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Kansas City Missouri School District
Executive Summary

Years of dwindling enrollment and continued demographic and social change culminated in the spring of 2010 when the Kansas City Missouri School District closed 24 schools. When added to the 15 schools throughout the district that had already been closed, the District was left with a potential community relations disaster. The problem of school building repurposing requires a comprehensive approach at every level of the district. An inventory of each closed building reveals not just a set of homogenous buildings but 39 distinct community anchors, each with its own history, attributes and significance to those involved with its operation as a school. In light of this, any decision made by the district should come as the result of a process of community discourse. This plan outlines steps for bringing together district leaders and community stakeholders in a process that, if successful, will not only result in repurposed buildings but a renewed partnership between the district and its constituents.

This document contains a comprehensive planning guide designed to move the District and its constituents through the process of finding new life for each of the closed buildings. In its pages can be found the data which forms the foundation for a community-based decision. The data is representative of the conditions found within the neighborhoods anchored by these school buildings and also of the district as a whole. The strategy that grew out of an analysis of this data is designed both to address the problems that have arisen out of the District’s past and chart a path to future successes as the District nurtures the children that still depend on it and welcomes new generations.

The community engagement plan found within this book is based on a process of engaging citizens and community leaders at every level of the District and within distinct geographic areas. The District can be divided into three general areas (or “zones”) which are anchored by Downtown Kansas City, Midtown, and the inner ring suburbs in the southern part of the District. Community engagement as designed by this Team has in mind the engagement of actors and resources in the economically healthy parts of the District in the central business corridor with those areas that have the potential to be revitalized by the repurposing of the closed school buildings. Through this engagement, the needs of the communities are met as resources are multiplied across the entire district.

This book is but a starting point for this process. To truly take advantage of the opportunity this situation presents will require the effort and determination of the entire District.
I. Introduction
The Kansas City Missouri School District is undergoing a radical transformation with the closing of 24 schools under the Right Sizing Plan implemented by Superintendent Covington and the Kansas City Missouri School Board. In the 2009-2010 school year, 17,500 students were distributed among 58 buildings, most of which were operating well under capacity. The District, facing significant projected budget deficits, took the bold steps to close 24 schools beginning August 2010. Combined with the 15 school buildings previously vacated by the District, there are now 39 abandoned school buildings within the limits of the Kansas City, Missouri School District.

The current problems faced by the Kansas City Missouri District are due to social changes often beyond their control. The KCMSD has experienced the effects of the Civil Rights Era, the flight to the suburbs, abandoned neighborhoods, pervasive poverty, the aftermath of the desegregation suit (Jenkins v. Kansas City School Board), and the School District’s decision to abandon the magnet system and return to neighborhood schools in the late 1990’s.

Over the last 50 years, enrollment has declined from 77,000 in the 1960’s to 40,000 in the 1980’s to a current enrollment that has dwindled to 17,500 scholars at the beginning of this school year. Continual change and instability in the District over the last 40 years has resulted in a lack of support in the community. As the District’s enrollment has declined, so has the community confidence and trust, leaving the District severed from much needed resources, partnerships and financial help.

The Board has proposed that these closed buildings be repurposed. They can be leased or sold, recycled and restored as useful buildings to serve the community. The repurposing process creates an opportunity to reestablish stability within the district and the neighborhoods it serves. Issues of stability range from fiscal to social responsibility, and most importantly the responsibility of addressing vacant schools and the impact placed upon neighborhoods that are already facing serious challenges. Change will not occur overnight, but striving for stability within a district plagued by a dwindling enrollment, financial insecurity, and the loss of neighborhood and community support has a chance of being restored by a credible process that takes a community perspective, rather than a District bottom line.

The purpose of this plan is to build the framework for a comprehensive planning approach to implementing the repurposing process. This Guidebook outlines pertinent data about the District as a whole and each of the 39 school sites. It offers a strategic framework for evaluating repurposing decisions, specific recommendations for real estate decisions and appropriate reuse suggestions where possible and, most importantly a Community Engagement Plan.
The repurposing process can be successful if it successfully includes the affected communities and neighborhoods within the School District. It is fundamental to establish a comprehensive community engagement process that works for a diverse district and discovers ways in which the district can reconnect with either forgotten, lost, or existing resources.

Building on the energy generated by the new School Board and its adopted Transformation Plan, the repurposing challenge can contribute to positive change for the neighborhoods involved.

## Historic Context

Through years of upset and controversy, the Kansas City, Missouri School District (KCMSD) district today finds itself in a very difficult situation. The need to reduce spending has caused the district to close 39 of its schools. Over the years, a series of policy decisions and legal disputes and socioeconomic inequalities have led to the current state of affairs in the KCMSD. This history, however, goes back even further than the historic buildings that are the subject of this plan.

At the time of the early border war between the State of Missouri and the Kansas Territory before the Civil War, Missouri was the northern most state to require separate schools for whites and blacks by constitutional mandate. As late as 1948 there were 6,000 school districts in Missouri, and only about 300 offered a high school education. Since schools were separated by race, many blacks in non-urban areas did not have access to an eduction because the small districts could not afford to open schools for just a few black students. So, many black families moved to Kansas City and St. Louis where there were high schools for blacks students.

In 1954 the Brown vs. Board of Education was a landmark 1954 decision of the United States Supreme Court that declared “separate but equal” public school facilities to be unconstitutional. The unanimous decision was a key element of the nationwide Civil Rights movement in latter half of the 20th century.
students in schools where they already attended. When redrawing boundaries was no longer possible, black students were bused to underutilized white schools where they had separate classrooms and cafeteria times.

By the 1970s the district was completely segregated, with the majority of schools being black, a few white schools west of Troost Ave, and no integrated schools. This pattern was encouraged to a large extent by discriminatory real estate practices such as racial steering, red-lining and block-busting. White flight to the suburbs, which was widespread in the 1950s and 1960s, was heightened even further by a major teachers strike in the 1970s that drove thousands of students to suburbs and private schools.

As a result of this noncompliance with Brown v. Board of Education, the Kansas City School District was sued along with the state of Missouri by a group of students and their parents. The 1977 Jenkins v. Missouri case ultimately resulted in a series of remedy orders between 1985 and 1987. Many schools were converted to magnet schools, which were intended to offer better educational opportunities as well as attract white students from the suburbs, and $500 million was spent on capital improvements to repair serious deterioration in the buildings. A tax levy increase had not passed in the District since the late 1960’s, due to Missouri’s unusual requirement for a 2/3 majority vote for bond issues. Between 1989 and 1993 this resulted in 22 new schools being constructed and 46 schools being renovated or expanded, to meet the new structural and curriculum needs.

Enrollment stabilized and rose during the magnet years, as Missouri suburban students were drawn to the magnet opportunities. After the Supreme Court struck down the legality of the funding for the suburban traspotationg. program in 1997, enrollment plummeted. Shortly thereafter, the Board decided to abandon the magnet program and return to neighborhood schools, with a few exceptions. The District has also had to compete with a large number of charter schools, due to Missouri’s unusual charter school legislation allowing unlimited number of charter schools within any district. With the loss of accreditation and an ongoing turnover of superintendents, the District has continued to struggle.

The overall result of KCMSD’s inability to successfully navigate these challenges of changing socioeconomic conditions, not unlike those of every urban school district in the United States, is a decline from 77,000 students in a AAA rated school district in 1963, to 17,000 students in 2010. In 2010 Superintendant John Covington recommended and the School Board approved to closing 24 schools immediately, in addition to the 15 already closed, in order to better utilize available resources and refrain from operating facilities at less than full capacity. Currently, the District has 34 operating schools, down from 66 just 20 years ago. Enrollment in Kansas City public schools is 92% African American while the voting majority (52%) is still white.
A summary of The District’s Transformation Plan

Facilities

As the KCMSD transforms into a world-class learning institution, Facilities and Maintenance will provide more than just bricks and mortar. The Operations Department will strive to ensure that all District facilities are not only well-maintained, but also enhance the educational experience taking place within classrooms. The Facilities and Maintenance Department will be a proactive force responding to the needs of the students, teachers, and building administrators. The following initiatives are key to the transformation of the KCMSD facilities:

- Implementation of an audit system that provides a numerical score for every facet of each building, including a regularly scheduled review of each building to find and repair problems in a timely manner;
- Incorporation of a “Going Green” philosophy - Operations will focus on innovative improvements to District buildings and properties that focus on energy and water conservation, eco-friendly material selection, improved indoor environmental quality, and design models that incorporate “green” initiatives into all future capital projects;
- Development of a five-year maintenance and capital improvement plan that provides a blueprint for the future construction, repurposing, and transformation of District facilities;
- Implementation of a system of evaluation that collects feedback to ensure that the needs of the community, parents, staff and students are met, and to pinpoint areas of improvement and build on areas of strength;
- Implementation of a system that will classify and prioritize all work orders to provide schools with clear information on what will be done, when it will be done and by whom it will be done; and
- Implementation of multi-use learning areas and construction of “flex” learning zones in buildings across the District.
- Exploring repurposing/refurbishing opportunities that allow for the implementation of “green” components throughout facilities; and
- Reducing energy usage by a statistically significant amount, freeing vital dollars that can be used for the betterment of our children’s education.
**Capital Improvement**

To provide the best support for student learning and academic achievement, the KCMSD has drafted and proposed to implement a comprehensive five-year Maintenance and Capital Improvement Plan (MCIP). Currently, the District addresses facility and maintenance concerns on an ‘as needed’ basis, without any forethought regarding the long-term goals and needs of District facilities. The district must transform the way that buildings are maintained in order to provide staff and students access to safe, secure and updated facilities. By ensuring that buildings and classrooms meet the needs of staff and students and are free from avoidable distractions, the five-year MCIP will increase student learning and academic achievements. Objectives of the MCIP include:

- Installing two distance learning labs in each high school;
- Installing state-of-the-art science labs that provide the latest in virtual interactive technology;
- Selling or repurposing all closed and unoccupied buildings;
- Installing air conditioning equipment and controls in occupied buildings where no or only partial AC exists;
- Upgrading building infrastructures as needed in order to support full classroom technology integration; and
- Utilizing “green” initiatives in the redevelopment or repurposing of school facilities;

**Repurposing**

During the Right-Sizing Community Forums, the committee collected feedback from the community regarding their concerns about the negative effects that empty buildings can have on neighborhoods. The District will establish a building repurposing committee, which will include community members, the City Planning Department, the Mayor’s office, architects and designers, as well as local and county agencies in order to ensure that vacated buildings do not become a blight to neighborhoods. The KCMSD will work closely with stakeholders to explore innovative ways to transform unused properties into community assets, including those properties that have remained vacant from previous school closing initiatives.
The Repurposing Committee will help neighborhoods and the District:

- Sell unused District property where appropriate;
- Demolish District buildings where appropriate and convert those areas into parks and green space that can be enjoyed by the neighborhood and community;
- Partner with area community groups to create community centers that provide residents with a wide variety of resources for empowerment; where applicable.
- Create community gardens and other living-learning-environments for student (and community) utilization; and
- Mothball the following facilities, which have been identified for future use, as a result of an anticipated growth through the marketing plan:
  - Robeson
  - Hale Cook
  - Knotts
  - Lincoln Middle
  - KC Middle School of the Arts
  - Northeast Middle
  - Scarritt

### Constructing a New Eco-Friendly School

As schools continue to age and technology evolves, building a new “green” elementary school will be a consideration by the District as it evaluates population growth and student enrollment over the next two years. As early as 2012, the District may break ground on a high-tech LEED-certified elementary facility engineered and designed to incorporate environmentally friendly materials and systems that will minimize its carbon footprint and maximize green technologies. Capturing wind, making use of solar power and recycling rain and wastewater are just some of the green initiatives that will be considered. These technologies will also provide “hands on” learning opportunities for students and promote awareness and instill stewardship toward the environment. Additionally, schools designed and engineered to embrace green technologies may qualify for Federal no interest loans and matching grants to subsidize construction costs.

