

Public Involvement as an Opportunity for Multicultural Sociability in an Urban Context

Ian W. Nunley

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Urban Planning

University of Washington

2014

Committee:

Mark Purcell

Robert Mugerauer

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Urban Design and Planning

©Copyright 2014

Ian W. Nunley

University of Washington

**Abstract**

Public Involvement as an Opportunity for Multicultural Sociability in an Urban Context

Ian W. Nunley

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:  
Associate Professor Mark Purcell  
Urban Design and Planning

The social compositions of American cities are in a constant state of evolution. With levels of domestic and international migration on the rise, the rapidly developing nature of these increasingly multicultural constituencies can often lead to verbal or even physical conflict unless mechanisms are institutionalized that encourage cross-cultural communication, interactions across difference, and inclusive governance. As a forum for solving community-wide environmental problems, public involvement processes in urban planning offer an opportunity for the public to interact across cultural differences as they deliver discussions about shared spaces to people and communities that might never have other reason to interact. In order to develop effective and inclusive public processes in multicultural cities, a pronounced emphasis must be placed on the implementation of community outreach, engagement, and design methodology that encourages progressive communication and collaboration. Following a review of the work of Leonie Sandercock and the future of urban cultural diversity, this paper presents the framework for an ideal

public process that organically fosters fruitful interactions across difference. This hypothetical framework is then used to analyze the public process currently being implemented in Seattle in association with the new Central Waterfront Program. Results from the analysis show a dynamic and comprehensive process, but not one that regularly encourages interactions across difference by members of the public. Following this analysis, a set of recommendations is then posited for strengthening the opportunities for multicultural interaction in the public oversight, outreach, participation, and engagement processes associated with the Central Waterfront. The work presented here has implications for future studies pertaining to the cultural dynamics of multicultural cities and the social production of space.

## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1: The Cosmopolitan City of Tomorrow</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
<b>Methodology</b> .....	<b>8</b>
<b>Chapter 2: Literature Review</b> .....	<b>13</b>
<b>Togetherness in Difference - Richard Sennett</b> .....	<b>15</b>
<b>An Ethical Indifference - James Donald</b> .....	<b>17</b>
<b>Public Order and Community Cohesion - British Home Office</b> .....	<b>20</b>
<b>A Politics of Local Livability - Ash Amin</b> .....	<b>23</b>
<b>A Sandercock Public Process</b> .....	<b>27</b>
Oversight and Outreach.....	28
Participation and Engagement .....	30
Translation into Design .....	32
<b>Chapter 3: The Seattle Central Waterfront Program</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>Case Analysis Methodology</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>Oversight and Outreach</b> .....	<b>35</b>
Central Waterfront Committee.....	35
Community Partnerships.....	37
Public Events .....	38
<b>Participation and Engagement</b> .....	<b>40</b>
Offline Engagement Methods .....	43
Online Engagement Methods .....	44
<b>Translation into Design</b> .....	<b>45</b>
<b>Chapter 4: Recommendations</b> .....	<b>48</b>
<b>Oversight and Outreach</b> .....	<b>49</b>
<b>Participation and Engagement</b> .....	<b>54</b>
<b>Translation into Design</b> .....	<b>56</b>
<b>Chapter 4: Conclusion</b> .....	<b>59</b>
<b>Works Cited</b> .....	<b>62</b>
<b>Appendix</b> .....	<b>65</b>
<b>Table 1: Official Community Partnerships with the Waterfront Program</b> .....	<b>65</b>
<b>Table 2: Central Waterfront Committee Membership (2014)</b> .....	<b>67</b>

# **CHAPTER 1: THE COSMOPOLITAN CITY OF TOMORROW**

## **Introduction**

The nature of urban development is currently engaged in a transformation taking place the world over. Globalized trends towards urbanization are placing increased strain on cities to adequately plan and design in order to meet the needs of these rapidly growing populations. The year 2008 marked the first time in recorded history that over half of the world's population resided in cities or towns (“Urbanization”). This dynamic evolution of human geography can be readily seen in many of the United States' large urban centers as individuals move closer to central cities in order to be in closer proximity to capital, services, and opportunity. Between July 2010 and June 2011, more than half of the United States' fifty-one largest metropolitan areas experienced more pronounced population growth within city limits than in their neighboring suburbs (Frey).

In the United States, among the cities experiencing the most prominent levels of population growth are those with industrial economies largely focused on technology and information systems, such as San Francisco, Austin, and Seattle (“Energy Boom”). The pronounced rise of these sectors of the national economy makes these areas alluring centers of employment, infrastructure and capital. Not only are these cities growing in terms of their overall population, but they are also attracting greater numbers from both home and abroad. The population growth in these cities has largely been driven by a combination of both domestic migration and international immigration, which has led to increasingly culturally diverse urban communities (Florida). Between July 2012 and 2013 alone, combined net migration into Seattle increased the metropolitan population by nearly 60,000 (“10 Metros”).

According to the American Community Survey's 2012 social demographics report for the city of Seattle, 17.3% of the local population was born outside of the United States. The foreign-born population of the city increased by forty percent between 1990 and 2000, and as of 2010, the city supports approximately 105,000 foreign-born residents. Of the foreign-born population, 53.1% hailed from Asia with China, Vietnam, and the Philippines representing the three largest countries of origin (ACS, 2012). However, immigration into Seattle also saw pronounced increases from other regions of the globe, most notably eastern Africa. Starting with the United States Refugee Act of 1980, thousands of Ethiopians, Eritreans, and Somalians began arriving in Seattle as immigrants and refugees, seeking to escape oppressive political regimes, drought, and war, and today approximately 15,000 Seattle residents originally hail from eastern Africa (Hinchcliff, 2010). As new foreign-born residents from a variety of social and cultural backgrounds enter and navigate their way through the city, the public realm and urban form evolves as entities increasingly compete for finite space, resources, and employment. As overseers of the built environment, urban planners and designers are tasked with managing the urban environment; entrusted to deliver equitable and just patterns of development capable of adequately meeting the needs of the local populace. This process is a delicate balancing act of competing interests all seeking to carve out their slice of the urban fabric.

The regularly evolving nature of these constituencies with new immigrants representing cultures all over the world often leads to verbal or even physical conflict unless a pronounced emphasis is placed upon building forms of cross-cultural communication and interaction across difference (Sandercock 96). These actions are necessary in that they allow for better negotiation over the urban environment by persons

representing so many geographically diverse cultural backgrounds and lived experiences. While conflict is not necessarily completely unavoidable, the ability to actively interact and communicate across our differences creates opportunities for better managing conflict and can encourage constructive dialogue concerning the nature of our shared urban environments. A failure to manufacture such opportunities for encountering difference often creates uncooperative communities and hostile urban geographies that can become stagnant in terms of economic growth and urban development (Amin 1).

In order to begin addressing the topic of interacting across difference within modern multicultural cities, we must first understand why this is a positive ambition that modern societies should strive to achieve. In the field of biology, diversity is valued for its natural ability to increase the resiliency and adaptability of living things (“Sustaining”). The same holds true in human sociology. Culturally and ethnically diverse societies are able to draw on a wider range of knowledge and lived experiences in negotiating modern problems that plague many urban centers (Sandercock 85-7). However, the mere presence of diversity does not directly necessitate cross-cultural cooperation. Why should we strive to move beyond simply living amongst cultural diversity and progress towards actively communicating and interacting across our perceived differences? What are the optimal arenas for beginning to bridge cultural divides and initiate shared practices of exploration and discovery?

As a historically diverse yet culturally and ethnically stratified city, this issue is very important to Seattle. As in many western cities, the systematic discrimination in Seattle has largely targeted immigrants, ethnic minorities, and non-English speakers (Gregory). As the local population continues growing and rates of immigration continue escalating, there

exists an increasingly pressing need for addressing the barriers to multicultural dialogue and collaborative learning in creating a more productive cosmopolitan society. The intensification of international immigration into Seattle, most notably from east Africa and Asia, reinforces the need for creating forums for allowing new actors into the scene an opportunity to negotiate, rather than simply assimilate, into the local environment (Amin 7). Urban planners are then challenged to develop bottom-up approaches to public involvement that place a pronounced focus on fostering proactive interactions across difference. These actions then empower members of the public with the opportunity to engage and interact with one another as a means of shared learning and mutually beneficial cooperation. A societal failure to begin adequately communicating across these cultural differences may further perpetuate the severe levels of inequality that exist in Seattle and the greater Puget Sound region (Harris 1). While we do not necessarily need to actively embrace and celebrate those different from ourselves, by building more robust mechanisms for facilitating proactive interactions across difference, we may begin developing greater recognition and appreciation for the positive and mutually beneficial environmental outcomes that can arise from increased cooperation and the recognition of difference in our multicultural cities of the future.

The public involvement processes in urban planning is one locus for initiating positive opportunities for increased cross-cultural dialogue and understanding by bringing communities of difference together in solving a problem that is universally shared by all parties. The public process is capable of bringing together sections of the population that might otherwise never encounter a shared opportunity to interact with one another. Providing a open and managed forum, wherein community members can equitably provide

input into the production of space, creates a platform for all constituents to openly convey their thoughts, experiences, and ideas. Members of the public may have differing perspectives and understandings of the issues at hand, but through the process of engaging with and learning from alternative perspectives, we may better understand and accept one another and the judgments made concerning our shared urban spaces (Blackstock et al. 13). The biggest impetus to fragmentation and violence in our urban environments does not arise from interactions across difference, but rather from doctrines and edicts that suppress such actions (Connolly 21). Rather than necessarily achieving some universal permanent consensus for addressing multicultural environments, regular interactions across difference throughout the public process allows for a continuous negotiation of the urban environment that seeks to address and solve problems of economic growth, political power, and social stratification (Amin 1). Furthermore, proactively engaging the thoughts and opinions of others may re-shape or strengthen our own personally held beliefs and values. Through the incorporation of this knowledge, we may become more resilient and adaptable both on the individual and societal levels, being able to better address and resolve universal problems in the built environment.

Unfortunately, many culturally diverse American cities have historically failed in asserting interactions across difference as a hallmark of success in planning public processes. These processes are often too limited in scope, unsustainable, and not extensive enough in outreach to all communities, thus directly limiting the number of opportunities for meaningful interaction across difference ("Stakeholder Involvement" 7). Therefore, models of public involvement should evolve to develop more comprehensive outreach and engagement methods that deliver increased opportunities for cross-cultural

communication. Many of the antiquated methods still in use by planning departments and design firms fail in identifying and recognizing the value of successful interactions across difference in delivering an effective and dynamic public process. As Leonie Sandercock describes, these interactions are vital in challenging citizens, governments, and urban planners to take greater control in managing the social and physical production of their urban spaces (86). There exist a number of possibilities for encouraging greater interactions across difference in three distinct stages of public involvement:

- 1) Oversight and Outreach
- 2) Participation and Engagement
- 3) Incorporation into Design

Rather than implementing the production of spaces by idyllic decree, we can begin placing greater emphasis on cross-cultural dialogue and collaboration in communities of increasing cultural diversity. With all this in mind the question then arises, how can urban planners generate more effectual practices of public involvement that thoughtfully engage all sectors of the local population and provide numerous opportunities for interacting across difference?

