STORIES FROM CARRALL STREET:
AN EXPLORATION IN PARTICIPATORY VIDEO

by

JONATHAN FRANTZ

B.A., The University of Western Ontario, 1997

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS IN PLANNING

in

THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

August 2006

© Jonathan Frantz, 2006
Abstract

Engaging citizens in planning and decision making processes in a meaningful way is a constant challenge to most planners. Participatory video is a process that has been successfully used to enrich planning and decision making process, but it is relatively under explored as a planning tool in urban settings. This research explores the potential that participatory video has as a planning tool by collaboratively developing, coordinating and implementing a year long participatory video pilot project through a community/university partnership in Vancouver's Downtown Eastside. The research puts forward an ideal participatory video framework, and provides a detailed description of the experienced case. Reflecting on this experience the research addresses how participatory video can be used to impact planning and decision-making processes, actions that may be taken to ensure a high degree of participation in participatory video processes, and how to conduct a participatory video under time and cost restraints. The research finds that participatory video can be used to attain many valuable goals, but there are associated trade-offs that need to be considered, and focus must be maintained on goals that are well suited to the specific application. When conducting a participatory video case it is critical to establish clear and open lines of communication, embed ongoing evaluation and reflection into the process, establish collective ownership of the project, pay attention to associated risks, and be clear and realistic about the intended goals of the project.
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Chapter 1. Problem Identification

Under the participatory model of democracy, public engagement is a critical component of effective urban planning. Through public engagement citizens become involved in dialogue and deliberation on public issues that concern them. A challenge facing planners is to engage citizens in these discussions and collect meaningful data that represents the citizen point of view. One under explored tool for public engagement that may help planners overcome that challenge is participatory video.

Participatory video is a collaborative video making process conducted by the people who have a story to tell, opinion to voice or concern to raise. It differs from traditional video making in that those with the story to tell actually shoot, script and edit the video themselves, as opposed to relying on video making ‘experts’. It is a framework that values the process as much, if not more, than the output. Participatory video can build capacity, empower people and transform communities.

As a means of communication, video is well suited to the planning realm. Planning is inherently visual and experiential, yet planners’ dominant method of communication is text. Video has the potential to animate the planning field by capturing detailed information rich with visual reference and human emotion. In using participatory video as method of communication, alternative forms of knowledge and creative forms of self-expression are validated. In doing so, information that would otherwise be absent from traditional engagement processes will be captured. By providing an avenue for alternative forms of expression, participatory video would likely appeal to a cross section of the population that may not participate in more traditional forms of public engagement.

Participatory videos have been made for over 30 years for various purposes. The primary users of participatory video have been international development planners working in rural settings and grass roots organizations. Participatory video has not been
extensively used as a public engagement tool within urban settings of a developed country.

This thesis is an exploration of the potential of participatory video as a successful public engagement tool for urban planners.

**Research Questions**

This research is focused on a participatory video project that I was intimately involved with as one of the project coordinators. Through my involvement with the Carrall Street participatory video case I developed the following research questions:

1. *How can participatory video be used to impact planning and decision-making processes?*
2. *What actions can be integrated into a participatory video process to help ensure a relatively high degree of participation?*
3. *How can a participatory video process be adapted to fit low budget and time constraints?*

In addition to addressing these research questions the video titled Stories from Carrall Street: An Exploration in Participatory Videos is submitted with this thesis as a component of the research.

**Introduction**

The purpose of this section is to provide an explanation of why a planning student is doing research on participatory video; in doing so I describe a popular participatory video case, and conclude by connecting participatory video to the planning profession through the notion of storytelling. My goal here is to introduce the reader to the basic concept of participatory video, and then throughout the body of this research paper, we will explore some of the finer points of participatory video through a case study analysis.
The Fogo Example

Under Pierre Trudeau the Canadian government was open and willing to support innovative programs seeking to eradicate poverty and bring disenfranchised citizens into mainstream decision making processes (Wiesener, 1992). With bold intentions to create a more responsive government and a more just society the Challenge for Change program created “forty-five films that intended to raise public consciousness about the rights and needs of disenfranchised and disadvantaged groups” (Wiesner 1992: 68). From a community development perspective, using community-based media to achieve these goals was uncharted territory.

From a filmic perspective, Challenge for Change departed significantly from the standard film making process by reducing the importance of aesthetic quality and negating the creative and authoritative role of the film maker in order to prioritize film making as a tool to bring about social change. With much skepticism by the film community “Challenge for Change” was not only about producing progressive films about social issues but also about the process of production as a form of social change, using film production and distribution as means of empowering politically and socially disenfranchised people” (Wiesner 1992: 69).

The poster child for the Challenge for Change project was a video series collectively referred to as the Fogo process. Fogo Island is a small fishing community off the east coast of Newfoundland. The Fogo process is still talked about today, some 30 years after completion.

The purpose behind the Fogo process was to help the residents work cooperatively to revitalize the dwindling fishing industry and to communicate effectively with public officials. In the late 1960’s Fogo islanders were struggling. As a community of 5,000 they were facing the collapse of their local fishing economy (leaving 60% of the population on social assistance), public infrastructure was in a state of disrepair, as many as 50% of the islanders were functionally illiterate, and differences in religion and
tradition socially divided the community. To address the problems facing Fogo Island the government at the time proposed to relocate the entire community to a ‘development town’ (Henaut). The dilapidated state of Fogo Island and the proposed relocation plan were to be the focus of a series of films.

Colin Low, a film maker, and Don Snowdon, an academic, teamed up to produce what was initially pitched as a traditional documentary style film series that would depict the plight of the people of Fogo island. After spending a significant amount of time on Fogo getting to know the land and the people, Low and Snowdon quickly discovered that the residents of Fogo strongly opposed the relocation plans and, though not unified in their stance, they wanted to fight for economic and social revitalization. Simply documenting the state of affairs on Fogo Island would do nothing but exacerbate the existing problems. As a result, Low developed the idea to use video as a mechanism to help the residents communicate their wishes to government officials as a means of addressing community economic and social trouble. In doing so he developed a revolutionary film making process centred on some key community based concepts, and two rules were formed during the film making process. Rule one is the guarantee that each subject has full editorial rights over their appearance. Rule two specified that every effort be made to ensure that the government would respond to the community-produced video.

Through the dialogue that ensued between the Fogo Island residents and government officials—and the publicity that the films brought to the island—a fishing cooperative and a central school were put in place as a response to the community expressed needs. Some residents of Fogo Island felt strongly that the films themselves and the process of making them strengthened community cohesion and brought many needed services to the island (Gwyn, in Wiesner 1992). There was no formal evaluation done on the Fogo project, so it is difficult to come to a conclusive understanding of how successful the Fogo films were as a community development tool. Sandra Gwyn, a National Film Board Official, interviewed a number of Fogo residents and produced a report in 1972 that showed the community was divided about the success of the films. Some residents
felt the films significantly benefited the community, whereas other members were not so convinced. Gwyn noted that some residents felt the films created community problems by glorifying certain community members featured in the films, which helped raise their status as leaders, when in fact they lacked many leadership skills. These acclaimed ‘leaders’ and their inability to lead, likely led to the relative failure of the fisheries cooperative. One other important note of reflection on the Fogo project came from Tony Williams of Memorial University who stated that it would be inappropriate to assign a linear relationship between the films and the subsequent action and development that occurred on Fogo (Williams 1988). Were it not for the sustained efforts of the university and the government the films in isolation would have likely resulted in a temporary moment of excitement at best.

While the impact of the Fogo project as a community development tool may not be conclusive, the Fogo process most certainly spawned a new form of process-oriented filmmaking. Many credit the Fogo process with being the genre precursor to what is now referred to as participatory video. Following the completion of the Fogo project, Memorial University used the Fogo process as a methodological foundation for a series of applied research projects. Some of these applications included: informing communities about the process of running elections, educating communities on the impact of oil drilling in the North Sea, conflict resolution, consensus building for problem solving, and therapeutic healing with mentally disabled children. While the university research was by and large considered to be successful, what researchers found was that this process was most effective in isolated communities with little or no access to cable television. They observed that communities with access to cable television used video less as a process and more as an output, attempting to mimic the slick style and appearance they had come to expect from television. They also noted that communities with relatively good communication links preferred other means of engaging with one another. These discoveries led Wiesner (1991) to conclude with the following statement, which to a large extent has inspired me to conduct the research in this project:
Although much has been written about the empowerment of local communities through media, little is known about the effectiveness of locally produced film and video in promoting social change in urban areas. In all likelihood, other less expensive and easier-to-produce media—particularly newsletters—have played a much larger role in community development than film or video. The question is whether projects like Fogo could work in urban areas if properly designed, and if so, to what end?

Planning Through Storytelling

In presentations and discussions, that I have been involved in regarding participatory video, I find myself continually referring to James Throgmorton, and his notion that planning is a form of persuasive story telling (1996). Throgmorton sees planners as future oriented storytellers who write constitutive texts, which enter a dynamic social setting often to be interpreted in many conflicting ways (Healey). While I disagree with Throgmorton on some issues, such as the notion that persuasiveness is equated to worth, I do adhere to the concept that we are all in a battle over scarce resources, and those who are more persuasive in promoting their values, win. I do not agree that this is the way things ought to be (as those who hold wealth and power tend to win that battle) but that seems to be the game we are playing. If it is the goal of planners to support the poor and powerless, to promote nurturing values that appreciate the collective good, and to accommodate diversity, then we need mechanisms to broadcast this voice. In Throgmorton’s competitive concept of planning, being an effective storyteller is a necessity.

There are many ways and forms to tell a story. Graphs, charts, numbers, written text, pictures, images, music, speech, art, and video all have the ability to tell a story. This brings up the question, what is a story? In its broadest sense a story is anything told or recounted, imaginary or true; more narrowly, it is something told or recounted in the form of a causally-linked set of events (Denning 2000). This element of order is what differentiates a story, from a single fact or statement. Referred to as the ‘classical
narrative' among filmmakers is the concept that a story ought to tightly weave all of its elements into a unified whole (Wayne, 1997). Depending on the intent and the source, there are numerous outlines, structures and frameworks available that proceed to highlight the critical elements of storytelling. Moving away from the structuralist approach to storytelling is the notion that stories are what define human existence. Stories are so ingrained in our being that we practically cease to realize they exist (Denning, 2000). Through stories, we are able to make sense of our surroundings, understand our past, the behaviour of others as well as our social and cultural environment (Polkinghorne, 1988).

Understanding that stories are what enable us to make sense of our world, Leonie Sandercock makes a logical connection between storytelling and planning in stating, "planning is performed story" (2003). Just as we are not consciously aware of our daily dependence on stories, planners are not aware that they, in their daily practices, are storytellers. While many planners would not associate statistical analysis, policy writing, mapping, modeling and research as story, it is. Hidden behind the guise of scientific objectivity there is an author, who by choice, collects and presents specific data in a particular way. In this sense, most of what planners do is storytelling, though it is rarely acknowledged as so. While Sandercock proclaims that planners often fail to realize that they are indeed storytellers, her panacea is for planners to embrace and utilize more creative means of storytelling. In her most recent book, Cosmopolis II, Sandercock provides compelling arguments that describe how creative story has successfully been used in process; as foundation, origin and identity; as catalyst for change; in policy; as critique and/or explanation; and in pedagogy (2003). Throughout the examples Sandercock provides, the overarching message is clear: imaginative storytelling should be more prominent in planning education, embracing and understanding storytelling will help planners produce more persuasive plans, and adopting storytelling into mainstream planning process could expand democratic discourse (2003).


Conclusion

This research is very much an attempt to respond to Leonie Sandercock’s persuasive call for planners to embrace creative storytelling in practice and education. Stemming from the innovative use of video on Fogo Island some 30 years ago this research attempts to fill some knowledge gaps regarding the application of participatory video in urban settings. The following chapter on methods will detail how I intend to draw meaningful reflection from my involvement in a participatory video project.
Chapter 2. Methods

The purpose of this section is to explain the logic behind my research process. Quite simply, my research method is to fully engage myself in the Carrall Street participatory video production process; to think reflexively while in action, and to compare my experience with participatory video to an “ideal” participatory video framework.

A Brief Introduction to the Participatory Video Case

This is a case study research project. The case is the Carrall Street participatory video project that I was intimately involved with over the course of one year. My role within the case was Project Coordinator. Working with a partnering non-profit organization called Projections; I collaboratively developed the participatory video framework, obtained funding, recruited participants and implemented the project. Through this thesis, I reflect on my experience with that case and attempt to answer a series of research questions to further explore the application of participatory video as a planning tool.

A Qualitative Approach

To begin the discussion on methods, it is useful to indicate what “methodological camps” is commonly associated with this research. Mapping out the various methodological perspectives was an important component in developing a suitable research design for this project. An overarching factor in deciding what process to follow was to extend the values of the participatory case into the design of the research process.

At the most general of divisions, this is a qualitative study. As a means of consistency, taking a qualitative approach for this study coincides with the concept behind participatory video. One of the validation points in using participatory video, as a
component of public process, is to provide a mechanism for expression that accommodates a wide definition of what constitutes data.

Naturalism / Progressivism

To further define the classification of qualitative research, Holliday suggests that it is useful to consider the degree to which researchers follow a naturalism or progressive approach (2002). Of the two, naturalism is a more rational framework that often attempts to define, label, code, isolate, and analyze. Whereas, researchers taking a progressive stance do not perceive issues to be so easily observed and therefore take a ‘softer’ approach to their research. Holliday (2002) makes the distinction in stating that “naturalists believe that meaningful social worlds can be discovered by ‘being there’, progressivists’ argue that there is no “there” until it has been constructed (2002: 21).

After reflecting on Holliday’s distinction between naturalist and progressive approaches, it becomes evident that this research is more associated with a progressive line of thinking. As a researcher, I became intimately involved with the case, which helped me to comprehend what I was researching. This deep connection to the case is what ultimately constitutes my data collection technique, not labels, codes or isolated analyses. I do indeed construct the reality with which I am researching both literally and figuratively.

Learning by Doing: An Active Research Agenda

Within the qualitative and progressive paradigms of research methodology, I have chosen to follow an action research agenda. To justify this approach I will address the following two questions: what is action research, and why do I consider it an appropriate methodology to address the research questions I have proposed?
To address this first question—what is action research—I am going to follow a simple exercise that Patrick Costello conducts with his graduate students. Costello asks his students to list several existing definitions of action research, identify commonalities and differences, and then develop your own interpretation of action research (Costello, 2003).

In reading over several definitions, some consistent traits emerge. Action research has a focus on improving professional practice. It is carried out at an individual level, focused on the self, while engaged in practice. Reflection, understanding, and knowledge are gained through a systematic, or spiral, process of review or studying. And, professional practice and educational reflection occur simultaneously.

Working with these common themes, for the purposes of this research I define action research as an attempt to improve professional practice, while being simultaneously engaged in practice and a process of constant reflection.

Moving on to the second question—why take an action research approach for this study—there are two methods of justification. One is my belief that since planning is a practical field of study, learning should occur by doing, in addition to theorizing. There is no question that having a theoretical base is essential, but to really grasp the meaning of theory and to bring it back to the practical efficacy that is planning, I believe that practice is a beneficial component of learning. The second justification refers back to my interest in being consistent with the participatory video process that is the focus of this research. Participatory video is often an iterative process of acting and reflecting. It therefore seems appropriate to extend the reflective concept that is embedded in the participatory video to the research being undertaken on participatory video.

My Chosen Action Research Model: Soft Systems Methodology
There is a spectrum of commonly agreed upon action research methods that have been tried and tested through academic application. While there may be some variation in what methodologies exist, Dick (1993) provides the following four categories:

- **Deakin**: a participatory model of AR in which the participants conduct a large portion of the research themselves.
- **Action Science**: stated to be a good approach if there is an interest in addressing interpersonal and communication issues.
- **Soft Systems Methodology**: three basic steps: first, immerse yourself in the situation and get an understanding of it (reality); second, write an outline of how the ideal system would function (ideal); third, compare the first and second dialectic drawing out differences, which foster a list of proposed changes that could be made for the fourth dialectic—to act on those recommendations (ideal informed by reality).
- **Evaluation**: the most written about research method within action research. Can range from very positivistic to very anti-positivistic, but in the end some form of evaluative claim is made.

Within the field of commonly practiced action research methodologies that Dick outlines, the Soft Systems Methodology is the one that is most in line with the needs and interests in this project.

