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Placemaking for Socially Resilient Site Design is a project focused on clarifying and characterizing social resilience. This project used ethnographic methods to answer the question: what qualities of place affect the downtown community’s desires for a temporary landscape in Wichita, Kansas? Through literature review this project further defined what social resilience meant at the site scale. Social resilience was operationalized as social systems ability to maintain function while promoting social trust, reciprocity, collaboration, and character between networks of varying scales (Putnam 1995).

Literature review provided the foundational knowledge on creative placemaking, a design strategy used to improve community prosperity through a sense of place and imageability (Artscape 2014). Place is determined by a user’s surroundings, and more importantly the memory of social engagement on site (Fleming 2007). Creative placemaking design strategies are valuable and specific to location. Therefore, it was imperative I incorporated ethnographic research methods to answer my focus question. Ethnographic research investigates cultural patterns and themes expressed or observed by a community (LeCompte et al. 1991). This form of research is unconventional for the typical site design process in landscape architecture. However, it proved to be effective in determining the most successful site use and organization. The ethnographic research allowed me to inventory and document user’s most desirable site needs and programming through the stakeholder design charrette and individual interviews.

In November 2014 the Wichita Downtown Development Cooperation requested our team as a partner in developing a temporary landscape for downtown Wichita, Kansas. The site was already selected with the intention of becoming Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. Funding for this project was awarded to the WDDC in the form of a $146,025 grant from the Knight Foundation.

Using an iterative community feedback process with five ethnographic interviews, I reevaluated the WDDC’s initial Pop-Up Park plan resulting from a community charrette. Recurring themes from interviews were identity crisis of downtown, outdoor preference, lack of residential amenities, negative perception of active and public transit, downtown lifestyle, Wichita as a place for families, and lack of nighttime activation. Using the recurring interview themes, I proposed a plan conducive to social resilience.
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1. INTRODUCTION & BACKGROUND
Introduction & Background
In 2007, the largest percentage of world population became urban for the first time in history (Ahern 2011). This trend is continuing, by 2050 it is projected that seventy percent of the world’s population will live in cities. As the world grows increasingly urban the "profound impacts on land-use, human welfare, social equity, and sustainability" become clearer (Ahern 2011). Therefore, human sustainability and vitality will be decided in cities and their metro regions.

Resilience is a system’s capacity to adapt and recover to its original state after a disturbance (Holling 1973). Urban areas will require resilience to adapt to fundamental social and ecological changes. Both natural and cultural processes are prone and subject to unexpected change. “While the concept of resilience is intellectually intriguing, it remains largely unpracticed in contemporary urban planning and design” (Ahern 2011). Yet, it is critical for urban landscapes to demonstrate both social and ecological resilience to ensure human vitality (Ahern 2011).

When initially introduced, sustainability in urban design and planning was regarded as a static concept. Designed urban landscape systems continuously failed because they lacked social and ecological resilience. In response, a new theory was proposed: resilience theory offers a possible solution to ensure human sustainability by promoting social and ecological resilience in a variety of urban systems and processes. Environments with stable and durable character are considered resilient: Resilience is demonstrated when systems are capable of regaining original function after unpredictable disturbance(s). “Building resilience capacity through landscape and urban planning requires that planners and designers identify the stochastic [random] processes and disturbances that a particular landscape or city is likely to face, the frequency and intensity of these events, and how cities can built the adaptive capacity to respond to these disturbances while remaining in a functional state of resilience” (Ahern 2011). To be effective, design for resilience must be based on the environmental, ecological, societal, and economic influences and dynamics specific to location; system interventions must be analyzed and able to adapt to unexpected change(s) at a variety of scales (Ahern 2011).

Resilience in urban design is frequently identified as having two parts, social and ecological resilience.
For this report, social resilience is operationalized through Robert Putnam’s characteristics of social capital; it is social systems ability to maintain function while promoting social trust, reciprocity, collaboration, and character between networks of varying scales (Putnam 1995). Ecological resilience is defined and operationalized based on C.S. Holling’s foundational research: resilient landscapes are capable of absorbing stress while maintaining system function.

Urban planners and designers are responsible for the development of a design process that harmoniously protects both social and ecological systems. Socially resilient landscapes form when urban spaces evoke positive, meaningful experiences and memories. Ecologically resilient landscapes are more capable of absorbing human induced disturbances while maintaining system functionality. Several scholars have already established the need for increased ecological resilience, such as C.S. Holling, Bryan Walker, and David Salt. However, these scholars do not define or reveal characteristics of social resiliency.

It is critical for this report to acknowledge the importance and necessity of both social and ecological resilience to sustain civilization. Ecological resilience is required in cities for human survival; however, this research study focuses on defining and developing social resilience in urban planning and design. Further explanation of ecological resilience can be found in Appendix B. Appendix B defines and characterizes ecological resilience and its symbiotic relationship with social resilience.

This report uses qualitative research methods to further define social resilience. Using Lynch’s theories of imageability and Ronald Fleming’s strategies for creative placemaking, this research study’s conclusions will be applied to a temporary, urban landscape, design proposal in downtown Wichita, Kansas. Two cities were initially considered when determining a location for a temporary landscape installment. Wichita and Manhattan, Kansas both displayed advantageous qualities in terms of potential stakeholders, community engagement, catalytic site opportunity, and renewed progressivism in downtown regions. Eight weeks were devoted to finding local stakeholders willing to invest in a temporary landscape in downtown Manhattan, Kansas. Formal proposals for site design and funding were drafted and distributed to interested correspondents. After little response in Manhattan, stakeholders in Wichita were approached. Wichita was ultimately chosen because the stakeholder’s enthusiastic response. As a group we unanimously voted to partner with the WWDC to collaborate on the design and implementation of a temporary landscape for downtown Wichita, Kansas.

“The development of urban space is essential to the activities of life in the city, as it supports the activities of the public domain” (Bettelheim 1998, 5). A final site-scale, temporary, urban design proposal evolved through literature review, landscape analysis, ethnographic interviews, and peer and stakeholder collaboration. The ethnographic methods were used to collect information to support improved social resilience on site. Analysis included the inventory and site analysis of the ‘pit’ on Douglas Avenue in downtown Wichita. The final design proposal explored a single site-scale, modular, temporary design using creative placemaking strategies for implementation. Site design programming featured locally influenced and fabricated elements amplifying urban imageability, and ultimately social resilience.

Wichita’s Downtown Development Corporation’s mission is to enable visitors and residents to live, work, shop, play, and learn in
a walkable, urban environment that fosters a sense of community (Wichita 2013). In the last four years $300 million has been invested in the development of downtown Wichita (Eagle 2014). This trend is continuing well into 2015 with a minimum of $175 million investments going into the Douglas Avenue corridor alone. The WDDC recently won a generous grant from the Knight Foundation, a media company that once owned the Wichita Eagle. The Knight Foundation started as a private, independent foundation to help local college students, and has evolved into a national private foundation to help foster and engage communities. The $146,025 grant was awarded to the WDDC because their application submission demonstrated “a real sense of place for everyone and anyone” (Eagle 2015). Money received from the foundation was awarded to activate public space through urban design. The site location, “a pit” excavated for an earlier, private development project which stalled five years earlier, was determined prior to submission of the grant. The ‘pit’ exists along Douglas Avenue between Main and Market, within proximity to three other downtown revitalization project sites: River Vista, Bidding Exchange, and Railroad Depot.

The ‘pit’ location was chosen because of its high visibility and infamous reputation. Fortunately, the site also met many of the qualifications identified through peer research for being a suitable, advantageous location for study. The site is an urban lot with public access directly to Wichita’s main thoroughfare, Douglas Avenue. The space is underutilized and within walking proximity to a core downtown residential population. For nearly a decade the hole in the ground has created a “sore spot in the revitalization of the heart of downtown” (Eagle 2014). Prior to the economic recession, developer Kelly Donham owned the plot of land with the intention to build a new hotel and conference center. In 2007 the recession interrupted construction, and left a gaping hole in its midst. Three years ago Robert Eyster and Michael Ramsey purchased the Douglas Avenue property. The duo, known as Bokeh development, plans to eventually develop the site into a Class A office building. Until then, both property owners are enthusiastic about the activity a temporary park will bring to the site.

The ‘pit’ is located in an ‘8am-5pm’ sub-district of downtown Wichita. This area has one of the highest concentrations of workers in the entire downtown region. Thus, the WDDC envisions the space as a daytime attraction to congregate and facilitate activities such as food trucks, movies, and modular games. The park is an interim solution that fits within the WDDC’s grant budget. As downtown Wichita continues to develop and improve existing vacant, and underutilized lots, the site will be reprogrammed. The Douglas Pop-Up Park is designed for adaptability and modularity. When the lot is developed, the park will be transported to a new, vacant location. Therefore, it was critical that site programming and furnishings be durable and modular because within 3-5 years the ‘pit’ will be cleared for building construction. Additional funding was built into the grant to support stolen or misplaced site furnishings. However, continued park maintenance and eventual relocation will come from a variety of public-private partnerships, including some involvement by the Wichita Parks and Recreation agency.

“Eyster and Ramsey [were responsible for] preliminary site work to ready the ground for dirt in the first quarter” (Eagle 2014). The project’s starting date was dependent on the simultaneous start of the River Vista project, as soil removed from the River Vista project was needed to fill the existing Douglas Avenue hole. The original goal was to have design and implementation finished by summer of 2015. This gave the WDDC, developers, and construction workers three months to design and build Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park.
Figure 1.2 demonstrates the project process as it evolved; beginning with literature reviews and ending with a site design proposal. Site programming was based on strategies found in literature review, ethnographic interviews, and peer research and collaboration. Prior to design and analysis, I sought and received approval from Kansas State University’s Institutional Review Board to ensure all human subject research was done in an equitable, safe, and legal manner. Analysis and observation occurred on site over a period of three days so data accurately reflected site use and patterns during varying days and times. On-site observations and a stakeholder design charrette informed the proposal for an adaptable, modular public space; the entire design process was based in combination with peer research and stakeholder collaboration.

Exploratory, ethnographic interviews with stakeholders occurred throughout the design process. One-on-one, open-ended interviews exposed existing perspectives, desired programming, and site design feedback. Interviews with residents who live and work in downtown led to a reevaluation of designs generated during the charrette for the Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. Through narrative interviews, participants revealed unmet needs of the downtown community. This ethnographic approach to gathering information for site design through carefully analyzed interviews is unconventional within the field of landscape architecture. The ethnographic data was integral to the revision of Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. By integrating the ethnographic data into the site design reevaluation process I was able to create a space with more promise of being socially resilient.
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DILEMMA

In landscape architecture, there is a large body of literature about ecological resilience. Some of this literature refers to social aspects of resilience, but few authors clearly define or provide strategies for fostering social resilience through site scale design. The location for this study is a derelict urban lot in the eastern portion of the downtown district of Wichita, Kansas. There is not a sense of place for people who live and work in the western, sub-district of downtown Wichita.
By synthesizing ideas of resilience, social resilience, and social capital from literature, this project begins with a framework for site scale design that uses creative placemaking. This project seeks to develop a renewed sense of place through a design process that incorporates principles of imageability for the downtown sub-district, as determined by people who live and work downtown.

What qualities of place affect the downtown community’s desires for a temporary landscape in Wichita, Kansas?
Little contemporary precedent exists on how to treat urban parks (Cranz 1982). Galen Cranz, in *Politics of Park Design*, reflects on contemporary park design as “confusion and failure” (Cranz 1982, viii). Modern park design frequently uses a “scattershot approach” to site programming and organization (Cranz 1982, vii). Rather than allowing the environment and user community to determine the park design, landscape architects combine a conglomeration of different historically successful elements to accommodate a broader variety of users. This approach rarely incorporates user input necessary to create a sense of place. Urban parks are failing because they are reflecting a false identity or no sense of place at all (Fleming 2007). User’s values, everyday behavior, and participatory action must be attained for urban landscapes to prosper (Hester 2006).

In *Design for Ecological Democracy*, Randolph Hester acknowledges the importance of participatory design, but goes on to admit the physical city needs a radical shift in contemporary development processes for social transformation (Hester 2006). “City form influences our daily lives. City form concretizes our values and reflects them back to us. City form can make us a more resilient society and more fulfilled individuals” (Hester 2006, 7). Traditional methods in landscape design fail to address design principles founded in everyday human values and behavior (Hester 2006). Oftentimes participatory design consists of a casual survey or questionnaire aimed to determine landscape programming preferences. However, as Hester recognizes, information received from participatory design often lacks data pertaining to user’s everyday behavior.

The ethnographic methods used in this report attempt to determine user’s values and behavior patterns to increase social resiliency at Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. A stakeholder design charrette and ethnographic interviews were used to determine user’s preferences based on open-ended prompts. The list of prompts were created to begin with more broad questions then continue to narrow to more specific questions pertaining the design of Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. This technique allowed participants to prioritize and narrate responses. Therefore, responses were more personal and organic to fit their values and behavior patterns. From these interviews I was able to conclude design strategies based on user’s existing routines. This study has the potential to serve as an example for the landscape architecture profession, offering a precedent for the significance of ethnographic research in the site-scale design process.
This research study demonstrates how social resilience can be amplified through creative placemaking in urban design. Social resilience “requires building an adaptable social infrastructure to assure meaningful participation and achieve equity in the face of socio-economic change and disturbance, and meaningful participation by stakeholders in planning and policy decisions” (Ahern 2011). This study uses an operationalized definition of social resilience adapted for application in downtown Wichita based upon established definitions of social capital. A leading scholar, Robert Putnam explains in Bowling Alone: America’s Declining Social Capital, social capital is the compilation of social organization that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit (Putnam 1995). According to Putnam, life is made easier by living in a community with a substantial stock of social networks, norms and trust. Communities with abundant networks of civic engagement encourage reciprocity and social trust. The same networks also “facilitate coordination and communication, amplify reputations, and allow dilemmas of collective actions to be resolved” (Putnam 1995).

Social resilience is therefore based on civic systems’ capacity to promote four core qualities: social trust, reciprocity, collaboration, and character between networks of varying scales. The civic systems combined ability to adapt and prosper over time determines the success of social resilience in communities. In other words, social resilience depends on how “social connections and civic engagement pervasively influence our public life, as well as our private prospects” (Putnam 1995, 30). Social network’s function to trust promotes solidarity, or individual’s connections with a community. Reciprocity in social systems enables bonding within networks and between different networks, capable of operating between social networks of different scales. When reflecting on past success, socially resilient communities embrace collaboration recognizing its service as a cultural template. Dense social networks of interaction influences individual’s “sense of self, developing the ‘I’ into the ‘we,’ or enhancing the [individuals] ‘taste’ for collective benefits” (Putnam 1995, 42).

Cities require social resilience to maintain system function when disturbances, or stress, develop. Disturbances can take shape in a variety of forms: natural disaster,
technological advancement, and climate change are all examples of how disturbances can directly, and indirectly, affect social resilience in cities. Cities and communities with strong social capital are more resilient to the stresses of unexpected disturbance. For example, once the flood waters from Hurricane Katrina receded along the devastated New Orleans coast in 2005 the city was quickly drowned with swarms of concerned community members and volunteers. New Orleans’ strong social systems demonstrated the power and importance of engaged communities during and after disturbances. “Every disaster carries with it remarkable stories of heroism and courage that rekindle the spirit and provide hope for renewal” (Cowen 2005). New Orleans natives contribute their respectively quick recovery to their strong sense of community and character (Cowen 2005).

As New Orleans demonstrates, social resilience is critical for urban vitality. A socially resilient, urban space that exhibits all four qualities of successful social systems allows civic engagement to flourish. Shared civic space is a conduit for social capital fueling potential for civic engagement. Public space in urban environments offer individuals a place to gather and potential for social engagement. These spaces create a foundation for strong social resilience in cities. Urban landscapes developed through creative placemaking encourage the growth and repair of social resilience through a sense of place and imageability.

The process of creating a strong, imageable site is a form of creative placemaking, or a process between user and landscape to develop a meaningful, engaging, and flexible space for any given user. Creative placemaking allows urban spaces to be reinvented through urban design, public art, historic preservation, and environmental education. Placemaking in urban design establishes memorable experiences and ignites imagination. Planning for, or developing, creative public space affords neglected urban landscapes the opportunity to reconnect with the urban context. Placemaking initiatives should provide unique experiences for pedestrians to express their relationship with the environment. Public art is one type of temporary installation that can have a potential influence on forming a sense of place (Webb 2014). These can be in the form of small-scale, site-specific installations that engage people’s imagination about the surrounding region’s history, culture, and geography. In doing so, we allow the underlying meanings of public space to be restored and made apparent to the public, which restores a vision of place (Fleming 2007). Sense of place is a key benefit of creative placemaking.

“Urban space is a conduit for pedestrian and vehicular transportation, a place for social interaction, a focus for the pageantry and ceremony of urban life” (Bettelheim 1998, 50). Urban landscapes offer residents unique opportunities and benefits including: accessibility, identity, connectivity, adaptability, social infrastructure, creativity, meaningful experiences, and most importantly a sense of place. Place is established in urban environments when relationships form between users and their meaningful environment (Scannell 2010). When people associate a sense of place with an environment, the space becomes indirectly more socially resilient.

In urban landscapes the sense of place is a multi-sensory experiential process. “Our bodies and movements are in constant interaction with the environment; the world and the self inform and redefine each other constantly” (Pallasmaa 2012, 44). Entire cities can have sensuous form (Lynch 1960). Although, the form of a city will not create unified, stratified order. Lynch describes the
opportunities present in imageable metropolitan, patterns, that are also intricate and mobile. Urban form must create an environmental sense of place “which is not simply well organized, but poetic and symbolic as well” (Lynch 1960, 119). Place can be interpreted through identity, or imageability.

Imageable, urban landscapes ensure a higher level of social and cultural site resilience (Fleming 2007). Imageability is the quality possessed by a physical object to evoke a strong image, memory, or experience to any given observer (Lynch 1960). Pedestrians value the experience and memory involved in passing through or visiting public space (Gehl 2013). Whether intentionally, or not, users generate a mental image associated with dynamic, or compelling, objects, structures, experiences, and scenes (Lynch 1960). Place is most successfully established when created by users with vested interest. Therefore, the public “should play an active role in perceiving the [site design proposal] work and have a creative part in developing site image. He/she should have the power to change that image to fit changing needs” (Lynch 1960, 6).
2. LITERATURE REVIEW
The relationship between frequent users and public space in contemporary urban design is frequently disconnected (Gehl 2013). The following literature review will introduce two sections of background information: pedestrian oriented urban design and creative placemaking. Within these sections, literature on social infrastructure and social capital is addressed. Following the literature review is an operationalized social resilience framework summary, synthesized from literature.
Sustainability is a broad, frequently used term in today’s society. Oftentimes the term is used exclusively to describe environmental processes. However, the term sustainability covers a range of socio-ecological systems and processes. In 2002, the term sustainable emerged as an adjective to describe system performance and rapidly spread as part of everyday vocabulary (Condon 2009). In the same year scientists discovered alarming ice loss in the Arctic Circle. As Patrick Condon illustrates in Seven Rules for Sustainable Communities the disappearance of ice triggers other negative climate affects. Without ice to reflect sunlight the blue ocean continues to absorb heat from the sun increasing seawater temperatures. No longer contained by the polar ice, methane is released trapping heat into the atmosphere.

These once feared scenarios are here. How did it get this bad, and can we revert? “If we change the way cities are built and retrofitted, we can prevent the blackest of the nightmare scenarios from becoming real and can create the conditions for a livable life for our children and grandchildren” (Condon 2009, 2). Cities are responsible for 80 percent of all Green House Gas (GHG) emissions. Urban form is directly linked to GHG by the way cities, specifically buildings, are built, arranged, fueled, and connected (Condon 2009).

However, the world did not become irreversibly polluted overnight. The most visible and detrimental change came at the close of World War II. People needed a place to live and jobs to sustain their new lifestyles once returning home from war. Therefore, metropolitan sprawl exploded and with it new interstates and roadways crisscrossed countryside’s to facilitate the car dependent populations. By the mid-1980s scientists and conservationists began compiling significant amounts of evidence revealing the irreversible, negative effects of suburban style living. However, many governments continued to pour tax dollars into the maintenance and construction of roadways. In America, residents had little incentive to abandon their commuter lifestyles. This population trend left metropolitan areas blighted, with lifeless identities. Today city planners and designers are faced with a big problem to solve: how the unsustainable, expansive, existing infrastructure in cities slow the progression of natural catastrophe through sustainable design? Condon gives seven rules for creating sustainable communities. These rules represent principles that create a high-functioning whole. If just one rule is missing or lacking the design entirety will face limited value and could potentially even be counterproductive (Condon 2009).