First, we must take a step back and re-examine how we conceptualize the public involvement process. Cities should work to deliver increased opportunities for equitable public outreach and guidance on the development and implementation of public involvement in order to create more uniform accessibility into the process for traditionally marginalized cultural groups, such as immigrants and non-English speakers. Opportunities for interacting with difference are only possible when all communities within the local population are invited to participate. This initial stage of public involvement is often

inhibited by co-opting forces of popular opinions that fail to adequately address the true breadth of culturally diverse interests housed within a local population ("Stakeholder Involvement" 7-10). To remedy this shortcoming, a greater emphasis should be placed on grassroots community-based outreach with relevant organizations and cultural groups. Casting a more inclusive net at this initial stage of the process, one that actively engages immigrant and native populations alike can help ensure greater equality in the production of the built environment and create additional opportunities for proactive engagement across difference.

Next, a concerted effort should be made in developing a broader mix of public engagement exercises that successfully cater to a wide range of personal preferences and cultural learning styles. A more dynamic mixture of qualitative techniques can provide a broader range of opportunities for interacting with difference that engage actors based on their personal comfort levels and learning styles. While some may be eager to provide input in a written format, others may be more attracted to group discussions or the physical manipulation of corporeal models. In addition to traditional on-site exercises, cities must also begin embracing new technologies in developing passive forms of engagement, such as internet community forums, that allow users the opportunity to enter into interaction with difference at their own leisure. This then builds a comprehensive set of platforms for harnessing the varied needs of all community members. The diversification in methodologies generates a more cross-culturally attractive public involvement process by eliminating possible perceived barriers to entry. The more exhaustive planners are in creating an effective toolkit for engagement, the more universally accessible the process becomes to different ethnic and cultural groups. A greater diversity of tactics and methods

for engaging the public builds a wider range of mediums for interacting with difference throughout each stage of the public involvement process.

Lastly, the input gathered through comprehensive outreach and engagement processes should be displayed in conceptual designs that are visually rich but still malleable and not overly deterministic in their depictions of the built environment. The public involvement component of an urban planning process should provide planners and designers with the necessary local knowledge to construct spaces that are true reflections of localized public interests. A failure to sufficiently convey the full range of community input may lead traditionally excluded populations such as immigrants and non-English speakers to disengage from the project entirely, diminishing opportunities for collaboration and maintaining active cross-cultural lines of communication (ibid.). Conceptual designs should embrace the true diversity and community drive intentionality of a space, as espoused by its inhabitants, as a means of generating further opportunities for sustained dialogue and discourse. The more capable we are of providing rich, but not overly deterministic concepts of space that are attractive and representational of all, the more likely the chances are for bridging sustained interactions across difference and maintaining a shared interest in mutually beneficial societal outcomes.

## **Methodology**

To begin answering these questions requires a review of literature surrounding the numerous possible futures that may become realized in our increasingly multicultural urban environments. This is achieved through analyzing Leonie Sandercock's 2003 text, "Cosmopolis II: Mongrel Cities in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century." In a section of the book entitled, "How We Might Live Together: Four Imaginings", Sandercock evaluates and critiques four

possible futures advanced by contemporary scholars and real world practices (85-96). In doing so, we may begin better understanding the positive societal outcomes generated from actively engaging, rather than merely co-existing with, those different from ourselves. Furthermore, I will then demonstrate why the processes of public involvement associated with urban planning are a fruitful medium for delivering opportunities for interacting across difference, as it brings together residents from numerous cultures and ethnicities in order to solve a greater community-wide problem. Advancing the principles of positive cross-cultural communication as espoused by Sandercock, this section concludes with the development of an ideal public involvement process, one that makes use of appropriate techniques and methods in achieving proactive dialogue across diverse ethnic and cultural communities.

Following a thorough review of the literature illustrating the positive societal outcomes that can be delivered through interactions across difference, the discussion will extend into a comprehensive examination of the implementation of public involvement in association with ongoing development of Seattle's new Central Waterfront Program (CWP). The CWP is a comprehensive municipal planning project that includes the razing of the Alaskan Way Viaduct, rehabilitation of the Elliott Bay Seawall, and a re-conceptualization of the downtown waterfront site ("About"). For the purposes of this thesis, I will narrow the scope to focus exclusively on public involvement directly related to the re-development of Seattle's central waterfront. This analysis is broken down into three key stages of public involvement: Outreach and Oversight, Participation and Engagement, and Translation into Design. Each of these three stages comprising the greater public involvement process are

analyzed in order to measure their effectiveness in fostering opportunities for meaningful interactions across difference.

The first stage of analysis reviews the incorporation of public oversight, community partnerships, and outreach being conducted as part of the waterfront project. This includes codification of the citizen oversight board known as the Central Waterfront Committee (CWC) and the numerous institutional partnerships that have been forged by Waterfront Seattle, a joint venture between the City of Seattle and the CWC ("Who We Are"). Who comprises the CWC membership and how were they selected? Are they representative of the many interests that comprise the region or representative of only a select few with the resources to participate in such a process? This section will also survey the formats for public events and outreach activities being conducted as part of the CWP for their ability to provide substantial mechanisms for supporting interactions across difference.

The second stage of analysis examines the methods being used for directly engaging members of the community and soliciting their opinions for conceptualizing the new waterfront. Adequate and active engagement across difference necessitates action from the public involvement team in delivering a multiplicity of culturally sensitive methods that are accommodating of different preferred mediums of expression. This will include discussion of traditional, in-person forms of engagement such as group discussions and the physical manipulation of corporeal models, as well as begin dissecting newly evolving methods for online community engagement. This will be important for understanding how the public involvement team is providing opportunities for bridging traditional barriers to accessibility for new immigrants and underserved cultural communities. Failure to deliver such an array of options for input may severely hinder the functionality of the public

involvement process as a positive arena for encountering difference and building better understanding of different cultures.

The final stage of public involvement analysis pertains to how project designers are harnessing the many voices of the region and incorporating them into conceptual designs for the new Seattle waterfront. In 2010, the Seattle City Council officially commissioned James Corner Field Operations as the lead architects for the CWP ("Lead Designer"). Envisioned by the CWC as a space where, "everyone may come together and co-mingle effortlessly", designers must incorporate the needs and desires from the region's many diverse cultures in order keep community members actively engaged in the process of creating a space where interaction across difference is supported ("Guiding Principles"). Conceptual designs are an incredibly powerful tool for providing additional public engagement opportunities and furthering cross-cultural dialogue as concepts continue evolving. If the early renderings produced by the design team do not espouse popular community interests, then the public may begin losing faith that their voice is truly being heard and incorporated into the plans. If members of the public begin disengaging from this process, then it becomes a much less viable mechanism for networking with difference and building sustainable multicultural community action. Meaningful and sustained involvement is necessary to maximize the number of opportunities for sharing experiences and effective communication across difference.

Following this case study of the Seattle waterfront, it is possible to assert recommendations for improving the public involvement process as an effective medium for communication and collaboration across difference. Best practices from alternative case studies will be included as a means of further advancing the conversation and supporting

the positive outcomes of cross-cultural collaboration, echoing the sentiments of Leonie Sandercock. Because the public involvement process associated with the CWP remains ongoing, there exists a wealth of prospects for further expanding upon the scope of this research. The relative effectiveness of this public involvement campaign in building opportunities for encountering difference and engaging in mutually productive dialogue for greater cross-cultural understanding may have a profound impact in maximizing positive societal impacts in the culturally diverse cities of tomorrow.

## CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

There exists no uniform blueprint for designing a public process for multicultural populations. Each city is inherently unique in the way in which competing social interests, cultures, and ideas interact with one another in shaping the urban form. Some societies live in defiance of difference with individuals living parallel lives to one another, never crossing paths to engage in discourse. Others embrace the diversity of their surroundings and actively participate in building a shared, common vision for the future. While there is no "right" way for living in culturally diverse urban communities, one that supports interaction across difference provides societies with the opportunities for self-reflection and growth that can only be achieved by providing platforms for activating this operation. Rather than becoming insular and limited to the innovations and ideas of a singular culture, collaborative communities of difference are able to directly engage one another in shared learning experiences that spur innovation and deliver the most universally optimum results. Creating a viable, shared, and politically inclusive urban environment, wherein there is a genuine acceptance of and communication with the cultural other, is the most positive outcome for the future of multicultural urbanity (Sandercock 94-6).

In 2003, Leonie Sandercock wrote a companion piece to her 1998 book, *Towards Cosmopolis: Planning for Multicultural Cities*. In *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel Cities in the 21st Century*, Sandercock further advances her thoughts on the potential futures of multicultural communities and how these are re-shaping our modern urban societies of difference. Sandercock uses the term "mongrel cities" as a metaphor for characterizing the modern urban condition in which cultural differences, immigration, heterogeneity, and diversity prevail (ibid. 1). In essence, the future nature of our cities is inherently culturally

cosmopolitan as both levels of domestic and international migration into major American metropolitan areas continues increasing. Sandercock's assertion is supported by population projections from the United States Census Bureau, as their forecasts predict net international migration into the United States to double over the next forty-five years, reaching approximately 1.25 million persons by 2060 ("2012 Population Projections"). With these population statistics as evidence of this migratory phenomenon, we must begin embracing the cultural diversification of our cities as inevitable rather than merely one possible future outcome. Once our cities and urban planners begin accepting this outcome as inevitable, we can more adequately begin implementing processes for activating positive multicultural discourse and interaction across difference. The central question her book poses is simple: "How can we (all of us), in all our differences, be 'at home' in the multicultural and multiethnic cities of the 21st century" (Sandercock 1).

This sentiment is not one solely espoused by Leonie Sandercock. A number of fellow contemporary scholars, notably Iris Marion Young, have often shared similar visions in recognizing the inevitability of migration, change, and diversity within the confines of our urban spaces (Young). According to the Migration Policy Institute, in 2011 the United States saw the inflow of over one million new legal permanent residents into the country (Batalova). Another report from the Migration Policy Institute indicates that the foreign-born population of the United States rose from 29.8 million in 2000 to 37.4 million in 2009 (Papademetriou). So if this increasing diversification of urban populations is unavoidable, how will our future urban societies adapt and respond to the increasing heterogeneity of their surroundings? Sandercock begins addressing these potential future outcomes in a section of the book entitled, "How Might We Live Together: Four Imaginings" (85-96). She

begins with a comprehensive summary of each author's vision and then begins an analysis of the consequences of each possible outcome, concluding with her own perspective on the future of multicultural cities, asserting interaction across difference as key in developing greater cross-cultural communication and understanding.

### **Togetherness in Difference - Richard Sennett**

The first imagining is one originally established by sociologist Richard Sennett in his book, *Flesh and Stone*. Written in 1994, Sennett uses first-hand accounts from his experiences living in Greenwich Village as support for concern that modern society may become trapped in a "diversity of the gaze", whereby people of difference occupy the same space but operate contrasting lives to one another without ever truly engaging across differences (358). Sennett paints a future urbanism wherein the many cultures of a city are unable, or rather choose, not to engage in the *process* of building a shared common destiny. Instead, actors operate based solely on their own personal interests with no concern for any possible alternatives. Sennett elaborates on this sentiment by opining whether "difference inevitably provokes mutual withdrawal." (ibid.). In this neoliberal model of urbanity, devoid of any sense of a commonly shared destiny, aggregates of individual interests will reign supreme in shaping our modern societies. The continuation of such actions, a cornerstone of the modern capitalist state, breeds entrenched conflict as individuals constantly compete for the finite resource of urban space. Without chance encounters with difference and channels of communication, our urban spaces become hostile geographies with actors constantly seeking to gain the upper hand over one another in the management of space and resources. Such a system continues perpetuating engrained cycles of social and economic inequality, as the select few actors that win out in

this struggle are able to continue exploiting the resources and political will of the rest of society.