**What is a Soft System Methodology?**

Soft System Methodology (SSM) has been developed as a problem definition and solving methodology (Rose, 1997). Falling within the action research typology SSM is designed to conduct research while in action. A distinctive focus of the SSM approach is the methodological interest in change. Within this framework, the researcher is considered an agent of organizational change that uses a structured balance of research and action to facilitate the collective identification of organizational or system problems and subsequent solutions.
As some of the language used to describe SSM indicates, the field of academic study responsible for most of the development of this method is management. SSM is typically used within organizations, community groups, companies, government, projects and practically any situation that involves people working closely together towards a common goal.

Peter Checkland is widely credited with establishing SSM as a trusted system of inquiry. Working out of the Lancaster University, Checkland and his colleagues helped SSM become a legitimate form of academic inquiry for a wide range of social science pursuits (Rose, 1997). In the early 1980's Checkland described his SSM framework as a seven-step process (Dick 1994).

1. The researcher is immersed in the problem situation;
2. The problem systems and their immediate context are defined;
3. Root definitions of the relevant systems (comprising the essence of the systems) are defined;
4. Conceptual models of the systems, intended as improvements, are developed;
5. The conceptual models are compared to reality;
6. Feasible and desirable changes are identified;
7. Action is taken to improve the situation.

Although Checkland (1990) finds it useful to outline his SSM process through a linear seven-steps, when applied, the primary interest is to compare a conceptual model to reality. The seven-steps are provided as a guide to help the research obtain an understanding that fosters change. Rather than go into more detail about each of the seven-steps I will save that level of detail for coming section where I outline my research plan.
Why use a Soft System Approach?

The decision to ultimately use a soft system methodology as the guiding framework for this research came from the need to better understand the complex social and political situation that surrounded the case under study. I was also attracted to a soft systems approach because it balances the interests of research and applied change. And, while providing enough structure to help a researcher gain an understanding of a complex situation SSM is an iterative process that can be both participatory and dynamic.

It enables managers to take an abstraction of reality as defined by a group decision-making process and to link it with some degree of coherence to the selection of primary goals and the means or resources with which to achieve them. Because managers operate in a dynamic environment, SSM’s feedback characteristics make for an on-going interplay between theory and practice.

(Lozes, 2001)

SSM is a tool that can be effectively used by managers as a feedback mechanism to help a group achieve their stated goals. By looking at the participatory video project from a management perspective I am embarking on a different path than most other researchers in my field would likely choose. To clarify this decision it is important to relate the participatory video case to my particular research interests.

As a point of perspective, I am viewing this case as a practicing planner who is interested in conducting another participatory video project focusing foremost on the process of a participatory video production. The knowledge and insight that I have gained through this project are associated with the practical components related to developing and delivering a participatory video process.

While undertaking the research I have continually been asking myself the question: if I were to do this again, what would I do differently? And what continues to arise is the salient need to manage. In using the word manage I focus on the general definition: “to
succeed in doing something, especially something that seems difficult or impossible; to survive or continue despite difficulties, especially a lack of resources” (Microsoft Word Dictionary).

**Researcher Involvement**

Any form of researcher presence is considered contamination by positivistic quantitative researchers, whose emphasis is on eliminating, reducing and controlling variables. This desire to remove researcher presence persists into positivist, naturalistic qualitative research, where the aim is to see the research setting as though the researcher were not there—untouched by the researcher’s fly-on-the-wall presence. Within a progressive qualitative research paradigm, however, there is a very different attitude. Here, it is recognized that the presence and influence of the researcher is unavoidable, and indeed a resource which must be capitalized on. (Holliday: 145)

As I address the research questions posed in this study, I make no attempt to cover my presence as a researcher; rather, I rely on my experience and reflexive thought as a means of gathering data. As Holliday states in the above quote it is acceptable to view the researcher presence as a resource that should be capitalized, and not a threat to the integrity of the findings. That being said, my data collection methods are subject to the same questions of validity, rigor and generalizability as a positivistic research study would be, so I do adhere to academically proven approaches.

**Learning From Experience: Reflection or Reflexivity?**

Following the active research model of analysis, my role as a researcher is to reflect on practical experience in order to make some improvement, to gain knowledge, and to learn from the experience. My duty then is to reflect in action, but what exactly does that entail?
Reflection is often associated with phrases such as “careful survey”, “tentative hypothesis”, “anticipated results”, and “calculative thinking”. These phrases used to describe reflection lead me to believe that the goal of reflection is to give order and logic to our lived experience. Ann Cunliffe and Mark Easterby-Smith clearly outlined three distinct assumptions behind reflection as experiential learning. First, is the concept that there is a real experience or an outside world that is there to think about—called reflective correspondence. Second, is the notion that there are in fact rational people that have an inner consciousness that allows them to think logically and make sense of the outside world. Third, is the belief that reflection is a cognitive activity that is under our control. These assumptions pertain to a world-view that I do not endorse, personally, or through the research presented here.

In my world-view, it is not possible to objectively view an “outside” experience and come to any rational point of clarity. I do not believe in the duality that there is a world to experience that is separate from a rational being that attempts to observe it. Our experience of ‘the world’ is a social construction, a cognitive interpretation of information that our senses are able to gather, but in no way does that infer that there is in fact a universal reality to observe. I am able to look at myself in a mirror, but that is entirely different than actually looking at myself.

“Whereas reflection encompasses learning by reflecting on experience, reflexive approaches embrace learning in experience” (Cunliffe in Reynolds p. 31).

Though this distinction between reflecting “on” experience and learning “in” experience may seem slight, it infers a drastically different ideology. Reflexive learning seeks transformation by relinquishing what you currently hold as being real and understood. As a researcher, reflexivity requires the researcher to acknowledge the contribution they had to shaping the meanings and concepts explored in the research project. It also acknowledges that it is impossible to remain “outside” the subject matter, that as a researcher you inevitably inform and change the research setting by your presence.
The concept of reflexivity extends to levels that appear to enter the realm of methodological fanaticism. While, the concept of reflexivity resonates well with my interests and this research, I am not claiming that I have a complete grasp of how to fully think reflexively. Like many aspects of this research endeavour, I will explore the concept and activity of reflexive thought throughout this research process.

Bias

As a researcher actively engaged in the project that I am qualitatively reviewing my biases and assumptions will undoubtedly impact the research. In an effort to relieve potential concerns surrounding the validity of the research I follow the advice offered by Janesick.

Qualitative researchers accept the fact that research is ideologically driven. There is no value-free design. The qualitative researcher early on identifies his or her biases and articulates the ideology or conceptual framework for the study. By identifying one’s biases, one can see easily where the questions that guide the study are crafted.” (Janesick 1994: 212 in Adrian Holliday, 2002: 53).

A significant bias that I hold is the affirmation that video is a tool well suited to the planning profession. Through academic applications and independent consulting contracts I have been using video for the past four years in the planning realm. I am a founding partner in a planning firm that specializes in the application of video in planning, and I intend to continue to pursue this innovative use of video. I clearly have a bias towards video, but it is also in my best interest to uncover and address weakness in applying video to the planning profession.

Research Plan
Thus far, I have provided some general information and insights on my methodological interests, but I have yet to synthesize this information into a coherent research plan. As the diagram below indicates, the research plan is informed by a series of research values and ideologies.

![Methodological Outline](image)

Figure 1: Methodological Outline

The purpose of the research plan is to synthesize the research values and ideologies into actionable items. The research plan is intended to provide some sense of direction while I am actively engaged in the participatory video making process. The essence of the research is to compare what I consider to be an ideal participatory video process to that which I actually conducted. The following steps detail the research process.

1. **The Ideal**: The starting point of this process is defining the “ideal” participatory video framework. This framework is developed through extensive conversations with video and planning professionals with a strong grounding in existing literature. The intent is to outline a base point to compare the participatory video case with.
2. **The Case:** I describe the participatory video case that I was involved with. The intent is to provide a basic understanding of the case.

3. **Problem Statements and Root Definitions:** By comparing the "ideal" framework to the participatory video case, I draw out a series of problem statements that reflect situations where the participatory video case diverged from the ideal. To understand why that divergence occurred I provide root definitions for three problem statements.

4. **Recommendations:** Once the root definitions are identified I provide recommendations on how to overcome the problem situations.

In conducting the research I became informed by the following series of data collection techniques:

**Journaling**
Throughout the participatory video process I maintained a reflexive journal. The journal was an informal means of documenting the activities throughout the process, as well as my feelings, thoughts and insights.

**Video Making**
A good portion of the participatory video making process was documented on video. Throughout the course of the project 18 hours of process footage was taken. I then reviewed all of the footage, recorded log sheets and worked with a group of participants and mentors to produce a 5-minute process video that serves as an introduction to the final participatory video.

**Dialoguing**
Dialogue was an integral component of both the participatory video making process itself and my research. Working with an informal communication structure dialogue was one of the main forms of communications.

**Screenings, Presentations and Discussions**
I was fortunate to have the opportunity to screen, present and discuss the participatory video final project at a number of conferences and events. The final video was screened at the Innovations in City Building Film and Video Event, Planners for Tomorrow, World Planners Congress and the World Urban Forum.

**Conclusion**

Through the methodological map provided in this chapter I attempt to validate the process used to answer the posed research questions. This thesis is a case study of a participatory video project that I collaboratively coordinated. Working within the qualitative research camp I use a research plan that is based on the Soft Systems Methodology. I do rely heavily on my own reflexive analysis, but I also use supportive data from a number of other sources.

Now that the logic supporting my research approach has been laid out, the remainder of this thesis outlines what I discovered through my experience with a participatory video case. In the next chapter I outline my perception of the “ideal” participatory video framework. This will serve as a basis for evaluation and guidance throughout the thesis.
Chapter 3. The Ideal Participatory Video Framework

One of the pleasures, and strengths, in academic thought is that it has the ability to be free from the practical realities that govern society. Academics can choose to not be bound by the same restrictive limitations that political, social and economic pressures place on other professions. Academics are free to think outside the box and create the ideal, and in the process push the boundaries of what is, or may be, possible. That is the intent of this chapter: to develop the ideal participatory video framework.

The purposes of this exercise is not to dream for dreaming sake, but to set a benchmark that will allow me to compare and draw meaning from the Carrall Street participatory video case that I experienced.

To ground my proposed ideal I rely on several sources of data as points of inspiration and validation. The most heavily weighted data source is existing literature on participatory video, including case studies, academic articles and books on the subject. I also draw on discussions with participants from the Carrall Street participatory video case for insight and perspective. And, I rely on my own values to put forth a proposed ideal participatory framework. It should also be noted that I am producing the ideal framework for a generic participatory video project, but do make reference to the Carrall Street case.

**Building the Foundation**

As a student seeking to understand what planning is, I find myself continually asking the question *why*. Why are we doing this, what is the point? So I will address that *why* question in this section by building a foundation of goals, and definitions in conducting a participatory video project.

Participatory video can help groups of varying kinds work towards a variety of diverse goals. It is difficult to select a series of specific goals that an ideal participatory video
process would achieve, without having a pre-selected group and situation. Some of the participatory video goals mentioned in the literature include:

- Capacity building and institutionalization: includes individual growth as well as organizational (White, 2003).
- Culture and continuity: culture is the root of many of our values and beliefs; therefore special understanding and respect for various cultures must be incorporated into the process framework (White, 2003).
- Facilitator: allow people to grow and develop in ways that they themselves see as important; keep their process facilitation free from personal bias (White, 2003).
- Authorship: with the help of video the facilitator can choose not to ‘author’ the message (Johansson, 2000).
- Narrative form: the process takes a narrative form instead of scientific; it generates stories instead of factual reports (Johannson, 2000).
- Identity: instead of objectivity, construction of the story goes with the affirmation of identity (Johannson, 2000).
- Political platforms: instead of identifying solutions, participatory processes are constructed like manifestos, with the purpose to mobilize political support of a cause (Johannson, 2003).
- Policy dialogue: rather than setting examples, participatory video pilot projects highlight what does not work and challenge stakeholders to address institutional problems (Johannson, 2000).
- Process vs. product: participatory video projects should accommodate values relating to both process and product (Huber, 1998).
- Foundation for action: helps to bring discussions that normally occur in personal and private arena into public realm, thus enabling them with greater authority (Braden and Mayo, 1999).
- Social change: one of the main goals in participatory video is to bring about social change (Huber, 1998).
• Participation: an obvious key element of the process (Huber, 1998).
• Therapy: participatory video as a social and community-based tool for individual and group development, as well as a powerful aid in the realization of people's abilities and potential (Huber, 1998).
• Activism: video used to bring about social justice and environmental protection (Huber, 1998).
• Empowerment: is between both therapy and activism, in that the individual and the collective benefit, and the ability to realize some form of change (Huber, 1998).

Looking at this list of goals, participatory video appears to be a process that brings people together to develop their individual capacity while collectively bringing about social change. While I certainly do not disagree with any of the goals listed above, in order to draw some meaning to this extensive list, I highlight some of the goals that are well suited for the Carrall Street participatory video case.

Seeing as the participant group consists of youth and students both interested in learning, education, skill development and personal capacity building these are all important goals of the project. Educationally, a primary focus is to facilitate a general understanding of the process of planning, development and decision making for the City of Vancouver. Skill development refers to all of the needed skills involved in video making. Capacity building implies growth or development, but in itself does not describe what is growing or developing. For the purposes of this case, I would like to see the case study participants develop the capacity to engage others in communicative storytelling processes. That does not imply that they become participatory video mentors and develop their own project, but that they apply some of the basic elements of participatory storytelling in their daily routine.

As a pilot project it is important that there is an element of reflective learning and institutional capacity building. Undoubtedly, the Carrall Street project will not unfold according to this ideal framework. To prepare for, and mitigate, the impending errors it
is important to integrate a systematic method of ongoing reflection as well as a detailed project evaluation. The intended benefit of reflecting on the project is to improve the project process while in action, and the project evaluation will serve to benefit future projects that embark on a similar path. Aiding that goal, is the capacity of organizations involved in the pilot project to conduct a similar project in the future. Therefore, institutional capacity building is important.

Though it may be stating the obvious, participation is a vital component of this, and any proposed participatory video project. This implies a balance that focuses on creating a process that enables the participants to have an active role in not only producing the video, but in defining the process they will undertake. Working towards this goal the project facilitator needs to create a welcoming space where participants feel free to express themselves. By focusing on participation the facilitators must bear the responsibility of removing their personal biases from the project (as much as reasonably expected) and instill a sense of authorship among the participants. While it is the responsibility of the facilitator to lead the participatory process, some onus of responsibility also lies with the participants to continually engage themselves in the process.

Much of the literature reflecting the various goals of participatory video highlights the dual roles of process and product. However, the focus tends to be on process. I would like to draw some attention to the importance of the final product. If participatory video is to be used as a planning tool, the final video product is paramount to its success. While planners are highly process oriented people, the audience will likely demand a high quality final product if they are to be convinced that the message in the video is worth listening to. The story must be told with a degree of persuasion. That is to say that the message is clear and compelling, and the production quality is reasonable.

**Defining Participatory Video**
Moving on from the various goals of participatory video, I would like to focus on defining the term. Participatory video is a process that adheres loosely to some common principles and values, but it does not have a single agreed upon definition. By not having a universal definition, participatory video is a dynamic process that has the flexibility to be transformed and tailored to specific situations. As user groups tailor the concept of participatory video to their interest they develop a sense of collective ownership and control over the process. It is therefore good for any user group to define how they interpret participatory video.

There are a number of definitions offered by 'experts' and practitioners in the field of participatory video that I could provide as a complete and acceptable definition. Instead, I have again chosen to refer a number of existing definitions, and produce my own definition of what I consider participatory video to be.

It is interesting to see some of the themes that are repeatedly mentioned throughout these definitions (White, 2003; Huber, 1998; and Johanssson, 2003). Collective involvement seems to be one of the more prevalent themes. Many of the definitions reflected on the concept that participatory video is conducted by all group members, that it seeks to harness the collective skills of the group and produce a piece that shares the common voice of the participants, as well as being collectively produced by all the participants.

Another common theme is that of communication. The output of a participatory video process has a definitive communicatory purpose, which in many cases is focused on giving voice to the voiceless. Many of the definitions mentioned other output-oriented goals that tend to focus on the ability to bring about change. And change can occur at either the individual level through skill development, empowerment and self-awareness as well as at the social level through political change and engagement, understanding and reflection.

In reflecting on the definitions provided through the participatory video case I present the following definition of participatory video.
Participatory video is a collective video making process that engages all participants in shaping and producing a final video piece with the intent to bring about some form of positive change at the individual, and societal level.