The tentative location for the proposed LEED building is the 3rd City Council District and 6th Board of Directors sub-district. Such a school will contribute to expanded learning opportunities for students, a heightened awareness of “green” technology for the area, and will minimize blight caused by school closures in this District for the past 25 years.
With the goal of a comprehensive approach to data analysis and strategy decided, the Planning Team set out to obtain as much information about the school sites and neighborhoods as possible. This involved contacting the District, the City of Kansas City, MO and other decision-makers, experts and stakeholders as well as the guidance of an Advisory Group made up of a cross section of public and private sector leaders. These advisors, supplemented by speakers with expertise in the history and development of Kansas City, its history of race and segregation, the history of the KCMSD and the KCMSD Building Board, community engagement and real estate developers, set the reference framework for the team’s analysis of current data.

Early data collection dealt mostly with district-wide demographics such as population, race, income, and economic factors such as high-cost home loans and unemployment. By working with the city, the team was able to Geographic Information System mapping to identify areas of concentrated problems such as poverty, vacancy or crime. This information was then compared to the location of closed schools in order to make preliminary determinations about their reuse. Specific data about the areas and neighborhoods surrounding each of the closed schools was also collected.

With this data as the foundation, the team set out to formulate reuse recommendations for all 39 currently closed school buildings. To accomplish this daunting task, the team held a two week charrette session. This session involved dividing up into groups, with each group analyzing 8 to 10 schools. The teams diagrammed each school using maps and photographs, identifying assets and liabilities within a half-mile radius as well as determining economic factors that would affect the ability of the District to sell or lease each building.

Based on these site-specific recommendations, the team evaluated the resulting District-wide patterns and formulated an overall strategic framework for the repurposing process. This came about through both district and site analysis where it became evident that district has concentrated areas of jobs and wealth on the west side of the city in the Central Business Corridor. Conversely, large areas of concentrated poverty lie on the east side of the District. Both sides of the District, however, had suffered from school closings and contained large segments of population that had no easy access to any open school, creating an “educational desert.”

In order to bridge this cultural and educational gap, the team developed a strategy whereby resources, talent and energy currently concentrated in west side would combine with the untapped potential of the east side to form a more
interconnected relationship within the District. The team analyzed the district in three geographic zones, with each zone re-connecting an economic anchor, such as Downtown or Midtown, to drive its transformation. The key to this strategy was the reuse of the schools, which would serve as both economic and symbolic catalysts for the reconnection of the district. This concept opened up more possibilities than simply analyzing the schools on an individual basis, but allowed for more clarity than a simple district-wide analysis.

In order to provide a further demonstration of how a school site might be transformed into a catalyst for its zone and the particular needs of the neighborhood surrounding it, the team designed a “Catalyst School” for each of the zones that would operate under a public-private partnership and provide community education within a specific focus. These are described in more detail in section II.

With data now gleaned at three different levels – District, Zone, and Site – the team was able to identify prospects for reuse at each school site. It is very important that these decisions be made with the communities and neighborhoods surrounding each of the schools. To facilitate this cooperation, the team has developed a community engagement strategy in which the district and residents would work together to determine the ultimate reuse for each school. This is described in more detail in section IV.

A Geographic Information System (GIS) is a system of hardware and software in which data is converted into a spatial or geographic form through the use of 2D maps or 3D modelling. This method allows planners to visualize data in order to identify and interpret patterns and trends within a city, district or neighborhood.
II. Analysis
District Facts & Analysis

The Kansas City, Missouri School District is one of 14 districts in Kansas City, Missouri, however it is the only district completely contained within the city limits. The KCMSD serves the population of the urban core of city and is managing complex issues facing many districts around the country. Challenges facing the district include, dwindling enrollments, closed schools, low incomes and home values, as well as, a racial divide.

Over the past four decades, student enrollment has been declining at dramatic rates. In 1963, the district housed 77,000 students. By 2010, enrollment has dropped to 16,886 students. Recent periods of sharp enrollment declines have occurred from the late 1990’s to 2001 and from 2006 to present. In the last four years, the district has lost almost 9,000 students, amounting to a 31% decline in student enrollment. During the same time period, the population of the district has also decreased but not as severely. From 1990 to 2000 the total district population decreased 7%. However, during the same 10 year period, the number of school-aged children increased slightly. This indicates there are still large amounts of children living within the district, who do not attend district schools.

Due to these enrollment trends, the district has more buildings than the student population demands. In a measure to address dwindling enrollments, as well as budget short falls, the district unveiled an aggressive plan to close school buildings. Superintendent of Schools, Dr. John Covington, purposed a Right-Sizing Plan in the spring of 2010. This plan called for the closures of 24 school buildings, including all district middle schools. Schools were to be consolidated to ensure better building utilization and efficiency. This plan was implemented in the fall of 2010 and currently leaves the district with a large stock of empty school buildings. Prior to the Right Sizing Plan, the district already owned 15 closed buildings and with the addition of 24, there are now a total 39 closed buildings. The district remains operating 34 open school buildings. Minimizing negative effects of closing school buildings is a key challenge the district is currently addressing.

The district is dealing with several difficult issues, including low incomes and low home values. The median
household income in the district is $26,458; this is 37% below the median for the Kansas City Metropolitan area and 21% below the median for the city. Low incomes are also reflected in the number of students receiving free or reduced lunch. In 2010, 80% of district students receive lunch aid compared to only 47% as a state of Missouri average. The district has low home values. The median home value in the district is $58,066; this is 44% below the median for the Kansas City Metropolitan area and 31% below the median for the city. The district also has lower than average rates of home ownership. 48% of housing is renter occupied; this much higher than 32% for the rest of the Kansas City Metropolitan area. High amounts of renter occupied housing may affect student stability. If students are moving frequently it may hinder their ability to stay within the same school and may stifle educational progress.

Data patterns indicate the school district is divided along Troost Avenue in Kansas City. Troost has historically been a racial dividing line in the city; large areas of white population lie to the west, while a large African American population lies to the east. More than just a racial and social divide, Troost has become a very physical divide of several demographic categories. Some elements that indicate a divide along Troost are income, home values, high cost home loans, foreclosures, location of school-aged children, location of jobs, and employment. This divide makes district issues more contentious as they serve a population split along this corridor.

In the 1990’s, the district population became more than 50% minority. By the year 2000, minorities made up 56% of the population. In 2010, 91% of the students enrolled in the district are minority. The largest minority group is African American students, who comprise 63% of the district. The fastest growing minority group is Hispanic students, who comprise over 25% of the district students. Interestingly, Hispanics only about make up 9.6% of total district residents. Hispanic families are concentrated in the areas of the Westside and Northeast areas, in the northern part of the school district. This continued growth among Hispanic students is sound reason for the district to plan for future growth in these areas.
The **median home value** in the District is $58,066; this is 44% below the median for the Kansas City Metropolitan area and 31% below the median for the city.

52% of housing in the District is **owner occupied**; this is much lower than the rest of the Kansas City Metropolitan area (68%).
Hartman Elementary is an example of the effects of the school boundary shifts that were a result of school closures. Hartman, formerly a neighborhood school, now has boundaries that stretch from the southern district line north to 39th street. The result is that a Hartman student living in Midtown must travel more than five miles to reach school.
An analysis of each of the schools at a site level was conducted concurrently with the district-wide analysis. Analysis at this level included site visits, windshield surveys, reviewing land use and zoning designations for each site and surrounding structures and neighborhoods within a half-mile buffer. Demographic information based on the 2000 census was also analyzed. In order to better provide guidance for the Team, a team of local professionals throughout the community were also brought in during the process. These advisers included Gwen Grant and Karen Curls of the KCMSD Building Board, Arthur Benson of the KCMSD School Board, Dan Musser of Zimmer & Companies and Steve Lebofski and Shannon Jaax of the City of Kansas City, Missouri Planning and Development Department along with other community leaders. All of this information provided the Team with the background to identify individual recommendations and reuse possibilities that are appropriate for each school. A summary of this analysis for all 39 closed school sites can be found in appendix A. Highlights of the Team’s analysis of two schools displaying differing characteristics are outlined below as examples.

The first, Bingham Middle, is located off of Wornall Road and just north of 77th in a commercially vibrant area. It is located in the heart of the Waldo area, with commercial land uses to the north, west and south, and single-family residential to the east (see Bingham Land Use Map). When analyzing the demographics around the school, it is evident that there is a high percentage of elderly in the area. Within a mile of the school, there are four assisted living facilities. This indicates that assisted living may not be the best reuse for Bingham Middle. With the structure’s proximity to the Waldo retail area, a commercial use would be a better fit for that specific building. This site is also one of the largest of the 39 facilities available for repurposing. Furthermore, this site is a good example of potentially problematic zoning. The parcel Bingham sits on is currently zoned M1, meaning light industrial usage. Should this building be sold by the District, the School Board and City should consider changing the zoning of this site to a less intense use. The risk, should the District sell this building, is that any new owner could potentially place an undesirable or inappropriate use on the lot. In that situation, both the District and City would have no legal recourse to deny such a proposal.

The second, Scarritt Elementary is located in the historic Old Northeast area. Scarritt sits in the middle of a single family neighborhood with the closest arterial being St. John Avenue four blocks to the south. This building is an example of the 16 neighborhood elementary schools (figure Scarritt Land Use) that are located in similar situations. A variable particular to Scarritt’s case
are data projections showing future growth of school-aged children in the northeast area of the District. In all other areas of the District, the number of school aged children are either declining or have stabilized. In addition, many of the still-open schools within this area are now at or over capacity. Community Centers are a popular solution for building reuse, but in this case at least four community centers exist within a mile of Scarritt. These are examples of factors that led the Team to recommend this school as one of the better candidates for temporarily mothballing. If the open schools in the northeast do reach capacity in the near future, Scarritt is a good candidate for reuse as an elementary school. It could be leased to an appropriate, low-intensity use (such as a day-care center) in the interim, so that the neighborhood is not subjected to heavy traffic or incompatible land uses.

All 39 closed schools were analyzed with the same attention to detail. There were many concerns with the schools as a whole. For example, the Team had many issues with the exact number of schools that were in the District’s possession. Manchester Elementary has been listed as being a building that the District owns, and is also listed as a school that has been sold. This situation has been true for several other schools, as has been a prevalent issue throughout the entire process. As inconsistencies in the information provided to the Team were solved, a strategic framework was able to be formed. This framework, developed from analyzing the patterns suggested by the detailed analysis of the data, deals with immediate issues surrounding schools as well as overall concepts and issues discovered at the district-wide level. The synopsis of the data showed healthy economic stability on the west side of the district, and issues such as blight and vacancy within neighborhoods being more prevalent in the east side. Since one of the Team’s stated goals in the process was to develop ways for the closed schools to connect back into the neighborhoods they had served for so long, a strategy emerged to find partnerships and resources from the west side of the District to help reinvest in these buildings and neighborhoods on the east side. In this way, relationships could be formed to help aid in reconnecting the city.
Kansas City Missouri School District
III. Strategic Framework
The strategic framework provides a guideline for the District and its stakeholders to make decisions for each school building in a coordinated manner. Through analysis of the District wide data this strategic framework was developed to reconnect the community and help direct resources to the east side of the District. The purpose of the strategic framework is to provide the District with an approach to the repurposing process that is comprehensive while also considerate of neighborhood needs and concerns. The goal of the process is to reconnect the school district and the school facilities with the community. As such, the framework requires collaboration between the District, neighbors and community stakeholders. Approaching the repurposing process within a strategic framework is also meant to build confidence and trust between the different parties involved to meet the challenge of school facility planning.

Analysis of the data gathered at a District-wide scale showed that economic and political resources were concentrated on the west side of the District. Analysis also showed that the east side of the District is where the majority of school aged children are located. The design of the strategic framework recognizes the current and historical racial and economic divide along Troost Avenue while seeking to bridge this east-west barrier through a comprehensive approach to re-purposing. Repurposing the 39 closed schools owned by the District requires a well organized framework at a manageable scale. Through analysis, three different zones were established, running across the District from east to west.