Worried that such a future has become the status quo in New York and urban American society as a whole, Sennett sets forth in challenging this idea with a more collaborative vision. Largely appealing to the morality of mankind, Sennett envisions an urban future where citizens are not satisfied by merely operating in tolerant indifference to one another, but rather in active engagement that builds upon our collective strengths and weaknesses in resolving spatial conflicts and building more cooperative future endeavors. Sandercock says that, "For Sennett, then, there is a normative imperative in the multicultural city to engage in meaningful intercultural interaction." (86). With this imperative it is then possible for different cultures to begin understanding a sense of shared destiny within the confines of our urban spaces. Sennett asserts that by achieving this understanding, there can be greater recognition of the ways our individual actions affect the actions and outcomes of others, and how communities might collaborate in certain arenas in order to generate greater, mutually beneficial outcomes. The physical activity of interacting with those of differing backgrounds and experiences than our own serves as a point of strength for developing a common vision for an urban future that local planners can access in order to foster a built environment that encourages active discourse. In building societal bonds that accommodate rather than merely tolerate difference, we as human beings may begin recognizing our shared similarities rather than solely focusing on our preconceived, and often untested, notions of difference.

Although Sennett does an excellent job of enumerating his preferred future, he falls short in answering the question of *why* it should be viewed as an imperative. Sandercock

continues her critique by expanding beyond an appeal to morality in activating this vision. She asserts adversarial conflict as an inescapable product of such interaction, but focuses on the positive nature of this outcome (Sandercock 88).

"This [*de facto* separatism] becomes a problem for urban governance and for city planning in cities where contact between different cultures is increasingly part of everyday urban life. A pragmatic argument then, is that intercultural contact and interaction is a necessary condition for being able to address the inevitable conflicts that will arise in multicultural societies."

Sandercock further elaborates on these sentiments by quoting the work of political theorist Bhikhu Parekh. "It [culture] therefore needs others to understand itself better, expand its intellectual and moral horizon, stretch its imagination and guard it against the obvious temptation to absolutize itself." (Parekh 366-7). In other words, by sensationalizing their own way of thinking and operating, insular societies become locked into a state of existence that is limited by the extent of their own beliefs and ideas, where innovation and production are confined to the skill set attained by a singular group. Embracing alternative ways of thinking and new ideas in the production of the urban environment aids in the quest for maximizing both individual and collective understanding of the positive social, economic, and societal gains that can be achieved through such practices.

### **An Ethical Indifference - James Donald**

While Sennett appeals to morality and common decency in his version of diverse urban futures, James Donald follows a more pragmatic approach in illustrating how we all might live together. Sandercock specifically addresses the possibilities enumerated in his 1999 text, *Imagining the Modern City*, for her analysis. In his work, Donald advocates for a re-imagining of community, one that is no longer limited to spatial definitions. A staunch

critic of neo-traditional utopic planning models such as New Urbanism, he sets forth theorizing a world wherein community is defined as a constantly negotiated set of social interactions (Donald 151). In his vision of the future, a "common culture" is never fully established, but constantly evolving. Echoing sentiments from contemporaries like Iris Marion Young and Susan Fainstein, Donald accepts the culturally diverse nature of urban environments, and the ensuing conflicts that will assuredly arise, as inevitable. Culturally diverse cities are not a possible future outcome, but rather a normative ideal of urban life. Conflict, migration, and change are constants and the ways in which our societies operate should continuously be evolving in order to meet the ongoing demands of their constituencies. He goes on to suggest that there exists an "ethical need for an openness to unassimilated otherness." (Donald 145). Donald proposes that by simply living together and occupying the same space, this ongoing process of negotiated urbanity may develop measured levels of acceptance of those different from us, without necessarily actively embracing one another.

In her critique of Donald, Sandercock sets out to establish how shared senses of community and society may play out in the context of his vision. "If we start from the reality of living in the present, what kind of commonality might exist or be brought into being?" (Sandercock 88). This is a particularly important point in understanding how this sort of workable, pragmatic urbanity will play out without regular interactions across difference. Donald advances the assumption that this experiential negotiation of community will eventually breed a sort of workable, if not necessarily inclusive and cooperative, shared civic culture and society. He elaborates by stating that commonalities will become apparent through, "broad social participation in the never completed process

of making meanings and creating values...an always emerging, negotiated common culture." (Donald 151). This viewpoint acknowledges the struggle associated with developing a sense of shared being and destiny. A common culture is not something to be achieved, but rather an ongoing process of learning and understanding that builds towards mutually-beneficial outcomes relating to the urban environment. As Sandercock notes, "This process requires time and forbearance, not instant fixes. Donald argues that we don't need to share cultural traditions with our neighbours in order to live alongside them, but we do need to be able to talk to them, while also accepting that they are and may remain strangers (as will we)." (88-9). In the multicultural future imagined by James Donald, we need only be capable of living *amongst* rather than *with* those different than ourselves in order to build a pragmatically functional urban society, where cultural differences are recognized but not necessarily actively embraced. In essence, this is a shared common culture built upon practicality and convenience.

While this rational viewpoint may be a more realistic platform than the rosier imaginings put forth by Sennett, Sandercock identifies a number of weaknesses associated with Donald's argument. Specifically, she points to the physical negotiation of space in these circumstances. "When it comes to a thicker description of this 'openness to unassimilable difference', the mundane, pragmatic skills of living in the city, sharing urban turf, neither Donald nor Sennett have much to say." (Sandercock 89). Neither author makes any mention of an open and democratic arena where these interactions might take place, nor do they detail how this sort of "agnostic politics" would unfold when confronted by the very real and tangled intricacies of everyday urbanity. In order to achieve either of these suggested visions, processes must exist for the interaction and communication across

cultural differences in order to build channels for problem solving and conflict resolution within the urban context.

### **Public Order and Community Cohesion - British Home Office**

The third imagining presented by Sandercock takes the form of a case study, examining reactions and policy response by the British Home Office (BHO) to a number of racially and ethnically motivated citizen uprisings that swept the country in 2001. Set in post-colonial England, the case study makes for an excellent examination into the intricacies of addressing increasingly multicultural urban populations. With the rising trends of domestic and international migration in the United States as reflected in statistics from the United States Census Bureau, municipal governments should actively review and shape legislation that stays in line with the evolution of their constituencies, as new actors arriving from international and domestic locations take up residence within the local environment (Florida).

In the spring and summer of 2001, a wave of racially and culturally motivated political unrest began sweeping across England and concentrated in the northwest region of the country. Cities such as Oldham, Bradford, and Burnley were met with fierce race riots, fueled by decades of mistrust and racial tension over housing, jobs, and community resources (Sandercock 89-90). In Oldham for instance, members of far right-leaning political factions such as the British National Party and National Front began attacking local Southeast Asian persons and businesses due to increasing fear from working class, white individuals about high crime rates. In the year leading up to the riots, over 572 racially motivated crimes were reported in Oldham, with approximately 62% of these crimes identifying a Caucasian person as the victim (Bagguley and Hussain 42-3). Riots in Burnley,

Bradford, and Leeds were all sparked by similarly jingoistic fears and decades of repressed anxiety stemming from a lack of employment and resources in the northwest region of the country.

Prompted by the burgeoning crisis, Prime Minister Tony Blair immediately enlisted the BHO to begin studying the underlying causes behind the riots and possible policy responses. "The inter-departmental Ministerial Group on Public Order and Community Cohesion was asked to report to the Home Secretary on what Government could do to minimize the risk of further disorder, and to help build stronger, more cohesive communities" (Sandercock 88-9). Teams were quickly dispersed in the cities where riots took place, in order to conduct research into the root causes spurring the uprisings. In addition to city specific research, other teams conducted comprehensive policy analyses of ethnic minority access to the national labor market and historical segregation in the multiethnic northwest England. Lastly, researchers were tasked with building a set of best practices for restoring united local and national civic identities.

In December of 2001, the BHO released the outcome of their research, *Building Cohesive Communities: A Report of Ministerial Group on Public Order and Community Cohesion*. The report found a number of striking similarities among affected communities residing in the neighborhoods where violence was initiated. All affected neighborhoods featured rampant racialized economic inequality, with average median incomes ranking far below the national average and some neighborhoods ranking amongst the lowest one percent nationally (BHO 8). Findings from the report also claimed the riots were instigated by men, both white and ethnic minority, associated with groups commonly linked with extremist activity. Most importantly, the findings pointed to the universality of historical

segregation in these urban centers as an underlying and unaddressed cause of the riots. As the report states, "Disturbances occurred in areas which had become fractured on racial, generational, cultural, and religious lines where there was little dialogue, or contact, between the various groups across social divides." (ibid.). Decades of disinvestment, underemployment, and ethnic migration increasingly fractured local populations along demographic lines. Discourse and engagement across cultures was seemingly non-existent. The lack of channels for communication across difference led to entrenched anger and fear amongst competing cultural groups that eventually sparked a wave of violence across the country.

After the presentation of findings, the report advanced a series of policy recommendations aimed at restoring civic unity in these fractured cities. Researchers placed particular emphasis on the rehabilitation of a common civic culture and identity as a starting point for easing racial and ethnic tension. Recommendations included both immediate re-investment of employment and social services in the affected areas. However, despite being identified as a root cause of the conflicts, no recommendations were made to encourage more proactive interactions and communication across difference directly within the affected communities. Instead, the report called for widespread national debate about identity, shared values, and common citizenship. Acknowledging a mix of macro social, economic, and culture causes behind the riots, the BHO endorsed a comprehensive re-imagining of identity as a means of building cohesive communities in the 21st century. The report recommended that the national government take the lead in formulating a re-imagined British identity, but also noted the need for debate and dialogue at the local level for any policy outcome to be truly effective (BHO 21).

In her critique of the BHO report and Home Secretary David Blunkett, Sandercock quickly highlights a number of concerns about the identified causality and policy recommendations. Firstly, while the report is quick to indicate the future outcomes necessary for more cohesive communities, it does very little in developing the requisite framework for achieving such an end result (Sandercock 91). The absence of a shared sense of belonging is a fair concern, but should the government necessarily take the lead in developing a sense of identity for its constituents? Whose sense of community and culture is it really if it's being driven largely by bureaucrats rather than citizens themselves? Secondly, she points to the problem of embracing a singular identity for "Britishness" that carries a tone of assimilation rather than communication and cooperation. "He [Blunkett] seems to define the problem of living together as a problem of 'them' adjusting to 'us', being gracious guests in 'our home'." (ibid.) This narrow line of thinking from the authors of the BHO report does little to support positive interactions across difference, instead suggesting that difference should evolve and embrace some sort of universal "British" identity. Placing greater emphasis on cooperative learning experiences in these multicultural communities increases the possibility of developing a society with productive interactions across difference, rather than merely assimilating diversity into orderly uniformity.