The Participatory Video Making Process

Now that some of the basic foundation has been established, and hopefully some of the “why” questions have been addressed, it is time to move on to the process of producing a participatory video production. I will attempt to remain true to my previously stated goals, and my definition of what constitutes an ideal participatory video process. The purpose of this section is to outline the general way in which a participatory video would ideally unfold.

11 Steps to an Ideal Participatory Video Process

I am putting forth 11 steps to describe an ideal participatory video process. There could just as easily be 7 steps, or maybe less, but the point here is to understand the succession of tasks needed to complete a participatory video.

1. Project Development

Before any participatory video project begins a number of initial development details need to be addressed. Mentors and facilitators must to be available, equipment must be ready, financing needs to be in place, participants must be selected and a host of other administrative and logistical tasks dealt with before there is even a project.

I am a proponent of participatory processes, but there are certain times when they are not beneficial or feasible, and this stage of project development is one of those times. During the initial stage of the project it is likely best if there is a clear leader, or two, for the project. In many regards the development stage is the most critical aspect of the
entire process as its success determines if the project will proceed, and it is in this stage that most of the parameters (time, funds, number of participants, output) for the project are set. Ideally, the individuals involved in the development of the project have excellent management and administrative skills, are good communicators, and well-practiced facilitators. The difficulty in this stage is to provide critical and defining information needed to get the project going, secure funds, and attract suitable participants and mentors, but then have the ability to transfer ownership to the collective involved in the participatory video production. This presents not only a challenge for the individual leaders, but for the design of the process.

2. Establish Rapport

Building rapport with the community, and partnering organizations as well as among the mentors, facilitators and participants is a key to the success of a participatory video process. Organizationally, relationships need to be built during the beginning stages of project development, and then fostered throughout the project timeframe and maintained after the project is complete. Particular care needs to be placed with regards to the community that the project is working in. As a point of clarity, each organization should discuss their respective goals and objectives in general, and within the context of this project and discuss the relationship between this project and their organizational interests. What it comes down to is developing a good line of communication centered on principles of openness and trust.

As a working group, consisting of facilitators, mentors and participants, developing rapport in a relatively short timeframe is a difficult, though critical. Most groups transition through the forming, storming and norming phases. This is to say that once the groups are formed they usually have a series of disagreements, through which they come to understand each other and develop a common agreement of how to effectively work together. As facilitators, it is their role to help this process along.
3. Define the Project Goals and Protocol

This is the stage where those who initially developed the project begin to release control of the project to the collective project group of facilitators, mentors and participants.

This transitionary stage should begin by reviewing and discussing the project framework. Each item in the framework should be open for discussion and any issues that are identified should be discussed and changes made to the framework based on the feedback by the participants. Clarity and openness are key concepts to reinforce. The leaders must be clear with their intentions for the project, discuss their concerns and admit to biases and assumptions.

Once the project framework has been reviewed, revised and agreed upon, the project group should discuss their individual reasons for being involved in the project and collectively they should produce a list of individual and project goals. Once the list of goals is generated, they needs to be reflected in the project framework.

In addition to goals, it is important to establish a list of project protocols. Some of the more critical protocols to discuss include a means of engagement, decision-making processes, equipment handling standards, and general project process. It is through collectively defining how to communicate and make decisions that the group will start to take ownership and responsibility in the project. The group could very well decide that they would like to keep an authoritative approach and elicit managerial control to the existing leader. Or, they may wish to do everything through consensus-based decision making. Whatever the organizational framework chosen, it is critical that it is a group decision, this is where the focus on process is instigated. This is a difficult and complicated process that is dependent on the skills of a competent facilitator. In working with the project group to develop a series of protocols the facilitator ought to continually refer back to the previously stated project goals, as well as timeline and practical considerations.
4. Skill Audit and Development

In the sense that participatory video can a personally empowering process, skill development is an important component of the project. There is also a certain level of skill that is required to produce a video, especially if there are imposed product oriented standards. It is the role of the facilitators and mentors to work with the participants to build the internal capacity to produce a video and achieve the projects stated goals. This process should begin with a group audit of existing skills. This needs to be done in a way that is not demeaning to anyone in the group.

The idea is not to focus what individuals are lacking, but to identify existing skills that can be drawn on through the project, as well as identifying what collective skills need to be developed. In traditional learning environments most of the learning comes from an authoritative figure, such as a teacher, who has knowledge they are attempting to pass on to those lacking knowledge, usually the students. While this style of learning may be appropriate in some cases, it does not fit with the participatory nature of this type of project. A collective learning approach is more appropriate, where the participants identify skills they perceive are needed and they determine how to gain those skills. This creates the opportunity for participants to become active in their own development and educations, again reinforcing the collective ownership and responsibility over the project. In this sense the mentors are available as a resource that the group can draw on, but they are not necessarily the authoritative teacher that will disseminate the required knowledge.

While I have indicated that video making is a linear process, skill development will occur throughout the project process, not only in step 4. A ‘skill check-up’ should be integrated into the project framework to constantly identify gaps and needed areas of development.

5. Shape the Story
Once most of the project framework and process have been established, the group needs to begin thinking about the video itself. A project facilitator should refer to the collective group and develop an approach that they will follow in order to develop the story. The facilitator and mentors will then work with the group to facilitate—but not direct—the story.

In shaping the story, some reference can be made to the traditional film making process that involves research, treatments, and scripts. This is an effective way to break down the necessary stages of video production, but rather than focus on this as an ‘industry standard’ it should be seen as a process in logic. Given the task at hand (developing a story) what does the group feel is needed to complete that task? Once the group has developed a process, and likely a series of tasks, the facilitators and mentors act as support in helping the participants work towards their stated goal.

6. Plan Production

Depending on the type of story the participants have chosen to tell they may find that scripting a complete story before shooting begins is the best process. Or they may choose to follow more of an iterative process of shooting and reviewing the footage as a process of story development. It really depends on the specific application and project details. For the purposes of the Carrall Street project working with a fairly detailed story prior to shooting was ideal in order to complete the project in a timely manner, and reach the output-oriented goals. Part of developing that script may be to conduct extensive off camera interviews, to see what material the subjects have, then the group can determine how that material makes a complete story.

At the end of this stage the group needs to have a detailed production plan. What research do they need to conduct?; what shots do they need?; who do they need to interview?; what is the general style they are going for?; and what is the overall impact they hope to achieve? These are just some of the questions that should be addressed in the production plan.
To encourage collective ownership of the video-making process group members should be encouraged to engage in discussions where they present their plan and then the group discusses and tries to help flush out any missing details, and solve any stated problems. The role of the mentors and facilitators is to guide the process, but also to encourage the group to think through and evaluate their own production plans.

7. Production

Once a comprehensive and logical production plan is in place the group begins shooting footage for their video. At this stage the project mentors will take an active role in working with the project participants to help them realize the video production they have outlined. The mentors are there as a resource. It is not their role to assume direct control over production, but to assist when called upon.

Throughout the production process it is ideal to have a series of reviews, where the participants gather together, and perhaps invite community members or subjects from the video, to view and discuss incomplete portions of the video. These review sessions will serve as a ‘check-in’ to see if the groups are achieving the objectives outlined in their story and their production plan, as well as the overall project objectives and goals. Through this element of review the video making process becomes dynamic; it allows the project participants to reflect while engaged in production and make adjustments as they see needed.

8. Plan Post-Production

Although there is reflection integrated into the production phase of the project, once production is complete a final review is needed before plans are made for post-production. What is important is that groups revisit their initial story concept to see that they have captured all the needed video and audio elements to shape that story in post-
production. Post-production is where the story comes to fruition. It is generally a
tedious and time-consuming task, though for those with an interest in editing it is
creative and exploratory. To ease the task of editing, and to ensure that the final piece is
shaped by the collective interest of the group it is a good idea to develop some form of
post-production plan. The level of detail in the plan is dependent on the group interest,
but some form of plan is needed. The group should present and discuss the post-
production plan to the group and then discuss the details and refine any shortcomings.

9. Post-Production

Through post production the story will begin to take shape. Post-production, which is
largely comprised of editing, presents some challenges to the participatory nature of this
project style. Editing is difficult to conduct in a group, which is why working from an
editing script is important. Screening rough samples of the work done, and engaging in
a group discussion is an ideal way to move the project forward. Once a ‘rough cut’ is
complete, inviting a larger audience for a screening is likely useful. This can serve as a
good litmus test to see how the audience receives the piece, and a chance to provide
feedback on the group’s ability to achieve their stated goals. Through the final
reflection any ‘pick-ups’ (additional shots, interviews, or sound) that are needed can be
identified and shot before editing begins.

10. Installation

Long before the final picture is locked, discussions about where and how to screen the
final piece are needed. Following from the consistent theme of participant ownership
and control, installation decisions should come from the participant group. Facilitators
should be used to guide this discussion and remind the participants of any practical
limitations. As a means of consistency the installation of the final video piece should be
reflective of the overall goals of the project.
11. Evaluation and Follow-up

The intent is to conduct reflective evaluation throughout the video-making process. In an ideal situation the participants will have regularly scheduled opportunities to reflect on the project process and make any required alterations, again staying focused on the original project goals and objectives, as well as timeline.

In addition to the ongoing feedback and evaluation, a formal evaluation should be completed at the end of the project. This is done to further the development and understanding of participatory video making processes. The type of evaluative process should be discussed with the participants and an appropriate method put in place.

Conclusion

Using my experience with the participatory video case, discussions with participants, and existing literature in this chapter I presented some of the key concepts of an ideal participatory video framework. This framework is very idealistic, and does not reflect many of the constraints that exist when attempting to conduct a participatory video project. Through this chapter I set-up a framework that will enable me to reflect on my perceived experience with the Carrall Street case and consider how the case differed from this painted ideal. In the next chapter I proceed to outline the Carrall Street participatory video case.
Chapter 4. The Experienced Participatory Video Case

The intent of this chapter is to provide an overview of the case and describe what happened. In describing the Carrall Street case I rely on summary documents created by the project team, my notes, meeting minutes, discussions with project participants, funding applications, and video footage.

Project Overview

The Carrall Street Greenway participatory video project was conducted as a pilot project to explore the application of participatory video as a planning tool. In this project, three teams consisting of youth with limited access to resources associated with Vancouver's Downtown Eastside (DTES), graduate students from the University of British Columbia’s (UBC) School of Community and Regional Planning (SCARP), and video and urban planning professionals collaboratively produced a series of short videos that conveyed their collective perceptions and ideas on the design and installation of the Carrall Street Greenway. Team members were involved in all aspects of the video making process from story development to shooting to editing. Through the process team members shared their expertise and insights in video making and urban planning by focusing on the Carrall Street Greenway project.

The Carrall Street Greenway is a major revitalization and community building initiative put forth by the City of Vancouver. This Greenway is proposed as a significant public realm feature that will link False Creek and Burrard Inlet and complete a recreational seawall loop around Downtown Vancouver and Stanley Park. It is also a strategic initiative intended to focus public realm improvements and private investment along the Carrall Street corridor which will attract visitors to the area and stimulate business activities while providing improved neighbourhood areas and employment opportunities for Downtown Eastside residents. (Kudzius and Chen-Adams, 2006)
The greenway will link the historic neighbourhoods of Chinatown, Downtown Eastside, with Gastown along a single streetscape. The City of Vancouver has been undergoing planning and public consultation for the greenway for nearly 10 years. City Council approved the release of funds for the Carrall Street Greenway project, and construction is set to begin sometime in 2006. For a more complete background on the Carrall Street Greenway project refer to appendix 1.

**Project Development and Funding**

I started to think about participatory video while working internationally. I was contemplating my ability to accurately capture the details of my experience in a place that I knew relatively little about. What I ended up doing was asking locals to take pictures that they felt represented their home, and asking them to tell me what they felt about my presence, and the work that I was doing. While this was not a participatory video process, it was a means to depict an experience and capture elements of this place from the perspective of the locals rather than my relatively ignorant perspective.

Prior to this trip I had been involved in a few small scale planning related video productions, through Ear to the Ground Planning Inc., a planning consulting firm that I started three years ago with two other colleagues from graduate school. One of the defining specializations of our firm is to apply video in various elements of planning processes. When I returned from my experience abroad I began researching participatory video and thought that this process oriented video production format would be an ideal concept for our firm to explore.

A month after my return, my business partner and I met two filmmakers from Projections, a film and video mentor program for street involved youth. We quickly realized the potential synergies that existed between our two organizations and began meeting to develop a participatory video project. This was in April of 2005, and for the next several months the four of us met every couple weeks and slowly started to build the project concept.
The Carrall Street project evolved to be a three-way partnership between Projections, Ear to the Ground Planning Inc., and SCARP. One of the initial interests in this working group was to develop mutually beneficial partnerships between the three organizations. Each partnering organization provided a unique set of experiences and assets to the project.

**PHS Community Services Society: Projections**

Projections is a film and video training and mentoring project for youth with limited access to resources. Projections projects focus on developing creative and individual capacity through programming that is relationship driven and provides transferable skills. Through hands on experience, internships, placements and mentorship’s Projections creates access and facilitates sustainable transitions. Projections, in its 6th year, is a project of the PHS Community Services Society.

**Ear to the Ground Planning Inc.**

Ear to the Ground Planning Inc. is a cutting edge planning firm that facilitates the transition to sustainability through the use of innovative planning tools and approaches that enhance participatory processes and technical analysis. Building on more traditional planning services EGP goes further by augmenting these services with tools and approaches such as video, community mapping and scenario-building to deepen and expand observation, storytelling, information gathering, and analysis. These tools help create planning processes and products that improve inclusiveness, communications and understanding among stakeholders and assist in long-rang thinking.

**UBC School of Community and Regional Planning (SCARP)**

SCARP’s mission is to advance the transition to sustainability through excellence in integrated research, professional education and community service. With more than five decades of experience in graduate planning education and research, SCARP pioneered the integrated approach to planning for development.
Once the project partners were in place and a draft framework was complete the next stage was to secure funding. Funding was secured from a number of sources including the National Film Board of Canada, Canada Council for the Arts, VanCity, Vancouver Foundation, Realestate Foundation, Diamond Foundation, Lando Foundation, John Hardie Mitchell Foundation, Western Economic Diversification, and City of Vancouver. In-kind support was provided by Projections, Ear to the Ground Planning Inc., the Roundhouse Community Centre, Purple Thistle, Interurban Gallery, SCARP, and the Portland Hotel Society (PHS) Community. Obtaining funding was a challenging and time-consuming aspect of this project. Fortunately, Projections has a good relation with a number of funders and a wealth of fundraising experience, which proved to be a great asset. In total $117,000 was raised in cash and $42,000 through in-kind donations.

Once the minimum amount of funding needed to conduct the project was in place we quickly moved to bring the participants and staff on board. The Carrall Street project involved a total of 18 people: 11 of those were project participants (6 students and 5 youth) and 6 were project staff, and one volunteer. The project participants were invited to the project as either a youth or a student. Having experience working with youth from the DTES who are interested in video production, Projections was responsible for youth recruitment (see Appendix 2 and 3 for youth recruitment brochure and application). A total of 5 youth were selected, three female and two male, but one youth chose to leave the project part way through the project due to personal reasons. The students were invited to participate in the project by Leonie Sandercock, Professor and Director at SCARP. The first 6 students who applied were accepted (3 female and 3 male).

Ear to the Ground Planning and Projections provided, or hired, the staff needed for this project. The roles and responsibilities for all those involved in the Carrall Street project are described below.

*Participants: (youth and students)*
The participants are the video makers. They are responsible for developing the concept of the video, scripting and organizing content, shooting, interviewing and editing.

**Project Director: (Projections)**
Primary duty was to co-develop the project framework, administer the project, obtain funding, liaison with the DTES community, and provide support as a mentor.

**Project Coordinator: (Ear to the Ground Planning Inc.)**
The role of the project coordinator was to co-develop the project framework, obtain funding, co-develop project curriculum, conduct project evaluation, coordinate the video documentation of the project process, and co-facilitate some aspects project implementation.

**Production Mentors/Facilitators: (Projections)**
The primary role of the production mentors and facilitators was to work with the project participants on video production. This included teaching the participants the skills required to produce a video, as well as providing support and leadership throughout the video making process.

**Project Support: (Projections)**
The primary role of the project supporter was to act as a point of contact for the project participants. In addition, they supported the Project Director and other staff members as needed, acted as a production mentor and facilitator, assisted with group communications and administration, and acted as a community liaison.

**Planning Advisor: (Ear to the Ground Planning Inc.)**
The role of the planning advisor was to co-develop project curriculum, provide information as needed on the City of Vancouver planning process, and educate the participants on planning concepts and processes.