Condon’s rules all seem to have a similar key element: transportation. Transportation accounts for 40 percent of all CO2 emissions, immensely larger than any competing factor. “The community of nations is finally agreeing that planetary meltdown can be avoided only if we cut climate change gases by 80 percent by 2050” (Condon 2009, 10). The United States is one of several countries needing to therefore reduce 85-90 percent CO2 release in the next thirty-five years. This is Condon’s rationale for focusing so heavily on reversing population’s auto dependence. Technological advances are moving at an undeniably expeditious pace; even so, options such as alternative energy sources will not save the world from collapse. As Condon explains, the way cities are built and retrofitted can ultimately save the world from the quickly approaching doom (Condon 2009). But, first there must be a strong desire for change. We must admit there is a problem and take full responsibility for the lifestyle retrofits also required to make the necessary transformations to ensure human vitality.
“The essence of sustainable [design] is found in its integrated systems” (Condon 2009, 161). A term was developed to better encompass the value of sustainability: Holistic sustainability is a design technique that promotes healthy, efficient, desirable, environmentally informed spatial design. Holistic sustainability is an attempt “to simplify what might appear complex: the overlapping and interconnected nature of the body of the world and how we might heal it” (Condon 2009, 161). Holistic sustainability is composed of three main elements: environmental sustainability, community sustainability, and economic sustainability. These elements work in unison to form a holistically sustainable urban site design. All three elements are powerful individually, but together create a synchronized system of healthy city growth.

How do planners and designers begin developing cities with place attachment and imageability? Planners like Kevin Lynch and Cliff Moughtin understand the importance of creativity, original identity, context, and people. They use the metaphor of the city as an organism rather than a machine: cities need balance to be self-sustaining (Moughtin 1999). Although many systems and processes are constantly at work within a city structure both scholars repeatedly acknowledge the importance of designing for the human scale. “The individual and the family, the neighborhood and the region, business and industry, government and education: all share in the rewards and penalties which result from the way we build and rebuild our cities” (Bettelheim 1998, 4). Without spaces for the pedestrian, cities remain unbalanced and therefore unsustaining. Urban dwellers need adaptable spaces to help maintain that balance.

There are many precedents and recent models for cities to look to for example. Bill McKibben gives an exciting and inspiring history of Curitiba, Brazil during Mayor Jaime Lerner’s time in office. Lerner was a progressive mayor willing to make risky city planning decisions he believed would solve every day urban problems. First, Lerner objected to the development of a freeway that would bisect the downtown core. Instead he campaigned for the pedestrian creating a downtown plaza with no vehicular access (McKibben, 2003). This example demonstrates pedestrians as the city’s highest priority using urban acupuncture as a method of change. By concentrating less on vehicular traffic and giving the space back to the pedestrians Lerner rejuvenated an entire downtown portion of Curitiba. Lerner’s progressive and creative attitude demonstrates his devotion to the citizens and in turn the city improved as a whole. “Curitiba is interesting not because it succeeded entirely but because it made a conscious effort to transform not only the shape
of the city, and then through that physical transformation to reshape it citizens. To unalienate people. Through respect” (McKibben, 2003). Just as Ahern suggests it is the age of experimentation. Urban planners and designers may need to take risks to further understand and identify thresholds within a city system. This example is so important because it shows how urban spaces can be reactivated when pedestrians are the main priority. What if pedestrians are the dependent variable in cities, and can be used as a tool of measurement to exploit threshold capacities in urban environments? Using the “learn-by-doing” experimental approach to design landscape architects could attempt identifying independent variables within cities. Through experimentation urban designers could determine whether strategies like providing infrastructure for pedestrians in underutilized urban spaces could be reprogrammed to improve urban quality of life (Ahern, 2013).

Spaces that actually engage the pedestrian will be more frequented. Passing through a mundane urban block is much less appealing than an interesting, activated one. On an ordinary day most people are willing to walk 400-500 meters (Gehl 2006). Tolerable distances are a compromise between the length of the street and quality of the street. Only extreme barriers will deter people from taking the shortest, most direct routes to final destinations. Distant destinations should remain hidden, or out of view, from pedestrians while the primary route is fully experienced. If long, boring expanses of landscapes are broken up with creative public spaces interjected into the concrete grid people will be more willing to journey by foot. Pedestrians will choose routes that are engaging and stimulating rather than bland thinking only of the final destination. For example subdividing a walk to work into more manageable segments makes the journey more interesting. People will think more about their experience and movement rather than entirety of the route. People

Urban Design Strategies:

The first three stories of urban buildings provide important links between people and structure, further breaking down the immense difference in scale. “If the ground floors are interesting and varied, the urban environment is inviting and enriching” (Gehl 2006, 19). When ground floor of cities is inviting and enriching people will activate the space. “For public space and buildings to be treated as a whole, ground floor facades must have a special and welcoming design. This good, close encounter architecture is vital for good cities” (Gehl 2006, 6). As cities and buildings grow larger they become increasingly self-sufficient. Urban design strategies do not typically take into account, or plan, the connection between sidewalk, façade, and interior happenings. The ground floors of buildings is where the public meets, it is where “urbanites have close encounters with buildings, where we can touch and be touched by them” (Gehl 2006, 7).
prefer to walk along the edges of buildings or structures rather than crossing vast expanse of open space. The edge effect is ‘people’s preference for staying at the edges of space, where their presence is more discreet and they command a particularly good view of the space” (Gehl 2006, 20). The experience then becomes more intimate and comforting while typically offering additional views into adjacent windows or storefronts. Although grade changes make routes more interesting extreme level changes create issues for pedestrians. Suddenly, walking rhythms have changed, and greater efforts are made to move across a space, influencing pedestrians to choose a less exerting path (Gehl 2006). The more sensual opportunities pedestrians have while reaching their final destination the more engaged they become in their surroundings, creating a more active public environment.

As cities become increasingly automobile oriented their urban aesthetic changes. Buildings are designed to appeal to viewers moving at sixty kilometers per hour rather than the average runner speed, seven kilometers per hour. As pedestrians are forced to walk in environments designed for a much faster pace they become disengaged by the boring facades and landscapes. When strategic urban spaces are designed to invite people in through use of imageability, automobile use has the potential to decrease. If cities were designed to accommodate the pedestrian’s journey using experimental qualities there could be several positive societal system changes. Urban dwellers lifestyles may change just for the potential to embrace their appealing environment from the sidewalk.

Urban architecture is immensely important to the pedestrian experience, specifically building location to the street/sidewalk. Successful urban cities typically have three crucial patterns: building to the sidewalk, making the street front permeable, and putting parking behind, under, or on top the buildings (Sucher 1995). Since accessibility and proximity on a local scale is vital to the success of pedestrian oriented communities, building uses will typically need to overlap: residential, shopping, dining, transport should all be located in the same place, just like a natural ecosystem. “The possibility of bumping into people is what makes the city a fertile place” (Sucher 1995, 25). Sucher claims it’s the details that make cities more pedestrian equitable: providing seating, letting people purchase food and drink, offering a conversation piece, encouraging the chance encounter, building neighborhoods for social strolling, putting public space in sun, offering interactive games space, providing place for music, reclaiming people and parking lots, providing sound, promoting growth, using moveable furniture (Sucher 1995).
Social Infrastructure:

“A city’s social infrastructure consists of public landscapes and their physical objects that contribute to community sustainability and growth” (Hood 2004, 145). Social infrastructure therefore has a large impact on cities “providing the foundation for the practices for everyday life” (Hood 2004, 147). How can pedestrian oriented spaces create identity for neighborhoods, communities, and cities? Can a thoughtfully integrated network of public spaces strategically placed throughout a city and embraced by public engagement begin to create an identity? Viewing sidewalks as social infrastructure suggests a need for change of conventional space and relationships to reinforce community and social patterns and idiosyncratic patterns. Thinking of public, pass-through, spaces as hybrid landscapes enabling urban environments to support multiple programming capabilities creates potential for entire city experiential imagery (Bernick & Cervero 1997). For instance, what would happen if bus stops were designed to be more open-ended spaces? So transit riders and the general public would be free to interpret the space for what they saw fit at the time.

Hood gives two specific processes of modification to improve the social infrastructure in public spaces: altering behavior settings and landscape program. Behavior settings deal with the acknowledgment, design and placement of furnishings and objects within a public space. Determining placement, type of furnishings and other infrastructure can create unique landscape opportunity and develop a character to reflective of the community. The second modification has more to do with relationships and dual-purposed landscapes. Creating a network of urban trails throughout a city could help connect neighborhoods physically and socially while also improving overall transportation. Hybridization of landscape functions and character may develop a new social infrastructure using objects and spatial arrangement. These improvements can be creatively designed to strategically fit the community’s existing or visionary image. Public space hybridizations are typically formed during a change in community culture, values, or needs. Ultimately, hybrid landscapes are the combination of a community’s social and physical character creating diversely functioning spaces. Both of these modification types usually evolve over time.

The formation of hybrid landscapes are not always foreseen, but improvisational, unfolding with the evolving social and cultural needs of the community. These evolutionary changes are known to be the most resilient because they were designed for and by the community at large. Improvement of social infrastructure in a community can only occur after understanding the physical, political and environmental context. Designers and planners using a resilient design approach must analyze and strategize socio-ecological patterns at a variety of scales to ensure successful design adaptation to withstand the stressors of time. Allowing users to be involved in this design process and influence design decisions will ensure the sustainability and continuance of growth in a community (Hood 2004).

When designers focus on users, programmatic issues are avoided by narrowing in on the social settings required to activate the space. Simply activating a space allows opportunity for imageability to occur. Neighborhoods with more accessible walkable space proved to have equally higher social capital among community members and neighbors. Community members living in the walkable neighborhoods attested to trusting their neighbors, participating in community projects, clubs and volunteering more, and were less likely to describe television as their main form of entertainment” ("walkable" 2010). The same participants with high social capital demonstrated higher quality of lives “through better health and
economic opportunities, among other things" ("walkable" 2010). Social capital can be described as a type of bonding, support, relational ties, while bridging connections of individuals from dissimilar groups. Urban design is a tool to create stronger communities and sense of place for residents through orientation. Transportation planners are designing cities to accommodate more compact neighborhoods, reducing the amount of vehicle traffic and enabling alternative forms of transportation with social capital in mind. As urban planners and designers enter into a more collaborative conversation with other experts in various fields such as ecologists, transit engineers, economists and anthropologists we can develop more resilient cities by balancing the equilibrium of socio-ecological systems.
This report will synthesize literature to operationalize a definition of social resilience as it applies to downtown Wichita, Kansas. Social resilience is one of two core components that combine to create resilient cities, the other being ecological resilience. Defining and characterizing social resilience is difficult because of its broad context. Therefore, social resilience was operationalized based on its contribution to resilience as a whole, and ideas and philosophies paralleling those of social capital. As described by Jack Ahern social resilience “requires building an adaptable social infrastructure to assure meaningful participation and achieve equity in the face of socio-economic change and disturbance, and meaningful participation by stakeholders in planning and policy decisions” (Ahern 2011). Similar to its counterpart, ecological resilience, social resilience depends on the health and function of the smaller, compositional systems of which it is created. These systems are labeled social, or civic, systems. Social systems ability to simultaneously promote four key qualities: social trust, reciprocity, collaboration, and character, at and between different system scales determines the success of social resilience within a community. Social resilience can therefore be measured by a social system’s ability to adapt and function over time (Putnam 1995).

Social resilience in the U.S. has seen continuous decline since the early 1970s. This is based primarily on the nearly identical social decapitalization trends. As the size and strength of social systems continue to decrease civil engagement continues to plummet to an all-time low. Some scholars argue America has actually seen an increase in a variety of social groups and non-profit organizations. However, as Robert Putnam explains many of these organizations and groups are nothing more than a mere mailing list. It is true there are organizations that have experienced record numbers of membership within the last fifty years; but a majority of these organizations promote little social capital. Being a member of an active labor union is a very different social experience than being a member of AARP. Whereas one social system requires active, engaging experiences the other requires little more than mailing annual dues.

These misconceived forms of civic engagement are slowly weakening communities’ social resilience. As social bonds dissolve within and between social networks that make up communities connections between individuals become shallower and devalued. Privatization is key driver wedging a deepening gap between individuals and communities. This is demonstrated in “reasonably reliable time-series data [involving] neighborliness” (Putnam 1995). Participants are asked how often they spend time with neighbors in every General Social Survey released since 1974. And every year since it was first released this question reveals a constant decline.

Creative Placemaking

Social Resilience:
in percentages revealing a widening gap in social and physical bonds in communities. This theme sheds light on potential reasons and solutions to slow down and even reverse the demise of social resilience.

A parallel trend in urban privatization and social decapitalization can be seen in countries around the world. As technology advances more individualized alternatives to transit, recreation, and socialization are made readily available. The development of the private automobile as a primary mode of transit is one of the best examples of how urban privatization weakens social resilience in cities. With the rise of the automobile in the early 1900s cities were able to spread out accelerating the growth of suburbia. American suburbs quickly began to dominate metro regions and countryside’s as commuting became a social norm. Cities began to operate around the growth and accessibility of automobile traffic. Unlike many alternative forms of public or active transit, automobile traffic fosters an individualized approach to transit and living standards. Less public space is allocated to pedestrian traffic, such as sidewalks or bike lanes that encourage social experience during routine activities. Residential, commercial, civic, and even institutional spaces have seen a decline in social resilience as once activated shared space has been sacrificed for preferred private use.

Social Capital:

Social capital is the compilation of social organization that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit (Putnam 1995). Social organization, and therefore social capital, is fueled through civic engagement. “The mechanisms through which civic engagement and social connectedness produce such results—better schools, faster economic development, lower crime, and more effective government—are multiple and complex” (Putnam 1995, 22). The importance of civic engagement, or social bonds within social systems, has been recognized by researchers in education, urban poverty, unemployment, economic development, crime and drug abuse, and health fields. As leading scholar, Robert Putnam explains in *Bowling Alone: America’s Declining Social Capital*, life is made easier by living in a community with a substantial stock of social networks, norms and trust. Communities rich in social capital reveal abundant networks of civic engagement that encourage reciprocity, social trust, coordination, and communication (Putnam 1995).

Since 1973 a thirty percent decline in civic engagement has been reported across America; this is seen at voting polls, public meetings, workers unions, political or government rallies, and school affairs. Countering, some organizations have suffered little from the disengaging trend. Many sports related groups, feminist groups, religious groups, fraternal societies, professional societies, and literary societies are experiencing steady membership since the 1970s. Putnam does acknowledge some counterrtrends in terms of social organizations. However, many of these organizations are what he considers tertiary organizations where members are typically unaware of one others existence. For example, a Sierra Club member may come into contact with five other members on his/her way to work, but because mailing in an annual membership due is the only requirement to remain a member these club
members have no knowledge of one another’s affiliations or bonds to one another (Putnam 1995). Although membership in tertiary organizations may continue to rise, do these organizations truly contribute to civil engagement? Or do they only continue to weaken the bonds of social capital in communities?

In the most fundamental regard, social capital is most apparent in families. Both extended and nuclear families demonstrate the most abundant and easily observable weakening of social bonds and therefore trend of social decapitalization. In neighborhoods across America socialization has dropped eleven percent from 1974 to 1993. Maybe lack of socialization amongst individuals can be linked to their overall lack of trust. From 1960 to 1993 the number of Americans that considered most people trustworthy dropped by twenty percent. Although most listed examples are from surveys taken in the U.S. these trends are apparent across the globe. In fact, America still ranks at the top of most lists for high levels of social capital in communicates. But why does social decapitalization continue to grow in America?

Although homeownership increases individual’s feelings of social and community responsibility the lack of social bonds keeps many homeowners from making the connections necessary to foster civic engagement (Putnam 1995). Many theories attempt to explain the unengaged population trends. Putnam lists four potential theories, two of which have already been recognized in this report as negative themes in city planning and design. Mobility: The “re-potting” hypothesis focuses on residential stability. Homeownership is a clear pattern in socially engaged individuals. "Mobility, like frequent re-plotting of plants, tends to disrupt root systems, and it takes time for an uprooted individual to put down new roots” (Putnam 1995, 65). Little root growth is established in suburban communities where privatization dominates weekly routines. Automobile dominated communities deepen the disconnection between neighbors and families. Cities are planned to accommodate the personal vehicle rather than alternative transit methods that encourage socialization. The negative social systems effects of planning cities around private auto transit doesn’t end on the road. When cities cater to cars as first priority then private homes and businesses suffer from social decapitalization. Front porches and yards are now frequently viewed as a commonality. Fenced and screened backyards are what residents demand when buying a home (Sucher 1995). Although homeownership continues to rise in the U.S since 1965, few roots are laid because of the suburbanization of neighborhoods.

“There is reason to believe that deep-seated technological trends are radically “privatizing” or “individualizing” our use of leisure time and thus disrupting many opportunities for social-capital formation” (Putnam 1995). Technology has greatly influenced America’s use of leisure time. The ever advancing technological trends that drive consumerism are simultaneously deepening a gap between personal and collective interests. Television is the best example of how technology has revolutionized humanity’s perception of community. Television typically encourages increased time budgeted to private recreation. This not only enable social decapitalization, but narrows people’s perception of community and develops shallower social experiences. Technological advances help satisfy individual preferences quicker by sacrificing priceless, or irreplaceable, “positive social externalities associated with more primitive forms of entertainment” (Putnam 1995).
Creative Placemaking:
Place describes what was, what is, and the interaction performed in a space (Fleming 2007). Space is merely a physical volume whereas, place is the interaction and experience within, or with, and environment (Steele 1981) Place is intercepted and perceived through our senses and usually communicated through recollection of experience or physical memory. Designers are prone to subconsciously grasp the physical characteristics that create an image of place (Fleming 2007). For the majority of people it is however, not the physical quality of a space but the remembrance of civic engagement within the space. “It is the recollection of patterns of life lived in a particular building or space that creates the “cornerstones” of mental association and gives such places the patina of affection” (Fleming 2007, 14).

Good urban design is conducive to positive, successful civic engagement; therefore, making it a key component in establishing place. Placemaking in urban design enables the public to access the meaning behind built space (Fleming 2007). For this reason, placemaking is frequently used for its dimensional, urban design strategy. “The elements of placemaking serve broad urban-design objectives that go beyond their intrinsic values as works of art, or their function as amenities, street furniture, and interpretation” (Fleming 2007, 19). Creative placemaking leverages the potential of space through meaning. Spatial meaning, or in some cases attachment or value, can most effectively be created through local talent and interest (Fleming 2007).

Place Attachment:
Place attachment is a unique, emotional relationship between an individual and their physical surroundings; although it is possible, it is rare user’s share the same place attachment with public spaces. “These connections are a powerful aspect of human life that inform our sense of identity, create meaning in our lives, facilitate community and influence action” (Manzo 2014, II). User’s place attachment is also influenced by past experiences and therefore relies on a user’s point of view to create an attachment. Place attachment can increases a landscape’s social resilience; place attachment can amplify a landscapes social resilience through people’s association of responsibility, belonging, and identity to them. Oftentimes, place attachment can be strong enough to affect issues such as belonging, mobility, intergroup conflict, civic engagement, urban redevelopment, natural resource management and climate change (Manzo 2014).

Urban landscapes contain symbols, or icons that represent meaning about ourselves, and something about the people or place the symbols belong. “This aspect of the urban fabric has been called the glue that bonds people to place” (Hull 1993). It is the responsibility of urban planners and designers to consider these icons placement and meaning because their contribution to place identity, community identity, health, and sense of place. Icons within cities may be unique natural features, religious sanctuaries or locations, personal homes, plaza or park space, public gathering spaces, places associated with historic events, or public art displays. Oftentimes, iconic spaces share similar connections or themes, such as symbolic of social groups, defined distinctive community character, and remembrances of personal accomplishments and concerns (Hull 1993).
Sense of Place:

Sense of place is formed through experience and memory. “It should speak of the individuals and their complex society, of their aspirations and their historical tradition, of the natural setting, and of the complicated functions and movements of the city world” (Lynch 1960, 119). A sense of place is achieved when a space develops unique behavioral and emotional characteristics for individuals transforming it into a place (Ayvazian 2014). “The design of a city is supposed to give all its citizens a sense of belonging, an identity, and be the instrument for the exercise of civitas, the dynamic, creative order that makes for civilization” (Von Eckardt 1998, 65).

Sense of place is a combination of social and physical components. Sense of place can be divided into two categories, cognitive and perceptual factors, and physical characteristic (Ayvazian 2014). The cognitive factors address meanings people perceive from a place. This focuses on the links people make with their environment: they assign meaning to their perceptions.