### **A Politics of Local Livability - Ash Amin**

As somewhat of a companion piece to the BHO report, the last imagining dissected by Sandercock was likewise borne out of the 2001 riots that gripped northwestern Britain. In 2002, Ash Amin published a report commissioned by the British Department of Transport, Local Government and the Regions entitled, *Ethnicity and the Multicultural City:*

*Living With Diversity*. Specifically, he seeks to comprehensively address, "what it takes to combat racism, live with difference, and encourage mixture in a multicultural and multiethnic society" (Amin 2). Amin's work goes beyond the BHO report and the other previous imaginings by further examining the deeply entrenched cultural and economic causes behind these deeply fractured communities and develops a robust framework for mending stratified urban populations. In essence, Amin does not merely ask *what* the future of multicultural cities should be, but rather begins articulating *how* and *why* we should begin activating more communicative multicultural urban societies.

Whereas the first three imaginings largely focus on outcomes, Amin takes the alternative approach of placing particular emphasis on process and action. Rather than painting an idealized vision for what global cities might become and working backwards in articulating how his dream might be realized, he takes the sensible approach of analyzing the past in assessing current conditions and building a set of methodical processes for beginning a new dialogue across difference. For Amin, it is imperative that we examine the past and how we arrived at our present state before we can even begin addressing the future. While the previous authors chose to overlook or only tepidly address issues such as post-colonialism, globalization, and conflict, Amin chooses to use these as his starting point. He not only acknowledges conflict as a necessary component in the process of rehabilitating multicultural cities, but also addresses them further by emphasizing the necessity of conflict in generating change. In his eyes, the riots of 2001 were a necessary catalyst for disrupting the status quo of engrained racialized social and economic inequality.

In the next portion of his piece, Amin begins debating the relative effectiveness of a number of popular policy fixes prescribed for delivering greater resources and opportunities to poor communities (Sandercock 93). He shies away from policies aimed at developing more ethnically mixed housing stock and public spaces, as they are not necessarily arenas of constant engagement and interdependence (Amin 12). Removing the agency of individuals in choosing where they reside only deepens isolation and disinterest. Instead, Amin looks to interactions in sites of banal transgression as the primary driver in developing trust and understanding amongst diversity. As Sandercock elaborates, "He [Amin] goes on to suggest that the sites for coming to terms with ethnic (and surely other) differences are the 'micro-publics' where dialogue and prosaic negotiations are compulsory" (Sandercock 94). Sites of routine interaction such as schools, workplaces, and community centers force the creation of lived experiences and engagement of difference. The physical action of compulsory engagement begins the process of deconstructing pre-conceived notions of the "other" and the rehabilitation of trust. As we continue to engage in these common interactions, we slowly begin work through our pre-conceived notions of difference and may begin the process of developing more universally beneficial urban spaces. "Part of what happens in such everyday contacts is the overcoming of feelings of strangeness in the simple process of sharing tasks and comparing ways of doing things" (ibid.). This ongoing negotiation and integration removes the exploitative dynamic of mere cultural assimilation.

As Amin begins sharing his theories on the future of these "mongrel cities", he routinely reinforces the point that such efforts will not come easily and without tension. He eschews the "community cohesion" vocabulary promoted by the BHO, instead placing

an emphasis on accommodating difference, "a vocabulary of rights of presence, bridging difference, and getting along" (Amin 17). This language echoes the "right to the city" philosophy of Henri Lefebvre by placing particular emphasis on the right to difference rather than the explicit need for a universal sense of community. Amin then elaborates on the means of attaining this end through the cooperation of government and the public. "The achievement of these rights depends on a politics of active local citizenship, an agnostic politics (as sketched by Donald) of broad social participation in the never completed task of making meanings, and an always emerging, negotiated common culture" (Sandercock 96).

The future of multicultural cities lies directly in the hands of local citizens. By being active and engaging across difference in the everyday activities of life, it is then possible to begin down a path of shared learning and cultural exchange. As we become more comfortable with one another and our respective differences in compulsory settings, we may gain a greater understanding of the "other" and become emboldened to begin replacing pre-conceived notions of cultural identity with real lived experiences. Rather than being guided under the edict of an institutionalized body, citizens themselves are granted autonomy in developing their own sense of localized identity and community. However, this bottom-up approach to negotiating diversity in the urban environment is only possible when local government and institutions support an inclusive system of governance that is willing to actively engage all sectors of society. The combination of these two factors maximizes the opportunity for shared cultural learning and societal engagement across diversity and difference, and should be combined with further measures that address issues of material inequality and institutional racism within the

urban environment. Only through a combination of all of these prescriptions might we begin truly recognizing positive interactions across difference and more engaging urban communities.

At the end of her section on the imaginings of diverse urban futures, Sandercock builds off the work of Amin in enumerating her own vision for the future of multicultural urban societies. She affirms his assertion in the power of multicultural "micro-publics" as key spaces for generating positive interactions across difference. Furthermore, Sandercock particularly emphasizes sites of "banal transgression", where people from diverse backgrounds are thrust together in unfamiliar settings that generate opportunities for initiating new attachments through lived experiences (Sandercock 94). As she points out, part of the added benefit of these particular spaces comes from negotiating the feelings of strangeness and awkwardness associated with sharing tasks and ways of doing things. However, she also notes that such opportunities require careful planning and management. "But such initiatives will not automatically become sites of social inclusion. They also need organizational and discursive strategies that are designed to build voice, to foster a sense of common benefit, to develop confidence among disempowered groups, and to arbitrate when disputes arise" (ibid.). With proactive measures for outreach and engagement, and with planners serving as managers of the process, the stages of public involvement carry the potential for delivering this ideal medium in the mold of Leonie Sandercock's vision of multicultural urban futures.

### **A Sandercock Public Process**

Through analysis of these various futures of multicultural urban environments, we may begin hypothesizing the mechanisms of a process for achieving encounters and

communication across difference. The public involvement process of urban planning projects provides an effective medium for such actions, as it brings groups of people together in order to better contextualize and solve community-wide problems (Lisk). Throughout the process, opportunities are provided for engaging with different people, cultures, and ideas in progressing a shared conversation that advances the project towards an outcome driven by collaborative community input. The public involvement process then becomes a sort of "micro-public" like those admired by Ash Amin, in which people from a variety of cultural backgrounds work together in a novel setting that encourages interaction and the possibility of creating new social attachments (Sandercock 94-5). Each stage of the public process requires careful planning and execution in order to maximize the overall inclusiveness of the public involvement process, and to provide ample opportunity for effectual, cross-cultural discourse. In order to meet the progressive aims of cross-cultural interactions espoused by Leonie Sandercock, the transparent process should include mechanisms for public oversight and guidance, exhaustive and culturally relevant methods of outreach, universally meaningful and engaging exercises for providing input, and the development of conceptual designs that reflect community input and encourage further opportunities for cross-cultural collaboration.

### ***Oversight and Outreach***

This model process for promoting interaction across difference begins directly with building a strong sense of transparency and public oversight in guiding the project. In order for a multicultural public process to be successful, there must be shared responsibility in honing and implementing the process. Developing a public oversight committee that is inclusive of marginalized cultural groups makes cross-cultural collaboration as a possibility

early on in the process. These representatives can then provide guidance on developing partnerships and outreach that cater to their respective communities. Incorporating local knowledge and experiences into the design of the public involvement process will increase the possibility for engagement opportunities across difference.

Furthermore, an urban planning public process of this magnitude should seek to forge effective community partnerships with businesses, social services, and community based organizations in order to further engage constituencies of varying cultures, interest groups, and disparate geographies ("Cultural Competence"). Special care must be taken to include a wide-range of cultural institutions in order to make equitable inroads with all cultural communities represented within the local area. Accessing these communities early in the process and sustaining their involvement as the project grows is vital in building valuable community buy-in and support. They may also provide an "in" to certain traditionally underrepresented populations that face additional barriers to actively participating within the process. Lastly, these institutions can serve as additional sites for conducting engagement exercises more directly in the locations where people work, live, and play and encourage public trust in the true motivations of the project. Doing so cuts down on the time and resources required for participating in the process, therefore enhancing the overall inclusivity and thus interactions across difference. By partnering with a diverse set of organizations representing many stakeholder communities throughout the region, a more complete set of unique cultural values may be present in helping direct the project as a whole.

While these community partnerships help in driving outreach with various cultural populations, they are not necessarily exhaustive and require additional methods of

outreach. Public events serve as an excellent opportunity for promoting the project and bringing large populations of difference together in a single location. They also may serve as possibilities for public engagement that can help ignite cross-cultural conversations concerning the production and use of a given space. Mixing the style, format, theme, and location of these events is integral in providing ample engagement opportunities that are more universally accessible and allow for different manners of expression. In doing so, the events themselves act as a sort of forum for recognizing the diverse set of individuals and experiences that co-exist within the local urban environment. Opportunities for cross-cultural engagement are greatly increased when outreach breeds broad social participation (ibid.).

### ***Participation and Engagement***

Of equal importance to public outreach and oversight are the methods made available to all members of the public for providing feedback. There is no universally accepted "best" methodology, and every culture is unique in their preferred means of personal expression. However, there are some methods that may encourage cross-cultural communication and engagement better than others. Planners must actively seek out exercises that allow for equitable opportunities for sharing from all community members and manage the experience in a way that encourages, but does not force, interactions across difference. While comment cards and community surveys are excellent methods for generating qualitative feedback, they are not as effective at generating a forum for interacting and communicating with difference because they do not require interactions with other members of the public. Active forms of public engagement, performed in a physical location, are a better platform for bringing groups of individuals together than

might not otherwise have reason to interact. The actions of discussion and physical manipulation of space, such as with corporeal models, can enliven debate and allow for the sharing of cultural perspectives towards solving a community concern (Francis 12). Group and interpersonal dialogue sessions encourage the direct encounter and exchange of ideas, especially those associated with issues of social identity and social stratification by challenging attendees to step outside of their relative comfort zone and engage the lived experiences of others (Zuniga 9). Participating in one of these activities may expose certain individuals to insights they may have never considered and replacing pre-conceived notions of difference with actual real lived experiences. The more aware we are of the differences occupying our shared spaces, the more comfortable and enlivened we may become to interact across these differences.

After conducting thorough outreach and facilitating a variety of formats for public participation, planners should examine just who exactly is participating in these engagement opportunities. Well-intentioned outreach and planning of the public involvement process is ineffective if it fails to deliver target audiences to engagement exercises. Capturing attendance information is a vital part of the process and helps inform and improve future engagement activities. To help encourage greater diversity among participants, special tactics must be implemented to engage historically underrepresented populations, such as immigrants and non-English speakers. These tactics can then be used to help design recommendations for stakeholder engagement opportunities that allow for a greater diversity amongst participants and thusly more chances for interacting across difference.