These three different zones have key economic generators to the west as well as sets of assets and issues that characterize each zone. Dividing the District up into zones also allows for a more analytic look at the state of the area that each closed school resides in, for each zone the assets and issues are similar yet different. The zone boundaries are illustrated in map 1.
Introduction to the Zones

Each zone has characteristics that separate it from the other zones. The North Zone boasts the highest number of jobs, is the only part of the District where the numbers of school aged children are expected to grow, and is primarily business oriented. The Central Zone is experiencing the greatest decline in population, has a concentration of educational institutions and is in need of reinvestment. Due to the Right-Sizing plan, a large portion of the Central Zone is left without an open school, which has created an “educational desert”. The South Zone is primarily residential and commuter based and has the most prominent east-west demographic divide.

With the population of the school aged children of Kansas City, MO remaining fairly stable (as indicated in table 1 below) there is a great need to build on the identified characteristics of each zone that must be addressed in order to promote growth and encourage enrollment in KCMSD schools.

Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Aged Children Kansas City, MO</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2009 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>33,436</td>
<td>31,375</td>
<td>39,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>31,179</td>
<td>32,013</td>
<td>29,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>27,298</td>
<td>30,920</td>
<td>27,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>27,128</td>
<td>28,653</td>
<td>29,336</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1990, 2000 U.S. Census; Gerald L. Hoff Ph.D. Office of Epidemiology and Community Health Monitoring

North Zone

The North Zone is the only zone that is projected to see a growth in population, shown in table 2. This growth is due in large part to the high concentration of jobs in the Central Business District (CBD) (see map 1) as well as redevelopment of the downtown area.

Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone Populations and Projections</th>
<th>1990</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2040 Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>80,374</td>
<td>78,993</td>
<td>88,405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>72,283</td>
<td>62,925</td>
<td>54,742</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>79,243</td>
<td>72,983</td>
<td>68,796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1990, 2000 U.S. Census; Steve Lebofsky, City of Kansas City, Mo

Major assets to the North Zone include the CBD and 111,419 jobs, 14 open schools, 46 neighborhoods, and a variety of recent investments. The Greater Downtown Area Plan (GDAP) highlights eight activity centers that are located in

The Greater Downtown Area Plan was adopted in March 2010 by the City of Kansas City, Missouri to address planning within the Greater Downtown Area, from the Missouri River to 31st Street and from State Line to Woodland Ave. The plan specifies 5 goals for advancing Downtown:
1) Create a Walkable Downtown; 2) Double the Population Downtown; 3) Increase Employment Downtown; 4) Retain and Promote Safe, Authentic Neighborhoods; 5) Promote Sustainability.
the downtown area; these include the River Market, the Library District, The Power & Light District, American Royal, the Arts District, 18th and Vine, Union Station and Crown Center (GDAP). All of these centers are located west of Troost except 18th and Vine. Also under construction is the Performing Arts Center that will add to the cultural appeal of the North Zone. The entire Old Northeast area is also a vibrant and diverse activity center with a mix of medium density commercial, retail and residential uses centered along Independence Avenue. These activity centers show the culture and vitality that is associated with the Downtown area. The resources present in these activity centers are possible generators of connectivity that could begin to spread to the east.

In a residential survey conducted for the GDAP “Sixty-five percent (65%) of those surveyed felt there was a lack of quality schools available to residents of the downtown area (GDAP).” If population growth is one of the main goals of the area is it imperative that quality schools be in place to spur the growth. Garcia Elementary on the west side and the 7 schools still open in the northeast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open KCMSD Schools</th>
<th>Closed KCMSD Schools</th>
<th>Private/Parochial Schools</th>
<th>Charter Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attucks Elementary</td>
<td>Scarrit Elementary</td>
<td>Niles Prep</td>
<td>Alta Vista</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitivo Garcia Elementary</td>
<td>Northeast Middle</td>
<td>Paseo Baptist Learning</td>
<td>Don Bosco Education Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendell Phillips Elementary</td>
<td>Woodland Elementary</td>
<td>St. Monica's Private</td>
<td>Urban Community Leadership Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheatly Elementary</td>
<td>Thatcher</td>
<td>Carver Christian Academy</td>
<td>KIPP Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfellow Elementary</td>
<td>McCoy Elementary</td>
<td>Cristo Rey Kansas City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.A. Rogers</td>
<td>West Rock Creek</td>
<td>Holy Cross</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trailwoods Elementary</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>St. Stephens Academy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln College Preparatory</td>
<td>Askew Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East High</td>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast High</td>
<td>Lincoln Junior High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garfield Elementary</td>
<td>Switzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladstone Elementary</td>
<td>Douglas Early Childhood Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Open and Closed Schools: North Zone
can certainly serve the Greater Downtown area where not many children reside currently. Schools available to all North Zone residents can be seen in table 3 on the facing page.

Along with the numerous assets in the North Zone, this area is the only part of the District where the number of school-aged children is growing. Table 4 shows enrollment for KCMSD in 2009 is at nearly 3,000 children while the 2009 school aged population for the zone is near 20,000. There are approximately 17,000 children not being served by the public school system. Map 2 shows the school aged population distribution for the District. The largest concentrations of children are primarily located to the east side of the district, and dominantly in the northeast section of the North Zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>7,320</td>
<td>7,076</td>
<td>6,422</td>
<td>7,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>6,328</td>
<td>6,518</td>
<td>6,659</td>
<td>7,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>6,033</td>
<td>5,640</td>
<td>6,231</td>
<td>6,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>7,505</td>
<td>5,268</td>
<td>5,811</td>
<td>6,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27,186</td>
<td>24,502</td>
<td>25,123</td>
<td>27,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 KCMSD Kids 5-19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 KCMSD Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Source: 1980, 1990, 2000 U.S. Census; Steve Lebofsky, City of Kansas City, Mo; KCMSD.
Other issues associated with the North Zone include a high number of vacancies, low home values, demolitions, and high amounts of poverty. These issues affect families and primarily children. Knowing that these issues are present in the area, the closing of 13 schools in the Zone have an additional negative effect on every neighborhood around these schools. Detailed analysis of the areas surrounding each school was conducted. Through both a charrette process as well as data analysis recommendations specific to each school were made. These recommendations can be seen in Table 5 below with the school name, category of reuse, as well as reasonings for category selection:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Askew</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Location and Multiple Reuse Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglass</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>Location and Easy Re-Use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwood</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Location and Difficult Re-Use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Middle</td>
<td>Mothball for reopening</td>
<td>Lincoln Prep already at Capacity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Commercially and Industrially Viable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCoy</td>
<td>Lease/Sell</td>
<td>Near Major Arterial (Truman Rd)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Middle</td>
<td>Mothball to reopen</td>
<td>Northeast Growth Projections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE at Manual</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Building Size; Commercially Viable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scarritt</td>
<td>Mothball to reopen/interim lease</td>
<td>Projected NE Growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Rock Creek</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Location and Easy Re-Use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West-Switzer</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>Proposed Housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodland</td>
<td>Community Catalyst Business and Innovation Center</td>
<td>Located near Regional Jobs Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Closed School Recommendations: North Zone

Source: UPD Senior Studio Students Fall 2010

Due to projected population growth three schools in the North Zone are designated for mothballing, or the “de-activation of property” for an amount of time until use of the building is needed again. Mothballing of buildings by KCMSD in the North Zone is necessary if the district plans on recapturing children in the future. Mothballing schools comes at a cost in the form of maintenance for each mothballed school, and with fiscal concerns being at the forefront of the District it is necessary to only mothball schools that will be needed for future growth. Table 6 lists the proposed school to be mothballed as well as the estimated costs associated with them.
The North Zone has an abundance of resources as well as future growth potential. With the closing of these schools there is opportunity for the community to see reinvestment and reconnection across the District.

Central Zone

While assets in the Central Zone are numerous, most of the 47,786 jobs are located to the west of the District. Individual automobile ownership is low. This indicates that while there may be jobs available to the residents east of the district it is difficult for them to access. Difficulty accessing jobs, 30-40% of the residents living in poverty as well as the high number of vacancies are characteristics that create hardships for residents in this area. These issues, as well as the 987 building demolitions since 2000 demonstrate that resources are not evenly distributed throughout the zone and areas to the east are at a disadvantage when it comes to job access and investment in neighborhoods. Table 7 shows the open and closed schools serving the Central Zone.

Table 7: Open and Closed Schools: Central Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open KCMSD Schools</th>
<th>Closed KCMSD Schools</th>
<th>Private/Parochial Schools</th>
<th>Charter Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weeks Elementary</td>
<td>Swinney Elementary</td>
<td>Cristo Rey</td>
<td>Genesis Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitcher Elementary</td>
<td>Westport Middle</td>
<td>Peterson Early Childhood Elementary</td>
<td>Tolbert Community Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delano Elementary</td>
<td>Westport High</td>
<td>Plaza Academy</td>
<td>Allen Village Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central High</td>
<td>Longan Elementary</td>
<td>Belmont Montessori</td>
<td>Derrick Thomas Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melcher Elementary</td>
<td>Franklin Elementary</td>
<td>DeLasalle Education Center</td>
<td>Gordon Parks Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Language Academy</td>
<td>Richardson Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfellow Elementary</td>
<td>Central Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver Elementary</td>
<td>Moore Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.L. King Elementary</td>
<td>Ladd Elementary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faxon Montessori</td>
<td>Meservey (ACE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 Source: KCMSD Scorecards; Amanda Crawley
Of the estimated 11,000 children located within the Central Zone, around 8,600 of them are attending public schools. Table 8 shows the catchment for KCMSD in the Central Zone while table 9 shows the percentage of catchment by KCMSD for all zones. Of the estimated 11,000 school aged children in the zone, nearly 8,600 of them are enrolled in the public school system. Central Zone has the highest catchment rate of all the zones, indicating that residents of the area rely primarily on public education. This highlights the importance of engaging the community in decisions regarding the future of KCMSD.

Table 8:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>5,434</td>
<td>5,114</td>
<td>3,505</td>
<td>3,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>4,769</td>
<td>4,174</td>
<td>3,666</td>
<td>3,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>5,108</td>
<td>3,774</td>
<td>3,684</td>
<td>3,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>6,919</td>
<td>4,189</td>
<td>3,663</td>
<td>3,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22,230</td>
<td>17,252</td>
<td>14,518</td>
<td>15,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 KCMSD Kids 5-19</td>
<td>11,041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 KCMSD Enrollment</td>
<td>8,601</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 9:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: City of Kansas City, Mo. Steve Lebofsky; KCMSD http://dese.mo.gov/schooldata/

The City of Kansas City, Missouri is currently conducting the Heart of the City Area Plan which is focused in the center of the Central Zone with boundary lines ranging from Interstate 70 on the north to Emanuel Cleaver II Boulevard on the south, the Blue River on the east and Woodland Ave. and the Paseo on the west. This plan is being drafted to identify assets and needs for the urban core, which is at the heart of the city. Within the plan four primary goals have been identified by the citizens involved to guide the future development of the area. These include:

1. Putting the people first
2. Creating jobs
3. Promoting sustainability
4. Increasing population
The closed schools in the Central Zone could work to help make these goals a reality. This area of the city is challenged by the most population loss, the highest poverty rate, the highest crime rate and the most disinvestment and blight. Instead of adding to these problems, the closed schools could be repurposed to generate growth and development on the east side of the district. There is a number of higher education institutions located within the zone: the University of Missouri-Kansas City, Rockhurst University, the Kansas City Art Institute, and Penn Valley Community College. These educational institutions could work to provide resources in the repurposing of the closed schools.

