robert Antonelli.

4.3 Public Opinions

Immediate Neighbors and the Hammond Heights Group

We spoke with the Hammond Heights Neighborhood Group several times during our research period, as well as several of the immediate neighbors of the Tower. Most people we talked to were not optimistic about the idea of re-opening the Tower, to say the least. Beyond saying that they believed that the Tower would never be re-opened, many said that they did not see the Tower fondly at all. Several noted that the Tower has been a source of distress for them, often attracting unwanted crowds, especially at night. Even those who remembered enjoying the open Tower in their youth often resented it now that they lived near it. Many recalled the problems that the Tower had in the 80s, saying that the moment that the Tower gets re-opened, the problems would return. (Abutters, Feb 2012, and Hammond Heights, Feb 2012)
Opinions weren’t all negative, however. The Hammond Heights Neighborhood Group, while adamant that they were content with the Tower being closed for good, did like the idea of an occasional supervised opening. This would be an scheduled community event, where citizens of Worcester and the families of the surrounding area in particular would be allowed to attend and enjoy the interior of the Tower. This would be handled by an appointed representative, not necessarily a member of the neighborhood group. Whenever one of these event were to happen, both the Worcester Parks and Recreation Department and the Worcester Police Department would be made aware of it in case they should want to raise any concerns.

As a whole, the community is dissatisfied with the level of security around the Tower at night. The amount of illumination on the Tower and on the roads leading up to it is dangerously low. There was a general consensus that before anything else should be done, measures should be taken to increase security at the park.

Meeting with the Parks Commission
On January 26, we met with the Worcester Parks Commission to ask their input on our project. The commission members and Director Robert Antonelli remember the Tower fondly and were optimistic about the idea of re-opening the Tower eventually. After the meeting, our group had the good fortune of bumping into Tom Morris, a park security guard who specifically tends to Salisbury Park. He had overheard our presentation to the Committee, and offered his opinion to us.

In his 37 ½ years working with the city, he felt the road should be kept blocked off or have a gate. A common problem with the park is that people park for too long.
works Monday through Friday from 4pm to 12 am. He told us that all parks close at 10 pm.

He feels that somebody should be on security during the daylight hours. He claims people don’t know that Bancroft tower exists, Worcester police probably won’t stay, and if it were to be reopened, crime would still occur. He feels that there should be a guard at all times. Another concern of his is that people use the tower as a bathroom. He said this kind of activity happens when the tower is unsupervised. It is not easy to clean because there is no hydrant nearby, and the only way to clean inside the tower is to use a fire hose. Another concern he brought to our attention is lurkers. For example, in October when he opened the park for the boy scouts, they saw a man hanging around in the woods nearby. According to Mr. Morris, there used to be three park security guards, now there is only him. During July and August, he works only on Monday, Wednesday, and Thursday. Another problem he has encountered with Bancroft Tower is people have been locked inside it. When he has shouted out that they were locking the tower up, a few instances have occurred when he has walked in on people in the middle of sexual activities and embarrassed them.

Despite all these issues, Mr. Morris expressed that the tower should be used more, but it should also have a supervisor. The tower should be locked and unlocked each time one goes in. He feels that there should be a permanent bathroom solution including plumbing, etc. and this project could perhaps involve the Worcester Vocational Technical High School students, specifically the plumbers, carpenters, and electricians to help make it. There used to be portable outhouses. If there were to be portable
outhouses again, he feels that they should be chained to a tree because a common problem with these facilities is that they are often knocked over. (Morris, Jan 2012)

4.4 WPI Survey Results

On February 6, 2012 a survey was sent out to the entire undergraduate email list at WPI. This survey was to get the schools opinion of Bancroft Tower. Part of this was to see if students were even aware that the tower existed and if they would be interested if it was open to the public again. The charted results of the survey are shown in Figure 15. A more thorough report of the survey can be requested from group Member Michael Pelissari.
Figure 15 - Graphs of Survey Results of WPI Students
Our survey was designed to bring attention to Bancroft Tower. Most students did not know that the tower was closed recently. They thought having the tower open was a good idea and would regularly go visit. Eighty-eight percent support the idea of regular part clean ups to keep it looking nice. However, 82% of the students thought Worcester Parks in general were not safe at night.

We originally wanted to send out a similar survey to the Worcester public, but time constraints and a lack of a way to distribute awareness led to us not pursuing that route. We instead satisfied this need by talking with the immediate neighbors of Bancroft Tower directly.

4.5 Safety Measures for the Tower

Lighting

Throughout public spaces, people are concerned with security, and a common public outcry to fix this tends to be lighting. However, these spaces tend to be over-lit. The fact is that over-doing or doing too little lighting can be good or bad. With that concept it is crucial to understand the area needing to be lit and plan accordingly. Now one may ask why lighting is important. (Cityscape Institute, 2012)

Lighting has four main categories for why it is important. Lighting can immensely increase the safety and self-awareness of people in areas that are used, such as parks or walkways. People tend to remember objects and places by focal points. By creating a well-lit area it helps in geographic orientation and helps people find their way. History is a topic in which we pride in the United States, and thus we spotlight and show off. For example, if a person has been the District of Columbia every monument and statue
is specifically lit to highlight its best features. Lighting then highlights the unique identity of an area enriching the history. Lastly the best sense of area is emotion, so lighting sets the drama and mood if applied properly. With this Salisbury Park and Bancroft Tower can be a spotlight of intrigue and pleasure. (Cityscape Institute, 2012)

Lighting can be used in many different ways and places. The best places are:

- Landscaping
- Transit stops
- Entrances
- Edges
- Retail Displays
- Architectural details
- Signage
- Focal Points
- Traffic-calming device

Salisbury Park and Bancroft Tower can utilize and benefit most with lighting from entrances, architectural detail and focal points. Entrances tend to be used, with a good flow of traffic, so indiscriminate lighting at entrances can lead to a more secure park. Bancroft Tower is a major architectural detail and the main focal point of the park. With this the lighting of the tower Arch, the small turrets outside the tower, can bring drama at night while providing a feel of drama for people walking at night. With the tower being lit it gives passing pedestrians a form of way finding.
The question that may arise next is: how much is enough lighting? Different kinds of light sources can have a varying quality of emission, effecting the appearance and safety of an area. There are two main types of bulbs which are commonly used to illuminate places, high-pressure sodium and metal halide. High-pressure sodium lights give off a yellow/orange glow. This makes the surrounding areas color retention poor do the color overlap, which over detracts from a pleasurable nighttime experience. It is also the most common type of light used for street lamps. Metal halide lights give off a warm white glow that does not affect how surrounding objects colors appear to the eye. This offers better clarity, improves driver’s reactions and uses less electricity per watt for the same amount of visibility compared to the high-pressure sodium light. (Cityscape Institute, 2012)

Lighting of and area greatly relies on the height and spacing of said lights, which also effects the areas mood and safety. The quality of light is impacted also by quantity. This is best described as brightness over a distance. Light dissipates the further away from the sources, so for a specified luminesce; a corresponding range of height is required to get the desired effect. (Cityscape Institute, 2012)

Ultimately every area needing to be list has different variables and the light levels must be deliberated for the exact location in question. With that there are general existing conditions in which much be examined in the end. (Cityscape Institute, 2012)

- street width
- sidewalk width
- path width (in parks or plazas)
• typical height of buildings
• number, placement, and types of trees
• types of paved surfaces
• roadway geometries
• length of the block

Graffiti Removal

According to Mr. Jordan O’Connor, sand-blasting is not the most practical solution for removing the graffiti from the interior of the Tower. The process could weaken the integrity of the stone, causing it to become more porous to rain and humidity. Long-term, the longevity is shortened. O’Connor recommended using a muriatic acid solution to remove the graffiti. If we know the type of stone the Tower is made of, we can find out what solution is needed online. (Keep America Beautiful, 2012)

There are several different graffiti removal methods, and each type of surface has a particular method to which it responds best. One can also protect surfaces from being vandalized further by applying protective coatings. The most common graffiti type is spray paint. Other types include etching products, stencils, lipstick, shoe polish, adhesives, markers, etc. The longer the graffiti stays on the surface, the more difficult it is to remove it. (Keep America Beautiful, 2012)

Most graffiti removers are unavailable at hardware, home improvement, or paint stores, with the exception of removers designed specifically for paint. Instead, the removers are sold to professional graffiti remover companies, cities, or countries, in bulk. (Keep America Beautiful, 2012)
The three most popular removal methods are paint-out, chemical removers and pressure washing. Paint-out involves using paint to cover up graffiti on smooth surfaces. The cost of this method is low, and ranges from donated paint to 6 cents per square foot. Aside from the low cost, another benefit of paint-out is the safety of paint as a product, as opposed to some chemical solvents. (Keep America Beautiful, 2012)

Chemical removers vary in strength. The stronger the solvent is, the faster the graffiti is removed. Some of the stronger solvents require safety measures to be taken for the sake of personal protection. It is crucial to select the proper product. A poorly matched solvent may cause results that are aesthetically unappealing. Small jobs, including spray paint and marker removal from utility boxes and light poles, use a chemical remover with a cloth or scrubber. “Handi-wipes” can also be useful. Bigger jobs require industrial products and sometimes require application by a professional. (Keep America Beautiful, 2012)

Pressure washing is when water or a combination of water and a solvent are used to remove the graffiti. Sometimes, a solvent is applied first and the surface is then sprayed with pressurized water. Other times, a “blasting media” (such as sand or baking soda) is used. This is an effective method, but it can wear down the surfaces that are being treated. (Keep America Beautiful, 2012)