### ***Translation into Design***

In order to maintain public trust in the process, the design team should adequately convey demonstrated community needs and desires into formats that are easily digestible for local community members. Designers must be careful to visually convey public opinion in a way that continues advancing the conversation without being overly deterministic. A failure to accurately portray community input could lead to a loss of public trust in the true intentionality of the process. If certain groups leave the process, the possibilities for interacting with difference become diminished. On the other end of the spectrum, overly detailed designs run the risk of public disengagement due to a belief that their continued participation is no longer necessary. Therefore, it is necessary for the public involvement and design teams to work together in creating visually rich models using multiple mediums that allow for continued community exploration into further developing their vision for the future of the project space. With greater opportunities for sharing lived experiences and ideas with one another, there become increased opportunities for fruitful cross-cultural communication in the development of shared spaces. The longer we can sustain meaningful and progressive arenas for multicultural dialogue, increases the opportunities for interaction across difference and achieving a future multicultural urbanism in the mold espoused by Leonie Sandercock.

## **CHAPTER 3: THE SEATTLE CENTRAL WATERFRONT PROGRAM**

### **Case Analysis Methodology**

This section dissects the public involvement plan currently being implemented as part of Seattle's Central Waterfront Program (CWP). The section is divided into parts covering three distinct stages of public involvement: Oversight and Outreach, Participation and Engagement, and Translation into Design. Information was collected from policy documents, event summaries, agendas, and meeting minutes procured from a number of sources including the Seattle City Council, Seattle Department of Transportation (SDOT), Seattle Department of Planning and Development, Waterfront Seattle, and James Corner Field Operations, LLC (Waterfront Seattle). This section also includes firsthand accounts of the presentation methods and exercises that took place at the Waterfront 2020 presentation at the Seattle Center in March 2014. The data is then analyzed for its effectiveness in promoting interactions across difference by members of the general public and achieving the goals of such a public process as enumerated at the end of Chapter 2. The true hallmark of success comes from successfully creating a process that includes thoughtful community exercises capable of supporting sustainable and meaningful interactions across difference in advancing development of Seattle's new central waterfront.

The Oversight and Outreach section of the case study specifically covers the planning, promotion, and guidance of the public involvement process. Investigating these processes aids in gaining a better understanding of how the program is seeking to be inclusive of all Seattle residents and encouraging broad participation that fosters cross-cultural interaction and communication. This level of analysis will also help better

understand the intentionality of the public involvement process and whether supporting interactions across difference was viewed as vital in conceptualizing public involvement. This subsection will include a review of the incorporation of the Central Waterfront Committee (CWC) and its membership, the network of partnership agreements with community-based organizations forged by Waterfront Seattle, and the formats and locations of the series of public events conducted as a means of performing public outreach and engagement.

Next, the Participation and Engagement section will analyze attendance figures from public engagement events and the specific methods being used in procuring public feedback and initiating interactions across difference. By reviewing the recorded attendance figures and demographics from the series of community workshops events, we can better understand who is and who is not participating in the public involvement process. In order to foster meaningful interactions across difference, the process must be inclusive of a broad mix of cultures and ethnicities in order to bring the full spectrum of local perspectives to the table. Reviewing the specific methods and techniques being implemented by the public involvement team allows for a better understanding of whether the selected exercises are successful in promoting interaction across difference. Are the methods varied and implemented in such a way that encourages participants to engage with one another? This section will conclude with a brief examination of embracing new forms of online public engagement in the process, and the relative benefits and drawbacks of these methods in promoting cross-cultural interaction.

The final section of the case study pertains to the codification of public input into conceptual designs. In order to meet the goals of Sandercock as outlined in the preceding

chapter, the designs should not be overly deterministic as to encourage further collaboration and interaction with the public. This section includes firsthand observations from the Waterfront 2020 presentation, specifically the digital and physical mediums used in conveying the updated concepts and the interactions they spurred from members of the public in attendance. Were members of the public encouraged to continue interacting with one another or merely showcase the designs with little opportunity for directed interactive feedback? With this case study and observations in place, it will then be possible to begin asserting a set of recommendations for improving the overall ability of the public involvement process in supporting dynamic, interactive, and sustained collaboration across difference.

## **Oversight and Outreach**

### ***Central Waterfront Committee***

From the initial planning stages of the Seattle CWP, city officials understood it would be important to develop a number of strategies for conducting effective outreach in educating the general public about the project and making them aware of opportunities for involvement. The goal of this comprehensive approach to outreach and engagement was driven largely by the intentionality of the space one that was reflective of the diverse cultural perspectives and ideas represented throughout the Puget Sound ("Engaging a Diverse Audience" 1). In November 2009, the Seattle City Council passed Ordinance #123142 that established the Central Waterfront Partnerships Committee (CWPC) to serve in an advisory role to the Mayor and City Council concerning the new waterfront. This committee, comprised of local business professionals, city commission representatives, and ex-officio members from City of Seattle municipal departments, were tasked with producing

a report on best practices for developing meaningful partnerships with organizations throughout the region. Much of the CWPC membership came from professional architecture and planning backgrounds representing private, public, and non-profit sectors of Seattle's downtown community (Waterfront Seattle). These recommendations would then be used to begin implementing educational public outreach through a diverse network of community institutions. After submitting recommendations to City Council in January 2011, with City Resolution #31264 the Central Waterfront Committee (CWC) was commissioned by the Mayor to continue in an advisory role as representatives of the public good and establish a set of "Guiding Principles" for directing the project as a whole. The 33-member body of the CWC moved swiftly to identify the new waterfront site as one supporting interactions across difference through the wording of the first Principle. However, while the Principle makes particular note of "locals" and "visitors", there is no explicit mention of cultural or ethnic diversity ("Guiding Principles"):

The Central Waterfront should engage the entire city. It is a public asset and should remain focused on public use and activities that attract people from all walks of life. It should be a place for locals and visitors alike - a place where everything comes together and co-mingles effortlessly. The process for developing a waterfront design should, in fact must, draw on the talents and dreams of the entire city. The resulting public spaces and surrounding development will engage us through a range of activities throughout the day and year.

However, an analysis of CWC appointees shows a much more limited representation of local population (Appendix - Table 1). Firstly, the racial and ethnic makeup of the committee is rather homogenous when compared with demographics of metropolitan Seattle, with only four non-white members included among the City Council appointees. According to the 2010 American Community Survey, persons of color now comprise

approximately one-third of the population living in Seattle ("Foreign Born Population"). Furthermore, population figures from the Puget Sound Regional Council indicate that the number of foreign-born Seattle residents has grown steadily from 11 percent in 1980 to 15 percent in 1990 and reached nearly 22 percent by 2005. While nearly one-fifth of Seattle's population was born outside of the United States, including sizable East Asian (8.9% of the total population), Latin American (3.1%), and East African (1.7%) immigrant populations, the CWC includes zero foreign-born members amongst its public membership (PSRC). The lack of diversity extends further into the geography and industries represented by CWC members. For instance, the CWC is comprised entirely of citizens serving in executive or managerial roles for businesses and organizations located within Seattle's central downtown neighborhoods. Therefore, it can be stated that the CWC is not representative of the numerous ethnicities and cultures that reside within the city.

### ***Community Partnerships***

As of April 2014, the CWP project website lists forty official community partnerships commissioned as part of outreach efforts (Waterfront Seattle). Partnerships have been established with groups representing a wide range of interests including downtown business associations, cultural heritage foundations, municipal government departments, and non-profit community development associations (Appendix - Table 2). The Seattle Office of Immigrant & Refugee Affairs has also partnered with the CWP in order to assist in providing more calculated and culturally appropriate outreach with Seattle's culturally and ethnically diverse international communities. These entities come from the public, private, and nonprofit sectors and while many are geographically focused within the central

downtown core, others have been made with organizations located in the culturally mixed neighborhoods of north and south Seattle.

### ***Public Events***

Waterfront Seattle's first large-scale kickoff event and public engagement opportunity was held on February 17, 2011 at the downtown Seattle Aquarium ("Public Involvement Summary"). This event presented an opportunity for the public to hear from local government officials about their approach to the waterfront and begin soliciting opinions on developing the space. The approximately 1,000 attendees at the event were provided opportunities to convey their opinions in various written and visual formats. The event included two activity stations where individuals were prompted to express their personal preferences for envisioning the future of the Seattle waterfront. The stations were divided thematically with the "Places Station" featuring a large aerial photograph of the project site, prompting individuals to express what sections of the waterfront were most important to them personally. The second "Uses Station" used a visual preference survey method to solicit opinions on the types of activities and programming they would find attractive along the new waterfront. According to the event summary report, over 600 individuals provided input at each of the stations and their results were captured and made available for review on the project website (ibid.). A video recording of the entire event, including engagement outcomes, was made available on a variety of city websites and social media networks to further aid in outreach efforts.

At the February kickoff event, and two subsequent public events held in May and October of the same year, the general public was encouraged to complete a survey with more directed questions about the space. The written survey prompted respondents to

identify what makes the Seattle waterfront unique and the types of activities they *would like* and *would not like* to see incorporated into design plans. The open-ended format of the survey afforded great freedom to respondents in thoroughly articulating their vision, but did not provide them with the means of engaging difference in a more directed and collaborative manner. The survey, which was also made available online the month prior and following the February kickoff event, received approximately 2,000 completed responses. These early outreach activities helped the project team begin better understand the lay of the land in order to develop appropriate engagement exercises moving forward.

Next, the project team facilitated a series of five workshop-style community forums carried out between January and March of 2012 ("Community Forums Report"). Each of the five workshops were conducted at a central downtown location and focused on a particular theme that had been identified as important to the general public, per the results of the aforementioned community survey. The themes included climate and context, mobility and access, environment and ecology, site planning, and historic preservation. Each forum included a presentation specific to the identified theme followed by a series of small group discussions lead by a project facilitator. These open and facilitated discussions provided attendees with the opportunity to share their unique lived experiences and encouraged engagement with those from different cultural backgrounds, through active listening and participatory exercises, in order to better understand their opinions about the waterfront.

In addition to large-scale public events and workshops, the project team has also staged a number of more personalized presentations individually tailored for specific audiences. These activities are built through partnerships with neighborhood

organizations, special interest groups, schools, and business associations. As of March 2014, over 220 such exercises have been conducted throughout the region ("Waterfront Progress Report" 30). Each of these activities adapts the specific presentation and format to best fit the particular population being engaged. The public involvement team engineered these presentations to appeal to the specific interests of the audience being addressed. For instance, presentations given at schools were designed to generate feedback on active play spaces and youth programming (ibid.). This allows those in attendance to drive the conversation around the issues that are most pertinent to them directly. This type of personalized public outreach helps extend the cultural and geographic reach of the process and helps encourage more sustained levels of involvement. However, the small-scale nature of these presentations does not encourage new connections across difference, as they are conducted amongst institutional groups that are centered on a particular culture, public issue, or personal interest.

### **Participation and Engagement**

In the case of the Seattle CWP, the audience targeted for inclusion into the public involvement process is a cross-section of the many cultural groups in the Puget Sound region ("Guiding Principles"). Throughout the process of public involvement, special care has been taken by the public involvement team to accurately capture the demographics of participants at public engagement activities. This measure was taken as a means of identifying the particular community groups that were actively participating in the process and to determine where more time and resources were needed in order to maximize attendance. Asking attendees to sign in and volunteer their contact information, residential zip code, and work location is one way of provide the public involvement team with

quantitative data concerning the populations actively participating and identifying those that require further effort in achieving greater inclusivity. In total, the five community workshops brought together approximately 755 attendees, or roughly 151 per event ("Waterfront Progress Report" 30-1). Of those in attendance at any of the community forums, 44% had not signed in at a previous public involvement event associated with Waterfront Seattle and 33% attended two or more of the themed forums. These results reflect a healthy mix of well-informed and engaged attendees along with new entrants participating in the process for the very first time.