The Central Zone has come to have the highest rates for poverty and vacancy as well as the biggest loss (and projected loss, see table 2) in population compared to the other zones. The current state of the Central Zone is a result of suburban sprawl and the construction of highways that acted to divide the city as well as neighborhoods. These factors all play into the educational desert that is located primarily within the Central and South Zones. The residents surrounding this educational desert are primarily of low income, and consists of single mothers with one or no car. This shows a disservice to the community in providing equal educational and transportation options. Map 3 shows the presence of this educational desert.
Table 9 shows the recommendations for school reuse concluded after analysis of the Zone, while table 10 shows the price for mothballing Ladd in order to address the educational desert. Ladd is recommended for mothball if KCMSD plans to continue to serve this area of the district.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Longan</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Location and Easy Re-Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westport High &amp; Middle</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Location and Easy Re-Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swinney</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Location and Easy Re-Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Hard Re-use of Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seven Oaks</td>
<td>Community Catalyst Urban Agriculture Center</td>
<td>Location and Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairview</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Location and Easy Re-Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Location and Hard Re-Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Middle School</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Location and Hard Re-Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson</td>
<td>Community Catalyst Healthy Families Headquarters</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladd</td>
<td>Mothball to reopen</td>
<td>Addresses Educational Desert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meservey</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Hard Re-Use due to location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Closed School Recommendations: Central Zone
Source: UPD Senior Studio Students Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Initial Cost $</th>
<th>5 year Maint. $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ladd</td>
<td>$ 644,325.00</td>
<td>$ 3,221,625.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10: Mothball Cost: Central Zone
Source: KCMSD Scorecards; Amanda Crawley
One way for KCMSD, as well as economic generators located to the west, to help correct this desert in education would be to invest in reuses for closed schools that serve the surrounding community. With the completion of the Heart of the City Area Plan, community input will help guide reinvestment in the urban core, which will have cascading affects throughout the city.

South Zone

The South Zone is also predominantly residential (76%) as well as owner occupied and has higher educational attainment than that of Kansas City as a whole. The South Zone only has 22,519 jobs; the lowest number of jobs for all three zones. Map 4 shows land use on the District scale, Residential use is primarily located on the east and south sides of the District. The primary economic generator in the south zone is the Waldo area located on the west side. It consists primarily of small businesses and is a smaller corridor of activity in comparison to the other zones.

In the analysis of the Central Zone, an educational desert was discovered that showed an area of the city that was not serviced by the public school system. Some of this desert is located in the South Zone. In the South Zone from 59th St. to Brush Creek there’s a high number of female heads of household not being served by a neighborhood school or child services. This also follows that neighborhoods east of Troost are dominantly classified as stabilization and redeveloping in the 1994 FOCUS plan; this implies the need for services.

The South Zone has a high number of charter schools in comparison to the other two zones. In area plans related to the South Zone, many neighborhoods indicated an interest in having charter schools locate in their neighborhoods. While the South Zone is projected in table 12 to lose population in the future, this decline could be reversed if measures are taken to recapture and encourage enrollment in KCMSD schools.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open KCMSD Schools</th>
<th>Closed KCMSD Schools</th>
<th>Private/Parochial Schools</th>
<th>Charter Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holliday Montessori</td>
<td>KCMSA</td>
<td>Global Montessori</td>
<td>Brookside Charter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banneker Elementary</td>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>Pembroke Hill Elementary</td>
<td>Tolbert Prepatory Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Border Star Montessori</td>
<td>Graceland</td>
<td>Pembroke Hill</td>
<td>University Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paseo High School</td>
<td>Chick</td>
<td>St. Peter’s</td>
<td>Academie Lafayette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troost Elementary</td>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>Calvary Lutheran</td>
<td>Benjamin Banneker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John T. Hartman Elementary</td>
<td>Pershing</td>
<td>St. Elizabeth’s</td>
<td>Benjamin Banneker Charter Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest Early College Prepatory</td>
<td>Pinkerton</td>
<td>Visitation</td>
<td>Pathways Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE Campus</td>
<td>Blenheim</td>
<td>St. Teresa’s Academy</td>
<td>De La Salle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satch Paige Elementary</td>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>St. Monica Catholic School</td>
<td>Brookside Frontier Math &amp; Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>Kansas City Academy</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hogan Prepatory Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knotts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The Plaza Academy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td></td>
<td>St. Paul’s Episcopal Day School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robeson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 11: Open and Closed Schools: South Zone**

Source: UPD Senior Studio Students Fall 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 to 4</td>
<td>6,370</td>
<td>6,187</td>
<td>4,855</td>
<td>5,108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>6,129</td>
<td>5,503</td>
<td>5,021</td>
<td>5,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 14</td>
<td>6,522</td>
<td>4,895</td>
<td>4,987</td>
<td>4,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 19</td>
<td>7,813</td>
<td>5,155</td>
<td>4,938</td>
<td>4,946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26,834</td>
<td>21,741</td>
<td>19,801</td>
<td>20,108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2009 KCMSD Kids 5-19**

15,000

**2009 KCMSD Enrollment**

5,933

**Table 12:** Source: 1980, 1990, 2000 U.S. Census; Steve Lebofsky, City of Kansas City, Mo
The catchment for KCMSD in the South Zone is nearly one-third of the total school aged population. There are families with children in the South Zone, but many of them are not attending public schools. The presence of children and lack of enrollment in KCMSD lead to the mothball proposal of three schools in the Zone to ensure that in the event that reinvestment in KCMSD were to occur, facilities would be in place to accept the growth. Investment in KCMSD is also strongly encouraged because many of the vacant buildings sit in the middle of residential neighborhoods and could be used for neighborhood schools in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KCMSA</td>
<td>Mothball to reopen</td>
<td>Connected to Paseo, large percentage of children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>Mothball/Interim Lease</td>
<td>Stable neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knotts</td>
<td>Community Catalyst</td>
<td>Used to be Environmental Magnet, stable neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Education Center</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Located on major arterial; largest site available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryant</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Located in the middle of a neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Located near major arterial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robeson</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Surrounded by a mix of residential and some commercial; Excellent access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>Sell</td>
<td>Located in the middle of a neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chick</td>
<td>Sell/Lease</td>
<td>Stable neighborhood, many possibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pershing</td>
<td>Sell/Lease</td>
<td>Located in the middle of a neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinkerton</td>
<td>Sell/Lease</td>
<td>Located in the middle of a neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blenheim</td>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>Located near Hwy 71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graceland</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Off of Hwy 71 with no exits</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13: Closed School Recommendations: South Zone
Table 14: Mothball Costs: South Zone

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Initial Cost</th>
<th>5 year Maint.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KCMSA</td>
<td>$707,355.00</td>
<td>$1,358,120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>$331,237.50</td>
<td>$635,975.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KCMSD Scorecards; Amanda Crawley

KCMSA and Cook are both recommended for mothballing in the South Zone. KCMSA is recommended because it is physically connected to Paseo High School and is not likely to be sold or leased for any other purpose in this location. Cook is recommended for mothballing primarily because of its location. It is located in the middle of a neighborhood of modest homes and income and if incorporated back into the District could be successful as a neighborhood school. Cook could also take on a use in the meantime that would leave the floor plan intact for future use as either an artist workspace or as an adult learning facility.

The South Zone is a divide between a stable west and the service-lacking east. There are opportunities for the closed schools to cater to community needs and bring the same viability in the west to the east. The South Zone has established itself as a primarily commuter based community leaving those without adequate means of transportation at a loss. Since these schools are primarily neighborhood schools they would work well with neighborhood friendly reuses, primarily focused at providing services to the surrounding neighborhood.
Each of the closed buildings has been an asset to the neighborhood in which it is located, and potentially can still be. Although every successfully repurposed school building can likely become a catalyst for creating a healthier neighborhood around it, there is an opportunity to create a larger community-wide impact with several of the closed buildings, due to their location, design and relationship to the Zone Concept. KCMSD has pledged to become more visible to the families in the district and the community as a whole. These four Community Catalysts could service a larger community than that immediately surrounding the school and provide the District with a tangible way to give something positive back to the community.

One Community Catalyst school is recommended for both the North and South Zones and two are recommended in the Central Zone based on the needs of its residents. The District would provide the building free of charge (or at a lower reduced rate) to partners in the community who would operate specialized programs out of each facility that are particularly suited to their zone. The District would seek partners in the community in the not-for-profit or business sectors to form alliances to operate programs with special themes that would attract students, parents, citizens from across the metropolitan area to participate in life-long learning programs and hands-on service deliveries.

North Zone

Woodland Business and Technology Center

Woodland Elementary is located in close proximity to Downtown and with over 111,000 jobs to help stimulate the area economically. Woodland is located one block south of Independence Avenue near a metro bus line and is situated in a diverse, higher density neighborhood of varied incomes. The location is also adjacent to Samuel U. Rodgers Health Care Center and the city annex that currently houses the Kansas City Fire Department and other civic agencies. Don Bosco, an active social service agency, also operates within the neighborhood.
The Business and Technology Center would provide citizens in the area with assistance in personal finance, starting their own business, job-preparation, and computer technology skills. It could provide a hands-on learning component for elementary, middle and high-school age students from around the metropolitan area with co-sponsors like Junior Achievement, the Chamber of Commerce and the Kauffman Foundation’s Entrepreneurial program. Area teachers could contribute to shared curricula for ideas, resources, speakers and projects to help students of all ages become proficient in business, finance and technology. Private sector partners could include the downtown banking and financial institutions, the Federal Government’s Small Business Administration, the City’s Minority and Women Business Enterprise support staff and the Full Employment Council, among others. There are also other small businesses close by which would gain benefit by having a technology center in the area.

Central Zone

Healthy Families: Seven Oaks Urban Agriculture

Seven Oaks, located off of 39th Street is situated in an area that has suffered from economic decline. While the neighborhoods to the north and west of Seven Oaks are comprised of modest post-War homes, there still remains an 18% vacancy rate. Within the central district, there are a total of 53,645 jobs, most of which are located on the west side of Troost Ave. Seven Oaks healthy families urban agriculture facility would help address these issues by bringing economic stability to the area.

With both of the Central District Community Catalyst sites located in the food and job desert, the need for a Healthy Families facility is significant. With the nearest grocery store being more than a mile away and many families not having access to private transportation, resi-
dents of the area are left with fast food restaurants and convenience stores for food.

The VA hospital, which sits on the edge of 35th Street near Van Brunt, is one of the few large employers in the area. As a partnership, the hospital would work with the school district and the Kansas City Center for Urban Agriculture (KCCUA) to provide a healthy learning, healthy living and healthy lifestyles facility at Seven Oaks with an emphasis on urban agriculture. There are approximately 7.5 acres of land directly adjacent to the building that could be used for crops planted in greenhouses, high tunnels and in open air to ensure a crop yield all year long. With a purpose going beyond just feeding the community, the Seven Oaks Urban Agriculture facility will teach children how to raise and take care of community-based farms and gardens, business skills as well as drive others into the community.

Healthy Families: Children First (Richardson)

Richardson Elementary, located in the Ivanhoe Northeast Neighborhood is an ideal location for the second Central Zone Community Catalyst facility. This facility has the potential to be used as an early childcare facility, a family services center and adult education center with an emphasis on healthy families and healthy children in addition to Seven Oaks. Potential beneficiaries form this facility would include not just the surrounding community but other neighborhood associations of Ivanhoe, Oak Park and Santa Fe.

South Zone

Knotts Environmental Learning Facility

Knotts Elementary sits adjacent to Swope Park on a small bluff and wooded lot near a stream. Being one of the youngest schools in the district at 20 years old, Knotts was originally built as an Environmental Magnet Elementary School to encourage environmental exploration and opportunities and as well as teach sustainability. For this reason, Knotts is recommended as the Community Catalyst for the
South Zone and is envisioned to serve as a center for environmental studies for the entire metropolitan area.

This contemporary sustainability center would offer family classes, activities and seminars on the environment and sustainable lifestyles. As a partner, The City of Kansas City’s Parks and Recreation would be the best candidate to help stimulate this idea. In addition to The City of Kansas City Parks and Recreation, Lakeside Nature Center located nearby and is known for hosting programs surrounded around wildlife could also be another beneficial partner to the environmental learning facility.

As the center is within a quarter-mile and ideal for walking, trails could be implemented to connect the facility to Lakeside Nature Center. Furthermore, Missouri Conservation could expand the nature center and provide classes and nature activities similar to those of the Discovery Center on Emmanuel Cleaver and Troost.