The two types of protective coatings are sacrificial and non-sacrificial coatings. Sacrificial coatings protect the surface well, but they come off and must be reapplied when graffiti is removed. Non-sacrificial coatings remain unaffected by graffiti removal and stay on the surface. Like graffiti removers, most protective coatings are unavailable
at hardware, home improvement or paint stores, and are sold to professional graffiti remover companies, cities, and countries in bulk. (Keep America Beautiful, 2012)

Detailed methods of removal for specific materials
- Aluminum Siding, Fiberglass: Paint remover (sparingly); rinse with water
- Glass: Razor blade to scrape off; can also use paint thinner
- Masonry: Power washing with low pressure; sand or soda blasting (may create a shadow); paint remover or chemical graffiti remover/solvent applied with brush and rinse with water; paint over
- Historic Masonry or Other Valuable Structures: Seek out a professional
- Metal: Paint thinner or chemical graffiti remover/solvent and rub with steel wool or sandpaper and rinse; power washing; paint over
- Pavement: Chemical remover and power washing; soda blasting
- Street signs: Chemical remover (make sure it does not remove reflective coating)
- Stucco: Paint remover/chemical remover and rinse with pressure wash; paint over
- Utility Boxes: Chemical remover with cloth or scrubber
- Vinyl Siding: Chemical solvents sparingly as they may remove the vinyl coating; repaint with primer first
- Wood: On painted, unweathered wood can try mineral spirits; power washing with low pressure; sanding; repainting
- Etching: Etching may be repairable on some glass (seek out a professional); replace glass.
• Adhesives: Scrape away as much of the adhesive as possible; use nail polish remover or acetone-based cleaner to remove remaining residue. Be aware that acetone-based solvents can soften plastics. (Keep America Beautiful, 2012)

Architectural Review

Conversation with Mr. John Morawski of the Worcester Building Permits Office

In order to get the Tower approved for public use, it must be examined and shown to adhere to the International Existing Building Codes (IEBC) Massachusetts Building Code CMR 8th Edition and the Book of Amendments as part of the International Code. These specifications are chosen by the Board of Building Regulations and Standards (BBRS), and if an exception to these rules is to be made, the case must be approved by this board.

In order to get Bancroft Tower approved for reopening, we or some other group would need to hire an architect or architectural engineer to officially examine the Tower, and suggest improvements. All of the specifics are listed on the BBRS website. (BBRS Monthly Meetings, 2012) Morawski also had the courtesy to recommend an engineer in the area that works with WPI regularly, Jordan O'Connor, who may be willing to examine the Tower for a discount. (Morawski, Feb 2012)

Conversation with local architect Jordan O'Connor

The Code Review of the Tower will largely be dependent on how it is deemed that the Tower is to be used. How many people will the Tower be able to hold at a time? (structural capacity) Will there be more live activity or stagnant activity? (moving people vs. people standing around) Can people get out quickly in case of emergency? etc.
Code reviews for already existing buildings are often more complicated than for new buildings. The Massachusetts Amendments document which compliments the BBRS should be reviewed. Page 133 goes into detail about lateral loading, gravity loading, etc. that should be kept in consideration during all renovations.

The existing stair tread depths and rises should not be a problem, at least for the two ones on the roof. What is more concerning to architects is the width of most stairs (~44”), which shouldn't be a problem in this case. However, some nosing and handrails could be added for extra measure.

The Architectural Access Board will need to make its own inspection of the Tower, or at least approve the conditions of it. This board is essentially the action arm of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Ordinarily, they would not approve the Tower for access because it discriminates against the wheelchair-bound. However, this has been found to be a great hassle with other old buildings, and the board sometimes makes an exception due to the fact that their regulations are prudish. This is written in 521 CMR Architectural Access Board page 7. If additional cost to make renovations for the disabled would exceed 30% of the cost to construct the building or $100,000, the requirement may be waived. (Architectural Access Board, 2012) An example that O'Connor gave of this happening is none other than WPI's Kaven Hall, which has no access to the second floor for the disabled. (O'Connor, Feb 2012)
Chapter 5: Analysis

5.1 - Public Desire

Our group found it vital to reach out to the community through interviews and a survey to determine whether or not the public is interested in having Bancroft Tower reopened for municipal use. The opinions we gathered range from opposed to skeptical to enthusiastic. However, the majority of responses to our project were positive and encouraging.

In February, our group sent out a survey to the entire undergraduate email list. This survey was designed to assess the students’ opinion of Bancroft Tower, gauge how well-known it is, measure interest in regular park clean-ups and a possible reopening of the Tower to the public, and determine how safe students feel about Worcester parks at night. Over 500 students participated in our survey, and we found that despite Bancroft Tower’s closure, the majority of students have visited the tower at least once. When asked if they would be interested in seeing Bancroft Tower reopened to the public, 84% of students said yes with 80% of students responding they would use the tower and 9% of students responding that not only would they use the tower, but they would use it often. When asked if they were aware that the Tower had been closed to the public since 1992, 57% of students revealed that they were unaware of this, and an overwhelming 88% of the surveyed students said they would support regular park cleanups to keep Bancroft Tower open. Eighty-two percent of the students who took our survey said they felt that Worcester Parks are not safe at night.
Our group intended on sending out a similar survey to the citizens of Worcester. However, distributing a survey with such a short amount of time to obtain responses seemed to be a difficult idea. In order to encompass the local residents’ opinions, we decided to conduct interviews by walking door-to-door and speaking with the abutters directly. We composed a letter to leave in the mailboxes of those who were unavailable to speak with us or not at home. These interviews generated the more negative responses to potentially reopening the Tower. Some of these neighbors mentioned that it would be too costly to have it reopened. However, most of the abutters fear that having the tower opened would attract negative behavior. These neighbors said that even though the Tower is closed, it already brings forth too many people who misuse it, disturb the peace, and engage in criminal activity. Some of the abutters noted that Worcester police have failed to patrol the area consistently in the past, and they fear that the park, especially because it is dangerously unlit at night, will be a haven for drugs, sexual activity, violence, and vandalism. Nevertheless, not all of the abutters were opposed to controlled use of the tower. The idea of having the Tower open during daylight hours and closed before sunset did not bother these neighbors. However, even these more positive responses upheld that the Tower is dangerous at night. Across the board, neighbors said they want increased nightly patrols and proper lighting.

We spoke with former Worcester mayor and radio talk show host Jordan Levy in order to gauge reactions and collect opinions. After discussing the history of the Tower and our group’s vision with Mr. Levy, he stated that he would really like to see it used for community events, neighborhood activities, school projects, and leisure. Mr. Levy himself remembers using Bancroft Tower and enjoying its spectacular view, especially
during spring and fall. He was extremely enthusiastic of our idea of opening Bancroft Tower to the public and certain that there were others who would be eager to see it reopened as well. Mr. Levy did note that improved security measures are a necessity and that it could certainly be a while before the City of Worcester would focus its attention on Bancroft Tower. Nevertheless, he feels that Bancroft Tower is an important landmark and a “monument that identifies Worcester’s past.” He said in conclusion that he believes Bancroft Tower would be “shameful to lose,” should be enjoyed by the younger generation, and that there will be others who may want to participate in this project. Mr. Levy read our group’s email address twice on-air so that interested listeners could offer us their input. However, our group did not receive such emails.

(Levy, Mar 2012)

5.2 - Safety Factors

The steps on the roof of the Tower are thin, and may be dangerous. Additionally, the spiral staircase in the circular turret could be dangerous to some people, especially the young and elderly. Each step is steep and the staircase is thin, and it may be dangerous when wet. The Tower is also completely unlit at night. According to the Worcester Fire Department, there is no danger of fire within the Tower.

5.3 - Crime Prevention

Lighting at night is essential for maintaining security in the park. The isolated location as well as the avid darkness makes the Tower a prime spot for crime and violent acts. This can be prevented with a series of floodlights that would illuminate the
Tower at night. At least one floodlight on each side of the Tower, as well as one on the archway would be sufficient illumination for the area. There is a spot on a nearby power line where there once was a floodlight that could also be used. The Park gets dangerously dark around 7pm, so this is when the lights should be programmed to become active. They would then be programmed to deactivate at the sunrise.

To have them illuminated all of the time would be a waste of electricity and a bother to the neighbors, so motion detection could be installed to minimize this. Perhaps the light at the archway could be constantly on at a low setting, and the others would be activated by motion detection. Having the place brightly illuminated will likely scare away any shady individuals wishing to do mischief. Hopefully, these lights can be arranged so that the neighbors aren’t greatly inconvenienced. The presence of lighting also opens up the possibility of video monitoring as a possible future installation.

There is currently a ban on public access to the park between the hours of 10pm and 6am. Even with the lighting installed, there should be no change to this policy.

5.4 - Additional Renovation Recommendations

The current state of the Tower leaves much to be desired in terms of cosmetic appeal. Besides the safety and security factors, the Park could be greatly improved with some simple alterations. The view from the lookout, for instance, could have a directional guide for pointing out all of the historic places visible from the top. This would include the airport, the downtown area, WPI, and of course the other significant hills in the city.
The grass around the Tower is well-kept but has much potential for more. Some landscaping work around the base of the Tower could greatly improve its appeal.

There is a plaque at the foot of the Tower detailing the life of Mr. George Bancroft. Another plaque could be added to detail the life of the Tower itself, as well as the life of Mr. Stephen Salisbury III. Once the Tower is allowed to be opened again for community events, either an opening schedule or contact information to find out an opening schedule should be made available somewhere within view near the large metal door.