**Academic Advisor: (SCARP)**
The academic advisor was overseeing the research conducted by the SCARP students.

My role in the project was as the Project Coordinator. I worked on the project from its inception, to completion. The total compensation for my involvement in the project was $9,000.

**Project Implementation**

Initially when the project was being developed there were two planners and two filmmakers. The balance between planners and filmmakers was intended to remain throughout the project and the intent was that this project would mesh the planning and filmmaking fields. However, over time the balance between planning and filmmaking was tipped towards the film side. One of the initial planners involved in the project slowly became less involved for various reasons. The role of the SCARP supervising professor was purely an academic supportive and administrative role, and not one of practical project support. The project had initially intended to have a planning mentor work with each production group, but this never materialized. During the main project implementation five of the project staff were from the filmmaking field and one from planning.

Once the project funding was in place, and the participants selected, the project facilitators and mentors began to work with the participants to develop the knowledge and skills needed for the project. Since the students and the youth came to the project with slightly different educational interests each group was involved in specific training prior to meeting as a group. The students focused on more academic topics and the youth worked on applied filmmaking skills.

The project was officially kicked-off on April 3rd, 2006 when all the participants and project staff were brought together for the first time. As a form of introduction, each participant and staff member produced a 30-second personal video introduction, which was screened during the first meeting. The project concept, framework and timeline were introduced to the participants and a number of brainstorming discussions were had.
around the concept and perception of participation and video. Personal and project goals and objectives were also highlighted and discussed.

After the initial meeting, the focus was on obtaining the background knowledge needed for the video production. The focus was on gaining an understanding of the Carrall Street Greenway concept, comprehending why and how planning in British Columbia is done, and developing the needed technical video making skills. To achieve the understanding and gain the skills required the project staff developed a comprehensive curriculum that they delivered to the participants (for a detailed outline of the curriculum see appendix 4). Each day’s session began with a summary of the last day’s concepts, an introduction of the day’s plan and a request for feedback and comments.

When the background knowledge was in place and the skill development complete the participants were engaged in an intensive production process. The participants were given a short timeline to develop the key concepts for the video, outline a loose script, and produce their video pieces. The process began by flushing out some of the key themes or concepts that the participants were interested in addressing through their videos. Various brainstorming and discussions were used to flush out ideas and to group the themes together in three loose categories. Once three general concepts emerged the participants self-selected into three working groups. Each group comprised a mix of students and youth, though not equally balanced.

Once the working groups were identified they began developing the specific concept for their video. Working from the previously discussed themes and concepts each group focused their efforts on a specific topic of interest. In refining their concepts the working groups repeatedly presented their ideas to the entire project group (participants and staff) to obtain feedback. This enabled some consistency to be maintained through each of the three groups. The process of review continued throughout the entire video production process.
With a basic video outline in place, the production groups where given one month to produce their final video. Groups were encouraged to follow a filmmaking process and develop treatment, script, production plan, shooting plan, and editing script to help maintain some sense of order during production. Throughout the production process the video mentors worked with the groups as needed. When the video was at the ‘rough-cut’ stage we held an open screening and invited all the community members that contributed to the videos in someway.

After feedback from the rough-cut screening was integrated into the video the final videos were locked in early June. Throughout the entire project process a camera was available to anyone involved in the project to record components of the process on camera. In total, over 18 hours of tape was captured. This was reviewed and condensed into a five-minute process video. The process video, and the three independent video pieces were combined to produce a finished video 20-minutes in length.

Since the completed videos are a component of this research I will only provide a brief summary of them here. Each of the three participatory videos differ significantly in their style and content, though as a package they complement each other well. The first video, produced by the “Salty Loaf” group, focuses on the history of Carrall Street and the surrounding DTES community, which is depicted through four flowing stories, told by longtime residents of the DTES. The second video, produced by the group called “BLEN” is a fast paced, heavily edited piece that questions the language used to promote development projects. Using a variety of interviews and examples from the Expo 86 case, this video draws attention to the Carrall Street Greenway and the 2010 Olympics, and questions the meaning of various words used to support these projects. The third video, produced by “Whishlist”, is a poetic video that brings attention to community ideas that may not have been incorporated into the existing Carrall Street Greenway designs. Through the use of stop frame animation, this video artistically brings community ideas to life.
With the video complete, the Carrall Street project group prepared for a series of screenings and presentations. Screenings and presentations were held at the World Planners Congress, World Urban Forum, and World Urban Youth Forum throughout the middle of June, and then a final community screening and celebration was held at the Interurban Gallery, on July 19th.

With the screenings complete the one task left to complete is the project evaluation, which is set to be completed by September, 2006.

For a monthly work plan see appendix 5.

**Categorization**

Participatory video process can result in a number of benefits, but it cannot be all things to everyone; there are tradeoffs. Bernard Huber, through his exploratory study on participatory video highlights a series of regularly debated categories of trade-offs that he has flushed out from existing literature on participatory video (1998). In his research these categories play an essential role in identifying where, in a range of possibilities, certain participatory video projects are situated. The categories that Huber focuses on are: process vs. product, benefit for the individual or collective, and the distinction of development goals, which include therapy, activism, and empowerment (1998). Using Huber categories, I situate the Carrall Street case in a spectrum of trade-offs.

**Process vs. Product**

In the case of the Carrall Street Greenway, product was a definite focus. As a pilot project, it was important that the message put forth in the videos attain certain level of comprehension. From the initial stages of the project a commitment was made to achieving a quality product. In this context I define ‘quality product’ as a final video
output that has a reasonable video and audio quality, and would not likely be considered
rude or antagonizing to people or organizations watching the video.

In the Carrall Street project, the term product also takes on another meaning. This
project was an exploration in participatory video, but it was primarily a means of
individual and organizational development. For the youth, the focus was on skill
development, employment creation and independent learning (research, communication,
presentation, logic). The students’ focus was on their independent research, video skills,
experience working on a relevant planning issue, and experience within a community.
Organizationally, the focus was on building relationships, developing cross professional
skills and understanding, research, and project experience. In this sense, the Carrall
Street project, has a number of products, not just the production of a video.

In the Carrall Street project there was a stronger focus on product than process. This
was largely due to the interest in achieving the diverse product goals, and producing the
final video in time for identified screenings and presentations. To a large extent most of
the process was developed as the project was underway, as this was very much a
learning by doing project. A significant amount of time was placed on developing
curriculum, establish connections with the community, supporting youth and student
educational interests, and developing the required skill. The degree to which the process
is considered completely participatory however, requires some more consideration,
which is discussed in the following chapter.

Individual vs. Collective

It is evident that the focus of the Carrall Street Greenway project was on individual
achievement. The stated goals and objectives of the project were focused on a number
of individual benefits (skill development, education, research, job placement, etc.).
While the production group as a whole worked together to produce the video, it was in
order to achieve individual goals. There was a collective interest in the Carrall Street
Greenway as a topic, and in the exploration of this specific video application, but as a group we did not have a shared commitment to the topic. The youth had some links to the DTES community, but were not residents of the community, and the students had an interest in the community, but no binding commitment to the area. Therefore, collectively there was not a strong sense of personal connection to the community.

Given the scope of the project, and the time and financial constraints, it was not feasible to work extensively with the entire community of Vancouver’s Downtown Eastside (DTES). This became a recurring discussion, and many of the participants questioned the validity of the process if it did not involve a strong component of community participation. The students further questioned their role in the project as many of them have little connection or involvement with the DTES community. More time should have been given to this topic, as it contains a lot of interesting concepts of representation, voice, entitlement, public space, community and the manipulative possibility of video production. The result of this discussion was to consider the Carrall Street case a project that represents the voice of the 18-person production team. The option however was left open for the individual production team to engage with the community as they see fit. This community engagement was done to varying degrees.

The Carrall Street project is heavily leaning towards the individual side of the spectrum. However, as Braden and Huong indicate, many of the collective benefits that are achieved through focusing on the personal development within a community are often overlooked (1998). Focusing on individual growth and development can often lead to positive intra-community benefits. Although the youth involved in the Carrall Street project are not all residents of the DTES, many of them do consider themselves members of that community. It is hoped that by focusing on the individual there are still significant benefits that are achieved at the community level. Furthermore, as a pilot project the Carrall Street project could have benefits that extend beyond the individual benefit by promoting the acceptance of this process, inspiring others, supporting creative means of expression, and inspiring dialogue.
Development Goal Clarification

In his thesis, Huber suggests that a decision should be made among participatory video users to support one, or several, of the three development goals: therapy, activism, and empowerment (1998). The Carrall Street project addressed all three of these goals to some extent, but is most heavily in line with the empowerment goal.

Through their application of participatory video as therapy Shaw and Robertson have identified that therapy should be interpreted in a general sense, as opposed to a form of treatment for the ill (1997). Taking that approach, the Carrall Street project had a heavy focus on individual learning, skill development, and personal capacity building, suggesting that there is a strong therapeutic presence running through the project. Where the Carrall Street project differentiates itself from a purely therapeutic piece is in the application of the final video output. When used in therapy, participatory video serves only the interests of the participants, which is not completely the case here. Though not the primary focus, the project was scoped to focus on the Carrall Street Greenway, and to explore relevant planning related issues connected to the greenway in an attempt to explore the possibility for change. There was also an explicit connection to research and development of participatory video as a planning tool.

Since there is a focus on producing a product that will bring about some aspect of change, the Carrall Street case can also be seen as having a certain element of activism. According to Harding and his handbook on video activism, a video activist is someone "who uses video as a tactical tool to bring about social justice and environmental protection" (1997: 1). The Carrall Street project is designed to bring attention to social issues, but I would not consider it a tactical tool. So while there are elements of video activism this case is not completely in line with this typology.

Based on Huber’s rationale, the Carrall Street case fits best within the ‘empowerment’ category. Huber describes empowerment videos as falling somewhere in between the therapy and activism perspectives, which the Carrall Street case does.
Empowerment seems to be a popular term used within the literature to describe certain participatory video development goals, and I agree this case fits best with the notion of empowerment, but I find the term somewhat patronizing. It fails to acknowledge the existing skills and ability present in the project participants, and diminishes the knowledge and understanding that they bring collectively to the project. Perhaps the term enabler, or catalyst is more fitting.

**Conclusion**

In presenting the Carrall Street case, I provide an account of who was involved in the project and what happened. In the following and concluding chapter I present my reflections and thoughts on the case and attempt to answer the research questions posed at the beginning of this research by flushing out some of the reasons why the Carrall Street case differed from the “ideal” case presented in the previous chapter.
Chapter 5. Root Definitions

The purpose of this chapter is to highlight some of the differences between the Carrall Street case and the “ideal” participatory framework presented in chapter 3. In doing this I put forth a series of “problem situations” and then elaborate on three of them through defining the “root definitions”.

To help guide the researcher to selecting relevant root definitions, Checkland suggests using a CATWOE analysis. Focusing on CATWOE reminds the researcher that there are often a number of factors within a system that should be considered. The mnemonic CATWOE refers to:

C – customer
Who would be the beneficiaries of the proposed activity?

A – actors
Who would do the activities?

T – transformation process
What is the purposeful activity expressed as (input transformed to output)?

W – weltanschauung
What view of the world makes this definition meaningful?

O – owner
Who could stop this activity?

E – environmental constraints
What constraints in its environment does this system take as given?

Root definitions are intended to stem from problem situations. They are used to help flush out the causal factors behind the problem situation. For the Carrall Street case I have identified several problem situations.

1. Application of Output
Focusing on the output-oriented component of participatory video, an important question to consider is how the final video output will impact planning and decision-making? Throughout the Carrall Street project there was not an overly clear indication
on how the video would be applied and to what degree the video output would bring about positive change. Unlike the Fogo Process case, the Carrall Street project did not have a formal agreement with the City of Vancouver to elicit an obligated response to the piece. In some respects, the success of the video as a means to impact planning and decision-making is brought into question.

2. Participation
Focusing on the process side of a participatory video process, just how participatory is the video making process? The question of participation was raised throughout the Carrall Street project and some participants felt that the project could have been more participatory. But, before making a blanket statement that the project was not participatory it is important to reflect on the goals and objectives of the project, with consideration of the relevant timeline and budget. If the project could have been more participatory, how could this be achieved?

3. Cost and Time
From an administrative and practicality perspective how does the time and cost of a participatory video project impact the project? The Carrall Street project was working within a defined cost and time framework, but how did these limitations impact the project? And furthermore, how can these factors be mitigated for future projects? Is it possible to produce a participatory video for significantly less money and in a shorter period of time? If there is an interest in using participatory video as a planning tool the cost and time factors are pivotal.

4. Communication
Communication is a critical factor in the success of any form of social interaction or collaboration. With complex multi-faceted projects, working with a tight timeline establishing clear and open communication links is essential. In the Carrall Street case, communication could have been more effective. What specific measures could be integrated into the process to ensure that communication is clear and effective?

5. Scope and Community Consultation

48
If participatory video is to be considered a planning tool, at what scope is it best applied and how effective is it in consulting with the community and obtaining public feedback? There was some concern throughout the Carrall Street project that the participants were not reflective of the community. Some participants questioned their right to be involved in the project. Several discussions were had around the scope of the participatory nature of the project. How can clarity be brought to this topic, so that future participatory projects have a clear concept of purpose and validity?

6. **Storytelling**
Participatory video is a means to tell stories. Through visual and auditory representation video has the capacity to tell stories rich with detail, emotion and feelings. It is this capacity as an effective tool to tell stories through a collective process that is being investigated here. But effective is it, and how easy is it for ‘non-experts’, to tell a story through video? For some people within the Carrall Street project, video appeared to serve as an excellent means through which they could effectively tell stories, but I question the degree to which it was an effective means for everyone to tell stories, especially those not particularly interested in developing the needed technical skills.

7. **Dynamic Flexibility**
An important component of a participatory video project is the flexibility to change and adapt to participant and other needs. To what degree can dynamic flexibility be integrated into the project framework? There were issues within the Carrall Street project regarding the amount of flexibility within the project framework and who is determining how the project is adapted. I believe that the project could have had more flexibility that enabled the participants to have control of how the project unfolded, but the question is how to accomplish this give the context of the project.

8. **Value of the Participatory Video**
When the participatory video project is complete, what are the values that the project achieved? There are a lot of associated benefits with conducting a participatory video project, but how many of them are realized and achieved? With the Carrall Street
project, a lot of the values of the project are difficult to measure. How can the success of participatory video projects be fairly and accurately evaluated?

9. Feasibility as a Planning Tool
To what degree is participatory video a feasible planning tool? Can it serve the planning profession well? Did the Carrall Street project impact planning and decision-making, and if so to what extent? Participatory is not likely a standalone process, it is best used in conjunction with other processes and frameworks. Exploring the relation that participatory video has with other existing planning tools and process, could shed some valuable insight regarding the feasibility of participatory video as a planning tool.

10. Ethics
Capturing images on video carries with it a high degree of ethical concern. To what degree do ethical considerations impact the participatory video making process and the community, and how can they be mitigated? The Carrall Street project was situated in a sensitive and potentially vulnerable community. While I believe that sufficient precautions were taken, there is a concern surrounding the applicability and sensitivity of using video in all communities. What steps can be integrated into the participatory video process that ensures proper ethical considerations are addressed?