Further results from the community forum polling found that 80% of participants both lived and worked in Seattle (ibid.). The data shows that the majority of attendees work and reside in close proximity to the central waterfront, with a precipitous drop off in attendance by those residing outside of the city center. The neighborhoods with the highest representation at the community forum workshops were Capitol Hill, Fremont/Wallingford, Downtown, and Madison Park respectively. These neighborhoods, while geographically proximate to the central waterfront, are also some of the most affluent and demographically homogenous in the city (Balk). A number of Seattle's affluent suburbs were also represented at the event, with multiple audience participants coming from nearby cities such as Bellevue, Bainbridge, and Mercer Island. Meanwhile, residents from more ethnically diverse neighborhoods of Seattle such as those in the Rainier Valley, located south of downtown and the central waterfront, were far less represented in public engagement exercises associated with the CWP ("Community Forums Report"). Each of the five community workshops was held in downtown Seattle, adding to the difficulty in accessibility for those who do not reside near the waterfront.

In order to encourage greater cultural and geographic diversity amongst participants at engagement activities, the CWC recognized the need for special tactics in engaging historically underrepresented populations, such as foreign-born residents and non-English speakers. Supporting this effort, a subcommittee of the CWC published a four-page document entitled, "Engaging A Diverse Audience, Including Traditionally Under-Represented Communities" that develops a framework for more universally inclusive and dynamic public involvement. These constituencies often face more pronounced barriers into the processes of public involvement than the general population. The document emphasizes the "Guiding Principles" originally drafted by the CWC and the intentionality of the waterfront as an inclusive space for diverse communities to regularly engage one another. "While the projects will strive to reach all people in Seattle and the region with information and opportunities for engagement, involvement from groups that do not typically participate in city planning and design processes will be a key hallmark of success" (ibid.). The city viewed this as important in order to deliver a space that would best foster diverse engagement across difference. However, the document does not recognize communication and interaction across difference as vital to the process. The content of the document goes on to identify eleven specific populations that are traditionally underrepresented in the processes of public involvement, including immigrant, low-income, youth, and senior populations. The subcommittee then created a unique set of key considerations and engagement tactics specifically tailored to the direct needs of each group.

### ***Offline Engagement Methods***

Early kickoff events focused on providing attendees with mediums for expressing their opinions in a written format. Surveys were distributed to those in attendance, asking a variety of questions concerning activities and events they would like to see on the future waterfront ("Public Input Summary"). While these surveys are a good method for acquiring valuable quantitative data, they do not yield an opportunity for open discussion and public exposure to different cultures. However, participants also had the ability to write their ideas on large white boards stationed throughout the event space. The public and open nature of this written exercise allowed for limited interaction and dialogue amongst attendees.

Oral and corporeal engagement exercises offer the added benefit of direct interaction between participants. These two means of engagement are used much more often in the community workshop events and group presentations of the CWP public involvement process. Because these events are intended to be much smaller, and centered around a particular thematic element or specific audience, there are greater opportunities for cross-cultural interaction. During the community workshop events, attendees organized into small breakout groups led by a group facilitator ("Community Forums Report"). These groups interacted with maps of the project space and engaged in discussion about the activities they would like to see stationed along the waterfront. This afforded attendees an opportunity to provide personal perspectives and actively listen and view the actions of others.

### ***Online Engagement Methods***

The public engagement phase of the Waterfront Seattle project has also embraced technology in diversifying their methodologies for generating feedback from the public. Creating opportunities for engagement online helps eliminate a number of the limitations associated with in person engagement such as travel time and the need for a physical site. The Waterfront Seattle website has been maintained as a platform for directly providing input on all facets of the project. The site contains detailed documentation of all project plans, conceptual design renderings, public meetings, and engagement opportunities (Waterfront Seattle). This allows users to engage visual and written communication associated with the project on their own time, housed in an easily navigable medium.

The CWP has also made a pointed effort in incorporating new technology into the public involvement process, as a means of increasing the accessibility of engagement opportunities to a greater audience and tapping into the true breadth of thoughts and ideas represented throughout the Puget Sound. For example, a number of promotional project banners are situated along the waterfront and downtown featuring scannable Quick Response (QR) code technology ("Design Summary"). This mechanism allows onlookers to scan the QR code with a smart phone device and directly access a wealth of educational material pertaining to the waterfront and a direct messaging service for providing instant feedback. Members of the public can experience the Seattle waterfront in its present conditions and then provide feedback for improving the space in future design and planning. Providing input while directly observing the space allows members of the public to display their preferences in real time.

### ***Translation into Design***

The first public presentation of conceptual waterfront designs was held in March 2014 during "Waterfront 2020", a weeklong series of community events aimed at drumming up excitement for the future of the local waterfront. Following keynote speeches from a number of city officials, lead project architect James Corner presented his updated designs to a crowd of approximately 150 individuals. Although the presentation included a number of components, the general focus was a series of computer-generated renderings of projects comprising the greater CWP. During the 216-slide long presentation, onlookers were greeted with incredibly detailed and visibly rich depictions of a new Seattle waterfront, meant to represent the diversity of cultural interests present throughout the city. All of the renderings were crafted in digital mediums and at a variety of scales as to provide a truly comprehensive representation for the ongoing community vision for the new central waterfront space (Figure 1). Photos of past and present conditions were also incorporated into the presentation in order to help illustrate the evolution of the waterfront site.



Figure 1: Street-level conceptual rendering of the future Seattle Waterfront. The image includes the re-developed section of the Union Street Pier.

*Source:* "Waterfront 2020", James L. Corner Associates, March 2014.

In addition to the series of computer-generated renderings, the Waterfront 2020 presentation also included a physical model of the conceptual design. Housed in a glass case, the scale model showed the entire 1.7 mile-long project space and incorporated a number of new design features that came to prominence during the public involvement process. The acutely detailed model highlighted new public spaces, pedestrian access points, and programming situated along the waterfront. Attendees were given an opportunity to provide written feedback on the landscape, but the glass enclosure prevented direct engagement with the physical features. The presentation renderings were also physically displayed on boards stationed throughout the room. Each station represented a specific project component for the new waterfront. Many of the presentation attendees provided additional feedback on blank whiteboards strategically stationed throughout the event space or on comment cards handed out upon entry. Again, while this allowed for further community input, the written exercises and lack of interaction did not foster greater communication across cultural difference. While attendees were encouraged

to engage the concepts and provide feedback, collaboration was not emphasized. The conceptual renderings, including James Corner's complete presentation, were made available on the Waterfront Seattle website the following day, providing additional opportunities for further community input.

## CHAPTER 4: RECOMMENDATIONS

The preceding case study in public involvement being conducted in preparation for the re-development of Seattle's CWP highlights many of the proactive measures being taken to create a more inclusive and robust process, but not necessarily one that is designed to foster greater communication across cultural differences. While pronounced effort has been placed upon creating more complete and exhaustive methods for community outreach and mechanisms for providing valuable public feedback, they have not fully capitalized on the full breadth of opportunities for interacting and engaging across difference. Guided by the intentionality of the space as an environment for the learning and sharing of diversity creates the possibility for the process of public involvement itself to serve as a micro-public of banal multicultures where participants from across the region can observe and actively engage across difference (Amin 13). As described by Leonie Sandercock, these simple yet meaningful interactions have the potential to build more cooperative communities and as such should be considered the true hallmark of success in multicultural cities. Starting this practice of shared learning in a city-wide undertaking, such as navigating public participation of a major urban planning process, may embolden us to engage other cultures of our own volition.

While a number of new measures have been implemented in order to diversify the methodologies of outreach and engagement to bring more cultural communities into the process, further consideration is needed in order to create a process supportive of regular interactions across difference. The city of Seattle and its partners have taken special consideration for engaging diverse communities, but how effective have these efforts truly been in bringing in new persons to the process *and* helping them interact with difference?

In order to effectively foster both the former and the latter requires modifications to each of the three stages of the greater public involvement process.

## **Oversight and Outreach**

### ***The Central Waterfront Committee***

The Seattle City Council took a very proactive step in this manner by establishing the citizen-led Central Waterfront Committee (CWC). Allowing for public input in the overall design of the public process created an occasion for diverse cultural representation in the preparation and oversight of outreach and engagement opportunities. As ombudsman of the public involvement process, a committee such as the CWC should be representative of the numerous neighborhoods, industries, and cultures existing in Seattle in order to provide additional opportunities for interacting across difference and to ensure that the full range of constituent populations are regularly informed, participating, and engaging one another throughout the process. However, as analysis of the appointed CWC membership shows, this component of process was largely controlled by a racially, ethnically, and geographically homogenous group of elite downtown Seattle businessmen and women. The lack of heterogeneity in the membership of the CWC therefore in and of itself did not foster an opportunity for meaningful interaction across difference. Extending membership beyond this limited scope could help better incorporate a diversity of local knowledge for conducting effective outreach and interaction amongst different communities. Bringing a broader set of backgrounds and experiences to the table could generate innovative ideas for developing exercises that better encouraged collaboration and dialogue across cultural divides. An inclusive and multicultural system of governance is essential in building a supportive cultural framework for public involvement that actively

builds interactions across difference (Sandercock 96). It would be exceptionally limiting to assume that such a homogenous body could adequately address all the sensitivities of so many different cultural communities.

An alternative case study for developing broader public oversight and outreach in multicultural communities is seen in the ongoing development of the Hiawatha Light Rail Transit (LRT) project in Hennepin County, Minnesota ("Case Study"). The Hiawatha LRT project will one day serve as a major public transportation corridor extending from downtown Minneapolis out to the Minneapolis/St. Paul International Airport. According to 2014 statistics from the United States Census Bureau, Hennepin County is one of the most ethnically and culturally diverse in Minnesota, including approximately ten percent of residents born outside of the United States ("State & County QuickFacts"). In developing the public involvement component of the project, local leaders took pronounced steps to build a robust public oversight committee by including membership and guidance from the substantial Native American, Latino, and African-American communities living in the region ("Case Study"). In July 1998, a 40-member Community Advisory Committee (CAC) was empowered by statute to advise local officials on a range of issues including community impacts, public involvement, and structured communications. Local government officials took special consideration in seeking key representational stakeholders from the numerous ethnicities and cultures represented throughout the county. Current membership includes neighborhood committee representatives from the nearby municipalities of Minneapolis and Bloomington, transit advocates, businesses located within one mile of the LRT corridor, metropolitan council members, and elected officials. The empowering statute for the CAC also stipulated that all meetings be open to

the public to provide further transparency and to encourage greater public involvement. Since 1998, the CAC has contributed over 7,000 hours to the project in developing comprehensive outreach and engagement processes for maximizing the opportunity for equitable levels of participation across Hennepin County (ibid.).