5.5 - Financial Burden to the City

**Code Review and Renovation Costs**

Before any renovations can be made to the Tower, a Code Review must be made by a certified architect. According to Mr. Jordan O’Connor, this should have an initial cost of about $7500. Once this review is done, costs of renovations can be properly estimated. Since the building is so old and unique, any estimates as to an ultimate accumulative cost would be speculation at best. More detail about possible sources of renovation cost are covered in our Findings section. (O’Connor, Feb 2012)

**Interior Clean-up**

According to records of previous clean-ups done of Bancroft Tower, a proper cleaning may cost around $400. This may not include the cost of graffiti clean-up, which may have to be handled by a different company. Records of past cleaning jobs are available in our appendices.
Maintenance Costs and Patrol Costs

According to Robert Antonelli, there is very little maintenance cost to the Tower. About $10,000 is allotted yearly for mowing around the Tower every other week and patrol costs, unless significant vandalism occurs. There is currently very little staff in terms of Park Security that can patrol the area, so it would be unrealistic to ask the Parks Department for extra coverage to this area unless somehow more of the budget were allocated to it. The Worcester Police Department may be asked for greater coverage, but it is difficult to ascertain how much of a demand that would be for them, as most police patrolling and other activity is unavailable to the public. (Antonelli, Nov 2011)

Liability Costs

The City of Worcester is self-insured and does not have insurance for human injury. Each year, the City allocates a varying amount of money to a general fund and pays for injury only if the Parks and Recreation Department is shown to be completely negligent. It would be rare for the Park or the City to be held responsible for anything so long as the Tower remains closed, and remains properly supervised while open. (Antonelli, Nov 2011)

5.6 - Financial Asset to the City

Park Appreciation

Bancroft Tower can be a source of community value and it can be a financial asset. The Tower is a symbol of the diversity, culture and history of Worcester. It should provide a source of enjoyment for people of all ages, as was intended with its construction. Having the Tower open and cleaned up would financially be worth the
effort because increased property values and increased municipal revenues go hand in hand.

**Real-Estate**

City parks are often selling points and attract home buyers. Often times, the parks attract affluent retirees who bring expendable income to their communities, increasing tax base and using fewer services than they pay for through taxes, such as public schooling. (How Smart Park Investment Pays Its Way, 2011) Parks increase property values and municipal revenues. Several studies conducted in the past two decades have shown that there is indeed a positive connection between open parks and increased property values. (Schwartz, 2008) Increased property values are affected primarily by two factors: distance from the park and the quality of the park itself. In a 2008 study commissioned by Friends of Hudson River Park with research by the Regional Plan Association and data from the Real Estate Board of New York confirms this connection and found that by the completion of the Greenwich Village section of the Hudson River Park raised real estate prices in the adjacent two blocks by 20 percent. (Schwartz, 2008) In 2003, a study prepared by Ernst & Young and New Yorkers for Parks reviewed the results of investment in six city parks and 30 additional parks. It found that real estate values were higher on blocks closest to well-managed and maintained parks. (How Smart Park Investment Pays Its Way, 2011)

5.7 - Expected Public use of the Tower

The Hammond Heights Neighborhood Group and the WPI fraternity ATO already hold events at the Park several times a year, including an Easter egg hunt and
barbeque in April, and a haunted house in October. If the Tower were allowed to be re-opened, it would enhance these occasions as well as encourage more frequent events and community gatherings. There have been plays put on at the Tower in the past, and it has become a popular spot for watching fireworks. It also has the potential to host rock concerts, should proper electricity be made available. Should all of these possibilities be realized, parking is a problem and should be addressed in the future.

5.8 - Worcester Activism in the Park

The WPI fraternity ATO does a lot of community service work around the park today, and occasionally a cleaning crew will be sent to spruce up the area and remove any elusive trash. Once the Tower is open again, it presents an opportunity to garner more community activity. The local grade schools and university organizations can come up to clean the area, while admiring the view and the architecture.

A donation bin could also be set up at the door of the Tower to aid to the cost of professional clean-ups and restorations to the Tower. This could be done with the aid of Debra Packard of Preservation Worcester.
Chapter 6: Conclusion

The first action that should be taken is to improve the safety around the Tower, particularly at night. The spotlight at the base of the Tower must be fixed according to the recommendations in our Findings section before any other measures are taken. More preferably, a newer spotlight or other form of lighting should be installed, as well as the availability of electricity in the park area. There once was a spotlight that illuminated the west side of the Tower. This provides a potential source of electricity that could be routed to new lights at the base of the Tower and in the archway. Once installed, if deemed necessary, motion detection could be added to trigger these lights on at night and keep them on at minimal power during inactivity.

The second necessary action is to hire an architectural firm to do a code review of the building. The initial cost of this is estimated to be about $7500. Any further costs for maintenance and clean-up are pure speculation until this is done, especially since the building is so old. However, here is a list of things that we anticipate would be among the list of expenses needed to approve the Tower for re-opening:

- Graffiti clean-up, by muriatic acid treatment, or by other means. For reference, the last graffiti clean-up occurred in 2006 by Empire Granite Inc., and cost a total of $400.
- Adjustment/fixing of the spiral staircase in the main turret. This may include manual re-fixing of the staircase to the base and top, or may include a complete replacement of the metal framing, depending on the recommendations of the architect.
• The addition of railing and nosing to the short steps on the roof of the Tower. This may be done with cheap additions initially, and a permanent solution afterward.

• De-weeding and de-molding of the roof (an ultimately cosmetic improvement, but may prove necessary nonetheless).

An inspection by the Architectural Access Board will also have to be made. It is possible that they will not approve Bancroft Tower for opening initially due to the fact that it has no wheelchair access. However, they may approve once an analysis shows that the necessary measures to make it so would be too costly, as is most likely the case.

Once adjustments have been made and a second code review is conducted to deem the Tower safe for entry by the public, a new policy should be instated for regulating entry. According to the Hammond Heights Neighborhood Group, the following conditions are suitable.

• Permission to open Bancroft Tower for public entry shall be granted to a group or individual on specific dates. This may happen once or twice a month for community and neighborhood events.

• The Tower should be open and supervised by this group during hours of operation. These hours could begin as early as 9am and end as late as 6pm, before the sun sets.

• During supervised opening hours, all citizens of Worcester should be allowed entry, as well as any visiting guests.
• The Tower should remain locked and closed during days and hours that are unspecified. However, some sort of notification should be present with contact information to find current hours of operation.

There are several possible funders for this plan. The primary funder would be the City of Worcester itself, taking necessary liberties from its yearly budget. Worcester Polytechnic Institute is also a possible funder, as it is in close proximity to Salisbury Park and owns much of the land in the area. The Hammond Heights Neighborhood Group may be willing to foot some of the cost, also due to the proximity of the park. They have provided the funding for necessary improvements in the past, such as the installation of the large metal door. Mrs. Debra Packard of Preservation Worcester has stated that putting together a public fundraiser for the project may be a possibility.

Extra and more consistent patrolling by the Worcester Police Department should be made on days when the Park is to be more active. It is also recommended that night patrolling should be more frequent once the lighting has been re-installed around the Tower.

Once the code review has been completed, and a list of necessary improvements has been compiled, a Subcommittee Meeting for Worcester Public Land Use should be held to evaluate the idea in a public forum, and decide whether or not to allow the necessary changes. If approved, Bancroft Tower can be made open to the public once again for supervised events.
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## Appendices

### A) List of Contacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>Position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guillermo Salazar</td>
<td><a href="mailto:salazar@wpi.edu">salazar@wpi.edu</a></td>
<td>1-508-831-5262</td>
<td>Project Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank DeFalco</td>
<td><a href="mailto:defalco@wpi.edu">defalco@wpi.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillip Clay</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pclay@wpi.edu">pclay@wpi.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dean of Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruth McKeogh</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmckeogh@wpi.edu">rmckeogh@wpi.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>IGSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Jiusto</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sjusto@wpi.edu">sjusto@wpi.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>IGSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Curley</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mjcurley@wpi.edu">mjcurley@wpi.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>WPI Finance and Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Looft</td>
<td><a href="mailto:lclooft@wpi.edu">lclooft@wpi.edu</a></td>
<td>508-831-6014</td>
<td>VP of WPI Government and Community Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Krueger</td>
<td><a href="mailto:krueger@wpi.edu">krueger@wpi.edu</a></td>
<td>1-508-831-5110</td>
<td>IGSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Antonelli</td>
<td><a href="mailto:AntonelliR@worcesterma.gov">AntonelliR@worcesterma.gov</a></td>
<td>508-799-1190</td>
<td>Director of Worcester Parks and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Morawski</td>
<td><a href="mailto:morawskij@worcesterma.gov">morawskij@worcesterma.gov</a></td>
<td>508-799-1206</td>
<td>Building Inspector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan O’Connor</td>
<td></td>
<td>508-754-3475</td>
<td>Architect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheila Killeen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kiltydog@charter.net">kiltydog@charter.net</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>President of Hammond Heights Neighborhood Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan Levy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jordan@wtag.com">Jordan@wtag.com</a></td>
<td>508-755-0058</td>
<td>Worcester Talk Radio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debra Packard</td>
<td></td>
<td>508-754-8760</td>
<td>Director of Preservation Worcester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Building Permits Office</td>
<td>508-799-1206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Antiquarian Society</td>
<td>508-755-5221</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Fire Department</td>
<td>508-799-1816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Historical Society</td>
<td>508-753-8278</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Traffic Division</td>
<td>508-799-8674</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Spirit of Worcester</td>
<td>508-755-5770</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higgins Armory</td>
<td></td>
<td>508-853-6015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worcester Garden Club</td>
<td>508-835-3342</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autobahn Society</td>
<td></td>
<td>508-753-6087</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B) Notes Taken from Meetings

Notes from IQP meeting on August 29, 2011

Robert Antonelli- Director of Parks

Rob Kruger- overseas program, friends with Rob Antonelli- wrote letter to him in April, no response

Terms: A (1/6 unit), B (1/3 unit), C (1/3 unit), D (1/6 unit)

Process of Developing a Proposal:

• Proposal defines project.
• Template on IQP website
• Know what safety, environmental, OSHA issues are
• Proposal should be done in A term
• Proposal includes introduction, background, methodology
• Becomes first chapters of final report, makes objectives clear

Background:

• Why is it closed? (if some details are confidential, it will be documented, but confidentially)
  - WPI attorney forbade contact with persons involved in suicide incident
• Liabilities-probably biggest hurdle
• What would be the benefits of opening tower?
  - Improved Worcester image
  - Need to research & perhaps survey others
  - Part of Worcester parks- no historical relevance, built by Salisbury III & made for friend when died
• Need a good, solid case to conduct study

Methodology:

• Survey of interview people
• Economics of having public buildings open to public
• What we’re telling city—providing resource to allow city to make good decision.
• Make very compelling
• Want to cover all ground, whatever is significant
• Who do we need to contact?