From Problem Situations to Root Definitions
I have listed 10 problem situations, and could likely list many more, but for the interests of the research needs I flush out the root definition for three of the problems situations identified. I did not use a formal decision matrix to determine which problem situations to focus on; I simply selected three that I see as particularly relevant and interesting. The remainder of this chapter is dedicated to describing the root definition for the problems associated with application, participation, and cost and time. In doing so, I provide a more in depth outline of the problem situation and then link the problem to deeper causes.
The following chart, which outlines the various CATWOE categories as they relate to the selected root definitions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RD</th>
<th>Customer</th>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Transformation</th>
<th>Weltanschauung</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Environmental</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Video (that it is used in decision making)</td>
<td>PV is an accepted and valued form of public input</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Political and city staff framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DTES Community</td>
<td>Mentors/Facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Political Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Participation is a central priority</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td>Political and mentor relationship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mentors/Facilitators</td>
<td>Mentors/Facilitators</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>Project framework</td>
<td>Working within fiscal and temporal limitations</td>
<td>Project Director</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director and Project</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Accessible Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: CATWOE Analysis

**Application**

The *application* issue is not so much of a problem as it is a point of clarification and an exercise in unpacking what it means to “impact planning and decision making”. As the literature suggests, there are a number of ways that a participatory video project could bring about positive change (White, 2003; Johansson, 2000; Huber 1998; and Mayo, 1999). Participatory video as an adaptable process has the ability to serve many application purposes, and can thus have many impacting ‘outputs’. The focal point then becomes on what the intended purpose of using participatory video is, and how, if at all, it was intended to impact planning and decision-making.
The Carrall Street project had a number of intended outputs and objectives that will likely impact planning and decision-making (see appendix 6 for list of intended and achieved outputs). The difficulty lies in defining and measuring the impacts of these achieved outputs. On the surface, it does not appear that the video output directly impacted the Carrall Street Greenway project. There was no formal agreement from the City to integrate the video into its official process. There was however good reason for this. While the Carrall Street project’s intention was to explore the application of participatory video as a planning tool, there was never any explicit hope that the output would have an immediate impact on the Carrall Street Greenway. The principal reason was timing. We knew at the beginning of this project that the City had, for the most part, completed the Carrall Street Greenway public consultation, the greenway design was complete, and City staff were preparing to begin construction before the year’s end. This issue of timing was discussed at length with the participatory project participants. Some of the participants questioned why we should even engage with the project, if there is little room to influence the Carrall Street Greenway. Then it became apparent that there is potential to influence how the greenway, as public space, is used. This was identified as an area of interest, and was addressed specifically in one of the videos.

There were some other factors that led the group away from seeking an agreement with the City on how the video would be integrated into official process. The City’s process was perceived as somewhat inaccessible by the production team. Had other factors been negated, it is difficult to clearly see how the City would integrate a participatory video into their standard process. It is not clear if the video would be interpreted as reliable data. While the City was supportive of the use of video as it relates to the Carrall Street Greenway project, it is unclear how, if at all, they intended to apply the results. There was also some expressed concern regarding the lack of youth voice existing in Municipal processes. Rather than attempting to challenged this perception, and attempt to infuse Municipal process with a youth voice, the group chose to focus on other objectives. While the City may have been perceived to be somewhat difficult to engage with, it should be noted that the City of Vancouver was very supportive, both financially
and conceptually, of this project. At an individual level the City of Vancouver planners that interacted with the Carrall Street video project, were positive, supportive, and helpful. The comments here pertain more generally to the bureaucratic nature of a large municipal operations and the challenges present when attempting to influence City Council.

Another reason that the project group did not attempt to reach an agreement with the City on the application of the video output was to remain somewhat autonomous, and welcome a broader notion of what constituted a successful output. Had we reached a specific agreement with the City, the participants’ production options would have been significantly reduced.

An underlying issue here is the various means available when attempting to bring about change. There are a number of theories and concepts on how political, social and economic change happens. One of the approaches adopted in the Carrall Street project was to support individual growth and development. All members of the Carrall Street project (participants and staff) were provided with an opportunity to learn and develop practical skills that may better equip them as change agents. Some of the positive development opportunities included: facilitation, video production, academic discussion, research, group work, project management and coordination, communication, persuasive storytelling, interpersonal relations, and literacy. It could be said that this emphasis on individual growth and development is a means to impact planning and decision-making, though the results may not be immediate and easily observed.

Through the public screenings it became evident that the videos served as a great point of discussion. The videos tend to elicit more questions than they provide answers. In this regard, the videos can be viewed as a catalyst for action, or a call to civil society. It is important here to acknowledge the evolving life of the Carrall Street videos. Even though the initial screenings and discussion have ceased, the videos will be circulated through various networks and will continue to inspire and be the focal point of many discussions—taking on a life of their own. Most of this will occur without our
awareness or control. This brings about the distinction between working through formal networks to bring about change, and working through informal structures. The Carrall Street project focused more on an informal approach.

The application issue appears to be a matter of the relative success of the intended application of the participatory video process. It is important to recognize that there are many ways to bring about positive change, and there are a number of alternative avenues to impact planning and decision-making. To paint all participatory videos with the same measure of success is inappropriate. The Fogo Process was successful in accomplishing its intended goals of using video to directly interact with government officials and bring about needed improvements at the local level. The Carrall Street project never attempted to achieve that same level, and type of impact, but the project had, and will continue to have, an impact on planning and decision-making.

**Participation**

As this is called participatory video project it is logical to question the degree of participation. There was some questions raised in the Carrall Street project regarding the degree of participation. Some project members felt that the process was not as participatory as it could have been. In addressing this problem situation there are a number of contributing factors.

The concept of participation itself brings-up some interesting points of discussion. One of which is the scale of participation. In the Carrall Street project, participation is considered at the individual video production group (3 or 4 people), at the project level (17 people), and at the community level (several hundred). As a group we discussed examples of participation, but we did not maintained how the group defined participation, or how the project achieved participation within various project scales. It became evident that project members interpreted participation to infer different things, and there appeared to be a breakdown in understanding what it meant to participate, and who was participating. This was evident at both the project level and the smaller video
production group level. Without maintaining a collective understanding of what participation means, individuals in the group responded to the lack of clarity in many different ways. Some displayed their tendency to lead and control situations, while others disengaged themselves from the process.

Going further with this discussion, there are factors that contributed to the lack of maintained clarity regarding participation, and the subsequent concerns raised around the degree to which the project was participatory. Bringing the students and youth together, should have been done a lot earlier in the project process. Prior to the first group meeting, the youth and the students were preparing for the project independently. The rationale for doing so was that since the youth and students have different educational interests they are better off preparing independently. In hindsight, bringing them together to conduct at least some joint preparation could have helped the overall participatory nature of the project by allowing the group more time to grow together. The Carrall Street project was intended to be equally supported by planners and film professionals, through project staff and mentors. Early on in the project development stage there were two planners and two film professionals, and the balance seemed to work well. However, through the course of time the film presence expanded and the planning presence was reduced; during project implementation there was five film professionals on staff, and one planner. As a result the project seemed to follow more of a film process. For me personally, not having the support of other planners impacted my ability and confidence to maintain some of the initial values I had hoped would be consistent throughout the production process. Coupled with the need to work outside of this project, and balance other aspects of my life, my impact on this project was admitted less than I had initially intended.

All of the students were engaged in some form of action research throughout the Carrall Street project. Action researchers are presented with the challenging task of observing for the purposes of research, while simultaneously being engaged in the process that they themselves are observing (Hopkins, 2002; Dick, 2002). Based on observations and discussions, the students achieve mixed levels of success in balancing both demands
simultaneously. The students were perceived by some project members as being somewhat voyeuristic, in that they were involved in the project for the primary purposes of observation, and less so as an active participant in the process. Furthermore, the research the students were conducting was not discussed with the entire project group. Early in the project process it was acknowledged that the students were conducting research on the project, and consent forms were discussed and signed, but there was very little follow-up and continued discussion. It is likely that this impacted the degree of overall participation by creating a divide between student participants and youth participants. This divide between participant groups, was also supported in the language used throughout the project. It was common among most project members to refer to SCARP student and Projections youth, rather than using one unifying term.

In addition to some of the unintended situations that may have contributed to the perception that the process could have been more participatory, there were some intentional choices made on the part of the project staff to direct aspects of the project. The primary justification for direction was to achieve a number of the outlined objectives of the project. Of these objectives, completing the project on time was of paramount importance. As the project proceeded and the deadline approached the project staff became more involved in actively directing the process. There was also a perceived need by some of the project staff to direct the process in order to attain some of the educational and skill development goals. Since most of the project staff were trained and experienced video educators, they proceeded to educate the participants as they had in previous situations, through a fairly standard teacher/student relationship. Another concern among the project staff was the level of organizational risk associated with this project. As a pilot project, working in a sensitive community there was some concern surrounding the ethical application of video, and thus various steps were taken to mitigate some of the risk to the community.

It is worth mentioning the complexity that this type of project brings to the ideal of participation. This was a creative project, where participants engage with emotion and feeling, which sometimes runs counter to the easy facilitation of a participatory process.
On several occasions project members promoted their creative interests, not out of disrespect for the participatory ideals, but through excitement and enthusiasm. This excitement and creativity was interpreted in a number of ways; some found it inspiring, and others perhaps as a sign of intended control. There were a number of factors that pushed the project down certain paths, at times differing the project from its intended track, like a runaway train. When this happened, the focus tended to be on the direction the project was going, rather than the people who had the ability to change direction. This project brought together a fairly diverse group of individuals that likely would not have interacted otherwise. The challenges presented here in working towards a functioning participatory process are likely more challenging than if the project were working with an existing organization that had an established working relationship. While one of the unique features of this case was the bringing together a diverse group, it was also one of the challenges. Similarly, one of the benefits of the Carrall Street project was the ability the project had in serving a number of diverse personal interests, including academic research, video skill development, organizational capacity building, literacy, work placements, and facilitation. This focus on the individual, and the absence of a uniform common good that bound the group together, negatively impacted the degree of participation as the project lacked a common unifying purpose.

**Cost and Time**

The problem at stake here is the negative impact of cost and time restraints on the Carrall Street project. Had the project been given a larger budget and more time, it certainly would have been a different project. Rather than focus on how the project would have differed, the intent here is to discussed the constraining factors.

The scope of the project was fairly ambitious. There were a number of intended objectives and multiple project goals. The project outline was somewhat vague; primarily since the entire project members were learning about the process while engaged in the process. The project staff introduced a lot of new concepts to a diverse group of individuals over a relatively short period of time. Not everyone was familiar
with the Downtown Eastside Community. And, the project partners had never worked together before. The project supported a community university partnership, which in its own right is challenging. In addition to developing the framework, and implementing the project the project staff was also responsible for securing all of the funding.

The Carrall Street project was certainly ambitious. A difficult challenge was not only completing the project, but to accurately match the project details (technology, video focal point, relationship to the issue, personal circumstances, agenda, etc.) with the project needs (technology, time, money, resources, etc.). Since the project staff were not following a proven framework matching the project details to the resource needs, presented some challenges as some project details and needs may have been overlooked, or under appreciated. Once the funding was in place, the project staff had to adjust and adapt accordingly as circumstances arose.

If participatory video has any chance of becoming a more widely used planning tool then the cost and time needed to complete the project must be significantly reduced. When describing this project to a senior planner at the City of Vancouver he said if we could get the process down to $20,000 and completed in two weeks, then we would have a process that the City could easily adopt. The Carrall Street project required roughly $170,000 (cash and in kind) and one year to complete. While I can appreciate that from the City’s perspective this abbreviated participatory video process may be ideal, it is important to consider how different the outcome would be. This raises the question what does the City want to achieve in applying participatory video?

**Conclusion**

After reflecting on the Carrall Street case I identified ten “problem situations”. Of those ten, I selected three and flushed out the “root definitions” of those problems in an attempt to uncover some of the underlying factors. The factors are diverse, interconnected and somewhat challenging to unpack. With an understanding of the
problems encountered in the Carrall Street case, and some of the factors that led to these problems, the next chapter applies this gained insight to address the research questions.
Chapter 6. Findings

The intent of defining the root definitions is to better understand the causal factors that contributed to the underlying problem situation. By reflecting on these root definitions I proposed three research questions that I will proceed to address in this chapter.

1. How can participatory video be used to impact planning and decision-making processes?
2. What actions can be integrated into a participatory video process to help ensure a relatively high degree of participation?
3. How can a participatory video process be adapted to fit low budget and time constraints?

1. Application

Throughout the Carrall Street project screenings, presentations and discussions people continually asked the question, what possible ways could participatory video be applied? Since my research focused primarily on one case I cannot provide a definitive answer to that question, but I can provide some insight that I gained while immersed in the topic. In doing so, I draw on various groups that have expressed an interest in using participatory video. A Vancouver based community group concerned with the impact that the 2010 Winter Olympic Games may have on local communities are interested in using a participatory video process as a visioning exercise. There has been an expressed interest to conduct a participatory video in Kenya to raise awareness of the challenges youth are facing in urban areas. An organization that sends Canadian volunteers around the globe would like to educate their volunteers in participatory storytelling techniques. City planners are interested in using a scaled down version of participatory video as a means to garner public opinion. A Vancouver based research group would like to use participatory video as a form of qualitative data collection. Civil society groups are interested in using participatory video as an advocacy tool. Educational institutions are
interest in participatory video as a means of enriching the way that people learn and develop. There are many possible applications of participatory video, some likely more appropriate and successful than others. In determining what applications are appropriate, it is critical to understand that participatory video does not carry with it an inherent set of uniform goals and objectives. Participatory video is appropriate if the users take the time and thought needed to cater the process to their specific needs. It is not a blanket methodology, it must be applied ad hoc.

While this research cannot provide blanket suggestions that apply to all applications of participatory video, it can provide some insight regarding how participatory video can be used to impact planning and decision-making processes by outlining some of the lessons learned from the Carrall Street project.

The Carrall Street project, had a number of layered project goals that were focused primarily on the individual good, which superseded the collective goals of the project. The project did not have a uniform goal that all of the project members were committed to. Compare this to the Fogo case. With Fogo, it was very clear that the purpose of the participatory video project was to communicate the community needs to government officials. This was a very strong collective goal that likely superseded all individual interests and goals. If the purpose of a participatory video is to achieve a specific impact, the goal of the collective should be the stated as the primary focus of the project, rather than individual goals. And likewise, participants should be selected that have a strong connection to that collective goal.

If the purpose of a participatory video is to directly impact official planning and decision-making processes, a significant amount of time needs to be spent engaging with the identified officials. Having not attempted to gain a formal agreement with the City of Vancouver it is difficult to say what specific steps would be needed, and it is very case dependent, but a significant amount of time should be allocated to the task. Showing identified officials that the project has a wide support from a number of key stakeholder groups is likely critical, as is the need to seek out individuals within the
organization that are likely supportive of the project. Overtime a case can be built and once there is a comprehensive and logical justification for a formal agreement the pitch can be made to the appropriate official.

At the project management level, it is important to clearly understand, as a collective production group, what the intended impact of the project is. This not only needs to be established at the beginning of the project, but continually revisited and discussed throughout the project process. Communication within and throughout the project is vital to successfully achieving desired outcomes.

The timing of the participatory video project as it is related to the desired impact, is of critical importance. If the intent is to impact an ongoing process, becoming involved at the early stages of the process is likely ideal, but is dependent on the specific case. Being clear throughout the project process about what the impact options are given the relevant timing is important.

The notion of what constitutes data is another interesting point of clarification. Do traditional forms of data collection (surveys, questionnaires, focus groups, public meetings, etc.) capture the essence of the given situation? The concept of using participatory video in the planning realm is centered on the belief that video has a unique ability to produce data that is rich with description and meaning. Participatory video is not well suited to be the sole form of data collection, but it can significantly enrich existing data collection procedures. Planners are seemingly caught in a continual struggle between the practical need to be reductionist (in order to ultimately make a decision) and the desire to be inclusive. In this struggle, participatory video could be seen as an ideal addition to a planner’s array of tools, as it has the ability, through visual, audio and text representation to provide rich descriptions that have been processed through a series of iterative reviews and refinement that culminates in a poignant story. By accepting a broad interpretation of what constitutes data the ability for participatory to significantly impact planning and decision making process is limited only by the creative application of the process.
It appears that participatory can impact planning and decision-making in a number of ways. Drawing on the experience of the Carrall Street project it is important to look at both the formal and informal approaches and to take a broad definition of what constitutes ‘impact’.

2. Participation

What actions can be integrated into a participatory video process to help ensure a relatively high degree of participation?

To help contextualize this question, it is best to perceive participatory video production as a spectrum of possibilities. Participatory video is not a single static process, it is dynamic, flexible and malleable to many needs and situations. Therefore, when considering the participatory nature of the process, it must be reflective of the intended goals and objectives. With that in mind, in addressing this question I provide insight to some general actions that can be integrated into a participatory video to contribute to making the process participatory.

In an ideal participatory video process it is necessary to develop a collective ownership of the project. Achieving this requires continued effort throughout the project, beginning with the thoughtful selection of participants and staff, to the degree that it is appropriate. Selection criteria should be determined with consideration of the project details, but there are some general attributes that should be considered, such as an expressed interest in the topic, interest in actively participating and contributing, an appreciation and patience for participatory processes, and flexibility. In addition to the personal attributes, attention should also be given to putting together a team of people that will likely work well together. Once the project members are selected the group should begin working together as soon as realistically possible. Various purpose driven group exercises can be used early on in the process to help the group coalesce.