“Experience is a cover-all term for the various modes through which a person knows and constructs a reality” (Tuan 2008, 8). This is different than feeling, in that feelings are more ambiguous as intention and affection coincide. Humans learn by experience, we take what is given and act on the situation. Therefore, experience is created by a construction of feelings and thought, this forms reality. Our senses facilitate these thoughts and feelings. Using sight, smell sound, touch, and taste humans determine personality to environments. For example, odors lend character to objects and places making them easy to identify and remember. However, senses do not act alone to create spatial character. Our five senses work together to reinforce one another organizing a spatially oriented reality. Kinesthesia, sight and touch, allows humans a naturally strong awareness of space. Recognition and perception of space influences human experience and memory (Tuan 2008).

Corridors offer people unique and different experiences. These experiences create a sense of place for urbanites; this attachment is determined by the journey between an original destination and eventual familiar destination. “It must be plastic to the perceptual habits of thousands of citizens, open-ended to change of function and meaning, receptive to the formation of new imagery” (Lynch 1960, 119). Rarely do people travel the same routes at exactly the same time therefore every trip holds a new experience. Similarly, corridors “allow for shared and similar experiences, but ones that gradually change depending on where you reside along the corridor” (Condon 2009, 70). Planners and urban theorists frequently focus on nodes of development; however, in most North American cities the corridors are the unique and defining characteristics of urban metropolis. So much attention is placed on the creation of urban nodes “it’s been made difficult to cherish the seemingly undifferentiated linear corridors that are such a humble and ubiquitous datum for our experiences” in cities (Condon 2009, 70). Corridors offer both private and public space featuring an array of destinations along a pass-through space.

“Emotional interaction with place points to satisfaction and attachment to place” (Ayvazian 2014). Sense of place is an evolving concept between people, their image of a place and environmental characteristics (Ayvazian 2014). In short, urban environments are combinations of physical and social parameters.
Imageability Theory Origin:

A highly imageable city, or space, is well formed, distinct, and remarkable (Lynch 1960). Placemaking initiatives should provide unique experiences for pedestrians to express their relationships with the environment. “The precept of the body and the image of the world turn into one single continuous existential experience; there is no body separate from its domicile in space, and there is no space unrelated to the unconscious image of the perceiving self” (Pallasmaa 2012, 44). Public art is one type of temporary installation that can have a potential influence on forming a sense of place (Webb 2014). These can be in the form of small-scale, site-specific installations that engage people’s imagination and exploration within the surrounding region’s history, culture, and geography. In doing so, we allow the underlying meanings of public space to be restored and made apparent to the public, which restores a vision of place (Fleming 2007).

Imageable as defined by Lynch is “that quality in a physical object which gives it a high probability of evoking a strong image in any given observer. It is that shape, color, or arrangement which facilitates the making of vividly identified, powerfully structured, highly useful mental images of the environment” (Lynch 1960, 9). As Lynch explains in Image of the City, imageable spaces are highly dependent on their context. “Nothing is experienced by itself, but always in relation to its surroundings, the sequences of events leading up to it, the memory of past experiences” (Lynch 1960, 1). Just as ecosystems are constantly in a process of evolution and adaptation, cities are constantly undergoing new phases. These phases can be determined by citizen’s visual, mental interpretation or legibility of their surroundings. We can think of these phases as Ahern describes thresholds in the systematic sense. Oftentimes cities are subjected to their own version of disturbances, such as a dynamic cultural or natural change altering the current perceived state of the environment by the inhabitants. Researchers and scholars determine disturbances based on change in city imageability.

Lynch claims organisms are structured to identify with their environment using a set of cues: “the visual sensations of color, shape, motion, or polarization of light, as well as other sense such as smell, sound, touch, kinesthesia, sense of gravity, and perhaps of electric or magnetic fields” (Lynch 1960, 3). Organisms therefore identify their environments by recollection of experiences and memories commonly created using a combination of the previously listed cues. For example, when first exploring a new, urban environment individuals will subconsciously create a mental connection with a preconceived or generalized visual as a guiding tool action/exploration (Lynch 1960).

This mental image is a combination of immediate sensation and past experience, or memory; without realizing people inherently create images based on the patterns from surroundings determined by the practical and emotional importance held by the individual. Therefore clarity is a key concept to intensifying the human experience in a city: when individuals feel safe and capable of navigating the landscape they’re able to relax, fully appreciating and observing their surroundings. Without a sense of legibility our surroundings lose “the emotional satisfaction, the framework for communication or conceptual organization, the new depths that it may bring to everyday experience” (Lynch 1960, 5).
Imageability Application:

“Place identity, although subjective and subtle, can be assessed and managed through sensitive land development efforts” (Hull 1993). The problem faced by many urban designers is how to make available space more meaningful. Proper use of space, through landscape programming is the great urban problem (Buttelheim 1998). Successful urban design programming occurs when a variety of urban scales have been inventoried and analyzed recording missing necessities for holistic sustainable urban life. Holistic sustainability considers urban dweller’s quality of life, as well as the resiliency and viability of ecological and social urban systems. Landscapes must possess societal value or meaning to remain holistically sustainable. Meaningful site programming consists of two key considerations: the landscape’s overall physiography, in terms of people, and composition of user group’s economic, social and ethnic profiles (Friedberg 1998). Arbitrary juxtaposition of programming, or activities, in urban design causes stress to the urban complex; this is an example of a system disturbance in the urban realm. “It matters little how efficiently the city is run if it concomitantly denies the riches of human life” (Friedberg 1998, 62). Like all humans, urban dwellers desire fulfilling experiences making meaningful landscapes a necessary component of an efficient and sustainable city. Imageability in urban design can develop community identity, reflective of their values and character.

“By appearing as a remarkable and well-knit place, the city could provide a ground for the clustering and organization of these meanings and associations” (Lynch 1960, 119). People like to have every opportunity at their fingertips 24/7, but also like to feel welcomed and a part of something: we want “familiarity and anonymity” (Sucher 1995). If executed successfully imageable spaces have the capacity to create such a vivid setting the “same daily action can take on new meanings” (Lynch 1960, 5). Place attachment is born through this process of creating neighborhoods and community networks. Therefore, meaningful, imageable urban design strongly depends on context and experience. Imageability and value is formed through a process: user’s journey to the site, landing at the site and exploration of the site.
Participatory Design VS. Ethnographic Feedback

Landscape architects and city planners are primarily responsible for addressing the constant evolution in urban design. There are few precedents in contemporary urban design, specifically urban parks (Cranz 1982). In fact, a major critique of modern, urban park design is its confusing and scattered programming and organization. “‘Park and recreation people must begin to take seriously their obligations to provide recreation experiences for people rather than recreation facilities’” (Cranz 1982, 141). In an effort to accommodate a larger majority of a particular population, designers attempt to create a space with multiple programming opportunities. Unfortunately, this approach develops unclear urban spaces seen as a failure to the public (Cranz 1982). In Politics of Park Design, Cranz addresses the issues of common park design practices that exclude the users from the design process.

Cranz comments on the importance of participatory design allowing the environment and user to determine design elements. Without user input, public spaces become a conglomeration of individually historically successful elements. With nothing to unify the site design the public space never evolves into a place. When potential users are actively participating in the design process it becomes “More than a simple experience, it [is] an aesthetic event whose subject, typically, was the urban population which participated in it” (Cranz 1982, 141). Urban parks are failing because users are either not being incorporated into the design process or not being authentically represented (Cranz 1982).

Participatory design is “translated into community involvement and advocacy planning, both based on the premise that people should express or be served in terms of their own needs rather than be given what experts had determined they needed” (Cranz 1982, 238). Including user’s input in the design process is extremely important to developing a sense of place in urban site design (Fleming 2007). Participatory design focuses on documenting user preferences. This is achieved in a variety of ways including surveys, questionnaires, or community meetings. In Design for Ecological Democracy, Randolph Hester encourages the use of participatory design, but acknowledges its sometimes ineffectiveness in determining user’s values and everyday behavioral patterns (Hester 2006).

Ethnographic research is different than participatory design because it focuses deeper on people’s values, behavioral patterns, and culture (LeCompte, et al. 1991). Applied ethnography identifies themes and patterns important to participants in their natural setting. Ethnographic research uses culture acts as a lens for interpreting information. The researcher is the primary tool of investigation; therefore, ethnographic research almost always involves primary interaction. This form of data collection process is beneficial in site design so local individuals and community needs are represented. Ethnographic data is location specific. Information collected from a series of ethnographic interviews of participants living in Chicago, Illinois is no longer relevant when applied to a site design project in rural Georgia. Ethnographic research themes develop valuable information that help instill a sense of place and identity within a site design because its thorough process reveals user’s values, cultural practices, and behavioral patterns (Hester 2006).

Using Kevin Lynch’s imageability theory, cities can develop identity at a variety of scales while maintaining continuity. In Image of the City, Lynch explains how imageability can be applied at a regional or site scale to create a unique sense of place through experience or memory. Imageability not only works at different scales but
can also connect them; landscape identity can be applied using patterns to clearly help people navigate spatial networks. However, broad patterns are only successful when examined at a variety of scales. Legibility is dependent on site context therefore making it impossible to replicate exact site designs. Each community has a different identity, therefore those values and opportunities should be reflected in site design.

Some imageable spaces may also be temporary. William Whyte in *The Social Life of Small Urban Spaces* addresses a process he calls triangulation, “process by which some external stimulus provides a linkage between people and prompts strangers to talk to each other as though they were not” (Whyte 1980, 94). The stimulus can be a physical object, or structure, sight, or experience. Triangulation can be considered a creative placemaking strategy. Triangulation gives strangers something in common, worth further discussing, creating a bond that benefits pedestrian activity. The link is not determined by the excellent quality of the experience; even if the hired musicians perform a terrible set, the bonds between audience members are still being formed. In some cases the bonds are stronger the worse the act is (Whyte 1980, 96). Crowds form between forty to fifty seconds offering little time for viewers to determine whether it’s worth watching (Whyte 1980, 96). This raises a valid question: why ban public entertainers rather than welcome them?

Activation like triangulation is key to designing a creative place. Urban planners and designers are challenged to model spaces for opportunity and ingenuity to grow. Cities can begin combining ideas, such as Whyte’s triangulation with Lynch’s imageability, enabling the multiplier effect. But first cities must begin changing policies to better meet the demands and needs of an evolving public. Therefore, it is critical for urban planners and designers to initiate instruments of ethnographic research. “Ethnographers become intimately involved with members of the community or participants in the natural settings where they do research. Intimate involvement means building trust between the researcher and the participants and often calls for a special kind of friendship” (LeCompte et al 1999, 10). When a trusting relationship is built between participants and researcher, a safe, open, and honest conversations will evolve. This ensures access to authentic community views. Without public input and support urban landscapes lack social resilience. See more on page 144 on the Limitations section of this report to understand how this study varied from typical ethnographic studies.
Relationship Between Imageability & Legibility:

Imageability plays many important roles in a city. The level of vividness and physical integration of city image can easily shape an individual’s perception of an entire city, “a good environmental image gives its possessor an important sense of emotional security” (Lynch 1960, 4). Environmental images are created through a process between the observer and their environment. The landscape offers distinctions and relations for users to adapt, recognize, organize and attach meaning. “Clarity of structure and vividness of identity are first steps to the development of strong symbols” (Lynch 1960, 119).

Legibility is the ease in which portions of cities can be organized into patterns or recognized at different scales. Imageable spaces and symbols play a key role in cities legibility; they create the mental image and pattern recognizable to the public. Legible cities incorporate “districts or landmarks or pathways [that] are easily identifiable and are easily grouped into an over-all pattern” (Lynch 1960, 3). The relationship between imageability and legibility is built on the level of flexibility offered by the landscape. “The observer himself should play an active role in perceiving the world and have a creative part in developing his image. He should have the power to change that image to fit changing needs” (Lynch 1960, 6).

The image created by the user is similar to cities, in which it is just a phase of the infinite, potential images the observer could construe because of the transformative nature of landscapes. Although landscapes change and evolve it is critical the overall patterns remain to sustain urban legibility at a variety of scales. Urban designers are tasked with building and rebuilding cities on these evolving landscapes to accommodate, sustain, and satisfy a vastly diverse population (Lynch 1960). Lynch recognizes the concurrent evolution between urban populations and their surroundings, proposing a scheme for image adaptability. “Lack of control on the part of the responsible agencies, the fragmentation of responsibility, the lack of objective and rational processes--the lack of overview-has created a situation in which urban space is either unused, misused, or developed in a proprietary way, all to the detriment of its potential for public use” (Buttelheim 1998, 50).
This portion of the research study is an attempt to better articulate social resilience by synthesizing literature review. The synthesized information develops a framework for social resilience in urban sites.

Socially Resilient Site Design…
- Encourages people to interact and fosters civic engagement
- Fosters an imageable identity
- Increases legibility of an entire sub-district or district by increasing imageability
- Promotes modes of active transit
- Reflects the needs and wants of its primary users
- Is abstract for adaptable uses
- Incorporates durable programming and furnishings
- Involves active public participation during the design process
- Reflects the values, culture, and behavioral patterns of its primary users
- Focuses on user’s experience
- Fosters positive social interaction
- Creates place within space
- Reinforces community, social, and idiosyncratic patterns
- Uses creative placemaking to leverage prosperous social systems
- Promotes unity, connection and support between individuals and communities
- Enables bonding within same social networks and between networks
- Influences individuals self perception and community perspective
Figure 3.1: Creative play space designed a variety in users, preferences, and activities in Copenhagen, Denmark (author 2014)
3. METHODS
“Life is unpredictable, complex, and ephemeral, so how on Earth can anyone plan how life might play out in cities?” (Gehl 2013, XII). As Jan Gehl describes in *How to Study Public Life*, social resilience is one of the greatest urban design challenges. This report uses ethnographic methods to further characterize social resilience in site scale design. Qualitative methods require unique steps in data analysis and inquiry. This research study features four main methods of developing background, relevance and conclusions informing a final research project design: literature review, stakeholder design charrette (collaborative conversation about design solutions), open-ended interviews, and the design of a temporary Pop-Up Park for downtown Wichita.

In *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mix Methods Approaches*, John Creswell explores how qualitative research methods test theories as an explanation to the research’s driving dilemma. “Qualitative inquiry employs different philosophical assumptions; strategies of inquiry; and methods of data collection, analysis and interpretations” (Creswell 2009, 173). The methods used in this report are forms of ethnographic research. Ethnography is “writing about the culture of groups of people” (LeCompte, et al. 1991, 21). In this sense, culture is the ritualistic patterns of individuals in a community determined by the attitudes, behaviors, beliefs, social arrangements, and norms expressed or observed. Ethnography assumes the researcher as the primary tool of investigation and documentation. Applied ethnography focuses on problems the researcher and stakeholders identify as important in the natural setting where research is being conducted. Therefore, ethnographic research is locally specific. It typically involves primary interaction with participants, uses multiple data sources, uses culture as a filter for interpretation, and offers researchers an accurate reflection of participant’s perspectives and behaviors (LeCompte, et al. 1991, 9). This form of research is beneficial in design so landscapes best reflect the local needs of individuals and communities.

Integrating ethnographic data into the site design process is unconventional for landscape architects. However, ethnographic research exposes patterns and themes necessary to creating landscapes with social resilience. Ethnographic data provides designers with the qualities needed to enhance a social capital. Designers must first
understand their user base and existing social conditions prior to design. If a site design is reflective of a community, or user’s culture and behavior, the space is more conducive to civic engagement. As Fleming discusses in *The Art of Placemaking*, there is a growing trend toward spaces with little feeling of place (Fleming 2003). Incorporating ethnographic research into the standard site design process could innovate the way space is designed. Ethnographic research could be applied to various project scales and types to increase social resiliency.

This report examines the relationship between several theories which affect urban design at different scales. The proposed methods tested the validity of developing social resiliency through creative placemaking in downtown Wichita, Kansas. Literature review informed project goals, methods, and evaluation procedures. Literature informed the necessity and value of social resilience in site scale design; as well as the need for ethnographic research as a primary method of instilling social resilience into and between social networks. Oftentimes, literature and research about social resilience takes a broad scale approach to analysis and design; strategies and approaches were adapted to apply to site scale design. The location for a temporary park, determined by the Wichita Downtown Development Corporation was ultimately used to explore the creation of a socially resilient urban landscape using ethnographic research.

An adaptable approach to methods, as seen in Figure 3.1, allowed this report to remain simple and flexible. Figure 3.1 diagrams how
Methods

Comprehensive analysis of themes and patterns emerge through photomontage.

**March 30, 2015**

- Comprehensive analysis of themes and patterns emerge through photomontage.

**April 2, 2015**

- A re-evaluated site design plan for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park is created from information learned during ethnographic interviews and shared with Jason Gregory.

**April 24, 2015**

- Site design of Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park concludes and final design drawings are shared with WDDC.

---

**Evaluation Phase**

- Interview Analysis Data

**Local Identity & Sense of Place**

Through peer and stakeholder collaboration, a conceptual site design was established; site analysis and stakeholder collaboration continued throughout the design process. Along with the stakeholder design charrette, open interviews were held with Wichita residents that live and work near “the pit”. Interviews were conducted with mix of residents to ensure a variety of perspectives and needs were documented. Analysis of the interviews guided an evaluation of the schematic design and resulted in a re-design of the Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park.

Project requirements and solutions evolved through collaboration and experimentation. Literature review provided the foundational knowledge to further define social resilience at the site scale as well as a set of methods to answer the key research question. Ethnographic research took shape in the form of a design charrette and individual interviews. The schematic design for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park was primarily influenced by the collaboration at the design charrette. Data synthesized from interview analysis yielded new findings about downtown user’s needs. Therefore, the revised site design was infused with a layer of social resilience using the ethnographic interviews as a lens for reevaluation. This diagram was ideal for diagramming unpredictable changes during ethnographic data collection. The built in flexibility allowed valuable, influential peer and stakeholder involvement.
Literature review determined accurate definitions of key terms within the research: social resilience, social capital, creative placemaking, sense of place and imageability. The literature review also defined project boundaries, developed a foundational understanding of urban, social systems, identified strategies within creative placemaking, and synthesized a framework for social resilience at site scale. At the core of this research proposal is the synthesis of an operationalized definition and framework for social resilience. This report focuses on social resilience theory as explored through social capital and creative placemaking: social systems’ ability to promote and maintain social trust, reciprocity, collaboration, and character between networks (Putnam 1995). The synthesis of ideas introduces new considerations for designing socially resilient landscapes.

It is important to understand the value of social resilience in cities; urban disturbances have less chance weakening social systems that are more socially resilient. Socially resilient site design can be achieved in a variety of ways, however this report claims the most effective involves ethnographic research to determine a sense of place supported through imageability. Without a strong sense of place, communities lack identity or imageability. Urban imageability increases social resilience when the created sense of place is influenced by users. As systems evolve in cities, the sense of place will adapt to fit the changing needs of users. Literature review demonstrated the necessity of including ethnographic methods to amplify site scale social resiliency. Literature also guided the choice of ethnographic research methods and ways of analyzing documented information.
Participant, or exploratory, observation is defined as a, “data collection technique that requires the researcher to be present at, involved in, and recording the routine daily activities with people in the field setting” in *Essential Ethnographic Methods* (LeCompte, et al. 1999, 91). A characteristic of ethnographic research is “inductive, interactive, and recursive processes to build theories to explain the behavior and beliefs under study” (LeCompte, et al. 1999, 15). Site inventory began with a primary research question and a series of hypothesized solutions. Initial hunches were explored through site analysis and stakeholder interviews.

Site inventory was key to identifying adjacent buildings, infrastructure, contextual, and social relationships. Figures 3.2-5 are images taken of the site in January 2015. Site inventory and analysis occurred over a period of days so observations covered a range of times and days. Passive observation allowed documentation of situations or systems at work without disruption of their natural flow. “The most accurate observations are shaped by formative theoretical frameworks and scrupulous attention to detail” (LeCompte, et al. 1999, 95). In the early stages, site documentation remained extremely accurate, descriptive and concrete to improve the level of synthesis precision. It was crucial to take notes and pictures of all existing site settings, events, sequences, socioeconomic differences, and people counts. Length of observation duration was crucial to identifying a thorough understanding of all site uses, patterns, social behaviors, events, and contextual influence. Preliminary site observations identified current site use and times of most use. Documenting all site patterns, events, social behavior, and uses further informed my list of potential site stakeholders. As I imagined and further realized during later site visits, these initial site observations were a form of recursive analysis: cyclical interaction between data and hypothesis, eventually revealing a pattern (LeCompte, et al. 1999, 15).