B&C Terms: prepare interviews, surveys, build evidence, come up with economic numbers
We need permission to go inside tower & take a look around, see how many issues, take pictures. Earlier the better, before winter hits

Invite Frank DeFalco to meetings: structural engineer, knows people in city

Structural Integrity: issues with physical building, structural safety

As soon as start preparing proposal, find where each person will contribute

Open a myWPI site: request new site, call it IQP site, upload & download info, has a discussion board

myWPI: can post material, professor’s expectations

A-Term: don’t need to meet every week, meet every other week

Get DeFalco involved for next meeting

Schedule appointment with Mr. Antonelli

Schedule appointment with Mr. Kruger first

For next time, have preliminary proposal, 5 sections of headings

Mail List- perhaps bancroft@wpi.edu
Notes from IQP meeting on September 12, 2011

Dividing Work?

Need to get in touch with Frank DeFalco (co-advisor)

Need to build up a knowledge base of these issues/Literature that addresses these issues:

- Terrorism & Historical Buildings:
  - How does it relate to our building? It doesn’t.
- All Safety Issues: How many issues apply to these buildings?
- Structural Integrity & Codes—DeFalco is good; structural engineer
- Operations for public places

IRB: internal review—interactions with people, kinds of questions, confidentiality (later) for surveys with school

Cross Benefit Analysis—Methodology—benefits, how do we measure?

Costs: How much do we have to pay? Citizens & city benefit

Find a way to quantify. Qualitative analysis

Economics of having building open: - property values in Worcester

City Square: between Union Station & City Hall: problem was people never bought from it. People find Worcester scary, strange people

Worcester Armory: older books on area

Create schedule

Background: what do we hope to accomplish?

Create reference section as we go-automated-websites. (Chicago style of works cited. Stick to one)

Need to use books as reference if things can’t be found online
Notes from IQP meeting on September 19, 2011

Meeting with Professor DeFalco

On September 14 heard back from Rob Antonelli, we have cooperation with Worcester Parks Department

Salisbury family, boards, etc. might sponsor project. Look at local Worcester foundations.

Funding from charitable foundations—should look up for proposal

Pictures of tower

Create detailed timeline

Include in proposal who’s in charge of what
Notes from IQP meeting on September 26, 2011

Need to have proposal written by end of A-Term

Joint sponsorship of WPI & City of Worcester for renovation of Institute Park

No contact from city of Worcester

Michael: Background overview of these types of buildings in general

Perspective: Gillette Castle—-in worse shape, still open to public

Provide Context: why it is important to preserve Bancroft Tower

Should be working on project 8 hours/week

Visit downtown library? Antiquarian Society? (corner of Park & Institute)

Economics:

- Liability issues
- Costs anticipated—i.e., lighting, cleaning it up, possible safety feature to be added to tower
- Real estate values near parks
- Costs of park to city of Worcester.

Remember to document sources
Notes from IQP meeting on October 3, 2011

Tanya:

1. Found study:
   - lighting in two communities, compared with similar but unimproved control areas, lighting reduced crime rates >40%
   - Savings from reduced crime far exceed the cost of lighting improvements
     - Saved 2.4x the cost in one area
     - Saved 10x the cost in another

2. Found 20 page document about measuring the economic value of a city park system:
   - Property value
   - Tourism value
   - Direct use
   - Health value
   - Community cohesion value
   - Reduced cost of managing urban storm water
   - Removal of air pollution by vegetation

3. Laws on MA’s public parks

Find Plans for Tower: structural issues, support, does it have a steel frame?

Go to:

- Local Library
- Archives
- See a lawyer
- Gillette Castle

Search IQPs & MQPs for lighting & crime
Notes from IQP meeting on October 6, 2011

**B-Term IQP Schedule:**

Week 1: IQP Outings
- Town Hall Archives
- Blueprints
- Past projects
- Financial concerns
- History
- Meet with town representatives, get permission for interviews

Week 2: Go to Bancroft Tower
- Take pictures
- Assess tower condition
- Look out for potential improvements
- Note defacing/vandalism

Week 3: Schedule Interviews
- Meet with lawyer about liabilities
- Need pre-made interview questions

Week 4: Antiquarian Society & Schedule Interviews

Visit Gillette Castle over Christmas Break

**C-Term IQP Schedule:**

Weeks 1-5: come up with site plans for improvements, anticipated costs

**D-Term IQP Schedule:**

Update project Methodology
Notes from IQP meeting on October 25, 2011

First meeting of B-Term

- Coordinate Schedules
- Look at Salazar’s notes on Proposal
- Mike Curley: legal guidance for WPI liability & negligence
- When was Bancroft tower closed?
Notes from IQP meeting on October 31, 2011

Reviewing Proposal

- Monument—what would it take to have it reopened
- “It is our expectation…”
- Use sources to support opinions
- Preliminary observations—hypotheses—first stage of research
- Save lighting part for later

- Researching danger of unlit parks
- Why was tower closed?
- Find preliminary source on exactly when & why park was closed.
- Can mention suicide—ask to quote WPI lawyers
- Find out more details about why & when
- Address: How can we get it reopened?
- Take a look at map of Salisbury Park
- Document images
- Address Comments within a week or 2, next draft by Friday
- This week: antiquarian society, archives—blueprints
- Have recap of interviews for next meeting

Interviews:

- Mike Curley
- Linda Looft
- Neighbors
  - How? Think of questions
- Email survey to students
- Foot pounders? Would they have interest?
- Maybe interview City Council—someone who has “voice”
- Campus Police?
- Worcester Police?

See who wants to have picnics & events

Need to document questions

Interview to find costs

Look at proposal & see who can provide evidence that can support our point of view
Hubbard Park in Meriden, CT

More Activism bullet points based on today’s meeting in “topics” section
Notes from IQP meeting on November 3, 2011

Meeting with Group Members

American Antiquarian Society

- Salisbury Park & other 2 Parks with towers (Norse & ???)
- Gillette Castle, Hubbard Park
- Why & when Tower was closed
- Images & maps

Worcester Public Library

Worcester Historical Museum—corner of Chestnut & Elm St.

Meeting with Mike Curley

Find out whether or not park was closed due to a possible suicide attempt. Was closing prior to or result of incident? Look for who has records on this information.

Director of Worcester Historical Society—see if anyone is available to speak to—plans, how long tower was open, currently shuttered. Why & how long?

Ask Antonelli about how much City of Worcester is liable for injury

Tower used to be under lit
Notes from IQP meeting on November 5, 2011

At Worcester Historical Museum


Berkshire Design Group (Northampton, MA) to develop master plan for the site, has worked on Elm Park & the Brimfield Town Common.

The Master Plan including a topographic survey, site analysis, & preliminary & final designs cost $6000.

Bib Dietrich: Fundraiser Organizer

American Antiquarian Society—Salisbury Family Papers—could have plan for Bancroft Tower.

Find information about park statuses—how progressed since ‘70s and 80’s.

Worcester Public Library has history room.

Joy Hennig: designated Worcester Room Librarian.

Thomas Jones: building mason.

Notes from IQP meeting on November 7, 2011

Find out who else wants tower open
Funding from Stephen Salisbury Foundation
Develop Strategy & have it well-documented
Document what we are working on; have record of what we’re supposed to be doing
Make list of documentation—Plan of Action—and explain it

Rob Antonelli interview:
Prep him well with information. Pre-knowledge of what it’s about
Fax: Mention IQP is a graduation requirement, write paragraph on what IQP is, mention DeFalco & Salazar
Find out how much time we have with him at beginning of interview. Get to point.

Questions:
- Insurance for park/Parks Dept
- Any records of blueprints—“how would we use information? Is it possible?”
- Could we make a video tour?—Document condition as we see it. Cannot make an assessment.
- DeFalco: “Just document appearance; don’t analyze structural integrity.”
- Sign board at site showing what’s where—at top from where people view things
- When & who & how we can get up there. Assign a specific day to go up [Document existing condition. Perhaps MQP structural engineering, panoramic view]
- Ask Antonelli’s opinion, Is it worth it? Is it possible?
- How does Park & Rec Dept work? Ask about organization. How is it handled internally? Support from city & state & how much they might impact Tower?
- Stress that we need to go inside in next 2 weeks at Antonelli’s convenience.
- Finding human labor costs: What will it cost to maintain?