Conclusion

The Community Catalyst proposal serves as an opportunity for the Kansas City Missouri School District to give something back to the community. It also allows for community involvement and participation through partnerships and collaborations. With many of the closed schools serving as beacons of education within the community, the District can now foster new programs revolved around business, agriculture, health and sustainability. As a valued strategy, the community catalyst will become a key connector within the community and give the District a chance to advance its mission and vision.
IV. Recommendations
Recommendations

The KCMSD is facing many challenging issues common to urban school districts. In addition, the task of repurposing 39 closed school buildings only adds another layer of complexity. Despite challenges, repurposing provides a great opportunity for this District and the community which it serves. Four primary goals can be achieved through a comprehensive, strategic repurposing process. The repurposing goals involve reconnecting, rebuilding, replacing and reinvestment.

Goals of Repurposing:

1. Reconnecting communities to each other. By setting up a repurposing plan that encourages community participation across social, racial, and economic lines, partnerships can flourish and collaboration can have a meaningful impact.

2. Rebuilding trust between the community and the District. A history of racism, bad press, underperforming schools, and accreditation issues has marred public opinion regarding the District. A solid repurposing plan has the potential to start to repair trust and reconcile strained relationships between neighborhoods and the District.

3. Replace an asset with an asset. Many of the closed school buildings have served as beacons of education and anchors within the communities in which they sit for in excess of 80 years. Now that the buildings have closed and will probably not function as a place of education in the future, a new use must be found that serves the community. The type of use and definition of an acceptable asset must be determined at the neighborhood level.

4. Reinvest in economically depressed areas of east Kansas City. The closing of a school can have an intensified negative effect if the area in which the building sits is already dealing with concerns such as low income, low home values and high unemployment. Concerted effort must be made to funnel resources and energy from strong economic areas of the District to areas that need assistance.

In order for a repurposing process to be successful and to reach outlined goals, two checkpoints must be met before the process can begin. First, all policy issues must be settled before a plan is drafted or community input is solicited. The District must present a consistent message during this process. The Superintendent, School Board members, and Building Board members must collaborate to develop a strategy for leasing and selling. This is important for a few reasons. First, so that the district presents a consistent message during this process. Second, so that developers or parties interested in purchasing the buildings will have a clear understanding of the process and any potential roadblocks are minimized. Simplicity and a streamlined process are important to
developers when evaluating project feasibility, so it is essential that the District make these policy decisions ahead of time so that they can attract reputable and capable developers.

District policy regarding goals, long-term strategies, decision-making, and educational structure must be cemented by leadership. The process of finding new use for 39 buildings is complex enough without District leaders going in different directions. A united, clear message will propel repurposing and gain support. Second, no action should be taken on repurposing a school site without input from the community. To repair trust and rebuild partnerships, neighborhoods must be included in repurposing decisions. The District must commit significant time to community-based repurposing process and use input to guide decisions in a meaningful way. If the District is presented with a repurposing opportunity that will greatly benefit the community during or before the formal process begins, they must be required to meet with the community before making decisions.

The real estate reality of this problem is that many closed buildings are located in areas that make repurposing more difficult. Even closed schools in more desirable areas could be difficult to repurpose due to the current depressed real estate market. Other factors that will affect salability include location and accessibility, adaptability economic surroundings, current condition, and neighborhood stability. Due to the current financial climate, the value of the schools will be lower lower than previous years and District not be satisfied with the amount developers are willing to pay. The District must decide if and in which circumstance they would consider selling or leasing a building for an amount they deem as undervalued in order to provide a positive asset to the community.

The District has four main options when choosing what to do with a closed school building. These are Sell, Lease, Mothball or Demolish.

Sell

There are both benefits and detriments with selling closed school buildings. One advantage is the District is able to acquire compensation for their assets. The District is also no longer liable for the annual costs of maintenance and security. From a municipal perspective, the City may support selling some of the buildings because those properties could be potentially returned to city tax rolls and generate revenue. A major disadvantage to selling is loss of control. Once the District sells a property, it is gone. If a building sells, there is no opportunity for revival of a school if the District beings to grow again and more buildings are needed. If the building is bought by a land speculator or some other disreputable buyer, the building may sit empty for years and negatively affect the community.
Mothballing is the process of “deactivating” a building for future reuse. The National Parks Service outlines three steps in a comprehensive mothballing process:

1. **Documentation** - The site is surveyed by a historic preservationist and a licensed architect to determine its condition and historic value.

2. **Stabilization** - Measures are taken to structurally stabilize the structure and remove debris that could potentially conduct or retain moisture.

3. **Mothballing** - The building is secured against vandalism or pest intrusion and ensures air circulation. Outlines a plan for site surveillance and maintenance.

This scenario has further consequences from the standpoint of community relations. Even if the district no longer has ownership of a building, they might be viewed as the responsible party by the neighborhood for selling the structure and contributing to blight. This was the case with the historic Booker T. Washington School on Prospect Avenue and more recently Bancroft School on Tracy Avenue.

**Lease**

The Board has explored the possibility of leasing all 24 closed buildings. A lease option is attractive because it enables the District to have flexibility and keep control of assets. This could be advantageous if the needs of the District change in the future. Leasing the buildings also bolsters District assets for collateral against future bond measures. A lease also provides some source of revenue to the District from a closed building. Disadvantages to leasing involve placing restraints and limits on repurposing. A lessee has little incentive to make improvements or major adjustments to the property because they don’t have ownership; this extremely limits what can be done within a former school building. A lease also shuts out potential incentives for redevelopment, such as historic tax credits. Without ownership, developers have little reason to be involved with school buildings. Leasing also stretches the role of the district and affects public perception, casting them as educator and landlord.

**Mothball**

Mothballing is a way to secure and preserve a building for future reuse. A benefit to mothballing is that affords the District options and delays the need to make decisions regarding properties. If the District experiences future growth, mothballing enables them to reuse the building once again as a school. Mothballing allows for time to pass and real estate conditions to stabilize. This affords the District an opportunity to make more money on a future sale. Mothballing also has the potential to save buildings that would otherwise be demolished. It does not take long for empty buildings to deteriorate quickly. If done correctly, mothballing eliminates quick deterioration and provides a better chance for future reuse. There are negatives associated with mothballing. The main detriment is cost. It costs on average an initial price of $7.50 per sq. ft. to mothball a school building, plus an additional annual amount of $2.88 per sq. ft. for continued maintenance. For example, mothballing Scarritt Early Childhood Center will initially cost an estimated $448,800 and $861,695 over a five year period for maintenance and operation. This is a significant investment of limited district resources.

**Recommendations**
Demolition

Demolition is another way to address a closed school building. Some advantages to demolition are that it potentially enables a site for usable redevelopment or open space, or removes a potentially dangerous structure. A disadvantage of demolition is loss of a historic structure. 71% of the closed schools were built prior to 1930 and nearly 84% could potentially qualify for inclusion on the National Historical Register. Historic buildings are often attractive for redevelopment due to their unique character and charm. If demolitions occur there is no way to get historic buildings back. Demolitions also can negatively affect a neighborhood. Sometimes even an empty building is better than no building at all. Schools serving as anchors for corridors often still achieve a purpose both visually and in the mind of neighborhood residents. Removing the building from the neighborhood fabric can have adverse affects by contributing to blight and losing of a sense of place.

Recommended Approach

The best repurposing approach for the District is one that does not commit to only one option, but rather takes a detailed look at each individual school site to determine the best option. This problem is complex and so it is fitting that a repurposing solution is not a one-size fits all scenario. The District should explore an approach that encompasses selling, leasing, and mothballing. Demolition should be used as a measure of last resort and only after the community has been consulted regarding goals for the site and potential effects on the surrounding neighborhoods.

The team recommends the District sell 21 schools. The schools to be sold include, Askew, Bingham, Blenheim, Bryant, Chick, Fairview, Longan, Manchester, Manual, Marlborough, Meservey, Pinkerton, Robeson, Swinney, Thatcher, West Rock Creek, West Switzer, Westport High, Westport Middle, and Willard*. Selling these school buildings will enable the District to obtain money for assets and direct resources to other areas. This strategy enables the District to sell viable, easily marketable schools in desirable areas in order to gain income. The acquired income can then be used to operate and

*For a detailed analysis of the justifications and approximate costs associated with these recommendations, please refer to Appendicies A & C
maintain closed schools that reside in areas where repurposing will be more difficult. This movement of funds will help move towards the fourth goal of repurposing, reinvestment in economically distressed areas of the District.

The process for selling school buildings should be thorough and strict criteria must be met prior to sale. The District cannot follow a first come, first served approach. Any buyer must be reputable and participate throughout the repurposing process. Neighborhoods must be consulted regarding new building use and potential developers. Potential buyers must have proof of sufficient capital for needed improvements and building reconfiguration, as well as plans and timelines to complete the project. The selling process must be stringent because selling to the wrong entity can prove to be more damaging than vacancy or demolition. However, it is important the the district recognize private sector interests and understand project feasibility from a developer’s perspective. Project feasibility will come down to three basic factors 1) Site acquisition (timing and potential roadblocks) 2) Ability to obtain financing 3) Return on investment. In order to address these private sector interests, the District should have clear policies and procedures, and be able to make fast and precise decisions when dealing with the sale of the buildings.

The District should also explore the possibility of offering financial incentives that could be applied to all redevelopment sites, and begin discussions with the applicable city and state agencies. The District should also be flexible and open minded when it comes to building programs and reuses. Specifically, these real estate deals will be put together packaged with multiple sources of financing, which will almost always include conventional debt from a bank. In this current economic climate, banks are especially concerned with risk and complexity. For example, a project that is 100% rental housing with a steady stream of income and just a few sources of financing will be more attractive to a bank than a mixed-use project with multiple sources of income and a complex legal and financial structure. A list and explanation of the most commonly used financing options and incentives can be found in Appendix.

In certain situations, the District may want to take an active role in steering potential buyers to specific buildings or areas of the District. For example, a charter school may be interested in purchasing a closed school building. Currently, there are 44 non-district schools within district boundaries. The majority of these schools are on the west side of the District in areas with higher home values and lower amounts of school-aged children. Therefore, if a charter wanted to purchase a building west of Troost, the District may want to persuade them to look at buildings on the east side of Troost, which would be difficult to reuse for any purpose other than a school. This would work to better serve children living in the District who do not attend KCMSD public schools, by providing a school closer to their home.
The team recommends the District lease four schools. The schools to be leased include, Central Middle, Douglas, McCoy, and Thatcher. Leasing school buildings will enable the district to retain ownership and control of the site. Leasing will also help to defray operating and mothballing costs. Special leases will be granted to four proposed Community Catalyst buildings, which are Business and Technology Center at Woodland, Urban Agriculture Center at Seven Oaks, Healthy Children’s Center at Richardson, and Environmental and Sustainable Living Center at Knotts. In these special lease situations, the District would partner with a private company, institution, or not-for-profit organization. The building would be provided free of charge by the District as its contribution toward an innovative regional education program would be operated by the outside entity. This special lease arrangement would help incentivize groups to partner with the District in this unique, community education endeavor.

Interim leases could be granted to any building recommended to be sold or mothballed until the building sells or is needed by the District. This allows for the buildings to have some kind of temporary use, this can minimize vacancy, crime, and building deterioration. The team recommends four schools to be leased or sold depending on the opportunity presented. The schools to be sold or leased include, Franklin, Graceland, Greenwood, and Moore. These four buildings are located in areas with low home values, large amounts of demolitions, as well as, other factors making repurposing more challenging. The District should pursue multiple options to ensure the best chance for reuse.

The team recommends the District mothball seven schools. The schools to be mothballed include, Scarritt, Northeast Middle, Lincoln Middle, Ladd, KCMSA, Cook, and Knotts. Initial mothball costs would be $3,979,178 and a 5 year maintenance plan would bring the total mothballing costs to $5,416,345. This mothball list is similar to the mothball list already proposed by the District. The District’s Capital Improvement Plan noted seven schools to be mothballed, including four middle schools and three elementary schools. The District’s schools identified for mothballing include Robeson, Cook, Knotts, Lincoln Middle, KCMSA and Northeast Middle.