Research settings are “locations where behaviors and activities relevant to a study take place” and can be documented through physical observation and key informants (LeCompte, et al. 1999, 97). As previously mentioned context plays an important role in site inventory and analysis; therefore, unobtrusive research, mapping, behavioral and event identification is necessary. “Events
are activity sequences larger, longer and more complex than single activities,” that take place in a specific location with specific purpose and agreed upon meaning (LeCompte, et al. 1999, 98). Landscapes may facilitate impromptu events; these events may have a specific purpose, but not a determined time and specified meaning for a predetermined target audience as LeCompte previously describes (Whyte 1980). This is why counting and mapping of site activity was important to observe. Activity within the site as well as in the immediate setting influenced experience of the site. During the second day of onsite analysis I recorded a parade passing by the site on Douglas Avenue in memorial of Martin Luther King Jr. An effective way to document this was diagramming site settings and adding in mapping, or tracking, data into diagrams. Using techniques like diagramming made it easier to decode observations into usable data. Figure 3.6 is a computer graphic of the compiled onsite observations and diagrams.
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Noise pollution from street traffic reaches to southern site boundary

Stormwater drains to West
2 hour on-street parking
Existing bus stop
Existing street trees
Existing bike rack
Existing light post
Noise pollution from street traffic reaches to southern site boundary
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Main thoroughfare in downtown Wichita, 4 lanes in addition to on-street parallel parking
Stakeholder Design Charrette:

Action research took shape in the form of a stakeholder design charrette. As described in *Designing and Conducting Ethnographic Research*, action research is site-specific, and encourages researchers and participants collaboratively identifying a problem, sharing information for better understanding of the problem, and engaging to fix the problem (LeCompte, et al. 1999, 90). In mid-January a design charrette was conducted at the Wichita Downtown Development Corporation, in Wichita, Kansas to discuss opportunities for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park design. The charrette began at 11:30am on a Friday morning and lasted until 4:30pm that afternoon. The WDDC invited a variety of stakeholders to the charrette to gather a range of perspectives and feedback about park design. It was critical to this study, and site design, to develop a thorough understanding of potential users and their needs; exploring the perspectives of current downtown residents, workers, and those that do both, informed the design of similar characteristics and lifestyle patterns of potential users. Figures 3.7-10 are images taken during the charrette.

Following is a list of verbal prompts I found conducive for small group discussion. The prompts were designed to get fellow group members to remember the value and impact the temporary park could have on the entire downtown district. These prompts were also used to passively remind group members the installation will only be at the Douglas Avenue location for a maximum of five year; therefore, we need to consider how site programming and furnishing can remain adaptable and durable for relocation.

- Do you interact with downtown Wichita routinely? What portions of downtown do you frequent most?
- What brings you to downtown Wichita most often? How do you get there?
- How far do you typically walk when exploring downtown? Would you consider the downtown district easy to navigate? Are there landmarks or other things that make portions of downtown more identifiable to you?
- Is there any one amenity or quality of downtown you feel is lacking?
• Would you consider living in downtown Wichita? Why or why not?
• Are you familiar with the site along Douglas Ave.? Do you have any relationship or interest in this specific site?
• How do you feel this site fits into the larger context of downtown Wichita?
• Have you ever used or interacted with the site before? If so, how and when?
• Did you feel safe in/around the site? How would you describe your experiences?
• Do you have an opinion on a more beneficial use of this space?
• How would you describe the neighborhood or community it is in? Can you name some of the adjacent businesses around the site?

Next, groups were given an hour to develop site plans, details, and preliminary site construction cost sheets. Groups were asked to propose materials, furnishings, conceptual artwork, and program elements in their site plans. Once complete, small groups presented their schematic design concept to the entire room for feedback. All three groups were given fifteen minutes to explain and take comments or questions from the audience. A diverse mix of small group members ensured a variety of site design proposals.
Along with the stakeholder design charrette, a series of one-on-one, in-depth interviews were held. In-depth interviewing allows “exploration of any and all facets of a topic in detail” (LeCompte et al. 1999, 121). The interviews were kept flexible and semi-structured with directionality and agenda so qualitative, textual data could later be synthesized (LeCompte et al. 1999). In other words, the interviews had a clearly defined goal to determine participant’s values and behavioral patterns. Participants were encouraged to lead the interviews and direct conversation. This form of interviewing offered participants the discretion to decide how to respond to prompts, not bounded by suggestive alternatives or constrained by response length. Six participants were interviewed to gain a deeper understanding of the needs and wishes related to landscape characteristics and amenities for people who live and work in the sub-district around the derelict site. This small sample size is a reflection of the time limitations placed on this report described in the Limitations section of this report on page 144.

Potential participants were identified through a snowball sample based upon an initial convenience sample provided by contacts downtown. I was also able to network with potential participants during the stakeholder design charrette. Participants were selected based on their relationship, proximity, lifestyle diversity, and most importantly, interest in the site’s development. These participants became key informants offering valuable, detailed information about site use, conditions, and opportunities throughout site design and development. It was important participants were truly interested and invested in site development because they were asked to continue participation in research and design proceedings until design completion. Interviews offered additional investigation and clarification useful in discovering new information during all portions of the design process.

William Whyte identifies a frustrating and problematic issue when interviewing informants about spatial preference and needs (Whyte 1980). He discovered the spaces people claim to like best during questioning was a frequently similar description of spaces informants avoided. This is not to say researchers cannot trust informant’s answers, but rather that we need to learn about people’s daily live and routines in a more thorough way than simply asking for a preference. Ethnographic researchers are tasked with identifying patterns and themes within answers. During the
ethnographic research portion of this report I analyzed situations and informant’s answers to identify patterns and themes, rather than specific answers. This approach means that researchers use a broad to narrow exploration technique during questioning. 

This lesson was also critical to the formation of interview questions. Interviews were intended to discover how the Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park could be integrated into local stakeholder’s routines and daily needs. Therefore, informants were questioned about their relationship to downtown as a whole. It was critical to understand how and when informants would, or could, use the reinvented space. This revealed a large percentage of potential user’s only using the space during work hours. The population majority activating the space rarely returned to this area once leaving work. This was important to note before asking informants specific questions about site design. The following is a hypothetical example: if interview patterns revealed a high interest in community gardening, yet no one in the neighborhood was willing to take on weekly maintenance responsibilities, who would tend the garden? Although a community garden could seem most appealing for site programming, it may not match what the informants reveal as most applicable to their existing routine.

All interviews were audio recorded and I took notes by hand. I briefly informed interviewees of the research intent and future use prior to beginning questioning; it was clearly communicated that their responses would be used entirely for research. All participants were asked to choose a pseudonym to encourage complete honesty during interviews. Sometimes in ethnographic research informants feel obligated to use their real names when given a choice out of fear they may give a wrong impression of hiding something. Participants’ anonymity was maintained by using the pseudonyms during all documentation. Participants were also required to sign an informed consent form before beginning interviews. This informed participants how the interview data would be stored, analyzed, and used. Data was stored in the researcher’s password protected laptop. Participants were given email contact so that they may access my eventual master’s report on KState Research Exchange (KREX).

Social resilience is based in community history, identity, narrative, and growth; without the local community’s organically narrated perspectives site design would hold little social resilience. A flexible question framework was used during the interviews as an outline tool. The following schedule of questions is organized to determine stakeholders’ daily routine and priorities. Eventually, I reflected their feedback by integrating identified high priority elements into the site design proposal.

**Spatial Preferences**
- What do you feel makes public spaces successful? Are there characteristics you feel make some more popular and always activated?
- What other cities have you lived in?
  - What is your favorite place in a city (ever/anywhere)?
  - Are there places you visited you felt really influenced you spatially?
  - Or you have fond memories from that you feel could be accredited to the specific place?
Routine Interaction with Downtown:
• What does a daily commute look like to you?
• Can you describe your interaction the downtown district?
• Is there anything that requires you to commute outside the downtown district?
  - Are these amenities found within downtown, but you preference specific locations?
• What businesses or services you find are lacking within the downtown portion of Wichita?

Identity / Place Attachment:
• Do you think Wichita has an identity? What about downtown?
  - What type of identity would you describe it as?
• What public space(s) in downtown do you feel most attached?
  - What is your investment to the space?
  - Why is this relationship strong?
• What would you consider iconic about downtown?
  - Does this term carry any weight to you?
• What places do you feel you frequent most?
  - How do you access them?
• How do you view the existing public spaces offered in downtown Wichita?
• Are there urban design elements they feel could improve downtown immediately and long-term?

Walkability:
• What is their main mode of transit?
  - How long is an average day’s commute?
  - Are active modes of transit even a possibility (safety, distance)?
• Do you consider downtown Wichita legible?
  - How do people give direction? By street name or landmarks, or both?

Natural Space:
• What spaces in downtown do you consider most natural?
• How important is it to you to have access to open/natural space?
  - What is the furthest distance you would travel to reach a green space?

Routine Interaction with Douglas Ave. Site:
• Do you have any routinely direct relationship or interaction with the location?
• During what hours and days do you routinely interact or have potential for interaction with the site?
• What would need to improve in downtown to make you stay in the area after work?

Identity / Place Attachment:
• What type of identity would you associate with this site?
  - Do you have suggestions how an improved identity could activate the site?
• What is your investment to the space?
  - Why is this relationship strong (or weak)?
• How could a different site programming be integrated into your routine using this site?
• How do you predominately access this site?
• How safe or comfortable do you feel around this site?
• Are there specific characteristics the site would need for you to consider activating it?
• How far would you be willing to walk during daytime hours to reach Pop-Up Park food trucks?
• How far would you be willing to walk during nighttime hours to reach the Pop-Up Park movie viewing?
• What forms of programming do you believe would be most beneficial to your daily routine?
Walkability:
• What is the main mode of transit you use to frequent the site?
  - How long is an average day’s commute?
  - Are active modes of transit even a possibility (safety, distance)?

Natural Space:
• To your knowledge, what is the next closest natural space from the site?
• How important is it to you that site redesign incorporates elements of open/natural space?
  - What is the furthest distance you would travel to reach a green space?
• How do you feel about the park being considered temporary?
  - Do you see the word temporary and consider it a negative attribute? (How would you suggest framing the temporality so that it can be enjoyed, or celebrated, while it lasts?)
  - How do you feel the WDDC should address park growth?
• How do you feel about this park only lasting 3-5 years?
  - Do you think the fact that it’s temporary may influence your ability to really feel engaged or attached to the space?
• Where else would you like to see the relocation of this site?
Informant interviews began in late January. I was seeking information relevant to the design and development of Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. As reflected in my interview prompts, it was necessary to first learn about each participant’s outdoor spatial preferences. I used broader, more opened ended questions toward the beginning of the interviews to gather this information prior to speaking specifically about programming preferences for the Pop-Up Park. As Whyte frequently stresses in his research endeavors: informants do not always know or understand what they truly enjoy at the time of questioning.

Informant’s narratives exposed routine activities and priorities that became the foundational elements of site scale social resiliency. The first two participants were Walt and Nikki. Their narratives remained fluid and flexible revealing gaps in assumed information. These gaps were filled as interviewees allowed their narratives to take small detours into outlying subjects. The interviews documented current opinions, organizing ideas, terms, and theorizing categories; this was important so that in future interviews I could use similar vocabulary terms with local informants. The interviews also provided a well-represented variety of perspectives. From these initial interviews some forms of stratification were apparent. Interviews also offered great insight into potential site needs and programming, as well as determining methods or questioning strategies that were most and least successful.

Although no specific time length was specified all interviews lasted between one and two hours. This was plenty of time to allow the participants to lead the interviews into the direction of their choosing while taking tributaries into portions they felt most relevant. I took notes during the interviews to document changes or variations in tone, physical posture, and noteworthy response lapses. These notes were useful in determining the portions of the interview the participants seemed to show the most non-verbal emotion and emphasis.

Data from interviews were organized and analyzed using a system of coding. “Codes are names or symbols used to stand for a group of similar items, ideas, or phenomena that the researcher has notices in his or her data set” (LeCompte et al. 2009, 55). Coding helped categorize ideas, themes, units, patterns, and structures within the transcript. At the most basic level, coding is a way of organizing data in the form of a framework that researchers can understand and use in support of results and conclusions. Themes and patterns are infamous amongst methodologists for emerging subconsciously during the transcription process. This emergence began with a loose count of observed “phrases, events, activities, behaviors, ideas, or other phenomena” that occurred repeatedly during the interview process (LeCompte et al. 2009, 47). I used both a deductive and inductive process of analysis to code interview data. Deductive analysis was used during the division of data into piles with similar principle concepts; as well as when I assigned a number of codes and highlighted text according to their congruity.

Interview coding took shape in a thorough noting process. Once the interviews were complete I methodically listened to the audio recordings several times to document what prompts were used and the participant’s answers. Each interview was listened to a minimum of two times. I spent a minimum of six hours the first time listening to an interview. Each time a different color text was used to keep record of when notes were added. These notes were then combined with the notes taken during the interview. This was critical
to the analysis process. With all the notes combined I could begin to draw conclusions about themes and patterns based on the participant’s verbal and non-verbal responses.

Themes are ideas or thoughts participants continuously discussed. Some identified themes are conceptualized rather than the direct, verbatim responses given by participants. This is because participants were encouraged to lead the interview session and could discuss a variety of topics in depth. Therefore, making it difficult to use specific words or phrases to accurately reflect similar ideas between participant’s responses. For this research study I synthesized participant’s responses to determine the recurring themes introduced during the interview process. I identified recurring themes after carefully listening and documenting the interview conversations a minimum of two times. The theme was highlighted in cyan when found in the notes. An example of this noting process can be found in Appendix D.

Recurring themes were identified by the number of times an idea was discussed and the emphasis placed on the topic. Themes were determined when a recurring topic was narrated with emphasis. For example, if an idea was discussed with little prompt during interviews and was habitually mentioned with fervor, or obvious interest, the idea was labeled a theme. The recurrence and emphasis was compared between individuals themes to determine a hierarchy. Recurring themes are the highest priority. Group, or overall, themes were determined based on the identified individuals’ themes.

As part of my analysis process I used photomontages to graphically express the interview portion of the ethnographic research. I created montage perspectives reflective of themes in participant’s interviews. These montages illustrate ways participant’s responses could be interpreted at the site scale. Participant’s quotes are used as labels for the design programming ideas. Quotes were taken directly from the interview’s audio recording. The quotes used in the montages are sometimes taken out of context of their original intent. This was critical to the analysis process because I was able to infer certain outdoor preferences based on their answers to prompts.
Morning yoga at the waterfront in Toronto, Ontario (author 2013)
4. FINDINGS
I chose the methods used in this report for their qualitative value in establishing social resilience at Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. The ethnographic research methods produced an abundant amount of information to analyze and synthesize. The information was collected and analyzed to determine whether the original Douglas Pop-Up Park design (resulting from a design charrette) incorporated elements of social resilient design. Once the bulk of the coding and analysis process was complete, I was able to begin reevaluating the plan for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. Using the information from the design charrette and interviews, a new re-envisioned plan emerged.

A major limitation in this study was the small sample group. As described in the Limitations section of this report on page 144, this report would have benefited greatly from additional interview participants. However, it was necessary to discover critical user’s insights as a comparison to group charrette participation, even if the timeframe dictated a small number of interviews. The reevaluated temporary design is a reflection of all the information gathered during the ethnographic research. These methods ensured the revised Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park plan incorporated imageable qualities reflective of user’s preferred sense of place. By creating a new, locally influenced sense of place, Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park could demonstrate high social resilience.

The newly revised plans are meant to enhance the existing park plans provided by the WDDC. This means the Pop-Up Park was not reinvented, but instead provided more opportunity for social system to thrive. I chose this course of action rather than designing a new space solely influenced by the collected ethnographic data because of the real life application. Once completed I shared the new design plans and report findings with the WDDC for them to integrate into their design as possible, and more so when the park is relocated. The revised plans maintained as much of the existing plan as possible while incorporating new elements that would increase social resilience. Data from the charrette and interviews were synthesized to improve the sense of place and identity of a space in downtown through the Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park.

The new plan meets both the needs of the interviewees and the WDDC. The Project Downtown portion of Wichita’s Master Plan established several baseline goals acting as a guiding framework throughout the design process. To ensure continuity and citywide legibility, Wichita’s Master Plan was frequently referenced for recommendations. Creative placemaking strategies were synthesized
with Wichita’s Master Plan to emphasize the development of corridors between existing and proposed urban nodes. Figure 4.1 demonstrates how the Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park is centrally located within downtown Wichita. Concepts suggested by Lynch for imageable city scale development were adapted for site scale application. Adhering to the goals and objectives defined by the WDDC, as well as defining a sense of place through imageability the revised plan for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park is seamlessly integrated into the existing urban context.

The Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park design proposal features elements adaptable to fit different locations. Elements used within the Pop-Up Park were designed based on durability and mobility. This component was critical. As downtown Wichita continues to develop, its needs will evolve. The present location of the Pop-Up Park is only temporary; within the next 3-5 years building development will eventually dominate the site. Therefore, elements used in Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park were designed to fit and rearrange into a variety of other locations. The Pop-Up Park offers diverse, multi-programmatic options. Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park provides social resilience through abstract design elements. The purposefully flexible elements allow users to independently, interpret a portion of design intent based on interaction, contextual awareness, and personal experience.
Figure 4.1: Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park site in proximity to other attractions in downtown Wichita, Kansas (author 2015)
Initial site inventory and analysis of the Douglas Avenue site began in mid-January, 2015. All social systems and behavioral patterns were documented on site using diagrams and pedestrian counts. Very little onsite activity was detected during visits. The first day of documentation was Friday, January 16; little onsite activity was present besides the occasional use of the gravel parking. However, the sidewalk along Douglas, adjacent to the site boundaries was relatively active. Every few minutes a pedestrian or bicyclist would pass the site. For this analysis I used pedestrian traffic counts provided by the WDDC. The counts diagrammed in Figure 4.2 are a better representation of the WDDC’s projected site users. These counts were taken during the summer of 2014 and offer a more accurate reflection of the current most active times of day. The highest recorded concentration of people was during the 11:30am-12:30am hour. This was critical to the design of Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park to determine the time of day when most people are currently passing the site. In current downtown conditions, the Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park’s primary user may be the downtown employee around the noon hour. However, the new Pop-Up Park has the potential to draw other users.
A thorough understanding and documentation of pedestrian traffic levels and times of activation remained important to this research because of the design’s temporality. However, additional considerations may be made if the installation was a permanent design and extended future forecasting and development planning was a concern. The Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park was designed to accommodate sixty to one hundred users an hour during the lunchtime rush. This number was based on existing pedestrian counts that pass by the site, illustrated in Figure 4.3, and the amount of customers needed for food truck owners to make a profit. This number is flexible based on park events and times. Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park’s flexible spatial arrangement allows for additional physical space as demand grows.

Figure 4.2: Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park Site existing pedestrian traffic count (author 2015)

Figure 4.3 demonstrates how vehicular circulation will flow on site. The diagram accounts for 20 parking spots for employees of the Woolf Brothers Building during the hours of 8am-6pm. These spots are reserved during the weekdays and open for public use on weekends. These spaces are also used for overflow, or flex, space during larger planned events. Food trucks will have reserved spaces during predetermined times, as advertised via social media as prescribed by the WDDC. The trucks will circulate into the site from the east, entering the site through the southern alleyway. Electric is provided to the food trucks by extensions cords running from the Woolf Brothers Building. Once service hours are over trucks exit back through the alley towards Main Street, to the west.
The ‘pit’ is currently sixteen feet below street grade. Site owners are filling the hole with cut from a different property. Therefore, existing conditions of the site determined a new drainage scheme for the park; the proposed plan uses natural methods to capture and cleanse onsite stormwater. Figure 4.4 demonstrates how onsite drainage is directed away from adjacent buildings and filtered through a series of vegetated dry wells before leaving the site. The proposed vegetated dry wells are designed to hold stormwater in a crushed stone sub grade to mitigate stormwater runoff. Therefore, the vegetated dry wells will cleanse stormwater before entering the sewer system, but also reduce the amount of runoff entering the system.
Figure 4.5: Sketch produced during the stakeholder design charette diagramming programming opportunities, constraints, and imageable elements (WDDC and K-State 2015)
The stakeholder design charrette offered valuable insight into the lives of people who both live and work downtown as well as the developers, and downtown business owners. Figure 4.5, 4.9 and 4.10 are examples of conceptual site ideas produced during the design charrette. As seen in the Figures above the mix of potential user’s perspectives rendered a rich diversity of programming ideas. The conversations and critiques from the charrette gave the designers and developers a better understanding of what amenities may be necessary to activate the space. Some important programming was established prior to the charrette and was therefore incorporated into all three-design schemes: food trucks, shade, and furnishings to sit and eat. All three group’s designs had strengths that were later incorporated into the final site design.

The first hour of the charrette was spent introducing stakeholders and taking a brief walking tour of the "pit". The walking tour revealed many site opportunities and constraints difficult to visualize on paper. All electricity will be run from the Wolf Brothers Building bordering the eastern edge of the site. A single spigot will also be provided on the Wolf Brothers Building for watering onsite vegetation. Vehicle access is to be minimal. A maximum of twenty stalls will be reserved for Farha Construction employees, and can only be accessed through the alley bordering the southern site boundary. Wireless internet in the park will be provided by Cox Communications. The property owners, Ramsey and Eyster, made it clear during this tour that the site is strictly a place-keeper with a purpose. Currently the “pit” is an eyesore, unconducive for adjacent development. They hope the Pop-Up Park can act as a “plug-in” that catalyzes development and then moves elsewhere downtown to continue activating other derelict sites.