In creating a sense of collective ownership of a participatory video project there may be some challenges facing the project leaders as they hand over project control to an
unfamiliar group of individuals. There is a certain level of attachment that exists after working for some time to get all the required components of a project in place. To mitigate the potential for this ownership conflict to occur the project leaders could do two things. One, be aware that they will likely become attached to the project, and be pro-active to ensure that they do release control. And then seek feedback to determine if successful. Two, is the project leaders would like to maintain some element of authority over the process they must clearly state to the participants at the beginning of the project their intentions, and explain their reasons for remaining in control. In a similar notion, all project members should explicitly state their biases and assumptions at the beginning of the project. It may be difficult to be forthright in announcing internal biases and assumptions, but there are a number of exercises that can help facilitate that process. Continuing with the communication theme, at the early stages of the process a series of key terms should be defined and explicitly integrated into the process. This includes the concept of participation, and how participatory the group intends to be throughout project and at what scales this applies to. Goals and objectives of the project should be routinely reviewed, discussed and if needed revised throughout the project. The facilitator leading this review, must maintain that concerns which are raised be acted upon in a meaningful way. This endorses the concept that the project is a product of the collective group. In addition to reviewing the goal and objectives of the project, it is important to review and evaluate the project process collectively. This includes reviewing the facilitation. Working with a good facilitator is of critical importance. When conducting all these above-mentioned reviews, it is important to take a number of different approaches at soliciting feedback, to acknowledge that people may gravitate towards different review methods.

Skill development and shaping the story are two stages of a participatory video project that should be designed to accommodate a high degree of participation. Following the skill development framework outlined in chapter 3, the emphasis is on learning through collective input, that uses a skill audit as the starting point. When shaping the video story, facilitators and mentors need to remain true to their roles as enablers and refrain from becoming engaged in content discussions. A critical point here is that the
participants have a specific mechanism to discuss and influence the process if they are not content with the way it is being delivered. In shaping the story the facilitators and mentors need to act as enablers, and not directors. As Jennifer Kawaja indicates this is a challenging task as the facilitator “experiences a constant struggle to find a balance between being directive and letting participants take initiative, between structuring and letting things evolve spontaneously, and between authoritarianism and nondirective dialogical approaches” (1994: 141). This ongoing challenging and questioning is what in many respects what defines this as a participatory video process, and not just a video making process.

It is also important to recognize that time is a factor in the level and success of project participation. While it is likely possible to produce a participatory video within a relatively short period of time, the process and results are going to be significantly different than a full participatory video process. The time factor is addressed with more detail in answering question three.

The most important action that can be taken to support the participatory nature of the project is to work with a good facilitator. Often people that are not professional facilitators underestimate the degree of difficulty that facilitation entails. The basic role of a facilitator is to make participation happen. It is not enough to simply ask participants if they have anything to say. A facilitator should make sure that everybody has a chance to share their views, and not everyone responds the same when given certain opportunities, but a good facilitator will rely on a number of techniques to draw out everyone’s perspectives. It is also important for a facilitator to draw out participants’ hidden agendas. Facilitators should make people actively listen, and accept different perspectives. A facilitator needs to understand when to intervene and direct and when to step back and let the group move forward independently. This involves extensive planning balanced with thinking on the spot to create a dynamic approach that reaches stated goals and objectives. Facilitators must remain content neutral and detach themselves from actively expressing their views on the subject. Learning how to
become an effective facilitator involves continued feedback and personal reflection that allows the participants to influence the process, as they deem necessary.

In summary there are a number of actions that can be integrated into a participatory video process to ensure a relatively high degree of participation. The underlying need is to create an environment where the project group has a sense of shared ownership. In achieving this the most critical element is to have a good facilitator.

3. Costs and Time

*How can a participatory video process be adapted to fit low budget and time constraints?*

One of the primary challenges for using participatory video as a practical planning tool is the time and cost associated with production. The Carrall Street project cost roughly $170,000 and required approximately one year to complete. That timeline and cost figure is highly prohibitive. In answering the question posed in this section I will put forth some key considerations and draft a rough outline for a drastically scaled down participatory video project.

After reflecting on the ideal participatory framework that I proposed in chapter 3, and my experience with the Carrall Street project, there are a number of critical points to consider when developing a participatory video framework. Conceptually, I see them in two separate categories, one is operational and the other relates to core values of a participatory video process. Operationally the points of interest are scale and scope. Through focusing on these two concepts a participatory practitioner can expand or reduce the level of operational complexity and thus associated time and cost. From a value perspective it is important for a participatory video process of any kind to remain focused on participation, skill development, production and application.
Scale

A constant question that arose throughout presentations and discussion regarding participatory video is that of scale. By scale I am referring to the size of the production in terms of the participant group and the production process. I have yet to come across a case of participatory video being used at any scale larger than the neighbourhood or community level. Lars Johansson, an accomplished participatory video practitioner operating out of Zanzibar, Tanzania described situations in which entire villages (maybe 200-400 people) turn out to watch the day’s video shoot (2000). While the entire village may watch the video, and provide input, they are not all actively involved in the production process. Due to the involved nature of the process, I cannot imagine conducting a participatory video at the city wide, regional, provincial or national scale. In this regard, I think there is a practical limit to the number of people that can be involved in a participatory video process. If the intent is to reduce the time and cost needed to produce a participatory video then focusing on small, cohesive groups is the way to continue. A key point here is cohesiveness of the group. Participatory video can be, and has been, used to bring a group of diverse people together, or to serve as a form of conflict resolution, which focuses more on the therapeutic values of the process. Working with a diverse or conflicted group would require significantly more time. Thus to reduce time and cost working with a group that has a solid working relationship is preferred.

In terms of the scale of production process I think it is possible to work with a number of different sized processes. For the Carrall Street project, there were 6 staff members working a total of approximately 2500 hours (this is a rough estimation, since we did not keep a record of hours) over the course of one year. Based on the nature of the case, and the objectives this was appropriate, but I think there is room to significantly reduce the amount of staff involvement and time. But in order to reduce the scale of the production process the entire project has to be properly scoped.
Scoping

The scoping of a participatory video project likely has the most impact on the overall cost and time required to complete the project. By scoping I am referring to the degree that the project details are defined prior to participant involvement. The more narrowly the project is defined the lower the time and cost factors. The challenge for the practitioner developing the project is to ensure that the project still adheres to the concepts that are unique to participatory video. The tendency would be to move to a more product oriented production style and an authoritative management structure. It is important to draw attention again to the fact that participatory video is a dynamic process that may be defined in any way that suits the users. Rather than viewing video productions as participatory or not, it may be more useful to consider it as a spectrum of possibilities.

To help understand how scoping could reduce the time and cost factors of a participatory video process let’s look at some of the values that I associate with participatory video. I have reiterated that participation, skill development, production and application are key elements of a participatory production. I will focus here on describing how these key values could be kept through a scaled down process.

Participation

What makes a participatory process successful? The literature suggests that a successful process depends less on the formal method of involvement than on the underlying qualities of openness, trust, respectful interaction, shared control and agency commitment. (Robinson, 2002)

Working from this quote from Les Robinson, I will focus this discussion on the underlying qualities identified through his literature review. The qualities of openness, trust and respectful interaction can to a large degree be addressed through careful
selection of a participant group. As mentioned earlier, working with an existing cohesive group of participants can dramatically streamline the production process, and as Robinson suggest, also contribute to making the process participatory. However, it is not sufficient to assume that a group, cohesive as they may be, are open, trusting and respectful. Therefore, a significant amount of time should be spent reinforcing these qualities. A good starting point is to have the group divulge existing biases and assumptions. There are a number of different techniques available to extract this information from the participants, including mapping exercises, word association, open discussion, and role reversal exercises. Developing trust takes time, and is difficult to achieve in a short period of time. However, by working with an existing group and using a minimal amount of staff to facilitate the project it is reasonable to assume that the existing trust within the group (if it does exist) would be continued throughout the production process. Unlike trust, maintaining a respectful work environment can be achieved while working with a short timeline. A common practice with group work is to collectively generate a code of conduct. Without going to the extreme of Roberts Rules of Order, it is reasonably easy to generate some basic protocol. Then it is the responsibility of the group, and the facilitator, to enforce that protocol and effectively address any discrepancies.

While it is helpful to outline the underlying qualities that lead to a successful participatory process, the most important factor is the facilitator. The facilitator is the single person responsible for ensuring that the process is participatory. One of the many tasks of the facilitator is to maintain Robinson’s fourth quality of successful participation, shared control. Since I am focusing on a scaled down participatory process it is not reasonable to completely turn over the project control to the participants, but that does not infer that control cannot be shared. It comes back to scoping. The project can be scoped, for efficiency purposes, to state that the project facilitator is responsible to guide the group through an outlined process. But, the project participants can influence that process through regularly scheduled evaluation and feedback sessions. Through scoping the facilitator can identify key decisions that will be made by the participants. By soliciting participant feedback at critical times in the
process it is feasible to promote a shared control of the project, while still working towards efficiency.

Robinson’s fifth and final quality of successful participation is agency commitment. This can be achieved through proper screening of involved agencies, confirmed through the biases and assumptions discussion and monitored through the ongoing evaluation and feedback.

Production

Production is the act of making the video. In the “ideal” participatory video framework that I described in chapter 4, the production is done completely by the participants. The participants develop the skills they deem necessary to make the video, and the production mentors are there as support. Assuming that the participants are entering the process with little to no video experience, this process of developing the skills and producing the video entirely themselves, is a time-consuming process.

To reduce the time and costs associated with that type of “ideal” participatory video framework, I proposed scaling back some of the skill development and participant oriented production. The participants in the Carrall Street project dedicated between 200 and 300 hours of their time to the project. With the Carrall Street project the participants were receiving benefits that justified the time they spent on the project. The youth were gaining valuable skills in video making and job placements, as well as a nominal amount of pay. And the students were gaining video skills, practical experience with an innovative planning process, and 12 credits worth of academic credit. To expect a community member to dedicate 200 to 300 hours of their time, unpaid, is unreasonable. In talking to other participatory planners about the time demands of the process followed in the Carrall Street case, they thought it to be a highly prohibitive factor if it were to be implemented as standard practice.
Skill development and active participation in the video making process is one of the trademark elements of participatory video. But, it is also one of the most prohibitive factors. With the aim of drastically minimizing the time and cost associated with participatory video process, perhaps the best option is to focus on the development of story telling skills, rather then the technical skill of video production. This may be blasphemous to the participatory video purists, but I believe it is needed if participatory video has any hope of become a useable planning tool. The basic idea is that the participants shape the story, script the shots, write the story board, participate in reviews, and become familiar with the process of video making, but do not necessarily do most of the technical video making themselves. I say necessarily, because I think it should be left open for those participants who are keen to learn, but for those who have neither the interest nor the time, they have an option to still participate and create their own story without the heavy time commitment.

Under this model of participatory video more emphasis is placed on developing the story, and the thought that goes into creating a video, and less emphasis on the technical aspect of video making. I think that many of the benefits and characteristics that define participatory can still be in place, but without necessarily learning the technical skills need to make a video.

To flush out the details of how a cost and time restricted participatory video would unfold, I developed a project framework, and budget for a participatory video process that costs $30,000 and can be completed in 3 months. See appendix 7 for the details.

Research Conclusion

Through this final chapter I incorporated the insight gained through the Carrall Street project, and the notions put forward in the “ideal” participatory framework to address a series of three research questions. While the answers are not definitive, since they are heavily connected to a single case, they should prove valuable to those interested in conducting a participatory video project.
In conclusion I draw out some of the findings that I consider paramount. Participatory video is not a process that can accomplish everything. There are indeed many valuable goals that can be attained through participatory video, but there are also associated trade-offs. It is critically important to focus on the goals that are best suited to the needs of the specific case. Once the goals are established a suitable project framework needs to be developed in order to realize those goals. In conducting a participatory video project, it is important to establish clear forms of communication, and imbed ongoing evaluation into the process. Work with a good facilitator and establish a collective ownership of the project. If attempting to conduct a participatory video project with a relatively small budget and short timeline, be realistic about what the outcomes will be, and pay particular attention to the ethical risks.

This research has been an extremely valuable experience, both personally and professionally. Throughout the process of being intimately engaged in the Carrall Street case I developed a great interest in participatory video and a respect for the potential that this medium has as a potential planning tool. I leave this project with a strong belief that participatory video, if appropriately applied, can be a valuable planning tool. While I have addressed three questions through this research, I have uncovered many more. My intent is to further pursue ways in which participatory video can be successfully applied as a planning tool through Ear to the Ground Planning Inc.
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Appendixes

Appendix 1: Carrall Street Greenway: Detailed Design and Implementation

GENERAL MANAGER'S COMMENTS

The General Managers of Community Services and Engineering Services RECOMMEND approval of the foregoing.

COUNCIL POLICY

In 1989, 1990 and 1994, Council approved the False Creek Policy Statement, the Coal Harbour Policy Statement and the Central Waterfront Port Lands Policy Statement, all of which include policies to create waterfront walkways-bikeways along their respective waterfronts.

On July 18, 1995 Council approved the Vancouver Greenways Plan. This plan supports the development of Greenways to support walking and cycling opportunities to local connections and promote community building. A total of 14 “citywide” greenways were identified, including a greenway from False Creek to Burrard Inlet between Cambie and Main Streets.

On July 28, 1998, Council confirmed principles to provide general guidance to actions and planning on the Downtown Eastside, Chinatown, Gastown and Strathcona, which include encouraging legitimate commercial activity, improving conditions at the street level, improving SROs, reducing crime, and helping community people find allies and seek a common future.

On July 9, 2002 Council approved the Downtown Transportation Plan to improve downtown access and liveability by improving streetscapes and creating a balanced transportation system that includes the promotion of walking and cycling in the downtown, and development of Carrall Street as part of a network of downtown greenways and bike routes.

On April 28, 2005 Council approved the concept design and a long term vision for the Carrall Street Greenway and confirmed the objectives that Carrall Street be a greenway that connects Gastown, the Downtown Eastside and Chinatown and build on the unique heritage character of these three neighbourhoods, a greenway that completes the downtown recreational seawall loop by linking False Creek to Burrard Inlet, and a greenway that encourages active ground floor uses and facilitates economic revitalization and community development.

PURPOSE AND SUMMARY

76
The purpose of this report is to update Council on the detailed design of the Carrall Street Greenway and to seek Council approval of the budget and staffing costs for the construction and ongoing maintenance of the Carrall Street Greenway.

This Greenway is proposed as a significant public realm feature that will link False Creek and Burrard Inlet and complete a recreational seawall loop around Downtown Vancouver and Stanley Park. It is also a strategic initiative intended to focus public realm improvements and private investment along the Carrall Street corridor which will attract visitors to the area and stimulate business activities while providing improved neighbourhood areas and employment opportunities for Downtown Eastside residents.
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This report presents special features of the design as well as multiple objectives for the project including additional greening, a granite water feature, recreational and pedestrian amenities, integrated placemaking through programming and arts, and economic revitalization.

The report also seeks Council approval for the construction, maintenance and staffing budget. The total estimated cost to complete the Carrall Street Greenway between Expo Boulevard and Water Street is $5,073,500, the increased annual maintenance cost is $76,500 and the total annual cost for a permanent Landscape Designer, including benefits, is $63,700.

BACKGROUND

The Downtown Eastside (DTES) is a diversity of communities, home to people of differing socio-economic and cultural backgrounds. It is also a neighbourhood that is experiencing considerable changes that create both new opportunities and challenges. Issues of social and economic sustainability and concerns about potential displacement of low-income residents in the face of increasing development pressures have been debated in the community.

The City has implemented a number of policies to address the complexity of these issues with the over-arching goal of area revitalization without displacing existing residents. The City is also a partner in the Vancouver Agreement, a tri-level government urban agreement intended to better coordinate government policies and resources to work together with communities and business in the Downtown Eastside on a coordinated strategy that promotes and supports sustainable economic, social and community development. The Four Pillar Drug Strategy, redevelopment of Woodward’s, Heritage Incentive Program, DTES Housing Plan and the Vancouver Agreement’s DTES Employment Strategy and Economic Revitalization Plan are all part of this comprehensive approach.

Carrall Street represents an intersection of history and contemporary urban life in Vancouver and the DTES. It connects the City’s historic districts of Chinatown, the Hastings Street corridor and Gastown, with the future development along north False Creek. It is also the location of the historical Canadian Pacific Railroad line and
interurban crossing. The street is lined with heritage buildings, dotted with parks, squares and other public realm spaces, and is now the heart of an emerging contemporary arts district. Within this intersection of historic places and built forms, Carrall Street is home to diverse cultures and economies.