Crafting a culturally inclusive public involvement plan capable of permeating multiple cultures requires an equally diverse set of public decision makers capable of bringing in a plurality of views, ideas, and lived experiences. This must then be combined with engagement techniques that specifically encourage interactions across difference. A more balanced Central Waterfront Committee, one whose membership is representational of regional ethnic and cultural demographics, professions, interests, and neighborhoods, would create a much larger knowledge base and skill set to draw from when developing techniques for effective and meaningful interactions across difference. This is not to say that the current CWC membership is completely incapable of delivering effective and diverse outreach. However, expanding multicultural representation in overseeing and planning of public involvement will help build greater cross-cultural capacity for public trust and increase the overall transparency of the process. Making a more deliberate effort at fostering inclusiveness during this early stage of the public involvement process is much more effective in encouraging sustained levels of interaction across difference throughout the life of the project.

### ***Community Partnerships***

The diversification of public partnerships has been a key component of the Central Waterfront Program's (CWP) public involvement plan. To date, the city has entered into agreements with forty different institutions and organizations spanning the public, private,

and non-profit sectors. Relationships have been forged with a number of entrenched cultural institutions in the region such as the Nordic Heritage Museum, Southeast Seattle Senior Center, and Town Hall Seattle (Waterfront Seattle). The project is also partnering with the municipal Office of Immigrant & Refugee Affairs to help capture the wants and needs of people not born in the United States. Furthermore, these partnerships have extended beyond cultural institutions to include user interest groups, social services, and business associations. This healthy and stratified network provides tremendous support to the public involvement and design teams as they continue outreach associated with the waterfront re-development. Their sustained assistance throughout the entirety of the project, including beyond the public involvement phase, will be essential in continuing to provide opportunities for the public to engage across difference.

After making inroads with these invaluable community partners, it is important that these organizations retain sustained levels of involvement throughout project development in order to continue fostering sites of cross-cultural interaction and communication. These relationships should serve as a building block, bringing institutions and communities together that might not otherwise cross paths. In 2012, the Washington State Employment Security Department published a training document highlighting best practices for sustaining meaningful community partnerships. The document highlights two essential rules for supporting such agreements:

1. Ensure shared vision, goals, plans, and processes and allocation of responsibilities are deeply understood by all parties and drive the partnership.
2. Build in realistic and proportionate gain and risk sharing for every entity under the partnership umbrella.

This first rule highlights the need for established lines of communication throughout the project timeline. There should be clear, recognized benchmarks for success that continuously motivates all parties to remain dynamically involved. The second issue drives home the need for equality in building these community partnerships. When striking these partnerships, it is vital that each organization be afforded equal standing within the project scope. Providing organizations with opportunities to participate in programming along the future waterfront would be an excellent method for retaining their participation beyond the life of project construction. Doing so increases the credibility of the process and provides additional incentive for organizations to remain involved beyond the duration of the public process. While the onus remains on organization leadership and members to drive this opportunity, a programming tie-in would keep community partners involved and deliver new mediums for interacting across difference.

### ***Public Events***

As highlighted in the waterfront case study, the current CWP facilitates a wide variety of public meetings and events as a means of promoting diverse community participation. By combining large promotional events proximate to the downtown waterfront, public hearings, community inspired thematic workshops, and personalized small group presentations throughout the Puget Sound, there are a wide variety of structural formats for engagement that embrace varying comfort levels and cultural learning styles. Performing the small-scale presentations across a wide physical geography is very helpful in increasing accessibility for historically underrepresented populations.

However, while the formats for events supporting in-person engagement have been numerous and varied, there are still a number of issues in fostering greater levels of cross-

cultural interaction. While small group meetings include a wide geographic distribution, the thematic workshops and large-scale promotional events are largely conducted in the city center. Heavy concentration of events in such a small geographic location makes attendance exceedingly difficult for those not living or working in close proximity to the central waterfront. This lack of universal accessibility creates an additional barrier to participation for certain communities. Placing a more pronounced effort on facilitating these events in a wider range of communities increases equitability in the number of involvement opportunities for all populations. Increasing the overall number of workshops and public events, and directing them into specific neighborhoods where participation has been minimal, will provide further opportunities for bringing in a wider range of cultural perspectives to engage with the process and other members of the general public. However, in order to be truly effective in fostering increased interactions across difference, the added frequency of events must be coupled with specific techniques that establish an open and engaging forum for multicultural communication.

## **Participation and Engagement**

### ***Offline Engagement***

The Seattle CWP has placed emphasis on multiple modes of expression in public engagement activities that allow participants to choose the method most amenable to their personal preferences and abilities. Early kickoff events featured quantitative surveys asking directed questions and large whiteboards on which members of the community could leave their narrative imprint of their future vision for the waterfront. During the thematic community workshops, facilitators used maps and physical models to help illustrate different components of the project. The opportunity to physically manipulate the

many spaces along the waterfront compelled participants to share anecdotes and opinions in an open and shared environment. These actions then provide the unique possibility of extending beyond mere discussions of the central waterfront and its uses.

In order to achieve a public engagement process that espouses the ideals of Leonie Sandercock, continued emphasis should be placed upon physical engagement exercises that are inclusive of a wide variety of cultural perspectives. Active forms of public engagement, performed in a physical location, are a terrific platform for bringing groups of individuals together than might not otherwise have significant reasons to interact in a productive setting. The physical actions of talking and manipulating corporeal tools can enliven debate and allow for the sharing of alternative cultural assessments. Being able to participate in one of these activities should expose certain individuals to insights they may have never considered and expand their knowledge of the local environment. This process then carries the potential of re-shaping the way in which certain individuals view the world and different cultures by supplanting their preconceived notions with actual lived experiences. These seemingly minor and insignificant levels of interaction may potentially encourage people to begin engaging different cultures of their own volition, as opposed to merely in such a confined and directed setting. The more cognizant we are of the different cultures that occupy our shared spaces, the more intrepid we may become to create cohesive urban environments that provide utility for all (Amin 12).

### ***Online Engagement***

In addition to more traditional forms of offline engagement, the new CWP has embraced a number of new technologies and online engagement methods that further build a sense of unified community around the new waterfront, but it is unproven whether

or not this form of engagement encourages meaningful interaction across difference. Beyond using social media tools such as Facebook and Twitter, the CWP has created a series of affiliate platforms that educate users and provide avenues for directed feedback and input. The project website is also updated on a regular basis with agendas, minutes, summaries, and photos from nearly all public events associated with the project.

However, while online spaces may perhaps create an open forum for diverse opinions, they do not necessarily encourage constructive debate that progresses a conversation towards positive ends. The anonymity of online communication and the lack of face-to-face contact may perhaps make it more difficult for users to engage those culturally different from themselves. Assembling constructive engagement opportunities across difference requires, "shared norms and socialization experiences on the part of participating individuals" (Dryzek 666-7). Constructing these types of experiences are more difficult in a digital format as actors are not required to actively negotiate difference. In fact, some studies of online environments and community engagement have asserted that these forums are often amenable to social and cultural narcissism, wherein participants actively seek out only those that share in their opinions or perspectives (Deuze 7). However, these specific limitations should by no means encourage disinvestment from the use of online and digital methods of community outreach and engagement, as they still offer added opportunities for informing the public and delivering new users into the public process.

### **Translation into Design**

At the Waterfront 2020 presentation, the James Corner and his associates unveiled their new conceptual renderings and models of the space. The images covered each of the

numerous projects comprising the greater CWP and were diverse in terms of perspective and scale. Using visually rich and intellectually stimulating computer-generated renderings elicited a series of wondrous reactions from those in attendance. However, there was a severe lack of interactivity associated with the presentation. There were opportunities for presenting written feedback, in the form of comment cards and station boards, but little opportunity was afforded for attendees to ruminate as a group. Even the physical models available at the presentation were concealed behind glass cases that prevented directed manipulation of featured elements and programming along the waterfront. And although the evening programming included a question and answer session with city officials and members of the design team, the "call and response" nature of this exercise limited the discussion to only a few select individuals. The rather detailed nature of the designs and lack of open and engaging debate around the concepts may lead those with less experience working within the public process, such as immigrants and non-English speakers, to begin disengaging from further involvement in the process.

Moving forward, the architects and design team should look to diversify the mediums being used for conveying the progression of the central waterfront. The strict adherence to exceptionally detailed, polished, and specific imagery could make it difficult for the layman to digest and provide constructive feedback. By better mixing the mediums for presenting updated design concepts, such as the incorporation of massing models, could provide greater opportunities for the public to interact with one another and direct feedback that further advances the public conversation. Allowing members of the public to collaboratively engage with corporeal models at this stage reinforces the fact that the concepts are not completed and further public input remains extremely valuable to the

process. Developing more sustained channels of interaction that build upon earlier stages of involvement will be essential in extending the opportunity for this cooperation beyond the relatively short life of the public process.

## CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSION

The preceding case study and analysis of the Seattle's Central Waterfront Program (CWP) has focused on the potential for public involvement to bridge cross-cultural communication. After being case under the domineering shadow of the Alaskan Way Viaduct for the past fifty-one years, the new CWP carries the possibility of one day becoming a universally accessible site where the many diverse constituencies of Seattle can come and not only occupy the same space, but engage one another in meaningful and shared experiences. If such a noble enterprise is ever to be actualized, the production processes of such a space must actively incorporate organic feedback spanning the numerous interests and desires supported by the range cultural expertise of the region. The public involvement process should challenge actors from different backgrounds to come together and share in the process of socially producing a future where interactions across difference are routine. A space that is comfortable and accessible to productively universal engagement across cultural differences in order to gain a greater understanding of the diverse cultures and worldviews existing within the region.

The planning profession should also begin recognizing the need for diverse interactions that extend beyond cultural differences. While the scope of the thesis has been limited to the matters of cultural diversity and immigration, the true definition of diversity extends far beyond this singular characteristic. "As the world's urban populations grow, cities become spaces where increasingly diverse peoples negotiate such differences as language, citizenship, ethnicity and race, class and wealth, and gender" (Kihato). This definition should be even more inclusive as to incorporate differences in terms of sexuality, age, religion, and geography. If we are to ever truly develop urban spaces that actualize the

purpose driven intentionality of the CWP and regular engagement of difference, planners must work to create more inclusive and participatory public processes that foster interactions across difference and produce lived experiences that better inform individuals about those that share the local environment.

Broadening the definition of diversity opens up a host of opportunities for new research into the topic. The increasingly cosmopolitan and socially progressive nature of many urban environments necessitates an evolution in the manner in which we implement each stage of the greater public process. Managers of the urban environment, including city planners and designers, must actively seek enterprising new means for connecting with the totality of their constituencies. We should foster productive interactions across difference for Seattle's marginalized populations in order to present new, managed opportunities for growing shared cultural competencies. Often times this wealth of intrinsic local knowledge goes untapped due to a lack of comprehensive outreach and engagement efforts with the public. If the new CWP is truly intended to reflect the unique diversity of Seattle, then every effort should be made in harnessing the full spectrum of demographics represented in the metropolitan area.

It will be very interesting to reflect on these processes once the new Central Waterfront Plan enters the stage of final design and concepts begin manifesting themselves in reality. The CWP is just one small piece of a very large social, cultural, and economic evolution currently taking place in Seattle. How will the new central waterfront be able to continue fostering interactions across difference after construction is completed? Even if the space is initially successful in achieving the goals espoused in the Guiding Principles of

the CWC, it must be resilient and adaptable to the needs and desires of a constantly changing dynamics of the local populace.