Once back at the WDDC headquarters, just two blocks from the “pit”, stakeholders were broken up into three small groups for continued collaboration. The first forty-five minutes of collaboration was dedicated to site design programming exploration. Simple aerial, base maps and existing site concept design information was provided to each group. Groups were encouraged to develop bubble
diagrams and inventory critical considerations induced by a temporary installation on trace paper. This portion of the ethnographic research remained highly dependent on the informants; the charrette offered vested, interest stakeholders an opportunity to prioritize and share what they believe to be most important to the development of Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. Additionally, attendance of Wichita City agencies, and property owners ensured a variety of perspectives were represented. Following is a list of attendees and their vested interest in Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park:

- Jason Gregory: Executive Vice President at the WDDC
- Mike Ramsey: property site owner, downtown developer with Bokeh Development
- Bob Eyster: property site owner, downtown developer with Bokeh Development
- Ted Farha: owner of Farha Building Construction, donating services to survey the site and fill the “pit” with soil
- Bob Cole: employee of Trans Pacific
- Courtney Looney: communications coordinator at the Knight Foundation
- Scott Knebel: Wichita planning department downtown revitalization manager
- Chad Finn: architect, principal of 3 Ten Architects
- William O’Neil: Landscape architect at Law Kingdon Architects
- Larry Hoetmer: Wichita City Parks and Recreation
- Troy Houtman: Wichita City Parks and Recreation Director
- Larry Weber: Garvey Center Operator
- Jeff Schauf: owner of Flying Stove and organizer of Wichita Food Truck Association
- Shannon Boone: resident and small business owner in downtown Wichita
- Tom Page: resident and musician in downtown Wichita
- Eric Wittman: resident and architect at SPT in downtown Wichita
Figure 4.6 illustrates how group 1 addressed the need for street appeal and allure for green space. The group proposed a shallow berm to guide people into the site, act as a seating element, and add interest through sculptural ambiguity. This idea provoked positive feedback as a way to increase green space, but with low maintenance. Group 1 also recognized the importance of activating the space along Douglas Avenue to draw new users into the site; they added standing height bars along the Northern site edge to encourage people watching and the feeling of site density. Encouraging users to inhabit the space directly along the site edge encourages triangulation. As people drive, walk, or bike past Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park they are influenced by the social engagement (Putnam 1995). This group also explored different configurations for food truck circulation. This was beneficial as the president of the Wichita Food Truck Association was present to give feedback and criticism.

As seen in Figure 4.7 the final schematic design, Group 2 focused more on simplicity and adaptability. As a member of Group 2, I was able to better understand the restrictions and liabilities of installing a temporary park. Mike Ramsey, property owner, developer, and member of Group 2, clearly defined many of the parameters and concerns of building on site. Ramsey promoted simple and small as a concept to create a higher feeling of density on site. Therefore our group brainstormed a phasing strategy; as the park’s popularity and user base grows the physical space and programming would adjust to meet the demand. Group 2 also chose to design a tree planter that could double as a standing bar with arms that could extend out into a shelf also accommodating the food trucks. Both of these design strategies were developed to make the park look activated and therefore conducive to triangulation.
Group 3’s final design plan demonstrated a strong sense of identity using local imagery. This group proposed two different concepts both incorporating identifiable community elements. In the image shown in Figure 4.8 the group suggested using airplane parts as sculptural elements leading users into and through the site. This idea was well received and encouraged additional group conversation about the importance of imageable elements. Group 3 also designed a lighting scheme for the space to improve immediate site perception. A thoughtful exterior lighting plan can increase safety on sites by decreasing negative perceptions.
Once all groups presented their plans some conclusive discussion summarized strengths and weaknesses in the design plans. This was also an opportunity for developers Mike Ramsey, and Bob Eyster to vocalize concerns and approval pertaining to design ideas and site details.

Jason Gregory met with peers and myself following the conclusive discussion. We determined which design concepts were worth further investigation and the types of design outcomes the WDDC was expecting from us. Jason asked that we develop a schematic plan for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park reflective of the charrette’s criticism. He also demonstrated interest in further investigating the potential of prototyping a planter for a three inch caliper tree and light art for the site. Before leaving the WDDC headquarters our team determined a follow up date to share design progress with Jason for further feedback.
Figure 4.11: Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park stakeholder design charrette reflection site design (Mercado and Giastetter 2015)
Following the design charrette, fellow group member, Nick Mercado, and myself collaborated to reflect on the ideas and criticism shared during the stakeholder design charrette. We compiled the designs to create a knowledge base for the final informed design solution. Informed design is a pedagogical approach to design used to enhance students’ knowledge and skills before proposing design solutions (Burghardt 2002). Community needs and character are a primary concern when designing for social resilience. Therefore, stakeholders that attended the design charrette were purposefully selected based on their relationship and vested interest in the site. Social resilience requires understanding of user’s perspectives, diversity, and needs. As seen in Figure 4.11 all stakeholder input was carefully analyzed to best understand site use, potential, and programming needs. Nick and I worked to create a design scheme reflecting the critical information about site user profiles and existing site identities discovered at the design charrette. This was necessary information for designing a strong sense of place with appropriately represented identity and meaning.

This schematic design plan incorporates feedback from all members of the design charrette. Nick and I focused on designing a site plan that was both realistic and reflective of the local user base. Figure 4.12 demonstrates how criticism and information was synthesized from the stakeholder design charrette into a site plan. This process began by reflecting on the notes taken during the charrette and group discussion. First, we diagrammed preliminary inventory and analysis diagrams to get a better understanding of site conditions. Together, Nick and I made a prioritized list of programming opportunities. This list acted as a guide as we methodically diagrammed several schematic plans. These diagrams considered site drainage, programming, circulation, and durability.

One week after the charrette Nick and I presented our revised schematic site plan to Jason Gregory via a video call. During the video conversation we explained the design and programming strategies, and how we synthesized the feedback into a functioning site plan. Jason offered valuable feedback concerning site design and implementation updates. Jason stressed the
importance of a phasing strategy for site implementation; the plan would preserve park budget and promote site success through growth planning. The critique offered Nick and I the opportunity to ask questions about site programming and utilities. With Jason’s feedback we could return to the schematic design phase with a better understanding of site needs and goals. As the close of the conversation we determined a date to have updated site design plans, sections, and details to Jason for review with Wichita stakeholders.

The last version of schematic design site drawings for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park were submitted to the WDDC on February 5th. Nick and I work collaboratively on these renderings to develop a working solution to needs expressed by stakeholders at the design charette and Jason’s extended feedback. The drawings submitted to the WDDC for review included a site plan with 3 phasing options, shown in Figure 4.12, 4.15 and 4.17. Each phase was designed to accommodate a different number and type user.

The first phase was planned primarily for the downtown employee lunch crowd. This plan focused on the success of the food trucks during the hours of 11:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. The plan was kept simple and small to allude to a higher level of density on site. Modular furniture was present, but in limited amounts to act as a testing ground. Three tree planters provided shade, and doubled as standing tables.
Figure 4.14 demonstrates the detailing of the tree planter. Numerous considerations were critical to the success and sustainment of these trees and use of planters. Kansas State University second-year landscape architecture students were asked to further explore the design and construction of these planters. The Creative Placemaking student group acted as design mentors during this semester long collaboration process. An iconic sculptural airplane salvage piece was proposed as signage along the Douglas Avenue edge to invite users into the site while introducing imageable elements. A berm made of artificial turf was designed into the plan as an artistic play element for children as well as a seating element. Bar height furniture was placed along the northern edge of the site to induce triangulation and also publicize the space to new users.
Phase II extended the Pop-Up Park space an additional twenty feet to the south. The additional space increased shade with six more tree planters. This phase also introduced more vegetated dry wells into the ground plane to cleanse and store stormwater. Figure 4.16 illustrates how the dry wells would theoretically work on site to cleanse and capture onsite water. This phase incorporated additional programming opportunities such as, movie viewing, medium-large gathering space,
Phase III was the optimal park design scheme. This plan incorporated a diverse mix of programming opportunities spanning times of day and days of the week. Nearly the entire site was programmed for park space in this phase. The southwest corner was activated with games such as ping-pong and beanbags while being lit at night to increase safety and times of use. As seen in the previous phase additional tree planters were added for shade and table space.
After completing this stage of the design process both Mercado and I pursued our individual master’s project. However, we continued to communicate advances in individual research relevant to the design and implementation of Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park to Jason Gregory at the WDDC. Nick continued his research on the design and implementation of a public light art installation for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. Simultaneously, I switched focus from the park design to the characterization of site social resilience for the Pop-Up Park through ethnographic interviews with downtown residents. When substantial progress updates were made I emailed learned information. Updates were typically sent in presentation format.

Second year landscape architecture students continued work throughout the course of the Spring 2015 semester to develop site furnishings for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. A design charrette and critique was held February 27. This was an opportunity for the second year students to present schematic design ideas to the Creative Placemaking Master’s Group. Students presented their site furnishing designs in groups of four. A total of four groups presented. Group 1 focused on a bench with a cement base, hackberry wood seating ledge and steel basin for native vegetation. Figure 4.18 is a digital representation of their seating detail. The second group chose to investigate a tree planter with seating wrapping around the base. This detail was inspired...
by the natural aesthetic of a boulder, Figure 4.19. The seating planter thoughtfully addressed drainage and insulation issues to accommodate a three inch caliper tree. Group 3 also developed an original seating detail. Apparent in Figure 4.20 wooden bench was inspired by wave formations. Its wooden platform and steel frame make it easily replicable and transportable for future park use. The final group designed a standing height, circular tree planter. As seen in Figure 4.21, the planter is supported by three steel supports and wrapped in an artistic steel plate. Similarly, group 4 accounted in their design drawings for proper drainage and insulation for a three inch caliper tree.

The second year landscape architecture student began prototyping designs in early April. Each team developed a working digital and physical model of their site detail. After reviewing the prototypes I enthusiastically integrated the imageable furnishings into my site design plan. Plans were made between the class instructor, Professor Chip Winslow, and Jason Gregory of the WDDC to have the site details funded, fabricated, and installed once site construction was complete. Each furniture piece was thoughtfully and uniquely designed for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park site and user’s affording the space opportunity for unique identity.
A: if you felt if Wichita or anywhere in Wichita might have an identity. What would you call it or could you identify anything specific to Wichita? Or even a certain characteristic?

N: uh that's hard. It's hard b/c they have this weird little identify crisis and we have for a long time b/c its Wichita specific, not kansas. It's like entitled inferiority. Not the identity we want to project. Everyone should want to be in Wichita but then everyone that's here says we suck. So when doesn't know. We suck in the dignity we should have. Austin is weird and so unique. But it doest show. It's hard and very segregated. So many different places to identify. B/c the people who live and work downtown and the people who play downtown is very different people are very much in their won pod and don't cross over.

N: (ugh that’s hard (making groaning noises. And super slow to answer) “we have an identity crisis and I don’t understand. Its Wichita specific” “entitled inferiority” “and it’s not the identity we want to project” everyone should love it but everyone that’s here says they suck. “we suck is not the identity we should have” (speaking passionately) “there are so many unique things that are here” there is so many different places to identify” the crowd of people that work downtown are completely different than the people who work downtown and live in the suburbs (talked kind of slowly and struggled to articulate) it’s very segregated, well that’s the wrong word. (started many thoughts but didn’t finish sentences)

Weird identity crisis (long pause and slow)
A: is it something that's physical or social?
A: you think it’s physical or social?
N: very much district west side/ east side. The people from downtown are the strange oddballs. B/c they go everywhere don’t identify themselves as anywhere specific. “Were the strange” in the eyes of the community. ‘Keep Wichita strange’. It’s not weird in a bad way. It’s an attractive measure. People from here tend t. I don’t know small minded. Simple thinkers, I didn’t say that. We just have a lot of stuff to do they just don’t do it. We did a stay-cation the other years and had a goddamn blast. We went to the zoo, went to a show at century 2, ate at all the restaurants, and stayed down by the river. There is just so much to do and no one takes advantage of it.

N: slowly answer and answer very detailed about types of people) east side and west side are in their own pod and they don’t intermingle. District defining lines. The people that live downtown are the oddballs b/c they go everywhere. You can
Interview Analysis

Themes:
Individual, ethnographic interviews were conducted over the course of three weeks. The initial interviews took place in Wichita on January 31, 2015. The final three interviews were also conducted in person, in Wichita on February 24th and 25th of the same year. This provided me with ample time to carefully document and analyze participant’s answers. The interview narratives unveiled a collection of themes. Each participant’s interview was first individually analyzed using the noting and coding process, and then graphically synthesized through an exploratory process of photomontaging. Figure 4.22 is an example of the noting and coding analysis used to identify individual and cumulative group themes. The photomontages on the following pages are collections of photographs or images compiled into a collage to illustrate concepts and inspirational design ideas.

I used the photomontages as a graphic analysis technique to prioritize and organize interview themes. Themes were directly represented in the montages using quotes from the interviews. The selected quotes are most reflective of the individual’s responses and noted themes. The photomontages are graphic analysis of a space interviewees would use in downtown Wichita, if it existed. Site programming was labeled with quotes from the interviews to reveal the inspiration behind design. The photomontages created are idealized park designs based on individual interviews. They were used as one step of the design process during the reevaluation portion of research. Ideally these spaces would be permanent installations; however, as reflected in the reevaluated site design plans the montages are strictly conceptual being many of the design elements shown are not temporal.

This graphic exercise was a deeper analysis of not only individual interview themes, but later overall themes. This portion of the design process was critical in helping me further understand and account for any, and all, underlying themes. Themes were then synthesized through the combination of coded notes, representational quotes, and graphic montages. Individual participant’s themes were compared and conceptualized to identify the overall participant group’s themes. The conclusive themes were documented and later represented in a revised, more socially resilient site design plan for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park.
INTERVIEW: WALT

Walt is a young professional living alone in downtown Wichita. He lives so close to work he “can barely make it through three entire songs on his iPod” on his walk. Walt is originally from the Wichita area and had no problem returning after graduating college.

Wichita Livability
There are amenities he wishes he could access by foot or bike in downtown
- “anything I would have to purchase I would have to drive...Because there is no or very little retail downtown”
- “Groceries are a big one. I have to drive to a store like ten minutes away”

Spoke passionately about distaste for Topeka, Kansas
- “It’s awful. We can’t find anything to do and they don’t have a downtown and we want to eat out but all they have is chain restaurants”

Wichita Identity
Very difficult for him to describe any sort of identity for Wichita
- “I think Wichita is very conservative and they’re very family friendly”
- “But as far as a real identity, no I don’t think we have an identity. Not like Kansas City”

He feels districts within Wichita are very nondistinct
- “um so you have Old Town and downtown and I dunno, to me they’re kinda the same”
- “Delano the area right west of the river does a good job separating themselves and try to identify themselves as their own community”

He feels Wichita is really developing in terms of great places to eat
- “I think the restaurants in the last three years have gotten way better”

Spaces downtown either don’t have an identity or its misrepresented
- “I really liked the airplane parts idea”

Existing Wichita Outdoor Space
There are parts of Wichita he prefers because of spatial character
- “I really like Delano a lot it’s kinda just a lot cooler”

Was infuriated by a newspaper article submitted by a WSU professor concerning the Pop-Up Park
- “He really pissed me off with that article so I looked up all his credentials, and he actually has some pretty impressive history. But I don’t think he understood the concept”
- “yeah yeah exactly and so by the off chance that maybe we can be there and get street tacos or listen to a band play there or do anything besides having a giant hole is a success in my mind.”

Mentioned a recent Wichita park he felt was successful
- “They just build all these really weird object and they have a huge chair and a wagon and the whole deal is that you walk up to this park and take pictures with the stuff. It’s awesome.”

He addressed a misunderstanding of parks in downtown Wichita
- “New York and big cites parks are just so important because you have people that don’t have private yards.
I think parks in general are hard for people to understand here.”
There is a disconnect between the people who live and use the downtown parks and those making decisions about the parks

“Naftzer Park, which is just awesome and I Love that park. And I feel like it gets a bad rep. and it an amazing park. And it is like really well done.”

**Commut**

‘Commut’ is not very relevant to Walt’s daily routine

“I don’t have a problem getting around. Um, I live in Old Town and I work 3 blocks away so that’s like 70% of your week. I hardly ever drive” “I can hardly make it through an entire song on my iPod on my walk to work”

Bike culture was something that really excited Walt to talk and elaborate on

“YEAH! There’s a bike club in Wichita and they do these pub pedals every Thursday”

“We hit four or five bars and stop and have a beer and ride to the next. Sometimes there’s like 50–75 bikes outside of these bars.”

**Outdoor preferences**

He mentioned 3 main cities with unique spatial characteristics that stuck out to him

“It just makes you feel like you know the city b/c it’s on a grid and there’s squares every two blocks so it just made me feel very comfortable”

“Paley Park in New York, it was just really a well done space”

(Balboa Park, San Diego, California) “I lived there for a bit and I wasn’t really used to a big city so that was an area I felt like I could relax and they had the zoo and museum there and it was just an enjoyable spot”
"I'm in a bike club in Wichita and they do like pub pedas so every Thursday they all will go on a pub pedal and get me into a further areas [of Wichita]."

"so by the off chance that maybe we can be there and get street tacos or listen to a band play or do anything besides having a giant hole is a success in my mind."
“I liked the idea of the berm because it was real simple. Um, I think someone had like tables or stools that are high up by the sidewalk. And I love that and I hope we do that.”

“Anything you have to purchase I would have to drive. Like clothes or groceries are the big one.”

“And the whole deal is that you walk up to this park and take pictures with the stuff. It’s awesome, I think they should do something like that. And put a whole bunch of weird objects.”
INTERVIEW: NIKKI

Nikki is a small business owner living in a downtown Wichita apartment. She lives with her ten year old daughter and dog. Nikki moved downtown from the suburbs of Wichita because of the accessibility, activities, and job convenience. She considers the move to be “the best decision she’s ever made”. Her daughter similarly loves living downtown.

Outdoor Spaces In Wichita
Likes Naftzger Park and the Riverwalk area because of the social capital
  We love Nafzger Park. People call it Burn Park but we love it. Also on the west of waterwalk apartment is awesome b/c of the pond and space for people to fish and foot truck rallies once a month. It’s like a downtown is supposed to be” people sit on the grass and on the sidewalk and eat and talk”
Little opportunities to conduct meetings with clients outside
  “I would love to have a place like the Pop-Up Park to meet with clients”
Little outdoor event space for work in downtown
  “We don’t really have a place for nice, small outside venues”

Wichita Identity
Feels like Wichita is at fault for its own lack of identity
  “We have an identity crisis and I don’t understand it. It’s Wichita specific ‘entitled inferiority’ and that’s not what we want to project”
  “There is this idea that everyone should love Wichita, but everyone here also says ‘we suck’. There are so many unique things that are here and so many place to identify”
She struggles with forms of physical and social stratification
  “East and west side are their own pods and they don’t intermingle. The people that live downtown are oddballs and strange”
  “you can live on one side and work on the other, but it’s strange to live and work downtown”
Addresses the ignorant perception of living downtown
  “There is much entertainment and so much to do but people just don’t do it”
  “After 8 months you would think they would be used to a family living downtown…They whispered it like it was a bad thing”
Elaborated on the Tallgrass Film Festival enthusiastically
  “Its one of my favorite, favorite events all year long. It’s so FUN!”
Living in A Downtown
Suburban living is so overrated
“After two weeks of deliberation they packed everything up in a week and moved. Craziest decision
they ever made. They knew immediately.”
“We never go to Derby anymore. There is nothing there to do.”
They appreciate and use the outdoor spaces more living in downtown
“Oh she loves it. Sometimes she says ‘oh I miss having a yard’ but she doesn’t. She didn’t play in it
when we had one. Ever. But here we do so much more.”
Lack of necessary amenities not a deal breaker
“It takes just as long to get to a store here than it did in Derby. In fact, it actually takes less time b/c
now I can do it on the way to or from getting [her daughter] b/c it’s on the way.”
Enjoys living an apartment building because the close community
“Its like having a whole neighborhood in a building”
Elaborates on frustrating laws that discourage taxi cab transit
“Cabs are not allowed to wait. So you will have to wait an hour. If you call them its takes 45 mins for
them to get here. But the city doesn’t allow for the cabs to idle.”
Wichita is ignoring a critical demographic to attract to downtown
“[the] goal is to attract college grad to work, live, and then grow downtown, not just leave”
More families may consider living downtown if the outdoor spaces accommodated family live
“you can’t throw sidewalk chalk outside and expect kids to be entertained”

Spatial Preferences
Enjoyed elaborating on how much she enjoyed Boston
“There is just not one negative thing about Boston. We can get anywhere in 45 mins for 5 bucks”
“[Tallgrass Film Festival] is one of my favorite, favorite events all year long. It’s so FUN!”