*For a detailed analysis of the justifications and approximate costs associated with these recommendations, please refer to Appendicies A & C*
Mothballing schools allows the District to plan for future growth. For example, Scarritt Elementary and Northeast Middle are located in Northeast Kansas City. This is the area with the most growth over the last ten years and the only part of the District projected to grow in the next thirty years. This area is home to a large Hispanic population, the fastest growing demographic group in the District. Mothballing these schools is justifiable because of projected growth.

The matrix in appendix C shows estimated initial costs and estimated operating costs for buildings under the mothball, demolition and reuse scenarios. For example, Westport High School’s estimated sale price is $2,304,256. The cost to mothball and operate the building for 3 years would be $4,150,439. It is unlikely that mothballing and holding onto the building makes financial sense for the district, making selling it a more economically feasible option. Also, when the district is considering lease vs sell, it is estimated that the district could lease a building annually for approximately 10% of the estimated sale price. At this rate, the District would have to lease the building for 10 years before achieving what they could have achieved through a sale. If the District were to lease a building for $1, there would be no virtually source of revenue, while still carrying a significant portion of operating costs (unless worked into a lease with the tenant).

Regardless of the option pursued at each school site, the District must make a commitment to these closed school buildings and the neighborhoods in which they sit. The District has to ensure that the closed buildings are safe and secured. Currently, a few closed buildings have broken windows and open side doors. This access to a vacant building has negative effects for the community and hurts the District. These buildings may no longer be in use, but they are still District assets. The longer the buildings sit unsecured, the more likely they are to be vandalized and decrease in value. If the District cannot commit sufficient funds to large-scale mothballing until the buildings are sold or leased, a measure of mothballing must take place. At minimum, all buildings must be locked and
checked regularly. In some instances, windows need to be boarded up, especially around first floor windows and at other access points.

Committing to closed school buildings includes planning for the future and thinking carefully about the community’s perspective on the closed facilities. According to the Capital Improvement Plan, the District plans to build a new green elementary school. This proposed school aims to be LEED certified and teach students about environmental issues and green technology. While this is an exciting proposal, the most environmentally-friendly course for the District would be to reuse one of the 39 closed school buildings it already owns. In fact, a stated goal of this proposed green elementary school is to “minimize blight caused by school closures in this District for the past 25 years.” The best way to minimize blight caused by school closures is to reopen one of the closed schools, not to build a new one. However, Green technologies can be incorporated into various school remodeling and retrofitting projects. This would allow for building reuse and provide an opportunity to teach students about true environmental responsibility.

For the expansion and renovation of the 66 school buildings under the court order for the desegregation suit and its remedy, over 300 homes had to be acquired in the urban core to make room for expanded facilities and larger sites. Some of these newly closed buildings were renovated or built within the last 20 years as part of that program. A new elementary building cannot be built on less than 5 acres and the standard from Missouri Dept of Elementary and Secondary Education is 10. Asking the same community to bear the brunt of more lost homes and fabric in the central city, while recently renovated buildings sit empty is an important policy decision for the Board to discuss with the community.

The District is faced with many issues and options in this repurposing process. A data-based, comprehensive approach to finding appropriate futures for the 39 closed school buildings will have the best chance for success. A repurposing process that contains a consistent message and a community voice as starting points is vital. Repurposing provides a unique and exciting opportunity for the District. Repurposing affords the District an opportunity to reconnect communities, rebuild trust, replace community anchors, and reinvest in critical areas. If the District is able to meet these four goals, it will be teaching the city and the region how to do things right. Repurposing can be the best lesson this District has ever taught.
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V. Community Engagement
The Kansas City Missouri School District has changed greatly from its inception to its present state. As Kansas City evolved through the decades, the district mirrored its evolution. As urban core neighborhoods continue to lose population, as crime inevitably gets worse, and as jobs make their migration to the suburbs, the Kansas City Missouri School District loses students, as well as tax base. The demographics of the district have changed and student population has decreased dramatically in the last 50 years. Students from challenged neighborhoods require more services from schools, and the Kansas City School District has to provide these services to more and more students each year with less money. Budget cuts and fewer and fewer taxpayers in the district strained KCMSD’s budget. With seemingly no other options, Superintendent Covington made the decision to close 24 schools in 2010, making a total of 39 closed buildings within KCMSD.

The question facing many parents, students, faculty, staff, and residents seems clear; what should be done with all of these closed schools? A Repurposing Plan, or Final Actions Plan, is going to be developed to guide and direct the School Board and Building Board in the future use or reuse of these closed buildings. Data collection and analysis can guide the decision process, but KCMSD residents, parents, and staff all have to live with the outcome. A Community Engagement Process is needed to collect and organize community input. Residents and parents that live near the closed buildings will be highly affected by the success or failure of the Final Action Plan. The closing of school buildings affected KCMSD residents, parents, students, and staff greatly. To make a Final Action Plan without their input would likely make the outcome less successful. This Community Engagement Process was created to facilitate public input and to gather ideas and solutions for these closed buildings. Public investment and buy-in is necessary for this process to be successful. Without this input, any Final Action Plan would be incomplete and have a high likelihood of failure. The success of this process lies in the commitment of the School Board, Building Board and KCMSD community stakeholders to work together and be committed to finding a viable solution. Utilizing the community’s strength, resources, and skills in combination with KCMSD staff and professionals, an innovative and unique Final Action Plan can be created. The following describes a Community Engagement Plan that can facilitate this partnership between the School District and the community.
Purpose

To design and facilitate a Community Engagement Process in which Kansas City Missouri School District residents, parents, and stakeholders can understand the challenges facing KCMSD and can partner with the district to create a Final Action Plan.

Goals

1) Present current circumstances facing the Kansas City Missouri School District to the School Board, Building Board, district stakeholders, and community participants

2) Create an environment where district stakeholders and community participants can voice comments and ideas about the repurposing process

3) Gather usable, helpful community input to present to the Repurposing Staff, School Board, Building Board and Steering Committee which will be used to create the Final Action Plan

Process

The Kansas City Missouri School District encompasses many different areas of the city, each with unique challenges and strengths. Because of these unique areas, the district cannot be analyzed solely on a district-wide scale; it must be broken down into smaller areas to gather a more complete scope of the closed buildings, their communities, and the district as a whole. In the same way that the data was grouped and organized, the Community Engagement Process will be grouped and organized.

KCMSD Leadership Summit

In order to engage the KCMSD School Board, Building Board, and Superintendent, the repurposing staff and community facilitator will host a KCMSD Leadership Summit, a half-day strategy session guiding the district staff through the data and the Community Engagement Process. This session will consist of explanation of how the district was analyzed and what the data might indicate for the Final Action Plan. This worship will also be a time to determine jurisdiction between the School Board and Building Board, what schools will be on the Mothball List, and hopefully improve communication and overall relations among the different facets of KCMSD leadership. Additionally, it is hoped that the parties involved will agree to a moratorium on selling buildings or making final decisions on the reuse of any closed building. This moratorium will serve as a contract between KCMSD and the community. Creation of the moratorium and upholding it will communicate to the community participants that the
district wants their input and will actually use it in the Final Action Plan. If upheld, it will help the district improve public perception and encourage participation in the Community Engagement Process.

Decisions to be Made at the KCMSD Leadership Summit:

1) Will Early Childcare Centers be a part of KCMSD in the future?
2) Can Charter Schools buy/lease closed buildings?
3) Will Signature Schools be expanded and need more facilities in the future?
4) Create the Final Mothball List
5) Has the district given up on recruiting children who are not currently enrolled in KCMSD schools?
6) Will the district have need for middle school buildings or buildings with large sites in the future?

District-Level Meetings

Following the KCMSD Leadership Summit, a district-wide meeting will be held. There will be 3 opportunities to attend the District-Level Meeting because the same meeting content will be presented at 3 different times. This meeting will be the first opportunity for community participation. The purpose of the meeting will be to present the challenges facing KCMSD through data, maps, and tables, as well as explaining the conceptual plan and the Community Engagement Process. It is hoped that through this district-wide meeting, the community participants will begin to understand the scope of adversity in KCMSD and get excited about participating in the Community Engagement Process. The set-up of this meeting will gather participants around round tables to listen and observe the data presented by the Repurposer and the Community Engagement Facilitator, then at their tables discuss what was presented and write comments. Then after the table discussions, the Community Engagement Process will be outlined and explained.
Goals

1) Community participants will learn about the data and the inherent challenges facing the district

2) Explanation of the Community Engagement Process that will excite and encourage public participation

The week following the District-Level Meetings will be used to advertise the Community Engagement Process. One of the ways by which this will be accomplished is through Traveling Charettes. These charrettes will serve as a way for residents to see what has happened so far in the Repurposing Process and to encourage involvement in the upcoming Community Engagement Process. During this week, district representatives as well as community facilitators will display information about the Community Engagement Process at community shopping areas or high pedestrian traffic areas. Additionally, the residents who stop by the display can go through a sample charrette process. Hopefully this sample charrette will encourage participation in future charrettes at the Zone and Site-Level Meetings.

Zone-Level Meetings

After this district level meeting, the zone level meetings will begin. There will be a total of 3 Zone-Level Meetings, one for each Zone. These zone meetings are a way to facilitate community participation at a smaller scale than the district level, but not as small of a scale as the school site level. It is hoped at these zone level meetings, that community participants can look at their zone and be able to identify the issues specific to their zone that would be relevant to all of the school sites within the zone boundary. Each participant will be given a packet with the data that is specific to their zone, and the presentation done by the Repurposer will recap the major issues at the district level and what it might mean for this zone. Additionally, these participants, working in small groups, will identify the assets of their zone and any major corridors, important institutions, community landmarks, or important areas. The historical context of some closed schools needs to be addressed at these meetings as well to determine if the closed school could be designated as an historic landmark. Community participants will also be asked to elect 2-3
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Proposed Locations for Site Level Meetings

**North Zone**
1) Location: Garcia Elementary
   • Switzer Elementary
   • West High
   • Manual
   • Douglass Elementary

2) Location: NE High
   • Scarritt Elementary
   • Woodland Elementary
   • NE Middle
   • Thatcher Elementary
   • McCoy Elementary

3) Location: Rogers Elementary
   • Greenwood Elem
   • Askew Elementary
   • West Rock Creek Elem
   • Lincoln Middle

*Italicized location indicates open school which will host meetings for schools listed.*

Zone Representatives to serve on the Steering Committee, who will work with district leadership and the Repurposer in the drafting of the Final Action Plan. During these meetings, there will be Graffiti Boards posted at each school site. These boards will serve as spaces for public comments and ideas. Residents will be encouraged to write what they want to see the site become. Also the boards will serve to publicize the upcoming site-level meetings.

**Goals**

1) Have each participant understand the data relevant to their zone

2) Identify issues and assets of the three zones

3) Identify major corridors, important institutions, community landmarks, and important districts within the zone

4) Elect 2-3 Zone Representatives from each zone to serve on the Steering Committee

**Site-Level Meetings**

There will be 10 site-Level Meetings. The 39 school sites will be grouped together by location to allow for 10 meetings instead of a meeting for 39 separate sites. These meetings will focus on assisting the residents surrounding the vacant schools to create development and design guidelines for those sites. These guidelines would be created so that the district could know if a proposed use, tenant, or design for the school site would be acceptable to the residents. Each participant will receive a packet if data that is specific to the site they are working with as well as some recommended uses for that site. The Repurposer and the Community Engagement Facilitator will present some of the decisions made at the zone-level meetings and discuss the issues and assets of the zone in which each school site is located. Participants will then conduct a charrette for each school site and present their findings and ideas. From these site meeting charrettes, a Site Spokesperson will be elected. This Site Spokesperson will then represent the school site at the District Expo and explain and present what the charrette group found to be a plausible solution for the site.

**Goals**

1) Have participants understand the issues and assets associated with the school site, as well as the zone-level data that would affect the site.