Before we fax, brief statement or strategy & questions written by Wednesday morning

Potential Table of Contents—how is final project going to look?
Outline of Major sections
Get paperwork printed out for interviews—get out to IGSD 11/08 or 11/09.
Notes from Meeting with Rob Antonelli on November 10, 2011

- No significant criminal activity beyond vandalism and attempted entry, graffiti, damage to gate because people try to get in. New, difficult lock installed, new bars on some windows & a gate used to combat this.
- In Antonelli’s 14 years with Worcester Parks Dept., there hasn’t been lighting around tower except for a single spotlight. Lighting by southwest side. Not operational because the bulb may have burnt out.
- City is self-insured and there’s no blanket insurance policy. Does not have insurance for human injury. City of Worcester allocates x-amount of money to a general fund & uses that money to pay for injury.
- Not a lot of money spent on maintenance. Grass is maintained every other week. Have had to repair wall next to the Tower 2 times in the last 6 years. Wall had been hit by cars a couple times. The main maintenance has just been mowing & leaf pickup.
- Night security is light. There is a night security guy who goes up as needed. Occasionally Worcester Police swings by.
- Antonelli: “As we see issues, we reprioritize locations” on security in parks in Worcester.
- Trying to install camera/security system in all parks for the purposes of license plate identification and addressing illicit sexual activity in the parks.
- Inappropriate behavior is no longer a problem at Bancroft Tower.
- There is one guy who patrols Bancroft Tower on Monday-Friday.
- There are 60 parks in Worcester.
- City spends very little (approx. $10,000/year) which covers the costs for staff on mower and patrol, unless there’s vandalism: Iron bars & door cost $1200-1500 to install; the wall repair cost $3000-4000.
- There is no compiled, organized timeline on the Tower available. However, records are available to be looked through, and Mr. Antonelli suggested we can create one and put it online for the city of Worcester.
- Funding—There are groups which advocate, assist in revenue, and help in Master Plans. Dr. Berkey & others donate money every year for Institute Park. Friends of Institute Park. City of Worcester borrowed $1 million for Institute Park & slowly distributed it with construction.
- All plans go through Antonelli’s office. Capital budget for city is online, which changes on a yearly basis.
- Parks Commission—There are 7 members of Park’s Commission, who are advisory to Antonelli, and meet once a month. They are Antonelli’s “eyes and ears in the public” who may have information about the city’s sentiment towards Bancroft Tower. There are public meetings which occur on the 4th Thursday of each month and meet at 7pm in the Worcester Parks Dept. building. Next meeting is December 22nd.
- Funding for Parks Department: Property tax, excise tax—money spent on vehicle up to $25 of 1000, state allocation: 50% of the budget comes from state, grants which come from Commonwealth, Greater Worcester Community Foundation, and pilots: WPI & Clark.
- Extra Costs: does Bancroft Tower stay open or will it need to be opened & closed? Antonelli’s staff works from 6:30 am – 3 pm; night shift works from 4pm-12 am. How does the tower get opened each day it needs to in fact be opened & closed? Will there be overtime costs to lock it up?
- Perhaps we can make an agreement with a fraternity or sorority at WPI or neighborhood organization, or an organization/someone at WPI to lock Tower at certain time each day to reduce costs.
- More time will have to be spent on trash collection. For example, a maintenance guy will have to spend more time cleaning park & have to walk inside the tower to clean it.
- Increased vandalism costs—ex: graffiti removal.
- Possibility of cost increase on Worcester Police Dept.’s side such as overtime & manpower distribution, etc.
- Liability Increase: What happens if someone tries to be reckless? Cost increase to city in case city gets sued.
- Recreational Use Clause limits liability to $100,000 unless the city was completely negligent. Can view Recreational Use Clause online mass.gov
- Worried about negative behavior. What does Bancroft Tower bring now that it’s opened? What if it needs to be closed again? What is the outcry?
- Lighting can work. Antonelli: “double-edged sword” on lighting. In some cases, lighting brings in negative behavior because it can create shadows in which someone can see others but not be seen—lurkers. Most areas have lighting. Can decrease timing, turn on & off. Security cameras work better with lighting.
- MBL—numbers that correlate to property. Assessor for value of property—call the Assessor’s office.
Notes from IQP meeting on November 13, 2011

Create outline of final report

Schedule meeting with Mike Curley & visits to tower

Submit questions to IGSD

Submit IRB form
Notes from IQP Meeting on November 14, 2011

Find guidelines for safety & buildings

Add “Safety” & “Security” under topics in proposal.

Look into jogging clubs: WPI, Assumption, Clark

Contact Boy Scouts of America

Who is going to rehab the building—Who will fund? Talk to Salisbury family.

Friends of Institute Park

Clearly determine what groups we plan on interviewing.

Structurally organize interviews

Consolidate notes from meeting with Antonelli.

Meet at Kaven Hall 8:30 am to bring Salazar to Tower on Tuesday
Notes from IQP Meeting on November 21, 2011

- Tower trip tomorrow: clean with trash bags & gloves. See how we may make a video documentary. Meet on steps of Kaven Hall at 8:30 am.
- Curley: "Find out if Worcester has a website & see if we can post a survey about Bancroft Tower."
- Looking at pictures—can we create panoramic diagram?
- Is metal staircase/bottom of staircase slippery when it rains?
- There are weeds growing out of tower.
- Don’t really know how to remove graffiti off stone
- IRB form is fixed, Salazar will review & return tomorrow
- Post survey on Worcester website? Salazar says it’s a good idea. Use Survey Monkey & create an account.
- Create a Bancroft Tower website at WPI? We would have to run through the website policies of school.
- Can develop on own personal directory?
- Survey: Needs to be thorough. We have enough sample questions. Need to develop it. Set up Survey Monkey site as prototype & use it to test internally. Then reach out to specific groups with email—i.e., student body, faculty
- For next week: What specific groups would we like to target? How will we interview them? Using Worcester website to set up a link to survey is a passive idea. We need to be more aggressive. Think about how we will reach target groups. Actively go door-to-door? Labor-intensive, probably more effective.
- For next meeting: Create a survey. What are we going to do with the information we find? Start organizing final report. We already have enough info. Need to bring outline on Monday.
- Check & see if WPI has free access with Survey Monkey.
- Create a video tour tomorrow—panoramic view & point out landmarks.
- Looking at Gantt Chart on myWPI: Bancroft Tower access, go to antiquarian society for Salisbury Family Papers to find blueprint, we are behind on interviews; should be surveying by now.
- Go to Hubbard Park over winter break
- Update Gantt Chart for C & D Terms—“Stop brainstorming.”
- Post notes from meeting with Antonelli on myWPI
Notes from IQP Meeting on November 28, 2011

Going over outline: 5 Rhetorical Moves

Waiting on IRB form—should be done by mid-week

Interviews: Actively define specific groups, representatives, pros & cons

- WPI surveys
- Potential Users of the Park—WPI students, Who will benefit from opening park?
- Police, Fire Department—does it need to be fit for fire?
- Who can fund for sustainability?
- Parks & Recreation
- Neighbors—Who might oppose tower opening?

Create map for top of tower? Sights, unique attractions i.e., Goddard Rocket, Worcester Armory

Where are Arguments for Opening Park?

- What would we write about public knowledge of tower?
- What happened between closing in 1992-present?
- When has tower been opened for specific events?

Structure history up until present

Physical dimensions go under Building Classification

Have a chapter on just the tower instead

Financial aspects—how much does it cost to build? What are the current costs?

Public knowledge—What can people know?

Official records?

Should restructure outline—create natural flow of information

Have newer version

Activism in Worcester—link to organizations
Continued notes from meeting on November 28, 2011

Need to somehow advertise Bancroft tower usage. Want to promote tower as an attraction and usable to public.

Conclusions:

- Present all evidence. How will city go about this?
- Give numbers

This week: Call Worcester Police Department, Fire Department that services Bancroft Tower, Armory, Antiquarian Society, Tourism Center?, Worcester Website?, City Hall?

Try to get writing on Worcester website.
Notes from Meeting on December 5, 2011

Email Frank DeFalco about Salisbury Foundation
Contact Higgins Armory
Go to Antiquarian Society Wednesday

Worcester Fire Department is not concerned about Bancroft Tower

Skulls: Do they consider Bancroft Tower a part of history & tradition?
Contact Footpounders? WPI groundskeepers, maintenance staff?
Any groups/constituents we should contact? Any groups from liability point of view?

Police log of incidents: is it public information?

Abutters: neighbors—go over & talk to them soon. Make letters to put in mailbox if residents aren’t there & make sure to put WPI email

Next:
- tentative dates & how they play out in schedule?
- Survey faculty & staff
- Target dates
- Featured attraction map for top of tower
- Update schedule for C-term
- Report for end of term: have a well-coordinated outline of report by end of B-Term
- Bill: call WPD & find out what they know
- Tanya: talk to buildings department 508-799-1206 and find out what their opinion is on the Tower
Notes from Meeting on January 26, 2912, the first meeting of C-Term

Preparation for Parks Commission Meeting:

Mention how we created project, especially James

PowerPoint: slides 4&5 relate to bullet points

Discuss what we think should be done—very specific points

After PowerPoint, what do we say? –Looking for input, interest

Slide 10—“What do you think” slide—asking for suggestions

“We would like to present our ideas” ; mention what we would like to do, and ask for feedback at end. Gain input, context

Advisor’s feedback/comments:

Report seems scattered

Already have gathered info on crime to serve our purpose.