“We don’t really have a place for nice, small outside venues”

“It’s like a downtown is supposed to be. People sit on the grass and on the sidewalk and eat and talk”
“Cabs are not allowed to idle in downtown. So you will likely wait an hour for one, its infuriating.”

“you cant throw sidewalk chalk outside and expect kids to be entertained.”
INTERVIEW: HECUBUS & SUCCUBAE

This interview was conducted with two individuals simultaneously. Heccuba and Succubae are an energetic couple “living an alternative lifestyle” in their downtown Wichita home. Both work and live in the same building. Neither Heccuba nor Succubae are native to Wichita, but stay for affordability of their chosen lifestyle.

Quality of Life
Live in northern continental city five months of the year
“What I love most about [northern city] is how excited people are to be outside”
People are more engaged in [northern city] with their environment and one another
“Every park is open and there are all these festivals and people leave work to drink a bottle of wine outside”
People are more tolerant of differences b/c they share more semi-private space
“Casual social interaction makes everyone more tolerant”
It can be frustrating at times to empathize with Wichitans outside the bubble
“Quality of life is just such a low priority here” “No one here cares about being happy” “There is such a xenophobic fear of change and difference and that prevents people from going out and exploring”
Life is about enjoying everyday
“Yes! Its 2 o clock, it’s chocolate and coffee time!”

Wichita Livability & Identity
Wichita is a place for business development and raise a family
“I thing the entrepreneurial spirit is awesome” “Final Fridays is successful because it’s a place to see and be seen, and its free so its something you can do with your kids”
Wichita lacks places with originality, atmosphere and culture
“There isn’t a cooler bar than my house”
They stay in Wichita because of the specific lifestyle, or ‘bubble’, they’ve created for themselves
“I LOVE my bubble and I love my friends and my house” “It’s a comfortable place to be when you’re an artist living an alternative lifestyle”
Wichita’s family oriented spirit is physically and emotionally present
“People are genuinely excited by your work. It’s a very supportive, nurturing, kind art community, it’s a very well made safe place, its paradise”
Wichita spends too much money on planning and too little on doing
“How about you spend $23 million and gave 23 small businesses loans to move downtown?”
“The first thing is to just put a grocery store downtown!”
Biking
Bicycle is their primary mode of transit
   “We bike everywhere!” “It’s so fun!”
Public perception does not understand a career biker
   “I was being harassed by the police in this town b/c they never saw a female on a bicycle”
There is little support for bike infrastructure in Wichita
   “But why don’t we educate the public first? Like let’s make it illegal to swerve and yell at cyclists”

Spatial Preferences
Living in Wichita is really opposite of the lifestyle they live in Montreal, but it makes them more appreciative
   “We feel like were the king and queen of downtown, its exhilarating living in this ghost city in the winter”
They enjoy running through College Hills, an older burrough of Wichita
   “a pleasant area with trees that are old city trees that are always beautiful”

Lighting
A defining moment in Hecubus’ choice to remain in Wichita was realizing culture existed
   “Each painting had this awesome light, I’ve never seen anything lit that astoundingly, it was so unexpected”
Outdoor lighting
   “no one will go there if its concentration camp lighting”
“How about you spend $23 million and gave 23 small businesses loans to move downtown?” “The first thing is to just put a grocery store downtown!”

“But why don’t we educate the public first? Like let’s make it illegal to swerve and yell at cyclists”

“a pleasant area with trees that are old city trees that are always beautiful”
“Every park is open and there are all these festivals and people leave work to drink a bottle of wine outside”

“I LOVE my bubble and I love my friends and my house” “It’s a comfortable place to be when you’re an artist living an alternative lifestyle”

“no one will go there if it's concentration camp lighting”
INTERVIEW: KATHERINE

Katherine is a young, single woman living in downtown Wichita. During the summer she enjoys walking to her job, otherwise she drives a personal car. Katherine is originally from Wichita and returned from a larger city after a couple of years after graduating from college. She is happy to be back in Wichita to be closer to family and surrounded by the friendly atmosphere.

Wichita Identity
She admits there is a lack of identifiable image
   “Other people aren’t going to love the city until the people that live in the city share what they love…. That way people outside Wichita can see all the things to celebrate”
As part of her job she has to push an identity, or perception, to potential new residents
   “so were friendly, that’s a good thing but it’s a hard sell”
Wichita can sometimes be confusing to navigate
   “with people from here you can use landmarks, but people from out of town not as much because there aren’t very many landmarks”

Living in Wichita
Katherine is a Wichita native and came back after 8 years of living in larger, more advanced cities
   “how easy it is to get involved in various groups and whatever activity it is you like”
Katherine’s primary mode of transit is personal automobile
   “The one thing I miss about both DC and Milwaukee is the public transit”
She feels the bus system is inadequate for daily transit
   “I’ve never ridden the bus in Wichita, it’s a perception thing for sure, but it’s not worth taking the time to do that”
The downtown living lifestyle suits her now, but she will likely move outside downtown when/if she had a family
   “there isn’t housing available downtown that could accommodate a family style living”
   “The parks downtown are not family oriented. There just aren’t things for kids to do”

Outdoor Space
Katherine continuously described how important it was for her to have a space to read
   “I lived in DC for a while and there’s just such great outdoor space. There are parks and benches and places for people to sit”
She mentioned several time she enjoyed being at the Riverwalk
   “I go running by the river and sitting at home and reading”
She would really like having an outdoor space accessible from the office
   “I like to get out and get some fresh air” “go sit outside and take our laptops and work or have lunch”
"The parks downtown are not family oriented. There just aren’t things for kids to do”

“The one thing I miss about both DC and Milwaukee is the public transit”
Other people aren’t going to love the city until the people that live in the city share what they love…. That way people outside Wichita can see all the things to celebrate.”

“I lived in DC for a while and there’s just such great outdoor space. There are parks and benches and places for people to sit”
INTERVIEW: PABLO

Pablo is a single man in his forties living in a downtown apartment. He owns his own business just five blocks from his home. Pablo enjoys living downtown for its convenience and walkable access to natural spaces. After moving into a downtown apartment from a house with a yard he sometimes feels out of touch with nature. Pablo is also a committed public transit user.

**Downtown Livability**

Basic necessary amenities are missing from downtown Wichita

“...The market is prohibiting us from having pharmacy, liquor store, and grocery. That sure would be nice” “Just basic groceries, just extremely basic groceries would help”

Difficult, and oftentimes impossible, to get food past 11 pm without a vehicle

“...and even if they had something that’s open till 12 that would help”

Downtown district is really created for the business day crowd

“...Bottom line is that there is a ton of lunch. It just highlights this isn’t a residential place. At 3 o’clock everything closes up”

The crowd the WDDC is trying to attract won’t come without some basic residential amenities

“...more bistros and art galleries. And the occasional tacos, sliders slash liquor store. That’s why big cities are so fun!”

**Green in Urban Design**

He appreciate large urban cities with green space integrated into pedestrian thoroughfares

“...They have green space and its dense and urban and they have more street trees than here”

Enjoys the river walk for its variety in spatial character and types

“...You get in there and there is a feeling of a lot of space going one direction and being nice and cozy and closed in all the other directions”

Appreciates the feeling of a private public space

“...The WSU campus is nice with flowers and plants and green spaces you can sit in a garden in essence and its pleasant”

Misses having a space closer to his front door with some green

“...Just walking by a raised planter would make me happy, just smelling some green in the summertime would be really nice”

Feels out of touch with the seasons after moving to downtown

“...That’s another reason to have green space is that it puts you in better touch with the weather cycles”
**Walkability**

Walking around downtown Wichita has its challenges

“it feels so harsh the way the wind rips across these concrete sidewalks”

Impossible to walk to get food past 10pm in downtown

“I would walk as far as the studio. And that’s 3.5 long blocks or 5 shot blocks. I bet its half a mile”

**Transportation**

Enjoys other cities because their public transit systems are more efficient and made for general public

“The public transit system [in New York City and Chicago] is just so great and accessible”

Uses the bus system for transit for amenities outside the close downtown core

“If you’re within 10 mins of downtown area then you have a pretty good bus density and time schedule”

Addressed the negative perception of public transit in Wichita

“People think it’s a tragedy that I take the bus”

Involved in advocating for the bus system and struggles for support

“They were hesitant to bring the general public down to the transit center for safety concerns, and it was in the middle of the afternoon!”

**Wichita Identity**

Attempts to push an identity he feels to be most true

“Were like a gritty urban, industrial center” “the center of things. And so I like the concept of us as the ennead”

“I think my perception of [Wichita] is a city of tree lined avenue and the river. The river is very important in my thinking”

Used Wichita lingo in different scenarios

“So if we take it up 30,000 ft.” [an airplane reference]
“Bottom line is that there is a ton of lunch. It just highlights this isn’t a residential place. At 3 o’clock everything closes up”

“Just walking by a raised planter would make me happy, just smelling some green in the summertime would be really nice”

“People think it’s a tragedy that I take the bus”
“more bistros and art galleries. And the occasional tacos, sliders slash liquor store. That’s why big cities are so fun!”

“We’re like a gritty urban, industrial center” “the center of things. And so I like the idea of us being the middle of the states”
REFLECTIVE EVALUATION OF PRELIMINARY SITE DESIGN

Recurring Participant Themes:
Social resilience for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park was grounded in themes presented during the ethnographic interviews. Recurring themes were identified by the number of times an idea was discussed and the emphasis placed on the topic. For example if a topic was addressed with little prompt during individual interviews and was recurrently mentioned with fervor, or obvious interest, the topic was labeled a theme. The recurrence and emphasis was compared between individuals themes to determine a hierarchy. Recurring themes remained the highest priority during the reevaluation of Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park site design. Group, or overall, themes were determined based on the identified individuals’ themes.

Although not always discussed in the exact context or situation, the overall recurring themes were addressed in every interview. The recurring themes focused on downtown resident’s image and lifestyle. Interviewees were collectively enthusiastic to narrate the advantages and disadvantages of living downtown. There was a sense of unexpected maverick pride expressed during these narratives. It
IDENTITY CRISIS

Informants were asked to illustrate their perception of downtown Wichita’s spatial character and identity. I hoped to determine any existing sense of community, place, or identity. All informants unanimously struggled to answer this prompt. Before attempting to describe various descriptions of Wichita identity, participants paused and slowly began to form a response. Each response began by acknowledging Wichita’s lack of image. As participants narrated responses they addressed their attempts to create an identity for Wichita, rather than speaking of an existing identity.

Participants described what they tell people Wichita is truly like: a gritty industrial epicenter, a place for people to come raise a family in the suburbs, a place to explore and start a business, a friendly city, and place in the midst of an identity crisis. There are currently several false sense of identities circulating through Wichita. Few of which residents of downtown feel are accurate representations, or real characterizations of Wichita’s true colors. For example, Hecubus describes a propagandized sense of patriotism trying to catch on that she feels is a misdirected perception of the real Wichita.

A possible reason for identity crisis may be the physical and social barriers in Wichita. Participants acknowledged the sprawling nature of Wichita that can sometimes segregate the eastern from western populations. This form of stratification did not seem to negatively bother participants but was recognized.
During every interview, participants fondly described their interaction with the Riverwalk Park. Nearly all participants claimed to use this space on a weekly basis, for various reasons and spaces. Riverwalk Park features walking trails, benches, and gathering spaces that border the Arkansas River. Participants use the space for reading, running, biking, walking dogs, and relaxing. The park seemed to be a favorite for its versatility it affords the people who live and work downtown. Participants appreciated the integration of green space into the park layout. Several times a statue, Keeper of The Plains, was mentioned to identify the area, acting as an iconic landmark. Riverwalk Park is used to host events and festivals during warm seasons; event activities were described as exciting opportunities for social engagement and cultural exposure. In many cases, participants viewed Riverwalk Park as Wichita’s version of an urban outdoor space.

Nearly all participants mentioned desiring an outdoor space they could bring a bottle of wine or six-pack of beer to enjoy during nice weather. Three participants actually verbalized their desires for a downtown brew fest or wine tasting event. Allowing open containers of alcohol in public can be a complicated situation. Hecubus recognized this during her narrative and explained how it works in Montreal. As long as people are enjoying their alcohol with food, law enforcers allow alcohol consumption in public spaces. For example, it is legal for a family to enjoy a bottle of wine in a park as long as it’s with a picnic. However, if a couple is obviously inebriated and insulting other patrons they will be approached by law enforcement.
When participants were prompted to discuss qualities of living downtown they appreciated and disliked responses focused around resident’s lack of basic needs. For example, informants cannot access necessary amenities without a private vehicle. In other words, these needs determined the basic amenities absent in downtown. Participants unanimously addressed their desire for a market or grocery store to relocate downtown. Biking to the nearest grocery store is difficult because the lack of infrastructure and distance. Riding the bus to the grocery store is equally as difficult because riders are allowed a limited number of bags to carry with them.

Other amenities such as late night food, clothing retail, book stores, and art supply stores were also noted as weekly, or biweekly locations residents were forced to drive to. Several of the listed activities were recorded and later creatively synthesized into potential site design programming options.
All participants were positive advocates for their downtown walkable lifestyle. A majority of participants were willing to walk five to ten blocks to destinations within downtown Wichita. However, they admitted Wichita is a car-dominated community making it difficult to live car free because of obligations related to their job. One participant was a career biker and passionately narrated the struggles of biking in downtown Wichita. There is currently little to no bike infrastructure to support bike commuting. There are also no laws protecting cyclists from distracted or aggressive drivers.

All participants initiated a discussion about the public bus transit system. Consistently, participants illustrated the negative perception of the system as seen by Wichitans. Only one participant habitually used the bus. All other participants considered the system too inefficient to be worthwhile. However, all but two interviewees admitted to have never actually attempted to use the system. In one instance a participant recollected an experience where Wichita city employees discouraged use of the bus system because they feared it was too dangerous for the general public. Besides walking downtown, Wichita is not conducive to other forms of active or public transit for downtown residents and employees.
DOWNTOWN LIFESTYLE

Participants acknowledged themselves as living an alternative lifestyle compared to most people living in Wichita. Living in the downtown district of Wichita is considered unconventional for most people living in the suburbs of Wichita. One participant recollected an article written in the newspaper after her family moved to downtown. She said people are still sensitive to the subject. However, living in downtown Wichita is a trend on the rise. In 2014, 300 new residential options went on the market to meet the growing demand (Wichita 2013). Participants commented that downtown is still seen as a just a place to work to most of the community; that a majority of the Wichita population believes there is nothing to do downtown, especially for people under twenty years old. Contrarily, most participants’ favorite thing about living downtown is all the activities accessible within a five minute car commute or walkable distance.
Although participants struggled to characterize Wichita’s identity, they did address the familial suburban communities surrounding downtown. Two of the participants discussed their plan to move back to the suburbs once they were ready to start a family. However, the participant who moved from the suburbs to downtown with her family claimed the scenario was backwards. Once relocated to downtown she felt she was finally part of a supportive and nurturing neighborhood. When she returns to her old neighborhood, in a suburb fifteen minutes away, people do not greet or offer help in the same way as downtown.

There seems to be a form of supportive community connection between the people who live downtown. All participants commented on a form of nurturing, friendly, supportive community they were apart of. For example, one participant continuously referred to her bubble as the main reason for loving living in Wichita. She described her bubble as her friends that are kind and generous and live to celebrate one another’s successes.
LACK OF NIGHTTIME ACTIVATION

Wichita is frequently accused of shutting down after 3 p.m. Most activities and weekday entertainment is aimed toward the downtown employee who commutes to downtown for work. Once the lunch hour is over most restaurants close for the day offering little to no options for downtown residents to access food by foot. However, some participants enjoyed this aspect of living downtown. Once the business day is over, downtown can feel deserted and extremely private. For some participants this increased their feelings of ownership and connection to downtown.
AN ICONIC FRONT YARD FOR DOWNTOWN WICHITA

Concept:
After WWII neighborhood design drastically changed as suburban development boomed. Priority shifted from having a thoughtfully designed front yard to a private backyard. Before the United States became so automobile dependent, and therefore increasingly privatized, neighborhoods were developed and oriented to accommodate the front yard. Designers still thought about the walkability and interaction between street infrastructure and front doors. This space was used for gathering and interaction (Moughtin 2003). Neighbors were encouraged to engage rather than retreating to a private, fenced in backyard. As Hecubus wisely stated “active outdoor spaces make people more tolerant and civil” (Hecubus 2015). As described in the literature review, communities social capital is suffering because the lack of civic engagement (Putnam 1995).

There is little to no preferred space for downtown residents to identify as their front yard. Not only were interviewees unable to collectively determine an identity for downtown Wichita, but also acknowledged their lifestyles were viewed as alternative by most Wichitans. Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park is an opportunity for the downtown residential community to project their identity to the city. It is a space for them to gather and create a place reflective of their neighborhood. Relying on the themes collected during ethnographic interviews, I’ve revised the existing plans for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park to be a reflection of the downtown communities’ identity by incorporating some basic residential needs. The Iconic Front Yard for Downtown Wichita concept was developed to remind users this place was created for a specific community in reflection of their values and everyday behavioral patterns. Figures 4.28-33 illustrate the evolved concept through site design.

Like most communities residents of downtown Wichita project a unique individual and collective identity. After extensive analysis and synthesis of five interviews, I found the downtown community to express tolerant, supportive, culture seeking, adventurous qualities. Their newly redesigned front yard was created to ignite explorative curiosity and satisfy their need for original solutions to everyday necessities. The redesigned Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park is an organized conglomeration of design ideas synthesized from the stakeholder design charrette, ethnographic interviews, and existing site plans provided by the WDDC.
IDEALIZED MONTAGE: AN ICONIC FRONT YARD

Figure 4.34: Conceptual photomontage for an iconic Front Yard (author 2015). NOTE: Idealized montage represents the site as a long term pocket park. Some ideas can be transferred to a temporary Pop-Up Park design.
The Phase I site plan for An Iconic Front Yard is a simplified version of an idealized, long term vision based in interviewees’ input. The Phase I translates the desires revealed in ethnographic interviews to a temporary landscape design. This Phase addresses several, but not all, recurring themes from the ethnographic interviews.
Douglas Avenue

A  Standing bar with option to sit on bike
B  Wooden handcrafted bench
C  Wooden, hexagonal tree planters with seating
D  ICT park entry signage
E  Modular wave seating piece with umbrellas
F  Artificial turf grass landforms with varying heights and bouldering grips on select faces
G  Standing height metal spool tables with umbrellas
H  Stationary vendor stand
I  10 foot cement and hackberry bench with feather reed grass
J  Finely crushed stone
K  20 foot wooden table for large groups
L  Metal tree planters with standing height ledge
M  Wooden timbers
N  Parking for several food trucks using the flexible space
O  Woolf Brothers Building, Farha Construction office
P  Gravel surface for overflow flexible space
Q  20 parking spaces for Woolf Brothers Building employee vehicles
R  Vegetated dry retention basin to capture, cleanse and store stormwater
SECTION A-A: AN ICONIC FRONT YARD

Figure 4.36: Phase I Section from an Iconic Front Yard cutting through site east to west (author 2015)
SECTION B-B: AN ICONIC FRONT YARD

Figure 4.37: Phase I Section from an Iconic Front Yard cutting through site north to south (author 2015)
PHASE II: AN ICONIC FRONT YARD

The Phase II site plan for An Iconic Front Yard is an idealized version of the site design. Phase II represents all recurring themes identified in the ethnographic interviews with site design solutions.
2, 20 ft. wooden table for large groups
Finely crushed stone
10 ft. cement and hackberry bench with feather reed grass
Wooden timbers
Standing bar with option to sit on bike
Vegetated swale with street trees
Wooden handcrafted bench
ICT park entry signage
Modular wave seating piece with umbrellas
Artificial turf grass landforms with varying heights and bouldering grips on select faces
Standing height metal spool tables with umbrellas
Two stationary vendor stand
10 ft. cement and hackberry bench with feather reed grass
Finely crushed stone
2, 20 ft. wooden table for large groups
Metal tree planters with standing height ledge
Wooden timbers
Parking for several food trucks using the flexible space
Woolf Brothers Building, Farha Construction office
Gravel surface for overflow flexible space
Stage space for events and festivals
Flexible space conducive for markets
20 parking spaces for Woolf Brothers Building employee vehicles
Vegetated dry retention basin to capture, cleanse and store stormwater
AERIAL PERSPECTIVE: AN ICONIC FRONT YARD

Figure 4.39: Aerial perspective of an Iconic Front Yard (author 2015)
Figure 4.40: WDDC's proposed site plan for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park (WDDC 2015)

Figure 4.41: WDDC's proposed site furnishing details for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park (WDDC 2015)
Site Design Disconnects

Figures 4.40-42 are the final site plans produced by the WDDC’s consultant for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. While the existing plans feature ample flexible space for users to interpret and individually program, it lacks a sense of place unique to downtown Wichita. A sense of place was achieved in the redesign process by using creative placemaking strategies to interpret the ethnographic themes. Themes were directly addressed in the redesigned park plan through programming and design elements. The following spreads diagram how social resilience was achieved through the redesign process. Each diagram highlights changes or additions to the existing plan explaining why revision was necessary, based upon interview findings.