2) Create design and development guidelines for the site that the district could use to determine if a proposed use would be acceptable.

3) Design a creative proposal or multiple proposals for the site

4) Elect a Site Spokesperson to present the proposal at the District Expo
District Expo

After community participants have worked through the charrette at the site level and developed creative solutions, a District Expo will take place. The intention of the expo is to inform the public about what went on during the Community Engagement Process, to attract potential developers or leasors and to publicize the future Final Action Plan. The residents who participated at the site-level meetings will construct a display board detailing the school site’s issues and assets as well as their proposal for what shall be done with the site.

The Graffiti Boards that were posted at each site will be displayed at the District Expo as well. The expo will be open to the general public to explore and become informed on all that has happened in the Community Engagement Process thus far.

Goals

1) Allow community participants to present and explain the solutions that they developed for each site.

2) Inform the general public about the Community Engagement Process

3) Attract and inform potential developers/leasors of appropriate used for each site and neighborhood criteria for successful repurposing

4) Publicize the upcoming Final Action Plan

District Staff, Repurposer and Steering Committee Meetings

Starting at the end of the Site-Level Meetings, KCMSD staff, the Repurposer and the Zone Representatives which make up the Steering Committee, will meet to begin drafting the Final Action Plan. They will take
public input gathered at all levels of participation and create a Draft Final Action Plan. The design and development guidelines created by the participants at the Site-Level Meetings will be integrated into the plan. This Draft Final Action Plan process will have about a month to be completed.

**Zone-Level Meetings**

After a Draft Final Action Plan has been created, the Zone Representatives and the Repurposer will present the draft at another round of Zone-Level Meetings. These meetings will serve as one last public input session before the Final Action Plan is approved. Participants at these meetings will be able to ask questions about the Draft and leave comments for the Zone Representatives and the Repurposer to consider before creating the Final Action Plan.

**District Staff, Repurposer and Steering Committee Meetings**

Using the input from the Zone-Level Meetings, KCMSD staff, the Repurposer, and the Zone Representatives will create a Final Action Plan. The Draft Final Action Plan will be updated and refined. Public comments and ideas shared at the Zone-Level meetings will be included as much as possible. This refinement process will have a week to be completed.

**District-Level Meeting**

This is the final step of the Community Engagement Process. The Final Action Plan will be presented to attendees and the Community Engagement Process will be explained and summarized. There will also be a celebration at this meeting to give closure to the process and to commemorate all those who participated.
Community Engagement Plan

- District Wide Meeting
- Zone Meetings
- Site Meetings
- District Expo
- Zone Meetings
- Staff/Board/Steering Committee
- Staff/Board/Steering Committee
- District Wide Presentation of Final Action Plan
Appendix A - The School Sites

The following appendix contains a representation of data that was examined for each individual school buildings and their adjacent areas. Population and housing data was taken from the 2000 U.S. Census. Zoning and land use maps are based on information given by the city of Kansas City, MO Planning Department. Historic integrity ratings of the buildings are on a 1 to 5 scale and are based on pre-existing historic surveys done for the National Parks Service in conjunction with the National Register of Historic Places. All photographs are original and were taken by members of the UMKC Senior Planning Studio.

Note: For an estimation of costs associated with reusing a particular building, cross-reference the listed square footage with the cost matrix in appendix C.
Askew Elementary School
2630 Topping Avenue

History:
Date of Construction: 1922-1923, 1956, 1968
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 58,190
Overview:

Located adjacent to Blue Valley Park, Askew is located in a relatively dense area of low to moderate income. The population 25% is school aged, and there are 4 day care centers within a half-mile radius of the school. There are no other schools or community centers within this radius.
Bingham Middle School
7618 Wyandotte Street

History:
Date of Construction: 1959
Architect: Kivett, Myers and McCullum
National Register Eligible: Likely
Historic Integrity: 5

Square footage: 101,640
Overview:

The surrounding population is of moderate population density with a high percentage of elderly. This may account for the large number of assisted living/retirement homes in the area. In contrast, there are relatively few daycares or community centers. The home values reflect the high average incomes of the residents in the area.
Blenheim Elementary School
2411 E 70th Terrace

History:
Date of Construction: 1924, 1931
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 67,760
Overview:
Blenheim is located within a relatively high population area. The surrounding neighborhood is very dense, based on the amount of single family households that exists. The area has a high concentration of children between ages 5-17. Within a half mile buffer, there is a high concentration of day care centers. Blenheim is located in a low owner occupied area. The neighborhood has a medium median housing value compared to other neighborhoods. There is a relatively high housing vacancy rate.
Kansas City Missouri School District

Bryant Elementary School
319 Westover Road

**History:**
Date of Construction: 1915, 1938
Architect: Smith, Rea and Lovitt
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 45,760
Overview:

Bryant is located in a higher income residential area, which is reflected in the high surrounding home values. There are a moderate-to-high number of elderly in the surrounding area, but no assisted living facilities within a half-mile of the site. The number of children is also high, as is the number of nearby charter schools.
Central Middle School
3611 Linwood Boulevard

Date of Construction: 1924-1925
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4 or 5

Square footage: 143,523
Overview:

The surrounding area has a moderate overall population density with a high density of children. This is reflected in the 9 day cares located within a half-mile radius. The area also has a high elderly population, but there are currently two assisted living areas in the vicinity. The area has moderate to low income, housing values and home ownership rates.
J. S. Chick Elementary School
4101 E 53rd Street

History:
Date of Construction: 1930-1931, 1953-1954
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 45,760
Overview:
The surrounding area has low overall population with a high percentage of children. There are 6 day cares within a half-mile. There are a high number of elderly but currently no assisted living facilities within a half mile. There are 2 community centers that exist within the area. Incomes, homeownership and home values are all very low.
Kansas City Missouri School District

Cook Elementary School
7302 Pennsylvania Avenue

History:
Date of Construction: 1923, 1930, 1952
Architect: Charles A. Smith (1923, 1930), William M. Icehower (1952)
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 44,165
Repurposing Resources

Overview:

Though the neighborhoods surrounding Cook have a high population overall, they fall in the middle range both for number of kids and elderly. There are no community centers or assisted living facilities within a half-mile, and the surrounding land use is homogenously single-family residential. Although the area does contain some relatively affluent blocks, overall homeownership is low.
Kansas City Missouri School District

Douglas Early Childhood Center
2640 Belleview Avenue

School Facts:
- Date of Construction: 1953
- Architect: Unknown
- National Register Eligible: Likely
- Historic Integrity: 5

Square footage: 36,466
Overview:

The surrounding area is of moderate density with low owner occupancy. Despite having the second highest percentage of school-aged children among District schools, Douglas has no day cares within a half-mile. Vacancy rates for surrounding properties are low, and it is an easy drive to Downtown, Midtown and the West Bottoms.
Fairview Alternative School
3850 Pittman Road

History:
Date of Construction: 1957, 1986, 1993
Architect: Unknown
National Register Eligible: Likely
Historic Integrity: 4
Square footage: 29,405
Overview:

Fairview Alternative School is located in a low-density area. This neighborhood has low numbers of children but a high elderly population. However, there are no daycares, assisted living facilities or community centers located anywhere near the school. Homeownership is moderate (25.1% - 40.2%) and median home value is in the second to lowest category among District schools ($24,701 – $65,600).
Kansas City Missouri School District

Franklin Elementary School
3400 Highland Avenue

**History:**
- Date of Construction: 1968
- Architect: Unknown
- National Register Eligible: Not yet
- 50 years old, unlikely
- Historic Integrity: N/A

Square footage: 79,640
Overview:

Franklin is located within a very high population area with a relatively low concentration of children between ages 5-17. Owner-occupancy in the area is low and the neighborhood has a relatively low median housing value. The overall vacancy rate is moderate.
G. B. Longan Elementary School
3421 Cherry Street

History:
Date of Construction: 1955
Architect: Eberett L. Peterson
National Register Eligible: Likely
Historic Integrity: 4
Square footage: 49,523
Overview:

Longan sits in a neighborhood with rapid growth in population and redevelopment of historic apartment buildings and homes. It sits in North Hyde Park, and an area that has only elementary schools within a mile radius. Homeownership is continuing to grow in this neighborhood, while at the same time the number of renters is growing exponentially.
Graceland Elementary School
2803 E 51st Street

History:
Date of Construction: 1924, 1953, 1956
Architect: Charles and Smith (1924), Voskamp and Slezak (1953)
National Register Eligible: Likely
Historic Integrity: 3

Square footage: 44,330
Overview:

Graceland lies in an area with a high number of children. There are numerous registered day care centers within the area. The surrounding area has about 14-18% elderly, with one assisted living center nearby. There are 3 community centers within the context of the site but not one within convenient walking distance. Homeownership and home values are both lower than the district average.
Greenwood School
3702 E 27th Street

History:
Date of Construction: 1906, 1911, 1932
Architect: Smith Rea and Lovett
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 59,510
Overview:

There are three elementary schools (Attucks, Wheatley, and Delano) within a mile of Greenwood. The area experiences high vacancy of structures and land. The average median income for these two neighborhoods is one of the lowest in the city, averaging less than $23,000 a year, along with median home values average between low $20,000s up to high $60,000 homes. There is also a high elderly population within a mile of Greenwood.
Kansas City Missouri School District

KC Middle School For the Arts
4848 Woodland Ave

History:
Date of Construction: 1992
Architect: Unknown
National Register Eligible: No
Historic Integrity: N/A

Square footage: 94,314
Overview:

The surrounding area has a relatively large percentage of both children and elderly. Amenities include three day cares, a community center and an assisted living center within a half-mile of the site. The site sits near a concentration of higher-income blocks, but most of the surrounding area is of moderate income.
Kansas City Missouri School District

Knotts Elementary School
7301 Jackson Avenue

History:
Date of Construction: 1992 (original school demolished)
Architect: Dan R. Sanford
National Register Eligible: No
Historic Integrity: 0

Square footage: 62,288
Overview:
The area surrounding Knotts Elementary has a higher density of individuals, and school aged children in particular. The elderly population is relatively low. The area is predominantly renter occupied with higher home values and lower incomes.
Ladd Elementary School
3640 Benton Boulevard

History:
Date of Construction: 1911-1912, 1921
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4 or 5

Square footage: 85,910
Overview:

Ladd is located in a very high populated area. The surrounding neighborhood is very dense, based on the existing amount of single family households. The area has a medium concentration of children between ages 5-17. Within a half mile buffer, there has a high concentration of day care centers. Ladd is located within a relatively low owner occupied area. The neighborhood has a low median housing value compared to other neighborhoods. There is a medium vacancy rate.
Lincoln Middle School
2111 Woodland Avenue

History:
Date of Construction: 1955
Architect: Marshall and Brown
National Register Eligible: Likely
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 117,040
Overview:

The surrounding neighborhoods have a large number of school-aged children, most of whom live in low-income households. The concentration of elderly is also relatively high. Serving these are several assisted living facilities, none of which are in walking distance. Median home values are significantly low, and the area suffers from a large amount of vacant lots.
Marlborough Elementary School
1300 E 75th Street

School Facts:
Date of Construction: 1927, 1938, 1952-1953
Architect: Charles A. Smith (1927, 1938), Shaugnessy and Bower (1952-1953)
National Register Eligible: Likely
Historic Integrity: 3
Square footage: 44,400
Overview:

Marlborough is located in a high population area with a high concentration of children. Within a half mile buffer, there is a moderate amount day care centers. Marlborough locates in a relatively low owner occupied area. The neighborhood has a medium housing value compared to other neighborhoods and a high vacancy rate.
McCoy Elementary School
1524 White Street

History:
Date of Construction: 1914, 1922
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 46,090
Overview:

The surrounding neighborhoods have a high percentage of children but only one daycare and no community centers located within a half-mile. Home vacancy rates are troubling and the large elderly population is not well served by assisted living facilities.
Meservey Middle School
4210 E 45th Street

History:
Date of Construction: 1927, 1934-1935, 1955-1956
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 129,580
Overview:

Meservey ACE is located within a relatively low populated area. The area has a high concentration of children between ages 5-17. Within a half mile buffer, there is a medium concentration of day care centers. The surrounding neighborhood has lower owner-occupancy rates and relatively low median housing value. The vacancy rate is moderate.
Kansas City Missouri School District

Moore Elementary School
4510 Linwood Boulevard

History:
Date of Construction: 1914-1915, 1924
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4 or 5

Square footage: 43,340
Overview:

The surrounding area has a moderate to high number of children and elderly. There are four day care centers within a half-mile radius. Other amenities are few, with one community center and no assisted living facilities in the vicinity. Home ownership and home values are both quite low.
Kansas City Missouri School District

Northeast Middle School & Thatcher Elementary
4904 Independence Avenue

History:
Northeast Middle
Date of Construction: 1925-1926
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4

Thatcher
Date of Construction: 1900, 1914
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 67,000 est
Overview:

The surrounding neighborhoods have a dense overall population and a very high concentration of children. This is reflected in the numerous day cares in the vicinity, three of which are within a half mile. The elderly population within the immediate area is also high, but this population suffers from a relative lack of amenities, with only one assisted living center in the vicinity. Housing vacancy rates are moderate, but home ownership is quite low.