Get 95% of work done by end of C-term

Survey:

- Composed for students to gather interest.
- Come up with questions for survey for professors—i.e., Would you take your class there?
- Maybe create an open-ended question at end on what those surveyed would do at Bancroft Tower. “If this tower opens up, what kind of things would you do there?”
- Staff should be surveyed
- The more people surveyed, the more input to support us.

To Do:

- Contact DeFalco about Friends of Institute Park, send email to him to update about meeting.
- Survey ASAP—set a deadline for them “send in responses no later than…”
• Fill in more material in report
• Have a draft by February 9, 2012
Notes from Parks Commission Meeting on January 26, 2012

Deborah Packard—Preservation Worcester
Deb Cary—Massachusetts Audubon

David Kowalecheck:

- as long as someone locks up Tower, he is not opposed to idea.
- Remembers Bancroft Tower from childhood.

Paul Gunnerson:

- remembers Tower,
- says we should hold a hearing (send to Subcommittee on Land Use) to explore possibility.
- Suggested WPI could provide some security
- WPI could provide a venue if we were to have a public meeting, would advertise meeting to abutters within 1000 ft of Tower
- Our group should have another way to reach out to neighbors such as walking
- “Viable Opportunity”
- Rockwell Field—similar example—Worcester State College
- Opposition may exist.
- Take opportunity to talk to Police Department

Referred to Subcommittee of Land Use, need to schedule room for meeting that is handicap accessible, Antonelli and Gunnerson are working on date

Tom Morris:

- Park Security Guard 37 ½ years
- Road blocked off—either keep it blocked off or have gate
- Works Mon-Fri 4-12
- Somebody should be on security during days
- All parks close at 10 pm
- People don’t know Bancroft Tower still exists
- Have open during the day
- Worcester Police probably won’t stay to supervise
- Problem is people parking too long
- If Tower was reopened, crime would happen, so must have guard at all times, in his opinion
- Problem is people using Bancroft Tower interior as bathroom—not simple to clean because there is no hydrant nearby. Only way to clean interior is by fire hose. This happens when Tower is unsupervised.
- There was an incident of a guy hanging around in the woods in October. This occurred when he opened park for Boy scouts.
- There used to be 3 security guards. Now there’s only him.
- In July & August he works only on Monday, Tuesdays, and Thursdays.
- People have been locked in tower. Security gave a shout out before locking. There have been incidents of “embarrassing” some people.
- Illicit homosexual activity still occurs in Greenhill Park
- Believes Bancroft Tower should be used more & there should be supervision
- Lady who brings students up
- Lock & unlock tower each time you go in

**Portable Toilet Solution:**
- Used to have portable outhouses
- Permanent bathroom solution—plumbing, etc. could be a vocational school student project (Worcester Vocational Tech) using carpenters, plumbers, etc.
- Put chain on portable outhouse & connect to tree because they often get knocked over
Notes from Interviews with Some Abutters

First Interviewee:
- WPI board of Trustees
- Lived there 35 years
- Greater Hammond Heights Assoc.—cleanups
- Mentioned John Anderson as a person of interest. Lives to left of Tower, once had keys
- Major concerns are money to fund Tower and homosexual activity

Second Interviewee, John Anderson:
- Lived there for 33 years
- Not thrilled at prospect of reopening Tower: costly, instances of people
- ATO: visits tower yearly, there’s 3 guys from ATO in Greater Hammond Heights Association
- Mentioned Nancy Jepson & Sheila Killeen as people of interest
- Phi Sig has an Easter Egg Hunt
- “Not keen” on having tower opened for certain amount of time during the day

Third Interviewee:
- WPI should be more involved with security of Tower

Fourth Interviewee:
- Says Tower is already an attraction and attracts many people
- Tower is not well lit
- Tower brings too much noise as it is
- There is inconsistent patrolling of area
- Has lived in neighborhood since 1998

Fifth Interviewee:
- Should visit Worcester Building Department on 25 Meade Street

Sixth Interviewee:
- Concerned about lighting
- Says WPI student have scaled the side of Tower
- Supports WPI as park security
- Lots of noise complaints. There used to be a Shakespearean group which performed at tower.
- Doesn’t care about Tower being opened during day, but is concerned about night
- Look into Wheeler Trust
Notes from IQP Meeting on February 9, 2012

Submit work by end of next week

By 23rd, Salazar will have comments for us

In report, have hypothesis on exploring opening the park. Then have a conclusion: yes/no because…

Cross Benefit Analysis is extremely important

Worcester Website: find website that has prime responsibility for showcasing Worcester and see if we can put information on it

Jordan Levy:

- hosts talkshow from 3-6
- knows city “upside down”
- we should collect his views, see what he thinks of our project
- is very active & involved in business community
- member of board of Mass Pike, major on city of Worcester, was a mayor

Issue of who promotes the use of the Tower.

To Do:

- visit building permits office tomorrow at 3pm & find ride
- John Morawski can be contacted between 8 &9 a.m. or 4-4:30 p.m.
- communicate with ATO
- schedule meeting with Hammond Heights
- Schedule day to use Higgins House for Subcommittee meeting
- Have draft of report by end of next week
- Post abutters’ opinions on myWPI
Notes from Visit to WPI Police Station on February 13, 2012

- WPI police patrols WPI & surrounding area
- Won’t tell us about patrol radius
- Won’t tell us patrol schedule
- WPI Police won’t be able to say how much of an extra hassle it is to patrol Tower
- Contact Lt. Mike Ellsworth mwe@wpi.edu
Notes from IQP Meeting on March 14, 2012, first meeting of D-Term

Plans for D-Term:

- Need to incorporate feedback into final report
- Preservation Worcester—no further need to contact
- Need to talk to Worcester Traffic people to see how much traffic goes through area. Or:
- Talk to Professor LePage who has equipment for counting cars & can provide information about counting traffic
- Contact different foundations that could potentially support tower

Final Report:

- Background: all info gathered about these types of buildings
- Methodology: anything we actually did. i.e., people interviewed, field trips, traffic count, etc.
- Should be writing “Mr. Salisbury” instead of just “Salisbury”
- Condition of tower today can be first step of methodology
- Results section is what we found
- Methodology section is what we did
- Expand on safety measures on Tower
- Analysis needs to be beefed up
- Show how positive or negative the responses are
- Analysis: even show negative impact such as crime, economics, safety which will ultimately lead up to the end result of analysis

Landscaping? Should there be a fence around tower to be secure? Something to consider or refute based on argument

Meetings for D-Term: Wednesdays at 1pm, communicate with Prof. Salazar via email, possibly Skype

To Do:

- Call Jordan Levy show (from 3-6), ask if we can possibly have a separate interview that is not on the air
- Rework writing to reflect our efforts
- Authorship page
Notes from Meeting on March 17, 2012

Creating Itinerary for D-Term:

- Incorporate feedback in final report—send draft by April 2nd, want to be all done by April 14th
- Professor LePage: this coming week, email first, drop in Tuesday or any day she specifies as free
- Contact foundations to support tower this coming week
- Parks Commission meeting
- Jordan Levy Interview: Send email today to his organization. If he responds by midweek, we can ask questions we are preparing. If he doesn’t respond, we will call in Wednesday at 3pm
- Contact and find Looft
- At the end of April, hopefully we will present at Parks Commission meeting and send copy of final report when finally done to Hammond Heights Association and any other contacts who have expressed interest.

Traffic Counting:

- Roads of interest: Bancroft Tower Road, Farnum St, Massachusetts Ave
- Specifically install counter on Bancroft Tower Road
- Purpose of counting is to gauge current public use of these roads & may need to address parking problems (brought to our attention at Hammond Heights meeting)
- Roads are not in best condition so parking on sides of roads may be a problem (safety & community issue)
- Also gauging how often tower is used even though it’s closed & want to see how much more tower may be used once open

Author’s note: The Worcester Traffic Division didn’t have any relevant information. We had planned to do a traffic count ourselves, but extenuating circumstances prevented this study.
Notes from Meeting on March 28, 2012

Updates:

1. **Linda Looft**
   - Emailed on Sunday because she is not in the state
   - Called on Monday, said it is probably not a good idea to have Parks meeting on WPI campus & instead talk with Parks Dept.
   - Not mentioning incident in report but prepare to answer questions
   - Recommended motion detection as security measure

2. **Jordan Levy**
   - Called today asking about time slots
   - Contact show at 508-755-0058

3. **Professor LePage**
   - We need her assistance to install traffic counters
   - Install counters on Tuesday, leave there for ~48 hours, pick them up on Thursday
   - Meet up with her

4. **Killeen**
   - Only organization besides Hammond Heights is Preservation Worcester
   - Invited us to Easter Egg Hunt Saturday from 12-2 in Salisbury Park
   - We must attend Easter Egg Hunt

Plans: meet at 3pm at Crow to call Levy, meet LePage on Friday, mention Nancy Jepson on acknowledgements page
Notes from Radio Talk Show Interview with Jordan Levy on March 28, 2012

Planned to Discuss:

- Practicality of reopening tower. Hammond Heights is optimistic about moderate openings, maybe for community events
- What the Interactive Qualifying Project is & how it is outside our majors
- How the idea came about
- Condition of the Tower today: good condition overall, graffiti, some trash we cleaned up, some weeds on roof, stairs going to turret can be improved
- Little reported criminal activity at tower beyond vandalism and attempted entry
- Potential improved safety measures: motion sensor capture, lighting
- Surveys to WPI students were overwhelmingly positive: 88% support regular cleanups
- However 82% of WPI students who responded to survey feel that Worcester Parks are not safe at night
- Talked to abutters
- Funding & maintenance ideas
- Ask for public input, give email address

Notes from Interview:

Jordan Levy: Overall, encouraging, said he would like to see Tower opened again. He mentioned that tower was misused but didn’t get into specifics. Says tower is “high profile of identity”

James described IQP and his inspiration. Levy asked him about history of tower, and mentioned how the tower is a “symbol.” Levy also mentioned “lovers, drinking, drugs, and vandalism. James described current state of tower and how it has potential.