It is important to the revised site design of An Iconic Front Yard would be much more expensive to implement than the existing plans for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. In this scenario an additional sense of place would cost additional upfront cost as well as maintenance and transport fees.
IDENTITY CRISIS & WICHITA, A PLACE FOR FAMILIES

When first entering the site, users are welcomed by three oversized letters: ICT. These letters represent Wichita’s airport code. Many times during the interviews participants would mention phrases or abbreviations referring to Wichita’s historical relationship with the airplane industry. During the day the letters are a bright tangerine orange. They’re large enough for patrons to pose with, or on, for photographs. At night the letters glow giving light to the space and attracting passersby’s. It was important the gateway to Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park be something iconic and imageable for Wichitans to identify with.

Multiple artificial turf landforms were added to the plan for topographical relief that offers a place to sit and children to play. The landform’s all remain under five foot. in height so sight lines can reach from Douglas Avenue to the alley. During interviews participants commented on the lack of play space for children in downtown. Nikki specifically requested on several occasions a place for downtown with organic shapes and materials for children to play on. The slopes of the landforms are conducive for both climbing and sitting, or lounging. Bouldering grips for children to use for climbing up the steeper portions of the landforms were also incorporated. On the other slopes sides of the landforms the slopes remain mild enough for users to lay or sit on. These slopes are oriented toward the west where the WDDC has proposed to showcase projected movies. The landforms are organized to allow main circulation flows through the site while providing small spaces between forms.

Figure 4.43: Downtown identity represented at an Iconic Front Yard (author 2015)
Additional imageable seating options were added to the eastern portion of the site. This furniture is made to accommodate a range of seating options so users can sit or lay down on. Interview participants commented several times about the generic urban design elements used throughout downtown only heightening ambiguity between districts. This furniture was developed so users could physically create a break in the downtown grid. The installation is created in segments and therefore modular for users. Each section consists of two waves. The frame is wooden with a hollow core and the seating is a plush Astroturf. These materials make the furniture easy to move around on the artificial turf ground plane. It was important to introduce another element to the park that was original to downtown. Modular furniture options allow users to create figurations and placement they feel is correct for the place. The action of moving furniture creates a sense of ownership that oftentimes makes a public space a place. Attached to the wave-seating feature are a series of umbrellas. I chose Pantone’s 2012 color of the year, Tango Tangerine for the color of umbrellas. I chose the bright colors for the Astroturf seating and umbrellas because of its high energy and vivacious hue (Pantone 2012).

The wooden decking seen throughout the site is another attempt to provide downtown with a missing aesthetic. Its tactile quality provides users a different memory of experiencing a space. Walking on the same gravel surface throughout the park is a different experience than mixing the ground plane texture between spaces. Downtown Wichita does not feature many patio or deck spaces. Providing the park with this material variation also sets a precedent for other downtown projects. The decking also works to alleviate on site stormwater runoff from entering Douglas Avenue, to the north, and the alley, to the south. Under the decking is larger, coarser gravel that encourages water infiltration and storage.
LACK OF RESIDENTIAL AMENITIES & DOWNTOWN LIFESTYLE

On the western portion of the site, a small, stationary vendor space was added. The structure is made of an old airstream and painted to reflect the rest of the site design. The structure was added after interview participants mentioned a lack of small business downtown. Each month a new food vendor can be spotlighted using the vendor truck. Few utilities will be provided inside the food truck during Phase I so vendors will need to do nearly all preparation prior to arriving on site. If businesses continue to show interest a second vendor truck will appear in Phase II. The vendor space will promote small business in downtown by providing starter companies with a space to advertise through product sales.

An oversized, wooden community table is located between the stationary vendor and food trucks. This space is semi-private, hidden behind a planter of Karl Foerster Feather Reed Grass. This grass is a drought tolerant, low maintenance grass native to Kansas. Using native vegetation reduces site maintenance costs and demands while providing ornamental aesthetic. Several interview participants commented there was little to no space in downtown for larger gatherings. Some participants requested the space for an office lunch break, meeting with clients, or small venue space. This table can fit up to 30 people sitting comfortably around it. In Phase II a second, similar table is added to the plan for the same purpose but to accommodate even larger groups.
Findings

The WDDC site plan features space for food trucks at the back of the site. Interview data revealed the importance of food in downtown, specifically after the lunch hour. Food trucks are a creative solution to late night food and variety. Phase I of the redesign site plan allows space for three trucks to comfortably fit during the lunch hour. The flexible space in the south of the site allows for several additional trucks. Phase II demonstrates how the flexible space accommodates several food trucks and how the trucks would circulate through the site.

A small semi-private space was developed directly east of the vendor stand. This space incorporates the metal and wooden spools proposed in the WDDC’s site plan. The spools are standing height bar spaces for people to enjoy their food. Umbrellas are also attached to these spools to provide additional shade in the summer.

An overhead plane drapes the site in shade with cut pieces of reused white linen. The linen squares are attached to cables running across the site. The cables are attached to the two buildings bordering the eastern and western site boundaries. Interview participants commented several times shade is very important during summer months in Wichita. Although shade is provided throughout the site in the form of umbrellas and trees large portions of the site, for example the artificial landforms remain in full sun. The linen acts as louvers providing relief to the site during extreme heat.

The WDDC site plan features space for food trucks at the back of the site. Interview data revealed the importance of food in downtown, specifically after the lunch hour. Food trucks are a creative solution to late night food and variety. Phase I of the redesign site plan allows space for three trucks to comfortably fit during the lunch hour. The flexible space in the south of the site allows for several additional trucks. Phase II demonstrates how the flexible space accommodates several food trucks and how the trucks would circulate through the site.
A stage platform from the original WDDC plans is incorporated into the Phase II plans for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. Nearly all interview participants mentioned having a space for events, small venues, or festivals. Including a stage into the site plan encourages these forms of site programming. The stage space is located toward the southwest corner of the site. Locating the stage toward the back of the site helps eliminate street traffic and lights. So if a show, or event, or festival is in process it becomes its own space. However, this placement does also allow for site lines into the site so passerby’s can see what’s happening in the back and be enticed to explore. The stage is located in the most flexible space on site. This way whatever the event may be there is room for vehicle access through the alley as well as large group gathering space.

Figure 4.45: Preferred outdoor spaces at an iconic Front Yard (author 2015)
Standing height bar seating was placed at the edge of the site on a wooden deck surface. The standing height bars were first mentioned during the stakeholder design charrette. Attendees recognized the popular trend in food trucks and with it the standing and eating before returning to work. The bar’s placement was more critical than the furniture’s design. In effort to make the space feel more populated the bars were placed up along the northern edge of the site. This way people enjoying lunch provided by the food trucks can sit along Douglas and attract additional customers. The placement is also a socialization tool; the bars provide a place to see and be seen. Triangulation and civic engagement is promoted through user’s initial perception of activation at entering the site.

Both the seating height and standing height planters were incorporated into the redesigned plan. These elements provide shade, vegetation, and seating for users. Interview participants commented on the use of green space in downtown Wichita. Having trees and other vegetation incorporated into the redesign was critical to the park’s success. Pablo mentioned several times during his interview how important urban green was to his lifestyle in order to feel in touch with the seasons. Many participants preferred Riverwalk Park for similar reasons. The trails seen at Riverwalk Park weave through a variety of vegetation and topographic changes. Along the trail seating elements are provided under the shade of trees. To increase the amount of vegetation on site a green wall was added on the western façade of the Woolf Brothers Building. The wall works to help cool the building, cleanse the air, add visual interest, and keep urban dwellers more in touch with the natural world. Plants are applied using a hanging fabric system from the Woolf Brothers Building to encourage plant establishment.
In Phase II of the site design process Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park extends its progressive design into the streetscape. A major theme during the ethnographic interviews was the perception and use of active and public transit downtown. Several participants are regular commuter bikers or at a minimum cycling enthusiasts. However, downtown is not conducive for cycling. The streetscape improvements add a bike lane to the street separated from the road by a vegetated swale. The bike lane is a one-way bike lane, therefore although this plan does not show it is implied a bike lane going the opposite direction is added to the eastbound side of Douglas Avenue as well. The vegetated swale features native grasses with deep root systems that capture and cleanse stormwater. The swale basin is gravel so water can also be stored. I placed the swale between automobile traffic and bike traffic to act as a physical barrier to protect cyclists and start a new vocabulary in Wichita that supports cycling culture.
Also incorporated into Phase II of Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park design is a bus stop shelter and new bike rack. The bus shelter is located at the existing bus stop location on the corner of Douglas Avenue and Market Street. Installing a shelter for public transit users will hopefully help alleviate some of the negative perception of bus transit in Wichita. Although the infrastructure is not in bad condition, some improvements to the current aesthetic may encourage ridership. There is currently a bike rack on site, however, it is not large enough to accommodate a large group of bikers. Additional rack space was incorporated into the Phase II plan. The new racks are reflective of existing site vocabulary. The bright colors and unique design may help draw attention to the burgeoning bike culture in downtown Wichita.
Malmo, Sweden (by author, 2014)
The goal of this report was to determine what qualities of place affect the downtown community’s desires for a temporary landscape? A series of five interviews were conducted with people who live and work in downtown Wichita to answer this research question as authentically and accurately as possible. These ethnographic interviews provided the key information for designing social resilience into Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. Interviewees were required to select a pseudonym to encourage honesty through anonymity. All informants were encouraged to organically lead the interview allowing them to freely narrate responses. Interviewees provided extremely valuable information by sharing concerns and interests about living downtown.

The interviews flexibility provided a range of discussion topics that varied between informants. I used a noting and coding process to decipher the main themes, patterns, and connections between interviews. Each interview was audio recorded and later thoroughly analyzed through noting. Notes taken during the interview were combined with notes from the recordings. Themes were identified after the notes were coded. Recurring themes were those that informants felt most strongly about choosing to constantly revisit a topic and demonstrate non-verbal emotion. The recurring themes identified the downtown community’s desired qualities of place. Recurring themes were directly addressed in the redesign process of Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park.

To ensure a thorough understanding of informant’s responses I used a graphic analysis technique of photomontage. Themes from individual’s interviews were inventoried and prioritized to best reflect participant’s narratives. Direct quotes were selected that most effectively represented the overall themes. Interviewee’s responses were analyzed and organized into a photomontage reflective of a space they would use in downtown Wichita, if it existed. The photomontages were a critical step in my personal design process to help identify and organize interview information. All photomontages created for this report are conceptual graphics of idealized site designs for a long term pocket park. Following this step, I extracted programming ideas that could translate to a temporary landscape for the ‘pit’. Site programming was labeled with quotes from the interviews to reveal the inspiration behind the design ideas. This graphic exercise was a deeper analysis of not only individual interview themes, but later overall themes.
Overall participant group themes were identified using the same process of noting, coding and photomontaging. Individual’s themes were compared to one another to begin drawing connections. Similar elements in the photomontages became obvious. Social resilience for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park revealed itself during this stage of the research project. Using the montages I was able to explore site programming that met the needs of the community, encouraged prosperity, and offered an imageable sense of place for users. The observable themes became the qualities needed to create place in downtown Wichita.

Social resilience is based in community history, identity, narrative, and growth. Using the overall participant themes I began to revise the WDDC’s latest version of site design plans for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. Recurring themes were conceptualized and synthesized for applicability to park function. New site phasing plans, sections, diagrams, and photomontages were created to illustrate improved social resilience. An Iconic Front Yard is a site design proposal that incorporates the downtown community’s desired qualities of place into an imageable temporary landscape.

The final site plans for An Iconic Front Yard were shared with the WDDC after design completion for design reference as Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park grows and relocates. However, the site design for An Iconic Front Yard is a more expensive option for several reasons. Site implementation would cost the WDDC more initial cost for construction, regular maintenance and effort to relocate. For this reason, the WDDC intends to implement the site plans shown in Figure 4.41 because its replicability, affordability, and simplicity. Jason Gregory of the WDDC explained the strengths of the site plan to be in the park’s flexibility and potential for additional investment. Gregory explained the WDDC’s intentions to continue investing in the park’s furnishings and programmings with money saved by implementing the current plans. Beginning in May 2015 food trucks will be available on site during the week. If demand continues the WDDC plans to begin programming food trucks on Friday nights as well. The WDDC also intends to push for improved city regulations for food truck vendors.

The WDDC selected two out of the four site furnishing designs created by the second year landscape architecture students. A light art installation designed and fabricated by Nick Mercado will also be funded by the WDDC and incorporated into the Pop-Up Park. These additions will encourage site identity through unique design elements.
Ethnographic research is not typically used by landscape architects in the site design process. However, as this research project demonstrates the collected data can prove invaluable to the health and longevity to landscape’s social systems. Integrating ethnographic research into the design process is an innovative way to create place from space.

This report demonstrates a deeper way of understanding and applying stakeholder feedback and community engagement in site design. Ethnography uncovers a particular population’s cultural values and behavioral patterns using the researcher as the primary tool for investigation. Through a process including a stakeholder design charrette, site and context analysis, and one-on-one ethnographic interviews, I recorded and analyzed aspects of the community character and identity. Interview responses were carefully analyzed so themes accurately reflected user’s feedback. The ethnographic themes became the foundation for site design criticism. The primary interview themes represent necessary site design elements to ensure social resilience at Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park.

The WDDC’s final site design plans for Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park are missing some of these critical design elements necessary to promote successful social capital, identity, and place. These missing elements are worth identifying because Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park is the first of hopefully many iterations. The park space is supposed to be replicable and this study could give the WDDC guidance for future relocation success.

An Iconic Front Yard addresses many of the disconnects seen between the existing Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park Plan and user’s values and daily routines. The reevaluated design is a synthesis of ethnographic interview responses. Ethnographic interviews afforded me a deeper understanding of user types, values, and desires. This understanding allowed the reevaluated design to be translated into a temporary landscape design that matched user needs and desires, promoting the potential for social resilience at the site scale.
**LIMITATIONS**

Time greatly limited this project’s scope and methods. Typically, an ethnographic study includes as many people as possible and as relevant to the question. With additional time I would have conducted many more ethnographic interviews. Still using a snowball sampling method to locate additional stakeholders, I would have the opportunity to network more thoroughly for interview participants. In a full scale study, I would have also interviewed stakeholders prior to the design charrette. If interviews were conducted with participants prior to the design charrette, answers to prompts may have varied more.

“What a proper ethnographer ought properly to be doing is going out to places, coming back with information about how people live there, and making that information available...not lounging about in libraries reflecting on literary questions” (Geertz 1988, 1). Additional time would have allowed me to observe the site during a range of seasons, days, and times of day to document any and all on site patterns. It is important for ethnographic research that the researcher, or author, be present as the primary means of investigation, as Clifford Geertz, a master ethnographer, explains. Geertz acknowledges in *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*, the patience necessary to collect anthropological information is “the sort of patience that can support an endless search for invisible needles in infinite haystacks” (Geertz 1988, 12).

I was also limited in my study scope because site construction timeline. Construction implementation was dependent on the progress of an adjacent downtown development project providing fill dirt. Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park implementation was postponed several weeks due to the slow progress of the River Vista Apartments. The construction delay inhibited me from studying the park post-occupancy. Therefore, I was unable to evaluate the outcome of the Pop-Up Park as implemented by the WDDC and Bokeh Development.
AREAS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

If additional time was allotted this semester I would set up additional ethnographic interviews with the same participants interviewed previously in this report. During the follow-up interviews I would share with them the themes I identified during their interview and the photomontage I created in response to their original interview. I would encourage a narrated response to how closely they feel the themes and graphic represented their earlier interview responses. I would inquire how they feel I could improve the photomontage and if there were important themes or patterns I did not document. Next I would show them the plans I created for An Iconic Front Yard. I would use prompts to encourage their honest design critique of the plans. This process would be valuable to determine whether I successfully translated information from the ethnographic interviews into a site design reflective of the downtown residential community.

Following construction of Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park, I would continue observing the space to measure times of activation, success of the site furnishings, and use of the flexible space. This report’s findings would improve if I could document the types of users and how they interact with the space. Did the site programming encourage users besides the expected downtown employees to visit? Continued observation and documentation would determine whether the elements used were conducive to social capital. Did the park begin to activate during other times than the anticipated lunch hour? Was it site programming, creative furnishings, or location that attracted people to the park?

Additional future research could benefit the WDDC by determining whether Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park created a sense of place and identity for the downtown residential community. After the establishment of Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park did the interview participants from this report feel downtown’s identity improved? How often did the participants use the space? It would be valuable to understand how the individual participants identified with the site, and whether the Pop-Up Park positively affected their lifestyle.

It is also of value to research how users reacted to the relocation of Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park. Douglas Avenue Pop-Up Park was created with the intent of
changing locations within five years of implementation. How did the
downtown residential community react to the loss of a park space?
Will the park space create enough place attachment within three to
five years to upset the Wichita community? Or will the promise of
relocation keep user’s content and optimistic?
Inviting existing and future stakeholders to be a part of the entire design process will ensure project validity. "Validity is the degree to which researchers actually have discovered what they think their results show, and how applicable the results are to other populations" (LeCompte et al. 1999, 271). This proposal suggests only positive is to gain by implementing socially resilient, imageable infrastructure in cities. However, what if people still refuse to use their improved urban infrastructure? What if a recognizable portion of the public feels the improvements are a poor reflection of their community? What if the proposed strategies are non-effective? People may argue that tax money is better spent in other areas rather than improving urban sustainability. Critics may also argue it’s not important to create a public space. There may also be a portion of critics that just don’t care because they are not connected to the site and therefore do not see any value in improving the urban landscape.

Despite these criticisms, urban residents and cities could still gain from the proposed ideas for strengthening the pedestrian experience. Providing better spaces offers more opportunity for people to walk, bike, or ride public transit to destinations could help reduce CO2 emissions. Designing spaces to encourage social interaction could help foster communities and formations of relationships and trust. Developing more mixed-use, higher efficiency neighborhoods could help a variety of people survive self-sufficiently in urban environments.
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Appendix A: Literature Review: Ecological Resilience

Resilience Theory Origin:
An ecologist, C.S. Holling originally introduced resilience as an ecological theory in 1973. This initial paper revolutionized the field’s perspective of environmental systems and relationships. Before this publication ecologists (and designers) considered systems to be based on a state of equilibrium. Contrarily, Holling defined the environment as a complex, dynamic, and adaptive system in an evolutionary relationship with humans (Holling 1973). Identifying this socio-ecological connection between landscapes and humans offered planners and designers an improved opportunity in developing cities. This philosophy also highlights the importance of inter-disciplinary engagement; not only between designers and ecologists, but an endless amount of combinations. Today ecological resilience theory is widely used in the design field used to “measure the perturbation that can be absorbed by a system before the ecosystem equilibrium is dislodged into another state of equilibrium” (Folke et al. 1996, 1018). Holling’s proposal to use a resilient approach to organize evolving human and ecological systems is growing increasingly relevant in other systems: governmental policies, bio-systems, city planning, socio-ecological relationships, sustainability, and panarchy.

Resilience theory is becoming increasingly relevant and applicable to environmental and societal systems as the world continues to grow closer to global catastrophe the need for resilient landscapes rises simultaneously. Following is a brief introduction into a sample of literature topics most significant to developing a resilient model for urban planners and designers to use as a guide for developing adaptable, imageable spaces for people.

Changing Landscapes & Human Responsibility:
In Biological Diversity, Ecosystems, and The Human Scale Holling stresses the importance of “functional diversity, and its relation to production and maintenance of ecological services that underpin human societies” (Folke et al. 1996, 1018). Maintaining functional diversity is critical to ensure resilience of ecosystems, and social, cultural and economic forces (Folke et al., 1996). When systems are unbalanced they’re less likely to overcome disturbances weakening their level of functionality after or during a disturbance. Holling emphasizes the importance of developing incentives to alter human lifestyles and governmental policies to act in harmony with the deteriorating essential processes “that control the dynamics and structure of ecosystems, and
of which biological diversity is a crucial part (Folke et al., 1996 p. 1019). “Ecosystems are fundamental factors of production becoming increasingly scare as a consequence of the rapid human population growth, and human behavior toward the natural capital base” (Barbier et al. 1994). Without healthy ecosystems that encourage biodiversity humanity would be irrelevant.