One of the key objectives for the Carrall Street Greenway is to be a key driver of economic revitalization in the DTES. It will focus public realm improvements in the area and has already leveraged private investments along the corridor to support new businesses and social enterprises and to provide training and employment opportunities for local residents. An important objective of the Vancouver Agreement’s DTES Employment Strategy is to assist local residents in filling new jobs, including part-time and low-threshold employment opportunities that will be created through increased business activities in the area.
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Discussion of making Carrall Street a unique pedestrian route has taken place in the community for several years. The Carrall Street Stewardship Committee, comprised of local business and non-profit representatives and community residents, was formed in 2002 to help guide the consultation and design process. City staff, working in partnership with the Stewardship Committee, established a set of project principles in 2003, explored various design concepts throughout 2004, and worked towards finalizing the greenway’s design concept amidst broad community support for the project. In April 2005, Council confirmed the objectives for the project, adopted the proposed concept design and instructed staff to proceed with the necessary detailed design.

DISCUSSION

Recommendation A calls for Council approval of the Greenway construction as described in the following section which outlines the Greenway detailed design, as well as drawings and sketches in Appendices B, C, D and E.

1) Greenway Detailed Design
Council approved the concept design for the Carrall Street Greenway where the roadway width is narrowed and parking is removed from one side of the street. This allows the sidewalks to be expanded and dedicated recreational paths to be provided for cyclists, skateboarders and inline-skaters on both sides of the street. The Greenway is subdivided into the Park Zone and the Heritage Zone. (see Appendix A for map and cross sections). Based on the concept design, staff have completed the detailed design for the Greenway and the concept design for the Maple Tree Square, in consultation with the community. Design Features

The detailed greenway design is a balance between creating a continuity of the greenway corridor while celebrating and acknowledging the different communities along the route. Each community along the route has different desires for the greenway features, yet without some unifying features the greenway will lose character and continuity.
One of the most important physical features of the greenway is the street tree alignment. Within the Heritage Zone north of Keefer Street there are three rows of street trees and within the Park Zone there are four rows of street trees. Each of these street trees will add to the street tree canopy and continuity of the greenway throughout the entire corridor. Custom tree grates have been designed to create a unifying design feature to be used at each tree location along the greenway.

Between the street trees on the western side of the street, a shallow granite channel is proposed to signify the ‘water to water’ theme of the greenway. This channel is located between the recreational path and the pedestrian area. Although very shallow, this channel collects rain water from the sidewalk area and funnels it into the street tree pits. Rain water is also reused in six other locations along the greenway in small infiltration gardens (see Appendix C for sketches of the granite channel and tree grate design). Differences in lighting fixtures will help emphasize the different communities along the route. In Chinatown the red lighting poles will be used and in Gastown the standard nine ball features will be used, consistent with existing lighting features in each area. Each of these standard designs will be retrofitted with energy efficient lighting fixtures while still retaining the individual character of each community.

Balancing Needs

Although the concept design approved by Council gave clear direction on the space allocation required for each transportation mode, several minor design modifications were required as part of the detailed design. The most significant change is the provision of a dedicated tour bus loading zone on the west side of Carrall Street between Keefer Street and Pender Street.

In the concept design the tour bus loading zone was located on the NE corner of Keefer Street, in addition to the tour bus loading zone on the south side of Pender Street in front of the Chinese Cultural Centre. In the detailed design another tour bus loading zone will be provided on the west side of Carrall Street opposite the Dr. Sun Yat-Sen Garden (the Garden). There are several concerns related to the location of this tour bus zone on Carrall Street including concerns related to pedestrians exiting the tour bus and interacting with users of the recreational path, as well as pedestrians crossing mid block to access the Garden. The Garden strongly believes their financial future is dependent upon a tour bus loading zone on Carrall Street but they have also acknowledged that should there be operational concerns with this tour bus loading zone, tour bus loading may have to be accommodated on the NE corner of Keefer and Carrall Streets, and/or the one on Pender Street.

Throughout the detailed design process the need for loading and parking was also further defined. Parking spaces and loading zones have been included on the west side of the street wherever possible and discussions have been ongoing with businesses in the area. The geometric design of the street has been further defined to ensure accessibility.
for loading vehicles and tour buses.

**Maple Tree Square**

The original concept design did not include a design for Maple Tree Square or the bike connection on Alexander Street. Further work has been undertaken on these sections and the designs are included in Appendices D and E. The Alexander Street bike lane requires only one significant geometric change related to the parking on the south side of the street. The angle parking in this location would be reversed from nose-in parking to back-in stalls to increase the visibility of cyclists and parking vehicles.

The concept design for Maple Tree Square focuses on making a space to be owned and enjoyed by the community. The main theme of the design is to strengthen Maple Tree Square as a ‘destination’ rather than a place to simply travel through. Discussions have been ongoing with the community regarding how this space should be used and how to incorporate all these potential uses into the geometric design while maintaining the Gastown character.

The concept itself uses a normalized intersection design to maximize the space available for the community and pedestrians on each corner. The intersection is designed to improve the sight lines for all road users therefore creating greater clarity. This also provides more space for programming activities such as sidewalk cafes. Superimposed on this geometric design is the urban design concept with a circular pattern. The traditional red pavers of Gastown are used to create concentric circles reinforcing the ‘destination’ theme of the space. Granite banding is used for the pedestrian crosswalks, for curbs and to announce the edges of the space.
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Further detailed design work for Maple Tree Square will continue in the rest of 2006 and its re-construction is included in the implementation plan presented in this report.

2) Other Activities Related to the Greenway

The Carrall Street Greenway is a focal point for coordinating a variety of design and placemaking projects as well as revitalization initiatives in the area. These projects seek to enhance the visual and physical links between the DTES neighbourhoods and other parts of the City, increase arts and cultural programming opportunities along the corridor and create spaces that showcase community artwork. The following provides description of some of these projects:

- **Pigeon Park Design Improvement**

Pigeon Park, also known as Pioneer Place, is a small (400 square metres or 4300 square feet) park located at Hastings and Carrall Streets. It is well used by the community as a gathering place for residents of the Downtown Eastside. The last major upgrade of the park occurred in the mid-1970s. Improvements that are being considered include replacement of existing elements in the park (concrete surface, benches, drinking fountain, and lamp post) and provision of additional elements (possibly a public toilet
and a covered canopy area; tables, trees, historical references, public art, etc.).

A preliminary concept plan has been prepared and discussed with the public. Additional consultation with park users and low-income community groups will continue this summer. A report to the Park Board is expected in the fall of 2006. The timing of the upgrades to the park will be coordinated with the renovation of the Merchants Bank, the Class A heritage building located immediately west of the park (the Media Centre at 1 West Hastings).

• Conservation and Reuse of Heritage Buildings;

Carrall Street is lined with heritage buildings. The Heritage Incentive Program provides facade grants, density bonuses and property tax abatement to facilitate rehabilitation and active reuse of heritage buildings and to help initiate economic activities in the Heritage Precinct. Appendix F provides a list of recent developments, including market and non-market and heritage and non-heritage projects, occurring along and around Carrall Street that will contribute to the gradual physical transformation of the street.

• Carrall Street Public Art Plan

The Carrall Street Greenway presents a significant opportunity to increase arts and cultural programming in the area, promote creative expression through the arts, encourage ongoing community participation in arts-related activities and showcase public art as an important component of urban placemaking. This corridor has potential to become the most exciting art precinct in the city, rivaling public art projects in many jurisdictions.

The City of Vancouver, through funding received from the Vancouver Agreement, commissioned the development of the Carrall Street Public Art Plan, which builds on the previous consultation and existing planning processes completed to date. Staff will report to Council on this Plan and its implementation in the fall of 2006. Carrall Street Greenway: Detailed Design and Implementation 7

• Programming Opportunities

Improved infrastructure is only one aspect of creating a re-energized Carrall Street. The vision for this urban greenway is to see an increase in active ground floor uses, including sidewalk cafes, galleries with activities promoting pedestrian interest and interaction and community-based arts and cultural programming in public spaces along the corridor. The greenway is designed to provide flexibility for these programming uses to occur.

An extensive public process took place in 2005 to generate ideas for and develop a coordinated approach to encourage community-based programming in public spaces and parks. This work led to the creation of the DTES Public Realm Programming Plan. Development of the Plan was funded by the Vancouver Agreement and Park Board, and
jointly administered by the Planning Department and the Park Board staff. This Plan will become a significant component of the overall DTES Arts & Cultural Investment Strategy. Staff will report to Council on this Strategy in the fall of 2006.

PUBLIC PROCESS & FEEDBACK

Staff began the detailed design work for the Greenway last year, based on the concept design adopted by Council in April 2005. The proposed detailed design outlined in this report was endorsed by the Carrall Greenway Stewardship Committee, the Bicycle Advisory Committee, the Chinatown Historic Area Planning Committee, and the Gastown Historic Area Planning Committee.

Staff also held additional meetings with the Dr. Sun Yat-Sen Garden staff and board to address their concerns regarding the location of the tour bus stop, as previously discussed.

In February 2006, the Stewardship Committee organized a Sustainability Forum with participation of more than 130 local residents, businesses, representatives of diverse community groups, university students and the interdepartmental staff team to discuss how the Carrall Greenway can further the goal of building a sustainable community in the DTES. Many creative ideas were generated through this Forum and some of these ideas have been incorporated into the planning and implementation process of the Greenway. The summary report of this Forum is included in Appendix G.

The interim detailed design was presented to the public at the Car Free Day event that took place in Gastown in September 2005 which was attended by more than 2000 people. Another open house was held in December 2005 at the Centre A Gallery on the corner of Hastings and Carrall Streets to showcase the detailed design ideas and gather feedback from the community; approximately 300 people attended this event. Film footage of the open house held at Centre A Gallery and produced by the Greater Vancouver TV is available for viewing at the recently launched interactive Carrall Street Project website at: http://vancouver.ca/carrall

In addition, a separate open house was held on June 1, 2006, to discuss the concept design for Maple Tree Square and the Alexander Street interim bike connection. The extensive public consultation process held to date indicates strong community support for the Greenway design and proposed strategy.
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FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The total estimated cost to complete the Carrall Street Greenway between Expo Boulevard and Water Street is $5,073,500. This cost includes:

- $3,498,500 for complete street reconstruction including new sidewalks, recreational
paths, street repaving, street trees and landscaping

- $750,000 for trolley line relocation from Coast Mountain Bus Company
- $825,000 for street lighting

Costs associated with items such as the Carrall Street Public Art Plan, Pigeon Park Redesign, Downtown Eastside Public Realm Improvements and Chinatown Community Plan Improvements will all be funded from the relevant program budgets and are not covered in this estimate.

Funding for the construction of the Carrall Street Greenway is available from the following sources:

- $1,500,000 from 2006 Streets Basic Capital for the Carrall Street Greenway
- $73,500 cost sharing from the 2006 Translink Bicycle Program
- $3,500,000 from the 2007 Streets Basic Capital for the Carrall Street

Greenway subject to approval of the 2007 Streets Capital Budget

Applications for cost share funding will also be submitted to Translink and the Province’s Cycling Infrastructure Program for the cycling component of this project. Applications will also be submitted through the Vancouver Agreement to fund the placemaking and economic revitalisation aspects of the greenway. If approved, this funding would be used to add complementary urban design features to the greenway. Any additional funding received from these sources will be reported back through the 2007 Capital Budget Process.

Future operating budgets will be affected by the increased maintenance costs associated with the greenway for a total of $76,500 as follows:

- $33,700 increase to the Traffic Operating Budget for street lighting maintenance
- $40,000 increase to the Streets Operating Budget for street maintenance
- $1,800 increase to the Streets Operating Budget for horticultural maintenance
- $1,000 increase to the Traffic Operating Budget for sign and paint maintenance.

Due to the large number of new materials and treatments incorporated into this greenway design, some maintenance costs have been difficult to estimate. As more information becomes available regarding these maintenance costs, staff will report back on any increases or decreases required to the operating budget.

The conversion of the Landscape Designer into a regular full-time position (as noted in the Personnel Implications) will be funded in 2006 by the Carrall Street Greenway project. For 2007 and beyond, funding will be equally distributed between the Operating and Capital Budget given that the position supports both capital and operating landscape work. Therefore, the annual cost of the position at $63,700, including fringe benefits, will result in an increase to the Engineering Operating Budget of $31,850 in 2007. Carrall Street Greenway: Detailed Design and Implementation 9
PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS

The design of the Carrall Street greenway has absorbed a large amount of Greenways staff resources over the past 4 years. The landscape designer working on this project has been devoted almost full time to this project for the past 2 years and it is anticipated the role of this designer will continue well into the construction phase of the project.

The landscape designer position within the Engineering Services department is currently a temporary position subject to annual review. During that review and based on its six year history, it was determined that this position is needed on an ongoing basis and the work is split evenly between operating and capital. This position will also be involved with the Granville Street redesign, various sustainability initiatives and the on-going promotion and maintenance of existing greenways.

If approved as a regular full-time position the Landscape Designer position will be forwarded to the GVRD Labour Relations Department for review and classification.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

Environmental sustainability is integral to the design of the Carrall Street Greenway. By reallocating existing road space to alternate ‘green’ modes of transportation, walking and cycling are promoted as the most important modes of transportation along the greenway.

Environmental design features of the greenway also includes the use of sustainable materials including recycled granite curbs, installation of energy efficient lighting and the reduction of storm water runoff through the use of infiltration planting areas and permeable materials selection.

The Carrall Street Greenway community discussed and celebrated the various sustainable features of the greenway at the Carrall Street Sustainability Forum in February 2006.

SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The planning process for the Carrall Street Greenway has facilitated several new community partnerships, generated dialogue and built community cohesion. Both public consultation and ongoing, in-depth community engagement are critical elements of this project.

During the past three years, the Stewardship Committee has been an important venue for community members to come together and work with the City staff team to look at ways to better design and program the public spaces along Carrall Street and advocate for interim improvements and a long-term plan for the Greenway.

In addition to the ongoing efforts by the Stewardship Committee, the City has
also undertaken many community-based outreach projects with funding from Western Economic Diversification through the Vancouver Agreement, including:

- “Renovating the Living Room” is a public process outreaching to the low-income community and existing park users, prepared for design improvement in Pigeon Park. The process was designed and coordinated by the Environmental Youth Alliance;
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- Storyscapes Chinatown: a story telling and collection project engaging the Chinese and Aboriginal communities;
- Youth Video Project: engaging at-risk youth in a participatory video project;
- Alexander Street Public Art: a visioning process to engage residents and businesses along Alexander Street to identify public art opportunities and possible public realm improvements; and

- Sustainability Forum: to bring together a wide spectrum of stakeholders to further generate ideas for the Greenway to contribute to a sustainable DTES community.

This Greenway project intends to ensure strong community ownership of the street and public spaces and promote dialogue among different community groups, both of which are critical to the goal of revitalization without displacement. With all of these elements in place, the Project will add another rich layer of meaning to this distinctive part of the City.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

Construction is currently scheduled to commence in October 2006 and continue through 2007. The first block to be constructed will likely be between Keefer Street and Pender Street, adjacent to the Dr. Sun Yat-Sen Garden. By constructing this block through the winter months it is hoped the impact to tourism at the Garden will be minimised.

Following the construction of the block between Keefer Street and Pender Street, crews plan to construct between Expo Boulevard and Keefer Street before completing the northern blocks between Pender Street and Water Street. It is hoped construction of the Block between Cordova and Pender Streets will coincide with Pigeon Park improvements and construction of Maple Tree Square will coincide with the low tourism season in winter 2007. Further consultation will be undertaken with local community groups and affected businesses in the Gastown area as the construction schedule is finalised.

After construction, staff will continue coordinating different aspects of the Greenway implementation and monitor the gradual transformation of the street. This would include information regarding the usage of the greenway as well as developments and activities
along and around Carrall Street. Staff would then proceed with a detailed evaluation of the issues affecting the implementation of the communities’ long term vision for the Carrall Street Greenway and the northern bridge connection. Items such as access requirements, traffic volumes, transit service relocation, crime and policing issues, sidewalk café applications, street activity and function, public art, public realm programming, heritage conservation and business development will be included in this evaluation.

CONCLUSION

The Carrall Street Greenway is a significant public realm feature linking False Creek and Burrard Inlet to complete a recreational seawall loop around Downtown Vancouver and Stanley Park. It is a strategic initiative intended to focus public realm improvements and private investment along the Carrall Street corridor which will attract visitors to the area and stimulate business activities, while providing improved neighbourhood areas and employment opportunities for Downtown Eastside residents.