Mr. Levy asked Tanya about how I envision it to look when opened, who replied that the tower would hopefully have limited access and be used for community events.

Mr. Levy asked about the costs. We replied that we don’t have actual numbers, but we did mention we talked to architectural firms and how costs will be part of our final report.

Mr. Levy said how it could be and outside theater in summertime, and Bancroft Tower could host neighborhood activities and school projects. Park could have sitting area and viewing area. He said if we had restoration and safety it could be a landmark.

Mr. Levy asked who we’ve spoken to, then noted how long it might take for City of Worcester to address problems. He doesn’t think the city will just open it soon especially because it is situated in a residential neighborhood.
Mr. Levy then asked about groups and mentioned Preservation Worcester. He thinks others may want to participate, calling Bancroft Tower a “unique landmark.”

We told Mr. Levy that we were hoping to gain input.

Levy told us that he himself remembers using the tower, and he remembers the view, especially in spring and fall. He said the Tower needs security and protection. Levy expressed his desire for young people to participate in Worcester’s culture, calling it “shameful to lose.” He said the Tower can’t fall into more and more disarray, citing it would be a “non-utilization nuisance.” He also stated, “The Parks Dept. doesn’t have funds,” which would damper our plan of reopening it.

Jordan Levy ended our conversation by calling Bancroft Tower a “monument that identifies Worcester’s past.”

Our Bancroft IQP email was read twice on air.
Notes from Meeting with Deborah Packard of Preservation Worcester on April 9, 2012

Ms. Packard said there may be architects who will work on tower for free, noting there are architects and engineers who are on Preservation Worcester Board

Preservation Worcester: “education & advocacy”; there are 40 tour guides

Neighbors and President Berkey may donate to Tower

Thinks our project is very possible because the work at Institute and Elm Parks is showing to be successful. Believes work on Bancroft Tower could be successful too.

Park Spirit: (organization to look into) concerned about all parks in city of Worcester

We can develop an annual or semi-annual event for Tower

Mass Audubon Society: may be interested in project, contact president Debbie Cary 508-753-6087, has series of programs such as “birds & architecture”

We may get leeway with regulations on Tower such as handicap access because it is in Worcester directory of historical buildings

Worcester Garden Club: may be interested in landscaping. Contact president Kathy Mickey at 508-835-3342

Wheeler Trust: only funds parks & planting in Worcester. May be interested in our project

Massachusetts Historical Commission in Boston may have blueprints of Bancroft Tower. Can call them to see

We may add Deborah Packard to our list of acknowledgments in final report.

Ms. Packard would like to see final report & panoramic image
Notes from Phone Call with Kathy Mickey, President of Worcester Garden Club on April 11, 2012

Worcester Garden Club donates money and also does projects for landscaping/beautification.

She will send bancroftiqp@wpi.edu a proposal, which will be sent to a board. This proposal is for landscaping projects.

We will need to look into people to maintain landscaping.
C) Record of communique with Worcester Police Department

From: Brignola, Annemarie J. [BrignolaA@worcesterma.gov]
Sent: Thursday, December 08, 2011 8:25 AM
To: Wright, William Henry
Subject: request

Mr. Wright,
Please see below regarding making a request for public records. Below is a sample letter, you can use this to make your request. Please be as specific as possible when making your request. You can then send this request to the Chief’s Office, 9-11 Lincoln Sq. Worcester MA 01608. If you have any questions please feel free to contact me via email or telephone.

Thank you,
[Securities Division, William Francis Galvin, Secretary of the Commonwealth]

[Related pages:
Citizen Information Service <http://www.sec.state.ma.us/cis/cisidx.htm>
Massachusetts Archives <http://www.sec.state.ma.us/arc/arcidx.htm>
State Records Center <http://www.sec.state.ma.us/rec/recidx.htm>

[Back to:
Public Records Division Home <http://www.sec.state.ma.us/pre/preidx.htm>
Secretary of the Commonwealth Home]
Making a Request for Public Records in Massachusetts

The Massachusetts Public Records Law can be found at Chapter 66, Section 10 of the Massachusetts General Laws. The Public Records Law applies to records created by, or in the custody of, a state or local agency, board or other government entity. Anyone may ask to view or copy documents held by these state and local records custodians. Unless the requested records fall under an exemption to the Public Records Law, the responsive documents must be made available to the requester. For a list of exemptions, please refer to Chapter 4, Section 7(26) of the Massachusetts General Laws.

While a public records request may be made verbally, in person, it is preferable to make the request in writing. A written request reduces confusion about what information is being sought. Additionally, if you do not receive an adequate response from the records custodian, a copy of the written request is required in order to file an appeal. The Public Records Law does not require any specific format for making a request, but the sample below will effectively communicate your request and help ensure a timely response.

It is recommended that your request contain the following information:

Date request mailed

Agency Head or Keeper of the Records
Name of Agency
Address of Agency
City, State, Zip Code

Re: Massachusetts Public Records Request

Dear ______:

This is a request under the Massachusetts Public Records Law (M. G. L. Chapter 66, Section 10).

I am requesting that I be provided a copy of the following records:

[Please include a detailed description of the information you are seeking.]

[Optional: I recognize that you may charge reasonable costs for
copies, as well as for personnel time needed to comply with this request. If you expect costs to exceed $10.00, please provide a detailed fee estimate.]

As you may be aware, the Public Records Law requires you to provide me with a written response within 10 calendar days. If you cannot comply with my request, you are statutorily required to provide an explanation in writing.

Sincerely,

Your Name
Your Address
City, State, Zip Code
Telephone Number [Optional]

Please be advised that if you do not receive a satisfactory response within a reasonable time period, you have the right to appeal to the Supervisor of Records. See Appealing a Denial of Access to Public Records in Massachusetts<http://www.sec.state.ma.us/pre/preapp/appidx.htm> for more information.

For additional information about making a request or filing an appeal, please see 950 CMR 32.08 (2), refer to our publication, A Guide to the Massachusetts Public Records Law<http://www.sec.state.ma.us/pre/prepdf/guide.pdf> (PDF, 300 KB) or call (617) 727-2832

Annemarie Brignola
Crime Analysis Unit
Worcester Police Dept.
9-11 Lincoln Sq.
Worcester, MA 01608
(508)799-8654 x1
D) IRB Exemption Form

Principal Investigator (PI) or Project Faculty Advisor: (NOT a student or fellow; must be a WPI employee)
Name: Guillaume Salazar
Tel No: 401-334-3621
E-Mail: gsalazar@wpi.edu
Department: Civil Engineering

Co-Investigator(s): (Co-PI) (non-student)
Name: Frank Petrosino
Tel No: _______________________
E-Mail: _______________________
Address: _______________________

Student Investigator(s):
Name: James Pizzi
Tel No: 401-334-3621
E-Mail: jepizzi@wpi.edu
Address: _______________________
Name: Michael Pellicciari
Tel No: 401-334-3621
E-Mail: _______________________
Address: _______________________

Check # Undergraduate project (MCP, IGP, Staff, older) ______
Graduate project (M.S., Ph.D., other) ______

Has an IRB ever suspended or terminated a study of any investigator listed above?
No ☐ Yes ☐ (Attach a summary of the event and resolution.)

Vulnerable Populations: The proposed research will involve the following (Check all that apply):
- Pregnant women ☐
- Human beings ☐
- Minors/children ☐
- Animals ☐
- Individuals with mental disabilities ☐
- Individuals with physical disabilities ☐

Collaborating Institutions: (Please list all collaborating institutions.)
______________________________
______________________________
______________________________

Locations of Research: (If off WPI, please indicate where on campus. If off campus, please give details of location.)
WP: National Museum of the American Indian
Project Title: Barrier-Free Environment on Campus: Shaping Library/Space

Funding: (If the research is funded, please enclose one copy of the research proposal or most recent draft with your application.)
Funding Agency: ___________________________ WPI Fund: ________________

Human Subjects Research: (All study personnel having direct contact with subjects must take and pass a training course in human subjects research. There are links to web-based training courses that can be accessed under the Training link on the IRB web site http://www.wpi.edu/education/training.htm. The IRB requires a copy of the completion certificate from the course or proof of an equivalent program.)

Anticipated Dates of Research:
Start Date of Research: March 2011
End Date of Research: April 2013

WPI IRB Use only
IRB #: __________________ Date: __________________
INSTRUCTIONS: Answer all questions. If you are asked to provide an explanation, please do so with adequate details. If needed, attach itemized replies. Any incomplete application will be returned.

1.) Applicable Exemption Number: Please provide the applicable exemption number from the list below which best describes the reason your research is exempt from IRB review.

Exemption Number: [ ]

Complete Text of Exemptions List
(from 45 CFR Part 46)

1. Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings, involving normal educational practices, such as (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.

2. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior, unless:
   a.) information obtained is recorded in such a manner that human subjects can be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects; and
   b.) any disclosure of the human subjects' responses outside the research could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to the subjects’ financial standing, employability, or reputation.

