

## CONCLUSION

As exemplified in the project profiles of Denver and Indianapolis, a co-location approach to redevelopment can be both a strategy and a necessity. Lessons learned from brownfields practitioners can be useful in identifying key strategies for successful management and implementation of co-location. The results, processes, and lessons learned of the different project profiles can also help brownfields practitioners discern whether a co-location approach is appropriate and feasible for redevelopment areas in their community and help determine how to bring resources to bear on the project.

In some cases, co-location might be necessary because it will be one of the few ways that sites will reach their redevelopment potential. As demonstrated in Fall Creek Place, it may not be feasible for some distressed properties to be revitalized when there are other difficult-to-redevelop properties in the vicinity. The city of Indianapolis realized that the brownfields in the Fall Creek Place project area were not very marketable because of the co-located vacant and blighted properties. At the same time, however, the vacant and blighted properties of the neighborhood could not be revitalized while ignoring the aesthetic, public health, and revitalization issues associated with the brownfields. Co-location was a necessary strategy for ensuring comprehensive and consistent revitalization of the neighborhood, protecting public health, and encouraging economic development.

Redevelopment on a parcel-by-parcel basis can hinder the development status or timeline of a co-located property. For example, if the cleanup of one site is incomplete or if a facility is still in operation, the use, sale, marketing, or redevelopment of a co-located brownfields may not be appropriate due to issues such as a real or perceived danger or traffic. This scenario holds true for the Shattuck Redevelopment Area in Denver, where dust, noise, and truck traffic from the co-located cement batch plant currently impacts the redevelopment potential of the area. However, a co-location approach to redevelopment fosters the practice of evaluating the situation of neighboring properties that are undergoing redevelopment and how the development of the properties can be logically coordinated. Just as the redevelopment of Shattuck will likely be coordinated with the expiration of the cement plant's lease, it might be possible for brownfields practitioners in other communities to coordinate the development timelines for other sets of distressed co-located properties in an effort to avoid delays or timing conflicts, and prevent sites that are incompatible in the short term from jeopardizing long-term redevelopment potential.

A co-location approach to redevelopment might be necessary to make the most of funding or to ensure that project funding goes as far as it was intended or expected. Acquiring property for redevelopment will be cheaper before any revitalization takes place. As demonstrated in Indianapolis, properties comparable to those that were val-

ued at \$3,000 at the start of the Fall Creek Place revitalization project were valued at \$12,000 following several improvements to the neighborhood. Luckily for Indianapolis, its co-location approach enabled the city to acquire most of the property within the project area before improvements escalated land values. Heeding this lesson could help brownfields practitioners better manage the funds supporting their redevelopment project and help prevent cost overruns or the need to scale back on development plans.

Different types of co-located properties may be subject to different laws, policies, or procedures, which can cause complications in the redevelopment process. This was the crux of the challenge for the Cross Community Coalition project in Denver. The Cross Community Coalition site was essentially a brownfields within the boundary of a Superfund site. Differences between Superfund and brownfields laws, policies, and funding mechanisms can cause complications in the redevelopment process that could be resolved through co-location. Without taking a co-location approach to the redevelopment area, the Cross Community Coalition site would have remained within the boundary of the Superfund site and would not be on its way to redevelopment.

By knowing the redevelopment procedures and requirements for each kind of site in an area slated for revitalization, redevelopment stakeholders can better plan their efforts. For example, community expectations can be managed, developers can plan their timeline and funding sources, and local governments can work with developers to streamline processes such as permitting. If

not coordinated, trying to redevelop different sites under different circumstances, programs, or laws could easily complicate, slow, or halt redevelopment efforts on one or more co-located properties.

Co-location can yield opportunities and results that are not necessarily possible when revitalizing an area on a parcel-by-parcel basis. Looking at a brownfields site and its surrounding parcels, brownfields practitioners can try to plan redevelopment that is compatible with the area, or have the opportunity to plan revitalization of several parcels so that the end results are compatible with a new land use and design. Such efforts could help to overcome a stigma that certain neighborhoods or areas may have. For example, the area surrounding the Shattuck site in Denver is industrial and commercial, but the community would like to see a more mixed-use redevelopment that will also include retail, office, and residential land use. Without a co-location approach, changing the characteristics of the neighborhood would not be possible because industrial and commercial spaces are predominant. However, by adopting co-location as the redevelopment strategy, an area-wide redevelopment plan and visioning document could be created, and revising built environment, landscape, and predominant land uses becomes possible.

Considering redevelopment of properties that are co-located may also offer an opportunity for land assembly. Developers sometimes choose greenfields over brownfields because they cannot find brownfields that are the right size for their proposed development. Similarly, a locally designed vi-

sion or desired redevelopment for an area may not be feasible on the size of parcels that are available. However, through land assembly, larger areas could be made available for revitalization, and the range of reuse options increases. In addition, larger-scale projects could act as an anchor for the neighborhood, encouraging other developers to invest and thus improve marketability of other properties in the area.

For example, Denver's Northside Park would not have been possible without land assembly. It included redevelopment of the old wastewater treatment plant and an adjacent property that had a history of industrial uses. Through land assembly, the city was able to create a greenspace that greatly exceeds the size of properties typically available for reclamation in urban areas. In addition, Northside Park has been a catalyst for economic development. There has been construction of enterprises at three properties near Northside Park, and several properties are on the market or have traded hands.