Square footage: 34,100
Kansas City Missouri School District

Pershing Early Childhood Learning Center

5915 Park Avenue

History:
Date of Construction: 1918, 1930, 1931
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 46,851
Overview:

Pershing sits in a residential area just two blocks west of a commercial and residential corridor. It appears to be in fair condition. There is a large concentration of school aged children in the area and the median income and home values are moderate. A relatively dense elderly population is served by relatively few assisted living facilities.
Pinkerton Elementary School
6409 Agnes Avenue

History:
Date of Construction: 1930-1931, 1953, 1980s
Architect: Charles A. Smith (1930-1931), Neville Sharp and Simon (1953)
National Register Eligible: Likely
Historic Integrity: 3
Square footage: 48,400
Overview:

The surrounding area has a dense concentration of children and a relatively high population of elderly. Three nearby schools have remained open. There is a lack of assisted living facilities in the area. Median incomes are low in the area, as are home values.
Richardson Elementary School
3515 Park Street

History:
Date of Construction: 1963
Architect: Monroe and Lefebvre
National Register Eligible: Not yet 50 years old, unlikely
Historic Integrity: N/A

Square footage: 56,650
Overview:

Richardson is located in a very high population area. The surrounding neighborhood is very dense, based on the amount of single family households that exists. The area has a relatively low concentration of children between ages 5-17. Within a half mile buffer, there is a medium concentration of day care centers. Richardson is located in a very low owner occupied area. The neighborhood has a relatively low median housing value compared to other neighborhood. There is a relatively low vacancy rate.
Robeson Middle School
8201 Holmes Road

History:
Date of Construction: 1960
Architect: Manuel Morris
National Register Eligible: Likely
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 151,800
Overview:

The surrounding area has moderate incomes with a low percentage of housing ownership. Vacant lots are relatively high in number, which is reflected in the housing values. Both children and elderly are high in number, and surrounding day care centers are plentiful, as well as assisted living facilities. However, there are no nearby community centers.
Scarritt Elementary School
3509 Anderson Avenue

History:
Date of Construction: 1927 (gym), 1950s
Architect: Charles A. Smith (gym)
National Register Eligible: Likely
Historic Integrity: 3
Square footage: 59,840
Overview:

Overall, the block in which Scarritt is located in represents the lowest category of median household income and median household value, while also falling within the highest category for vacancy. This area has a dense concentration of elderly and school aged children, as well as a high concentration of people in general. There are a scarce number of day care centers in the vicinity. However, several community centers are in close proximity.
Seven Oaks Elementary School
3711 Jackson Avenue

History:
Date of Construction: 1926-1927
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 5

Square footage: 51,696
Overview:

The surrounding area has a high number of school age children. There is an area with a very high number of kids to the southeast. There are three daycares within the half mile buffer. There is a high number of population that are 65 years or older. There are no assisted living centers or senior housing in the vicinity and one community center. Surrounding homeownership is relatively low, and vacancy levels are moderate. Median household income is relatively low.
Swinney-Volker Elementary School
1106 W 47th Street

History:
Date of Construction: 1914, 1927, 1980s
Architect: Charles A. Smith (1914, 1927)
National Register Eligible: Likely
Historic Integrity: 3

Square footage: 54,373
Overview:

Swinney is located in the West Plaza neighborhood in an area of high income but low homeownership. It is adjacent to mixed land uses. The area has a lower number of children so reuse as something other than a school is recommended.
West Rock Creek Elementary School
8820 E 27th Street

History:
Date of Construction: 1956, 1968
Architect: Unknown
National Register Eligible: Likely
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 30,250
Overview:
West Rock Creek is located in an area of relatively low population-density. The proportion of children and elderly are both high. Currently there are no daycares, assisted living facilities or community centers located anywhere near the school or surrounding neighborhoods. The neighborhood has moderate home values but high overall ownership rates and very low vacancy. Incomes, however, are low.
West-Switzer Elementary School

History:
Date of Construction: 1899, 1926, 1939, 1958
Architect: Unknown
National Register Eligible: Listed in 2009 (all buildings and additions)
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 97,537
Overview:

The Switzer buildings sit close to downtown just west of I-35 and are surrounded by residential with a community center nearby. Income for the area is low and the area is dominantly renter occupied. The pocket of higher vacancy to the east corresponds with the location of I-35 and South-west Trafficway. The area directly surrounding the school experiences a lower number of vacancies.
Westport High School
315 E 39th Street

History:
Date of Construction: 1908, 1964
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4
Square footage: 269,684
Overview:

The school is surrounded by an area with a moderate number of children but a high number of elderly. The area is high in amenities, with at least six day cares, one community center, and two assisted living centers within a quarter-mile radius. The area consists of a relatively dense population, most of whom are renters of moderate income. Property values are high, with many multi-family units in the vicinity.
Westport Middle School
300 E 39th Street

History:
Date of Construction: 1923
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 166,650
Overview:

The school is surrounded by an area with a moderate number of children but a high number of elderly. The area is high in amenities, with at least six day cares, one community center, and two assisted living centers within a quarter-mile radius. The area consists of a relatively dense population, most of whom are renters of moderate income. Property values are high, with many multi-family units in the vicinity.
Kansas City Missouri School District

Willard Elementary School

History:
Date of Construction: 1923
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4

Square footage: 48,941
Overview:

Willard sits within a single family neighborhood. This neighborhood has a high vacancy rate as well as a low median home value. There are also several parks in close proximity to the school.
Woodland Elementary School
711 Woodland Avenue

History:
Date of Construction: 1921, 1936, 1990
Architect: Charles A. Smith
National Register Eligible: Yes
Historic Integrity: 4
Square footage: 100,913
Overview:

Median incomes and home values are in the lowest bracket. This block group also falls into the lowest category of elderly population and there is no assisted living in this neighborhood. There are 2 daycares within a ½ mile of the school and a heavy concentration of children to the north and medium concentration to the south. Three charter schools and 1 community center are currently located within the ½ mile radius as well.
Appendix B - Zoning

Like almost all American cities, Kansas City utilizes zoning to regulate the use and physical form of buildings and development. This is to ensure that inappropriate uses are not situated near each other (i.e., a manufacturing plant next to a single-family home). In standard, or “Euclidian”, Zoning, uses are typically divided into discrete groups such as residential, commercial, and industrial, and are regulated through the city code of ordinances. How a property is zoned can have a tremendous impact upon its value and utility in a neighborhood.

In the case of the KCMSD school properties, many were originally zoned for uses now incompatible with their surroundings. It is feared that should these properties be sold to outside developers, there would be nothing in the city code to prevent developers from moving forward with a detrimental project. Zoning can be changed or circumvented through rezoning or a variance via the Board of Zoning Adjustment. However, this process is often costly and time intensive depending on the change desired and the scope of the redevelopment plan.

Each zoning designation allows for certain types of uses. R-1 is the most restrictive, allowing only for single-family homes on lots of a certain size. The uses become less restrictive in R-2, which allows for duplexes, in R-3, which allows for row houses and apartment buildings, and so on. C-1 and C-2 zoning are typically neighborhood-focused retail, allowing for smaller shops and business. M-1 is the most inclusive, focused primarily on light manufacturing but also allowing for uses such as carnivals, baseball fields and foundries. Any R or C use is also allowed in M zoning.

Currently, only Lincoln Prep is zoned URD (“Urban Redevelopment”). This is a designation that requires the city Planning Department to review developments on a case by case basis rather than prescribing more rigid across the board regulations. The stated purpose of the URD is to allow more latitude in the redevelopment of blighted or depressed areas. The development may include residential, commercial, or light industrial, but the developer or property owner must work with the city to determine the level of conformity required with respect to surrounding development. The city council must approve any development plans in advance. To qualify for rezoning to URD, a property must be within a designated “blighted” area, a conservation area or an economic development area under the Real Property Tax Increment Allocation Redevelopment Act. Rezoning to URD also requires a recommendation to the city council from the Tax Increment Financing Commission.

Many schools are classified as multiple zoning districts because a portion of their property fronts a commercial street and another portion is adjacent to residential development. Westport Middle school, in fact, exists in four separate zoning districts! This may be advantageous or problematic depending upon the strategy recommended for each individual school; developers may be reluctant to take on a property governed by multiple sets of regulations, or they may use it to their advantage by splitting the lot into separately zoned parcels, a process which may also require Board of Zoning Adjustment approval.

Other rezoning opportunities may exist should this study determine a lack of housing, commercial or office space in an area where there is demand for such. The city code makes allowances for higher densities or other uses, such as office (O or CPO), or as part of a larger planned development district (GP). Strategies with respect to zoning must be tailored to the possible uses of each school building as well as the needs of the surrounding neighborhood. It is crucial that zoning be used as a tool and an asset in the process whenever possible.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1A</td>
<td>Fairview, West Rock Creek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-1B</td>
<td>Bryant, Cook, Douglas, Pershing, Robeson, Willard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2A</td>
<td>Blenheim, Knotts, Marlborough, Moore, Westport Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2B</td>
<td>Askew, Bingham, Chick, Franklin, Graceland, Greenwood, Ladd, Manchester, McCoy, Scarritt, Seven Oaks, Thatcher, Westport High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R3</td>
<td>Longan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R4</td>
<td>Richardson, Robeson, West-Switzer, Westport High, Woodland, Westport Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Westport Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>Blenheim, Greenwood, Manchester, Moore, Thatcher, Westport Middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M1</td>
<td>Bingham, Lincoln Prep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>URD</td>
<td>Lincoln Prep</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School With Multiple Zonings

School With Potentially Problematic Zoning (Industrial)

![Westport Middle](image1)

![Lincoln Middle](image2)
Appendix C - Cost Matrix

In determining the feasibility of different repurposing scenarios, the team created a Cost Matrix to organize the costs and potential income generated by possible outcomes. This table estimates initial and operating costs for these outcomes using a baseline price per square foot. This baseline price per square foot was estimated with the help of Daniel Musser of Zimmer Real Estate Services. Outcomes in the matrix are separated into two categories: Keep Scenarios and Sell Scenarios. Keep Scenarios include mothballing, demolishing, re-using, and leasing. Sell Scenarios include cost estimates for rehabbing for the same use and rehabbing for a different use. Market value estimates for each building were not estimated in this Cost Matrix, however, the most recent tax assessments for each building and parcel are included. There are many variables that could affect the sale price of each building, like location, adaptability, condition, and neighborhood. Estimating a sale price using a baseline price per square foot might be misleading.

### KEEP SCENARIOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>mothball</th>
<th>demolish</th>
<th>re-use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>initial aver:</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$12.50</td>
<td>$60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating aver:</td>
<td>$2.88</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
<td>$9.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SELL SCENARIOS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>rehab, same use</th>
<th>rehab, new use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>initial aver:</td>
<td>$125</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>operating aver:</td>
<td>$9.50</td>
<td>$9.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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