3. Research involving the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures, or observation of public behavior that is not exempt under paragraph (b)(2) of this section, if:
   a.) the human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office; or
   b.) federal statute(s) requires without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

4. Research involving the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens, if these sources are publicly available or if the information is recorded by the investigator in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

5. Research and demonstration projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of Department or Agency heads, and which are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine:
   a.) Public benefit or service programs;
   b.) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under these programs;
   c.) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or
   d.) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those programs.

6. Taste and food quality evaluation and consumer acceptance studies, if:
   a.) wholesome foods without additives are consumed or
   b.) a food is consumed that contains a food ingredient at or below the level and for a use found to be safe, or agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant at or below the level found to be safe, by the Food and Drug Administration or approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

2.) Purpose of Study: Please provide a concise statement of the background, nature and reasons for the proposed study. Insert below using non-technical language that can be understood by non-scientist members of the IRB.

3.) Study Protocol: Please attach sufficient information for effective review by non-scientist members of the IRB. Define all abbreviations and use simple words. Unless justification is provided this part of the application must not exceed 3 pages. Attaching sections of a grant application is not an acceptable substitute.
2.) Purpose of Study
Our project is exploring the possibility of reopening Bancroft Tower to the public. We are composing a document that will explore this possibility in-depth. We are collecting opinions from the public and compiling data from other similar parks around New England. As part of the research element of our project, we would like to visit the site and go inside the Tower to better understand the potential and feasibility for this facility to reopen it in the future. Our academic advisors are Professor Guillermo Salazar and Professor Frank DeFalco from the Civil and Environmental Engineering department at WPI. The final report is expected to be completed by mid-April, and we plan to submit our findings to the Worcester Parks Department for their review and comments.

3.) Study Protocol
A final report will be written that covers all of the work involved with the project and all of the recommendations for future actions and policies regarding the tower. Our goal is to cover the following objectives:

- Address the safety of the inner tower and the top of the tower, and draw up basic plans for future modifications.
- Address the condition of the Tower, including vandalism, littering, and sanitation. Include recommendations for clean-up projects, if necessary.
- Address safety in the park at night, as well as community safety in the surrounding area.
- Address all other reasons discovered that prevent Bancroft Tower from being open to the public, and what potential benefits that the community has from it being closed.

We will try to get interviews with different parties that may be concerned or involved with the Tower. We will interview the community area surrounding the park area and get their opinions on the Tower’s closure, and its potential re-opening. We will survey the students at WPI and find out if there are any on-campus organizations interested in the Tower’s reopening. We will also be contacting public funding organizations, such as The Friends of Institute Park, who may be willing to fund any adjustments we recommend to be made to the Tower. We will also send out letters or emails asking basic yes-or-no questions that will aid in our research. Finally, we will talk to the Park’s Commission, which is a monthly public meeting at the Office of Parks and Recreation.

This is a list of basic questions we will ask the interviewees:

1. Do you know about Bancroft Tower in Salisbury Park? If so, have you ever been there?
2. Are you aware that Bancroft Tower was once open to the public?
3. Would you be interested in going inside Bancroft Tower if you had the opportunity? If so, would you go often and what would you do?
4. Have you ever been to Salisbury Park at night? Do you feel that the park is safe at night? If not, for what reasons?
5. (For residents that live near the park) Have you noticed any illegal or unsafe activity around Salisbury Park at any time of the day?
6. Would you be interested in a possible re-opening of the tower?
7. If there were a community event put together for the purpose of cleaning and maintaining the park periodically, do you think that people would be interested in participating if it meant that Bancroft Tower were open more often? Would you personally be interested?

Meanwhile, we will also be researching other projects and cases of similar Towers in New England, and what was done to keep them as city assets. These other sites, such as Gillette Castle, serve as a possible source of insight into what direction our project should head in. This also contributes to our ongoing research into various financial aspects to the Tower.
9.) Deception: (Investigators must not exclude information from a subject that a reasonable person would want to know in deciding whether to participate in a study.)

Will the information about the research purpose and design be withheld from the subjects?

No [ ] Yes [ ] (Please explain.)

10.) Adverse effects: (Serious or unexpected adverse reactions or injuries must be reported to the WPI IRB within 48 hours using the IRB Adverse Event Form found out at http://www.wpi.edu/offices/irb/forms.html. Other adverse events should be reported within 10 working days.)

What follow-up efforts will be made to detect any harm to subjects and how will the WPI IRB be kept informed?

There is no possibility of harm to subjects.

Investigator's Assurance:

I certify the information provided in this application is complete and correct.

I understand that I have ultimate responsibility for the conduct of the study, the ethical performance of the project, the protection of the rights and welfare of human subjects, and strict adherence to any stipulations imposed by the WPI IRB.

I agree to comply with all WPI policies, as well as all federal, state and local laws on the protection of human subjects in research, including:

- ensuring the satisfactory completion of human subjects training.
- performing the study in accordance with the WPI IRB approved protocol.
- implementing study changes only after WPI IRB approval.
- promptly reporting significant adverse effects to the WPI IRB.

Signature of Principal Investigator

Date

Print Full Name and Title

Please return a signed hard copy of this application to the WPI IRB c/o Ruth McKeough 2nd Floor Project Center.

Or email an electronic copy to irb@wpi.edu

If you have any questions, please call (508) 831-6699.
E) Permit to enter Bancroft Tower

City of Worcester
Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Dept.
50 Skyline Drive
Worcester, MA 01605-2898
(508) 799-1190

Worcester Polytechnic Institute
Box 795
100 Institute Road
Worcester, MA 01609

Customer Type: Resident

Authorized Agent: James Pizzini

Work: (210) 355-0813 Home: (210) 355-0813

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE/USER</th>
<th>PERMIT NUMBER</th>
<th>CHARGES</th>
<th>DISCOUNT</th>
<th>TAXES</th>
<th>REFUNDS &amp; CREDITS</th>
<th>PAYMENTS</th>
<th>NEXT PAYMENT DUE</th>
<th>BALANCE DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11/14/2011</td>
<td>M Pacheco</td>
<td>4361</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESERVATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT NAME</th>
<th>FACILITY</th>
<th>CENTER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Documenting current condition of tower</td>
<td>Bancroft Tower</td>
<td>Bancroft Tower/Salisbury Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type: Special Event</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bancroft Tower Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Worcester, MA 01609</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATES RESERVED</th>
<th>HRS</th>
<th>DATES RESERVED</th>
<th>HRS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thursday - 11/10/2011</td>
<td>07:00 AM to 05:00 PM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Friday - 11/11/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday - 11/12/2011</td>
<td>07:00 AM to 05:00 PM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sunday - 11/13/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday - 11/14/2011</td>
<td>07:00 AM to 05:00 PM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tuesday - 11/15/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday - 11/16/2011</td>
<td>07:00 AM to 05:00 PM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Thursday - 11/17/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday - 11/18/2011</td>
<td>07:00 AM to 05:00 PM</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Number of Dates: 9 Total Number of Hours: 90

NOTES:

DISCLAIMERS

Any use of amplified sound system or other noise in any of the City of Worcester Public Parks, Playgrounds, Playing Fields, or Public Property or building shall not be plainly audible at a distance of 50 feet or more from said Public Park, Playground, Playing field, or Public Property or building.

PLEASE INFORM ALL PARENTS, COACHES AND PARTICIPANTS THAT PARKING IN THE FORMER SALTER SCHOOL PARKING LOT IS NOT AUTHORIZED BY THE CITY AND THE SCHOOL WILL HAVE VEHICLES TOWED IF THEY ARE PARKED THERE. THE FORMER SALTER SCHOOL PARKING LOT IS A PRIVATE PROPERTY AND NOT PART OF THE PARK FACILITY.

PLEASE INFORM ALL PARENTS, COACHES AND PARTICIPANTS THAT THEY MUST ONLY PARK AT THE CHURCH. THIS IS FOR THE SAFETY OF ALL PARTICIPANTS PARTICULARLY THE YOUTH.

PLEASE INFORM ALL PARENTS, COACHES AND PARTICIPANTS THAT THERE IS NO PARKING AT THE TRIANGLE OR ON THE RESIDENTIAL STREETS IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD.
PLEASE INFORM ALL PARENTS, COACHES AND PARTICIPANTS THAT THE CITY WILL TICKET THOSE WHO CHOOSE TO PARK IN NO PARKING AREAS.
IT IS THE LITTLE LEAGUES RESPONSIBILITY TO MANAGE PARKING FOR PARK FACILITY USE OF INDIAN HILL FIELD.
GREATER HAMMOND HEIGHTS
NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION
Worcester, Massachusetts EST. 1987

GHHNA Board Meeting

February 28, 2012

I. Welcome – Sheila Killeen and Nancy Jeppson
II. WPI Students/Bancroft Tower
III. Treasurer’s Report – Susan Mathews
IV. Committee Reports:
   a. Membership/Membership Chair – Sue Horan
      -Mailing of Membership Letter
   b. Bancroft Tower – John Anderson
      -Crime
      -Parks Department-after posted hours, lack of proper lighting, patrols, brush clearing
   c. Municipal Concerns & Zoning Ordinances – John Anderson
      -Academy Street Resident Parking
   d. Facebook/Website-Michele Miller

V. New Business:
   a. Officers/Board Members
   b. Annual Meeting-Date, Speaker, Location
   c. Easter Egg Event-Date
   d. Earth Day-April 21st 10am to noon

VI. Old Business

VII. Adjourn

Thank You to Kristina Spillane for hosting!

2/28/2012