Co-location projects can be a challenge to fund because, by definition, they require more than one project to be planned or implemented along the same timeline. Few municipalities have the resources to support multiple projects simultaneously, so looking at the ways in which brownfields practitioners have garnered resources could help others find ways to fund successful co-location projects. Two keys to the co-location redevelopment in Denver and Indianapolis have been acquiring grant funding and establishing partnerships.

Grant funding can be the primary resource to finance a co-location redevelop-

ment, or a critical supplement to fit a particular need. Seeking grant funding for a co-location project could be more advantageous than when acquiring resources for a single brownfields redevelopment because with co-location, there are several more facets that could qualify a project for a diverse set of grants. For the city of Indianapolis, securing U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Homeownership Zone funding was essential to the Fall Creek Place project. The funds were used for most of the land acquisition, and, according to the local project manager, Fall Creek Place would not have been possible without the financial assistance from HUD. Both Indianapolis and Denver used U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) brownfields grant funding to finance the brownfields components of their respective co-location redevelopment projects. This EPA money was a critical supplement to the array of other resources used to finance co-location projects. Cities used the EPA funds to pay for site assessments, which enabled them to use other funding sources to address other aspects of the redevelopment. Rather than planning on one grant resource brownfields practitioners should identify several grant opportunities that might be able to fund at least one component of the overall co-location project.

Grant money can also serve as seed money to bolster opportunities for other local stakeholders to engage in revitalization efforts. For example, in Fall Creek Place, people are so pleased with the revitalization of the neighborhood that many would like to see the city continue its efforts and move beyond the defined project area. Unfortunately, the city does not have the resources

to do that. The HUD funding, which was the funding foundation of the project, is not substantial enough to support revitalization beyond Fall Creek Place. Presumably, if the city were to try to implement another project like Fall Creek Place without the HUD funding, that project would come at the expense of other city programs and services. However, the local government's inability to expand revitalization efforts can actually create opportunities for nonprofit or private-sector developers. They could study the example, approach, and lessons learned of the local government and try to replicate or build off of the Fall Creek Place success. It is in this way that a local government can use grant funding for a co-location project as seed money that will act as a catalyst and yield additional revitalization.

Grants are not necessarily required for a co-location project. However, like most brownfields and other local government programs, co-location redevelopment projects have to compete for prioritization when it comes to budgeting and appropriating resources. Few local governments will have the resources to support a large redevelopment project independently while maintaining service delivery. The co-location projects in Denver and Indianapolis were funded with a combination of resources, but grant funding was a key factor in augmenting the capacity of the local government to undertake the redevelopment effort.

Partnerships can provide an array of resources to support a project and to keep it moving. In general, partners can bring valuable resources, such as funding, in-kind services, expertise, ideas, and staff support. Be-

cause different people have different strengths and areas of expertise, a diverse set of partners can yield creative solutions on how to reach a goal. Partners in the Northside Park project met every couple of weeks over several years to identify and address redevelopment issues, troubleshoot, and share ideas on how to overcome challenges. This strategy proved successful for managing complex issues and ensuring steady, incremental progress of a complicated redevelopment project.

Partnerships may also be necessary for facilitating redevelopment. For example at the Cross Community Coalition site in Denver, navigating all the regulatory procedures and guidelines required communication and coordinated efforts among the local government, federal government, and the nonprofit sector. In essence, each of these entities became partners in the project: They were working toward a common goal and contributing a variety of resources needed to make the site accessible and ready for redevelopment. Had any one of the entities not acted cooperatively as a partner, the site might still be mired in a bureaucratic process.

The process of securing funding and partnerships should happen at the initial stages of project planning and continue on through project completion. Lining up most grant and other funding sources, and establishing partnerships during the project-planning stages are essential to ensuring that enough resources have been secured to implement the project. However, the process of seeking funding and partnerships should not stop there. As the project grows and de-

velops, other organizations might be interested in participating or contributing to a project, so it might prove strategic to share news about the project. Fall Creek Place had a quarterly newsletter mailed to neighborhood residents, project partners, funders, and other stakeholders in the Indianapolis area; the community also had a Web site that featured historical information about the project and the most current news. Media outlets may also be interested in reporting on events or success stories. Demonstrated success may help to garner more support for the project from other organizations and potential funders, and may help the project become a stronger contender in grant competitions.

Some of the lessons learned from co-location redevelopment projects are not necessarily unique to co-location and are actually relevant to other brownfields redevelopment scenarios. For example, pursuing grant opportunities, securing partnerships, and garnering resources are efforts that most brownfields practitioners undertake. However, addressing more than one distressed site along a common timeline can oftentimes be a more expensive or complex endeavor than a single-site brownfields redevelopment, even if co-location can be worth the added investment of resources. Looking beyond a site-by-site approach creates an opportunity to use brownfields redevelopment to facilitate area-wide revitalization. For this reason, sharing the specific strategies and lessons learned of co-location projects can help brownfields practitioners identify opportunities where planning and implementing co-location can yield

comprehensive revitalization and transform a neighborhood or landscape.●