Carrall Street Greenway: Detailed Design and Implementation

Implementation of the Carrall Street Greenway is timely, given the emerging initiatives in the area and the opportunities presented. The partnership and momentum built with the community in the past years presents a good opportunity to pull together diverse areas of work such as greenway construction, placemaking, urban design, public art, economic revitalization, heritage conservation and park and public realm programming. Staff recommend that Council approve the detailed design of the Carrall Street Greenway and the budget and staffing costs for the construction and ongoing maintenance of this Greenway.

* * * * *
Appendix 2.b.: Youth Brochure

**The Project**

**Part one: Introduction to Production**

February & March

Introduction to film and television skills, community engagement and related planning processes. Production teams will be dispatched to film community events related to the Carrall Street Greenway project.

**Part two: Production**

April & May

Production teams will be made up of Projections and SCARP youth. Each group will build their own five-minute documentaries from preproduction planning all the way through to post-production in May, continuing to use issues related to the Carrall Street Greenway as the central theme.

**Part three: Installation**

June, July & August

The finished piece will be aired at a World Urban Cafe during the World Urban Forum. It will then be part of a wider mixed media showing at the InterUrban throughout the summer. There is the potential for a wider distribution at film festivals and events in Canada and around the world. In addition, this project in its entirety will be profiled on the NFB's 'CitizenShift' website.

**Want to join us? You...**

- Are between the ages of 18 and 29;
- Live or are involved in Vancouver's Eastside or Downtown South;
- Self-identify as street involved or at risk;
- Have an interest or passion for artistic creation, dialogue and group work, and/or community arts;
- Are interested in further education and/or projects in film and video;
- Can commit to a flexible ten-hour work week;
- Are involved with youth support networks in the Downtown Eastside/Downtown South;
- Don't need experience (but it's always an asset);

**Sound good?**

Send a paragraph of interest, a reliable contact number/email, and anything of relevant interest to:

projectionsinvancouver@gmail.com

**The Films Will**

- Serve as a document of the City and Parks Board's community consultation process surrounding the Carrall Street Greenway revitalisation projects;
- Play a large role in Vancouver's artistic contribution to the upcoming World Urban Forum in June;
- Provide the content for a mixed-media show at the InterUrban in July and August;
- Be released into wide distribution throughout the GVRD at grassroots events and forums;
- Be added to the National Film Board (NFB)’s 'Citizen Shift' website, which focuses on socially conscious video production.
Appendix 4: Carrall Street Participatory Video Curriculum

Pre-Production Curriculum (Student)

Goal: The purpose is to prepare the SCARP students with relevant understanding of participatory planning and technical video skills prior to production. We are taking a participatory learning approach that will focus on facilitated group discussions. Due to time limitations we will not be able to cover topics with a great degree of depth. We will provide an introduction to relevant topics related to this project and encourage students to undertake more in depth research on topics that are relevant to their individual research.

1. Introduction (February 23)

Objective: Provide an introduction to participatory planning

- Generate collective goals and objectives for the project (Projections facilitators and mentors in attendance)
- Introduction to participatory community planning: history, why it’s done, pros and cons, and challenges.
- Introduction to Participatory Video: previous applications, brainstorm group definition, watch example of PV and discuss.
- Self reflection: flushing out stereotypes, biases and assumptions.

2. DTES Walk (February 24—March 7)

Objective: Learning about the DTES.
• Each student is scheduled to go on a walk through the DTES with community leader who is working/living in the DTES.

3. DTES (March 9)

*Objective:* Discuss the DTES, and value of self-awareness.

• Intro to story telling: integrating visual and verbal story telling
• Discuss DTES.
  o Students in class mapping exercise
  o Talk about history of DTES (using the students presentation of maps; filled in by facilitators).
• Biases and assumptions: how to raise awareness and manage them when engaged in community planning.
• Hearing vs Listening: reference to John Forrester

4. Video Skills (March 11)

*Objective:* Introduction to the technical components of digital video making.

• Conducted by Projections mentors.
• Intro to camera, audio, shot composition and Final Cut Pro.
• Hand out video bio task.

5. Carrall St. Greenway: Central Area Planning (March 16)

*Objective:* To learn about the Carral St. Greenway Project
• Presentation by City of Vancouver planners on the Carrall St. Greenway Project: history of Carrall St., current stage of the project, connection to the DTES revitalization, and Q and A.

6. Video Lab: Cosmopolis Lab (March)

Objective: Practical editing lab time.

• Overview of Final Cut Pro editing.
• Time to work on your video bio with video mentors on hand to help.

7. Project Preparation (March 23)

Objective: To prepare for working on the participatory video.

• Team work discussion.
• Project discussion: framework, protocol, timeline and procedures.

Production Curriculum (Students and Youth)

Goal: The purpose of the production curriculum is to aid the video making process by facilitating learning on relevant video and planning topics.

Production Schedule: April/May

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday/Group</td>
<td>12-6 pm</td>
<td>6 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday/Lab</td>
<td>10-6</td>
<td>8 hrs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenings</td>
<td>extra curricular</td>
<td>2hrs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Full Group Meeting (April 3)

*Objective:* Introduce team member and work of team building.

- Facilitated by an external facilitator
- Focus on team bonding and introduction exercises
- Show individual intro clips

2. Introduction (April 10-13)

*Objective:* Provide a project and thematic introduction and overview.

- Screen documentary videos that the youth produced on the Carrall St. Greenway.
- Discuss micro Carrall St. issues with guest planner John Ingram, an independent planning consultant working with the Carrall Street Stewardship group.
- Review the standard planning process—conducted by Tom Lancaster, Community Planner with Smart Growth BC.

*Lab:* scavenger hunt of images

*Screenings:* The Salesman, Bus 174, City Scape

3. Training (April 17-20)

*Objective:* Take the technical into the realm of storytelling.

- Why planning? Intro to what the purpose of planning is: why is it done, what does it ideally achieve, and what are the benefits of participatory planning. How can this type of process impact the DTES?
- Discuss how storytelling is used as a method of data gathering and a tool in decision making. How can stories inform and enlighten? Expand this discussion to include
relevance on this process to the DTES. Leave the youth with something to think about regarding themes, to follow-up on next week.

- Understanding the various methods available when shooting documentary film.
- Break into individual groups.

*Lab:* Review footage from previous week and discuss angles, shot composition, and lighting.

*Screenings:* Ready When You Are, Sandspit to Dildo, New Shoes, Ballad of Crowfoot (these are short and will be shown in class and discussed). Other suggested screenings: Deep inside Clint Star, Tarnation (screening at the Interurban April 13)

4. Pre Production Planning (April 24-27)

*Objective:* The reality of subjectivity. Discuss and define the themes.

- Attend and record protest against the cutting of the Youth Advocate position at the City of Vancouver.
- Logic. Introduce the 7-step planning process and the concept of logical problem solving. Work through an example and then help the groups apply this to the planning of their video.
- Consensus based decision-making discussion and examples.
- Discuss themes and how to connect the micro (Carrall St.) with the larger macro planning issues.

*Lab:* Mockumentary: teams will be given a fake documentary subject and will construct the piece from scratch; shot and edited in camera. Screened in class.

*Screenings:* Burden of Dreams, All Gone Pete Tong
5. Pre Production Planning (May 1-3)

Objective: Production and all that entails.

- Pitch session. Each production team will reveal their final production plan and the group will comment and discuss.
- Prepare releases and ethical forms for shooting.
- Review the purpose of the video pieces, and reinforce the intent to reach planners, politicians and decision makers.
- Discuss how this process can be participatory. Each write a definition that we can review at the end to see if we were indeed participatory. At what scale are we participatory?
- Discuss research that is needed.

Lab: Review of group specific shoot.

Screenings: Deep Inside Clint Star

6. Pre Production: Extra Session on Interviews (May 5th)

Objective: To gain a better understanding of how to conduct a good interview.

- Special guess Sudha Krishna, a former CBC senior producer and current Director of Production for a local multi-media company will talk about his extensive experience conducting interviews.

7. Production Beginning (May 8-10)

Objective: To begin production.

- Have a quick check-in to see that the groups are prepared and ready for production.
• No formal class or lab time, the following weeks will be spent with the individual working groups and mentors.

8. Production Review and Introduction to Post Production (May 15-17)

Objective: Review current status and discuss challenges and next steps.

• Each group is given 15 minutes to show footage that is then discussed by the larger group and constructive criticism given.

• Provide a brief introduction about post production process, to get people thinking about editing and the final product.

• Work in groups and develop more detailed treatment.

9. Production (May 17-28)

Objective: Time for the groups to work on their videos.

• Groups have scheduled time to work on their videos and can have mentors available when needed.

• Email, phone and in person check-ups scheduled throughout production.

10. Post Post Production (June 5-9)

Objective: Review final video and discuss production kits.

• Screening of final pieces

• Final Post Production Details:

• Putting the press kit/production binder together. Stills, One pagers, releases, etc.

• Initial discussion about distribution and Schedule.
11. Presentation Preparation (June 10-15)

Objective: To complete the final video process piece and prepare for presentations.
- Discuss and prepare process piece.
- Discuss and prepare for presentations.

12. Screenings and Presentations (June 15-19)

Objective: To screen and present the Carrall Street participatory video
- Friday June 15\textsuperscript{th} Planners for Tomorrow Conference: Partial screening and brief presentation
- Saturday June 17\textsuperscript{th} Super Saturday "Innovations in City Building", a film and video program: Screening
- Saturday June 17\textsuperscript{th} Exposure: Film Night – Film and Video in Youth-Led development – Screening and workshop: Screening and presentation
- Monday June 19\textsuperscript{th} World Planners Congress: Screening and presentation followed by discussion
Appendix 5: Carrall Street Project Monthly Work Plan

January 2006 – Outreach / Introduction

• Outreach and selection process begins for youth team.
• Participatory Action process training.
• Develop curriculum.

February – Introduction

• Initial youth and student team selection.
• Introduction to Video Part 1 – working in the field.
• Workshops – 3 days (2 class - 1 day for film (screening and pre-production).
• Complete the community package: includes Project synopsis, introduction and release for all on camera.

March – Pre-Production

• Sensitivity training and communication contracts.
• Continued documentation of Carrall Street Greenway (Stewardship group, Storyscapes, Pigeon Park and Alexandra street projects).
• Video training: includes education and field exercises.
• Land-use planning discussions: review planning process and discuss Carrall Street specifics.

April – Production

• Workshops – class 3 day a week – additional day for field may be required.
• Brainstorm and identify planning theme for each video.

• Identify break out teams

• Develop video treatment and shooting script.

• Shooting begins.

• Working with mentors to collect footage and interviews.

• Screening of material.

• Editing.

• Working in teams with film mentors for preliminary (rough) edit.

• Identify potential placements and or areas of interest for future option plan.

**May – Production and Post Production**

• Shooting and story development continues.

• Editing.

• Working in teams with film mentors (fine cut).

• Locked picture(s) May 15.

• Distribution options (festivals and alternatives): establish plan.

• Screening event planning.

• Secure placement plan.

**June – Post Production/Distribution**

• Initial evaluation begins.

• Completion and packaged materials.

• Installations.

• World Urban Forum: workshops and presentations
• Post forum screening and editing of footage.
• World Planners screening and presentation.
• Planners For Tomorrow screening and presentation.
• Preparation for Interurban installation.

_July / August - Distribution_

• Installation: design, preparation and promotion.
• Process documentation – pre- production, begin log and capture.
• Interurban exhibition July 19 runs for two weeks.
• Placements.
• Distribution and festival submissions continue.

_September – Placements / Follow-up_

• Festivals
• Evaluation report (surveys, interviews and presentation)
• Post Production on process and evaluation visual piece.
Appendix 6: Carrall Street Project Outcomes

- 4 completed videos √
- identifying relevant planning issue √
- 6 portfolios (projections participants) √
- Participant placements (projections) √
- SCARP student completion (paper and credits completed) (in progress)
- 70-80% completion of participants √
- 6- projections youth + 6 SCARP youth (5 youth and 6 SCARP)
- Production of documentary and supporting footage √
- Background paper and evaluative report - completed by primary partners (in progress)
- Template (model) for further partnerships (projects): Ear to the Ground and Cosmopolis Lab. (discussions in progress)
- Development of model for collaborative and participatory action research video making. (in progress)
- Distribution of films through identified (and additional paths). √
- Final screening for participants and the public. √
Appendix 7: 30 in 3

The purpose of this section is to put together a framework to conduct a participatory video for $30,000 in three months. In creating this framework I will adhere to the operational points of interest outlined above, as well as the stated participatory video values. In developing the project outline I refer to the "ideal" framework described in chapter 4.

Scale and Scoping

For the purposes of this exercise I am going to fabricate a potential client and any relevant details as needed. The following list details some of the relevant facts about the client organization.

- Existing, cohesive organization;
- Well functioning organizational structure with active board and respected leader;
- Interested in using participatory video as part of a visioning process;
- Video will be used as advocacy piece to promote the application of their vision;
- Organization is faced with a tight timeline and need the final video output as soon as possible;
- Organization has half of the money required for the project, the other half needs to be fundraised;
- Organization has coordinated a group of participants willing to work on the project;
- The participants will spend some time before the project begins to develop some conceptual thoughts and build momentum before the project begins;
- The participant group:
o Have committed to attending two meetings a week, each lasting three hours over a three months period, with an additional 3 full days over the weekend, and the organization's leader is willing to attend at least 6 meetings to assist the project facilitator where needed;

o Are interested in video, but not willing to take the time to learn all of the skills required to produce a video themselves;

o Are willing to hand over most of the technical aspects of video making to the project staff;

o Are willing to adopt the participatory video making framework proposed by the production staff;

As stated, the goal is to produce a participatory video within three months for a cost of $30,000. The final video will be no more than ten minutes in length. Limits will be set on the total production time, and subsequently the video will not be polished to broadcast quality. The approach is similar to that of a design charrette, where creativity supercedes the degree of completeness.

Production and Participation

Due to the organizational interest in using the participatory video primarily as a visioning and advocacy tool, effort will not be focused on developing video skills. However, the participant group will be introduced to the basics of video making, and will develop details audio and video scripts, determine the shot list, select and conduct interviews (as deemed necessary) and participate in regular review sessions. The only
aspect of the production that participants will not be actively involved in is the editing. Editing is the most technical component of video making, and the most time consuming to learn. At least one participant representative will be onsite for all video recording to direct and discuss specific shot details. The participant group will write a detailed editing script and then attend regular reviews of rough edits to provide comments and feedback to the production mentor.

In this case the participatory video framework will be adapted to be used as a visioning tool. The story represented in the video will include a documentation of various visioning exercises and discussions, and culminate in a final vision represented through video. The total video will be no more that 10 minutes in length with approximately 5 minutes containing vision process footage and 5 minutes of the vision itself. The participatory video coordinator, project facilitator and the participant group leader will develop the specific visioning exercises, which will be vetted through the entire participant group. While the participant group will not be involved in developing the initial project process, systematic feedback and evaluation on the process will be integrated into the framework.

Conceptually it is relatively easy to develop a participatory video process that can be completed within three months, but to develop a budget that accommodates the project needs for $30,000 is indeed a challenge. The majority of the budgeted to staff costs. A total of almost 600 hours of staff time is expected to complete the project. Staffing needs are divided into the following roles:
- Project Coordinator: project development and overall management.
- Project Facilitator: visioning and meeting facilitation, and video production.
- Production Mentor: video production.
- Project Administrator: administration and communication.
- Technician: technical trouble shooting and video mastering and duplication.

In order to keep costs low there are some project needs that will have to be donated through in-kind contribution. It is assumed that the organization has access to an appropriate meeting space. Participants are assumed to have access to laptop computers that can be used for word processing. Participants are also assumed to cover transportation and food costs, and will not be given an honorarium for their time. It should also be noted that the equipment costs are well below rental costs, and are priced for depreciation, maintenance and repairs, which assumes that the production team has equipment that can be allocated for the project. GST is also not included in the budget.

The following budget is provided as a rough estimate of the costs associated with the production of the participatory video production process outlined above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>30 in 3 BUDGET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAFF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Mentor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EQUIPMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Camera</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$1,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microphone</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tri-Pod</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editing Suite</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>$6</td>
<td>$672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Drive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,988</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUPPLIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DV Tapes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>$1</td>
<td>$20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing</td>
<td></td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc</td>
<td></td>
<td>$342</td>
<td>$342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$712</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OVERHEAD**
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROJECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the proposed outline to produce a 10 minute participatory video for $30,000 in three months is ambitious, I believe it is possible provided time limitations are adhered to and a competent project team is assembled.