The realized future of the Seattle CWP remains unknown. Only once the space has been constructed and actually experienced by the public will we be able to adequately reflect on whether the cross-cultural interactions facilitated by the public involvement process aided in delivering on its goal. However, an analysis of the public involvement process can help identify the optimum methods being implemented to help encourage these interactions in the development of multicultural urban environments. The physical production of a diverse space for engagement is only possible if we become aware of the benefits associated with experiencing and interacting with difference. These opportunities can help support acknowledgement of the right to difference (Sandercock 96). These interactions may seem like mere minutiae, but the truth is quite the contrary. The path towards maximizing our ability to recognize and better understand difference in the context of our shared multicultural environments starts in the everyday experiences and interactions across difference in urban life..

## WORKS CITED

- "2012 Population Projections - Projections of the Population and Components of Change for the United States 2015-2060." United States Census Bureau, 2012. Web.
- Amin, Ash. *Ethnicity and the Multicultural City: Living with Diversity*. Swindon: ESRC, 2002. Print.
- Bagguley, Paul, and Yasmin Hussain. *Riotous Citizens: Ethnic Conflict in Multicultural Britain*. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2008. Print.
- Balk, Gene. "Think Seattle Isn't Diverse? Take a Closer Look." *Seattle Times Blog*. Seattle Times, 6 Mar. 2014. Web.
- Batalova, Jeanne. "Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States." *Migration Policy Institute*. 9 Dec. 2010. Web.
- Berger, Knute. "Where Do Seattleites Come From?" *Crosscut*. Puget Sound Regional Council, 30 Sept. 2009. Web.
- Blackstock, Kirsty, Elizabeth Kirk, Yen-Chiang Chang, and Grant Davidson. *Public Participation and Consultation in Regulatory Regimes*. Rep. Macaulay Institute, 2006. Print.
- Building Cohesive Communities: A Report of Ministerial Group on Public Order and Community Cohesion*. Rep. London: British Home Office, 2001. Print.
- "Central Waterfront Project - Design Presentations from Shortlisted Teams." *SDOT - Central Waterfront Project*. Seattle Department of Transportation, 2012. Web.
- "Chapter 27. Cultural Competence in a Multicultural World." *Community Tool Box*. University of Kansas, 2013. Web.
- Community Forums Report*. Seattle: Waterfront Seattle, 2012. Print.
- Connolly, William E. *The Ethos of Pluralization*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota, 1995. Print.
- "County and Metro Population: 10 Metros with Largest Numeric Increase." United States Census Bureau, 2013. Web.
- Deuze, Mark. *Media Work*. Cambridge: Polity, 2007. Print.
- Donald, James. *Imagining the Modern City*. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota, 1999. Print.

- Dryzek, John S. *Discursive Democracy: Politics, Policy, and Political Science*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1990. Print.
- "Energy Boom Fuels Rapid Population Growth in Parts of Great Plains; Gulf Coast Also Has High Growth Areas, Says Census Bureau." *United States Census Bureau Newsroom*. 27 Mar. 2014. Web.
- "Engaging a Diverse Audience, Including Traditionally Under-Represented Communities." (2012). *Waterfront Seattle*. City of Seattle, 2012. Web.
- "February 17 Event Public Input Summary" Seattle: Waterfront Seattle, 2011. Print.
- Florida, Richard. "Two Very Different Types of Migrations Are Driving Growth in U.S. Cities." *CityLab*. The Atlantic, 21 Apr. 2014. Web.
- Francis, Mark. *Participatory Planning & Neighborhood Control: Proceedings of the Neighborhood Participation Conference*. New York: Center for Human Environments, 1979. Print.
- Frey, William H. "A Big City Growth Revival?" *The Brookings Institution*. 28 May 2013. Web.
- "Friends & Partners." *Waterfront Seattle*. City of Seattle, 2014. Web.
- Gregory, James. "Segregated Seattle." *Seattle Civil Rights & Labor History Project*. University of Washington, 2004. Web.
- Harris, Glenn. *Racial Equity in Seattle*. Rep. Seattle: Race and Social Justice Initiative, 2012. Print.
- Hinchcliff, Catherine. "Ethiopian and Eritrean Communities in Seattle." *HistoryLink*. 16 Nov. 2010. Web.
- Kihato, Caroline. *Urban Diversity: Space, Culture, and Inclusive Pluralism in Cities Worldwide*. Washington, D.C.: Woodrow Wilson Center, 2010. Print.
- Lisk, Franklyn. *Popular Participation in Planning for Basic Needs: Concepts, Methods, and Practices*. New York, NY: St. Martin's, 1985. Print.
- Papademetriou, Demetrios. "Immigrants in the United States and the Current Economic Crisis." Migration Policy Institute, 1 Apr. 2009. Web.
- Parekh, Bhikhu C. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2000. Print.
- "Public Involvement and the Hiawatha Light Rail Transit Design-Build Project, The Metropolitan Council and Partner Agencies." *The Transportation Planning*

*Capacity Building Program / Focus Areas*. United States Department of Transportation, 2010. Web.

Sandercock, Leonie. *Cosmopolis II: Mongrel Cities of the 21st Century*. London: Continuum, 2003. Print.

"Seattle Quick Facts." *American Community Survey*. United States Census Bureau, Mar. 2012. Web.

Sennett, Richard. *Flesh and Stone: The Body and the City in Western Civilization*. New York: W.W. Norton, 1994. Print.

*Stakeholder Involvement and Public Participation at the U.S. EPA: Lessons Learned, Barriers, and Innovative Approaches*. Rep. United States Environmental Protection Agency, 2001. Print.

"Sustaining Life on Earth." *Convention on Biological Diversity*. United Nations Environmental Programme, 2013. Web.

"Urbanization: A Majority in Cities." *Urbanization: A Majority in Cities: Population & Development : UNFPA*. United Nations Population Fund, 2007. Web.

*Waterfront Program Progress Report: Q4 2013*. Seattle: Waterfront Seattle, 2013. Print.

Young, Iris Marion. *Justice and the Politics of Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton UP, 1990. Print.

Zuniga, Ximena. "Bridging Difference Through Dialogue." (n.d.): 9. University of Massachusetts - Amherst, 2003. Web.

## APPENDIX

Table 1: Official Community Partnerships with the Waterfront Program

Public & Local Government Entities	Institutional Focus
The Arc of King County	Disability Services
The Central	Neighborhood Group
Metropolitan Improvement District	Business Development
Pedestrian Advisory Board	Transportation
Pike Place Market	Business Development
Port of Seattle	Transportation, Business Development
Seattle Aquarium	Education, Environmental Stewardship
Seattle Arts Commission	Education
Seattle Housing Authority	Housing
Seattle Office of Arts & Cultural Affairs	Social & Cultural Services
Seattle Office of Immigrant & Refugee Affairs	Social & Cultural Services
Seattle Youth Commission	Social & Cultural Services, Youth Programming
Town Hall Seattle	Social & Cultural Services
Private Entities	Institutional Focus
AEG Live	Business Development
Antioch University	Education
REI	Business Development, Environmental Stewardship
Nonprofit Entities	Institutional Focus
Alliance for Pioneer Square	Business Development, Neighborhood Group
Camp Fire Central Puget Sound	Environmental Stewardship, Youth Programming
Chinese Information & Service Center	Social & Cultural Services
Downtown Seattle Association	Economic Development, Neighborhood Group
Easter Seals Washington	Disability Services
Lighthouse for the Blind, Inc.	Disability Services
Literary Source	Education
Municipal League of King County	Government Accountability
Nordic Heritage Museum	Social & Cultural Services
Northwest Center	Disability Services, Youth Programming
Pacific Science Center	Education
Puget Sound Maritime Historical Society	Social & Cultural Services
Seattle Architecture Foundation	Education
Seattle Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce	Business Development
Seattle Parks Foundation	Environmental Stewardship
Seattle Works	Social & Cultural Services
Senior Housing Assistance Group	Housing
Southeast Seattle Senior Center	Social & Cultural Services, Neighborhood Group
Space.City	Education

Swedish Cultural Center	Social & Cultural Services
Transportation Choices	Transportation
Washington Council of the Blind	Disability Services, Environmental Stewardship
YMCA of Greater Seattle	Social & Cultural Services, Youth Programming

Source: "Friends + Partners", *Waterfront Seattle* (2014)

Table 2: Central Waterfront Committee Membership (2014)

Central Waterfront Committee Members	Profession	Industry	Race
Tom Bancroft	Executive Director, People for Puget Sound	Public Policy	White
Carol Binder	Trustee, PCC Natural Markets	Food & Beverage Services	White
Mahlon Clements	Director, VIA Architecture	Architecture & Planning	White
Toby Crittenden	Executive Director, The Washington Bus	Community Development	White
Bob Davidson	CEO, Seattle Aquarium	Community Development	White
Bob Donegan	President, Ivar's Seafood	Food & Beverage Services	White
Rollin Fatland	Former Deputy Executive, King County (WA)	Government	White
Erin Fletcher (Slayton)	Associate Vice President, HDR Architecture & Engineering	Architecture & Planning	African-American
Ben Franz-Knight	Executive Director, Pike Place Market Development Assc.	Community Development	White
Dave Freiboth	Executive Secretary, King County Labor Council	Public Policy	White
Gary Glant	CEO, Glant Textiles	Business	White
Patrick Gordon	Principal, Zimmur Gunsul Frasca Architects	Architecture & Planning	White
Craig Hanway	Owner, C.A.&D.S. Architecture	Architecture & Planning	White
Gerry Johnson	Partner, Pacifica Law Group	Law	White
Greg Johnson	President, Wright Runstad & Company	Real Estate	White
Bob Klein	Partner, Short Cressman & Burgess PLLC	Law	White
Alex Kochan	Vice President - Pacific Northwest, AEG Live Inc.	Entertainment	White
Ed Medeiros	Executive Director, Phinney Neighborhood Association (Retired)	Community Development	White
Dave Meinert	Managing Partner, Onto Entertainment	Entertainment	White
Nate Miles	Vice President, Eli Lilly and Co.	Pharmaceuticals	African-American
Cary Moon	Principal, Landscape Agents	Architecture & Planning	White
John Nesholm	Partner, LMN Architects	Architecture & Planning	White
Vlad Oustimovitch	Principal, VOKA Architecture & Planning	Architecture & Planning	White
Mark Reddington	Owner, LMN Architects	Architecture & Planning	White
Charley Royer	President, Institute for Community Change	Public Policy	White
Catherine Stanford	Principal, CA Stanford Consulting	Real Estate	White
Brian Steinburg	Senior Associate, Weber Thompson Architecture & Design	Architecture & Planning	White
Tony To	Executive Director, HomeSight	Real Estate	Asian
Ronald C. Turner	Owner, Ron Turner Real Estate Group, Inc.	Real Estate	White

Todd Vogel	Executive Director, International Sustainability Institute	Public Policy	White
Maggie Walker	Board President, Seattle Art Museum & Chairwoman, Bullitt Foundation	Philanthropy	White
Maiko Winkler-Chin	Executive Director, SCIDpda	Community Development	Asian
Martha Wyckoff	(Emeritus) National Board, The Trust for Public Land	Philanthropy	White

Source: "Central Waterfront Committee", *Waterfront Seattle* (2014)