Whether visible, or not, every space on earth is functioning at a level germane to human existence. Ecosystems are undoubtedly complex systems constantly adapting to maintain equilibrium; these adaptations are typical and necessary for the existence of the individual and large-scale socio-ecological system survival. However, when too much stress is put on a system it has the potential to cross a threshold unable to regain necessary function. This same idea of resiliency can and should be applied to a variety of systems beyond the environment. Human systems can be approached with the same philosophies Holling describes in Biological Diversity, Ecosystems, and The Human Scale; initiating interdisciplinary research and conversation using a resilient approach to design offers landscape architects an opportunity to develop a truly holistically sustainable model. In The Social Impact of Urban Design, a group various disciplined, distinguished authorities compiled provocative and frequently astringent essays. “While their perspectives are varied, a major concern emerges: the need for sensitive governmental decision-makers who must think deeply about people before even beginning to think about bricks, concrete, glass, and steel” (Bettelheim 1998, 4). People need healthy environmental function for vitality, therefore, landscape resilience is included as a major concern in urban design. Many landscape changes are irreversible, while some landscape types are at risk of disappearing altogether. Thus, it is critical for increased human intervention and application of resilient design to help maintain ecosystem health, specifically biodiversity.

Oftentimes, people act out of individual motives and do not take into consideration a larger process at work. For example urban sprawl alone accounts for 400,000 hectares of farmland in the US annually (Dramstad 2011). This is dangerous for ecosystems because many fail to signal long-term consequences until the damage is irreversible and the ecosystem is on the brink of collapse (Holling et al. 1996). Even small transformations in ecosystems can bring drastic change. Loss of biodiversity is not just the loss of a species, but a disturbance to the human system; societal well-being and survival is compromised as structural processes, on which society depend, transform undetected (Perrings et al. 1992). In his essay, Response to “Panarchy and the Law”, Holling recognizes the great social consequences unknown, beyond experience and happening at every geographical scale. Panarchy Theory includes four core features of change: role of diversity during recovery after disturbance, role of stability between disturbances, role of likelihood of collapse across spatial/temporal scales, and the inhibition of the process of collapse spreading (Holling 2012,). Human error persists as these features, the foundation for global persistence, growth, enrichment and most importantly sustainability, remain largely unprotected.

Landscape architects have the responsibility and opportunity to intervene taking a leadership role to ultimately slow down, and possibly stop, system collapses. Biodiversity will continue to decline unless wide scale human intervention is actuated to protect and preserve remaining landscapes. Unfortunately, in many cases landscape protection is frequently misinterpreted to mean stop of all human activity. For example, a study in Norway demonstrated landscape protection to be a highly resented term; a majority of
farmers considered landscape protection an infringement of their property rights (Dramstad 2011). Even with the implementation of protection laws many system collapses are surprises and frequently caused by economic exploitation of resources generating economic gain all while invisibly advancing system vulnerability (Holling 2012). Therefore, connection between science and policy must be established and dialogue initiated between “researchers, policy makers and those actively changing the landscape – the planners, developers and landowners – with the common goal to generate sustainable landscapes” (Dramstad 2011, 331). New law and policies could even aid in monitoring changes in thresholds. Hence, society must place intensified focus on establishing dialogue rather on the development of additional tools; resilience theory offers the guiding principles (tools) landscape architects need to establish change. Initiation and increase in dialogue would create more sustainable landscapes applicable at all scales of implementation.

It is common in ecological resilience and sustainability literature to focus on broader scale improvements and implementation strategies. However, using dialogue and new land policies as Dramstad suggests ecological resilience and sustainability can be successfully achieved at the site scale. In fact, there are numerous ecosystem services that are best observed and documented at the site scale. Ecosystem services are “goods and services that are of direct or indirect benefit to humans” (ECOSYSTEM 2014). In Landscape Ecology, Richard Forman divides the landscape into three categories for study: patches, corridors, and overall structure (Forman 1986). He explains how to use a matrix and determine boundaries to perform an effective study on a small or large spanning landscape. Forman describes a matrix as the broadest, most connected landscape type, becoming the key role in overall landscape function. It is difficult, if not impossible, to assign roles to landscape elements within the matrix without individually examining the patches (Forman 1986). This same approach to evaluating landscape ecology will be used in the inventory and analysis phase of site design for the Douglas Ave. Pop-Up Park. As Forman suggests, a matrix will be determined and labeled. Next patches and corridors will be identified and analyzed based on their level of suitability. Suitability will be based on the existing ecological processes, contextual infrastructure, and goals of the WDDC. These patches will serve as opportunistic locations for the location of a migrating temporary landscape installment. The Douglas Pop-Up Park will become the first “patch” for examining landscape ecology function. Breaking entire regions up into patches make it possible for scientists to research such specific ecological patterns, such as ecosystem thresholds.

Resilient Application:

Jack Ahern, ecologist and landscape architect, illustrates how the concept of threshold can be applied to landscape planning: “The use of habitat amount threshold to conserve species promotes proactive planning that would prioritize areas for protection before the threshold is reached and would restore habitat based on the threshold target” (Ahern et al. 2011, 275). Ahern defines threshold as the point an independent variable is crossed creating sudden, large change in the state of the dependent variable. Once a threshold is crossed the system enters a qualitatively different state creating different dynamics and feedbacks (Ahern 2011). Threshold application in landscape planning could conserve species, habitat, and ecosystems. To manage and enhance resiliency of a system it is necessary to identify drivers that may encourage threshold cross, and enhance system aspects that help maintain resilience to manage social-ecological systems. Therefore, if closely monitored key species/ecological process changes may be detected,
allowing potential intervention before system extinction (Wiens et al. 2002). Unfortunately it is difficult to establish thresholds reaching endangerment because often the dependent variable is a naturally fluctuating organism making it difficult to detect negative changes. Holling also stresses the need for “extensive and continuous monitoring over large scales to anticipate possible shifts in ecosystem and human behavior, while attempting to increase knowledge and introduce policies to maintain or enhance ecosystem attributes that sustain diversity” before thresholds are crossed inducing devastating change to ecosystems (Holling 2012, 36). It is difficult to ignore the frequency in which Holling parallels ecosystem function with human function. Applying resilience theory to landscapes is a holistic process. If every system depends portions of another for functionality landscape architects must plan for the human user and their integration into the designed environment. Ahern identifies the danger is crossing an independent variable’s threshold; often in urban landscapes it is the fault of human interference that ultimately forces natural systems into a different state. Using a resilient approach to design landscape architects can better plan for the harmonious interplay of socio-ecological systems.

Adaptable Landscapes:
In Urban landscape sustainability and resilience, Ahern identifies five strategies (biodiversity, urban ecological networks and connectivity, multifunctionality, redundancy and modularization, and adaptive design) to build resilience capacity through transdisciplinary collaboration, scientific research, planning policies and design applications in urban landscapes (Ahern 2013). Biodiversity improves city’s evolutionary processes contributing to the quality of life in a growing globally connected world (Mueller and Werner 2010). Connectivity as the primary urban spatial organization strategy allows a larger potential for providing beneficial, naturally occurring ecosystem services (Ahern 2013). Planning and designing multifunctionality in cities is challenging because of the intensive, deliberate organization of functions ensuring independent operation (or complimentary if possible) due to the typically limited space and resources. Resilient models suggest a modular, redundant, decentralized approach to urban planning to prevent failures from spreading through an entire system ultimately causing collapse. Every space on earth is unique challenging the transferability of innovations. Therefore, many spaces are answered with general, standardized solutions with little to no innovation involved stifling sustainable practices. Not only do these generalized development practices repress natural ecosystem functions, but also the quality of life for many urban dwellers. Contrasting these status quo design strategies, adaptive design are experiments based on “best available knowledge, with uncertainty specifically acknowledged” (Ahern 2013, 1209).

This design strategy has potential to push the envelope on sustainable design bettering the lives of people and the environment they live. For example, half the world’s population currently lives in cities, by 2050 city dwellers will account for 70% of the population. It is typical of modern urban planners and designers to plan and develop based on theory rather than in reference to the public they are designing for (Moughtin 2003). The American population is no longer demanding suburban homes at the rate it was during the 1960s. However, mundane, suburban developments continue to be built. It seems there has been a miscommunication between citizens and designers; again, recognizing the urgency for dialogue between disciples. Just as landscapes are observed as dynamic, self-organizing systems, cities are composed of similarly dynamic and complex systems. When urbanites understand and
accept the symbiotic relationship between urban and natural processes the concept of sustainability changes challenging to build the resilience capacity of cities (Ahern 2013). Cities can integrate the same concepts and tools established in landscape ecology into urban planning and design processes to “understand, model, and manage the frequency, magnitude and extent of urban ecosystem dynamics” (Ahern 2013, 1204). Once interdisciplinary integration is fully realized cities become laboratories for urban sustainability. Ahern claims the adaptive, “learn-by-doing” approach to urban design could advance urban resiliency if focusing on the “transdisciplinary research collaborations between landscape ecologists, urban planners and urban designers” (Ahern 2013, 1204). “A city with resilience capacity can deliver ecosystem services over time, in a context of characteristic urban dynamics and disturbances” (Holling 1978). However this adaptable approach also runs high risk of creating political and economic risks for cities because it’s experimental qualities. “The ongoing discourse on landscape urbanism embraces uncertainty and ecological dynamics” (Corner 2006). Instead of viewing cities as systems of equilibrium, a more sustainable definition of a city integrates economic, social equity, environmentalism, and resiliency as fundamental to the socio-ecological urban system (Adams 2006). Landscape architects are fit for this leadership role in adaptation experimentation. What else can we learn from our impossibly, naturally resilient environment in which to apply to our own self-organizing systems?
Appendix B: Literature Review: Sustainable Urbanism

In Seven Rules for Sustainable Communities, Patrick Condon outlines an incredibly compelling argument as to why sustainable development is vital to human existence, and even mentions humanity’s need for habitual behavior changes. However, his research lacks an element of societal motivation. Regrettably, many people struggle to see long-term benefits, even if it concerns their existence. In most situations, Condon communicates the imperative changes needed to happen by 2050; however, he fails to explicitly mention some of the more immediate benefits of sustainable design. Sustainable communities can improve resident’s quality of life right now.

Implementing Condon’s first rule: restore the streetcar, has innumerable, identifiable, benefits for residents seen directly after implementation. Streetcars promote walkable, transit accessible, virtually pollution free communities. City patterns created by streetcar systems connect neighborhoods on a broader scale offering urbanites more opportunities for distant mobility. Unlike rapid bus transit, the streetcar creates identifiable corridors. Corridors created by streetcars build consistent densities along routes stimulating additional investment. Contrary to many city planning theories, metropolises are composed of more than series of nodes. Developing the corridors between destinations as places for pedestrian growth and interaction instills a sense of place. Condon mentions in several precedents the identifiable, naturally occurring evolution of community structure along streetcar corridors. The streetcar successfully achieves a sustainable balance between density, land-use, connectivity, transport, and public realm. This balance affords residents health, economic, social, and growth benefits. Residents living along a streetcar routes have the advantage to walk to and from stops increasing their daily exercise regiment. Living along a streetcar corridor can also eliminate private vehicles saving residents thousands of dollars in initial costs, maintenance, and insurance annually. Without driving in solitary residents are afforded unique, experiences with every journey, and chance for new interaction every ride. Over time experiences can grow richer as healthy density along corridors and stops increase. The experiences created during the journey can also develop into place attachment.

Condon emphasizes the importance of city master planning to increase sustainable living. “[Urban,] open space in the
city is too often a conglomeration of unrelated designs. Because of this [urban.] open spaces are made less functional for the user than if there had been a comprehensive design” (Bettelheim 1998, 50). Condon suggests throughout the text how important the use of corridors are in cities. Rather than developing a conglomeration of nodes, Condon suggests using corridors to establish place. These corridors increase overall and site specific sustainability. In fact, Condon suggests ways to encompass both social and ecological resilience into corridors: “providing a connective tissue capable of accommodating movement, [sense of place, and untrammeled nature] (Condon 2009, 125). Table 2 illustrates how Condon’s rules are ecologically resilient as defined by Holling.
Placemaking for Socially Resilient Site Design is a study focused on further defining social resilience at the site scale through investigative research using ethnographic methods. Social resilience is operationalized based on its contribution to resilience, as a whole, and ability to sustain social system function. Creative placemaking is “a strategy to improve community well-being and prosperity while also fostering conditions for cities to define, draw attention to and distinguish themselves on a global scale” (Artscape, 2014).

Other qualities of site scale social resilience explored during research included: adaptability, pedestrian-orientation, and ecological resilience. The goal of this research study is to further characterize and define social resilience to improve the sense of place, legibility, and imageability in cities beginning at the site scale. To amplify social resilience ethnographic methods were used to inform the specific placemaking strategies.

The proposed design process was tested through the design of a temporary, urban design landscape installation in Wichita, Kansas. The Wichita Downtown Development Corporation plans installation of the temporary design for late spring of 2015. A locally informed sense of place and imageability were developed through thorough site analysis, one-on-one interviews with local residents, and peer and stakeholder collaboration. Site design success was measured through stakeholder and residents’ feedback to answer the question: does the site reflect a desired sense of place and community identity?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compact Development</th>
<th>Community with programming and amenities that reflect those that live and/or work there evolve into identifiable districts (Lynch, 1960)</th>
<th>This form of city living and working promotes growth of social trust, reciprocity, collaboration, and character (Putnam, 1995)</th>
<th>Getting lost or disoriented is seldom because development happens all within 5-10 min. walk from transit line in any direction (Lynch, 1960)</th>
<th>Synergistic relationship between transit and adjacent commercial opportunities; these spaces act as memorable landmarks to users (Condon, 2010)</th>
<th>Linear public realm corridors represent urban character and definition. Corridors offer communities a place to thrive between destinations (Condon, 2010)</th>
<th>New experiences; even routinely traveled routes offer new chances for interaction (Sucher, 1995)</th>
<th>Riders can hop on or off at stops between destinations. Everyday necessary amenities become more accessible and convenient (McKibben, 2003)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interconnected Streets</td>
<td>Memorable connections; certain street patterns allow vistas of farther destinations; easy to orient (Lynch, 1960)</td>
<td>Connected infrastructure and pattern development happening at the ground floor in cities promotes social engagement (Putnam, 1995)</td>
<td>Traversing the city is clear and people are confident to use transit routes and system. Physical connections can be made and remembered (Lynch, 1960)</td>
<td>City street patterns can be developed and oriented around key landmarks (Lynch, 1960)</td>
<td>Certain road patterns can be identifiable based on location or topography to create a sense of place within city street pattern (Lynch, 1960)</td>
<td>Less dead end situation and more through streets for mixed land-use and experience diversity (Condon, 2010)</td>
<td>Interconnections allow more route options and diversity of land-use (Condon, 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Diversity</td>
<td>Amenities and connections appear and grow in areas well sustained by people actively living and working in the same proximity (Lynch, 1960)</td>
<td>Develop more engaged communities that participate in social organizations and networks (Putnam, 1995)</td>
<td>Establishes clarity in cities when development begins at a neighborhood level and turns into community, then district (Lynch, 1960)</td>
<td>Community based icons become the district, or neighborhood, landmarks (Lynch, 1960).</td>
<td>A neighborhood acts as a place where people work and live; private sense of home within a broader community (Putnam, 1995).</td>
<td>Familiarity and safety; Livable communities with engaging destinations and commutes are desired for experience and convenience (Sucher, 1995)</td>
<td>Flexibility is afforded to people who live and work within the same community, or district. Commute is less demanding and transit modes are numerous (Putnam, 1995)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linked Parks and Natural Spaces</td>
<td>Park system develops and identity based on programming. Unique configuration and connective system offer entire cities identity based on natural space (Lynch, 1960)</td>
<td>Additional diversity in population allows communities to explore different relationship types (Putnam, 1995)</td>
<td>Neighborhoods evoke place allowing people to orient themselves within a city based on the neighborhood's character (Lynch, 1960)</td>
<td>Old buildings that are retrofitted are re-purposed while maintaining memorable or iconic meaning (Condon, 2010)</td>
<td>Layered space between buildings and streets contribute to space for community (Gehl, 2013)</td>
<td>Higher densities and diversity in living opportunities gives more potential for new and different experiences (Gehl, 2006)</td>
<td>More, diverse living opportunities available when relocating; adaptable to a range of ages, income, and family styles (Gehl, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greener Infrastructure</td>
<td>Makes the symbiotic relationship between nature and urbanity the identity; can change entire behaviors of communities also influencing perceived spatial character (Lynch, 1960)</td>
<td>Parks and natural areas become people's front yards in cities; linking these spaces allows for larger mixes of people to congregate and socialize (Putnam, 1995)</td>
<td>Can become the primary organizational pattern in a city (Lynch, 1960)</td>
<td>Parks and civic space act as landmarks independently; but can also incorporate iconic elements within (Condon, 2010)</td>
<td>Urban environments public, natural space, and parks also double as a private natural environments for city dwellers (Condon, 2010)</td>
<td>Used to uplift spirits and offer residents a temporary release from urban confines (Pallasmaa, 2006)</td>
<td>Open space breeds adaptability; programming is unlimited and offers a range of opportunities that draws numbers and diversity, i.e. hybrid spaces (Hood, 2004)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6.1: Literature review summary
## Durability

### Pedestrian Oriented
- Creates corridors designed for the pedestrian scale; destinations appear along commute paths (Hood, 2004)
- Smaller blocks are more convenient walks. Pedestrian crossings and ground level amenities promote active transit; relieves congestion (Moughtin, 1999)
- Walking is easier and more convenient than driving; offers more destinations for any opportunity within 5-10 mins (Moughtin, 1999)
- Jobs and industries in cities today are not longer “smell bad, toxin emitting” facilities and could be paired with other amenities better integrated into context (Condon, 2009)
- Neighborhood growth fostered by demographic influence frequently develops into a rich ground floor activated by community needs (Putnam, 1995)
- The seam between nature and city becomes a place for transit of all kinds. These corridors promote pedestrian activation (Condon, 2009)
- Retrofit of old suburban style planning techniques and materials offer a chance for improved pedestrian development (Gehl, 2006)

### Social Infrastructure
- Stops offer space for hybrid programming and interaction (Hood, 2004)
- Freeways and arterial roads promote privatization while smaller road sizes give back to the public realm encouraging civic engagement (Sucher, 2003)
- Makes potential for interaction stronger if destination locations are always with a 5 minute walk (Moughtin, 1999)
- Fosters potential for interaction during routine commutes because closer physical proximity of social networks (Putnam, 1995)
- More engaging neighborhoods with space that accommodates semi-private use (front lawn rather than backyard) (Sucher, 1995)
- Putting green space out front instead of back offers opportunity for interaction and mixed-use programming (Sucher, 1995)
- Places one thought of as gray' space are reinvented as usable green spaces: EX: green roofs (Condon, 2009)
- Bikeways are included in greener solutions to get more energy consuming vehicles off the road (‘walkable’, 2010)

### Bikeability
- Clearly defined paths; street pattern used for creation of bike thoroughfares helps clarity of navigating the city (Moughtin, 1999)
- System convenience; close street-building proximities promotes accessibility. Bikeable streets promote happiness in communities (McKibben, 2003)
- Increased destinations within small area creates shorter travel times and convenience (Moughtin, 1999)
- Mix of populations living in a neighborhood means a mix of transit users. Bike infrastructure promotes residential housing diversity by offering active modes of transit (Sucher, 1995)
- Trails and paths running through city become thoroughfares for active transit (Gehl, 2013)
- Bikeways are included in greener solutions to get more energy consuming vehicles off the road (‘walkable’, 2010)

### Connection
- Neighborhoods are more connected; increases opportunity for mobility to further reaching destinations (Sucher, 1995)
- Options for different routes reaching same destination relieves congestion (Condon, 2009)
- One-stop shopping; people can visit more destinations within a smaller area (Hood, 2004)
- Less time is spent in private commute and more time is given to the potential for engagement (Putnam, 1995)
- Makes places more accessible if located in proximity to transit modes beside private vehicle (Moughtin, 1999)
- Trail systems can connect cities through parks and natural greenways (Condon, 2009)
- Trail systems can connect cities through parks and natural greenways (Condon, 2009)
- Urbanites naturally congregate in public, areas; a connected natural, public system is the foundation for interaction potential (Gehl, 2013)

### Triangulation
- Corridors are the defining and unique character of North American cities that encourage the most impromptu interaction (Condon, 2009)
- A sense of place, comfort and confidence is best achieved with a smaller block approach; people are more outgoing in environments exhibiting these qualities (Putnam, 1995)
- Diversity increases with density; diversity promotes interesting experience and interaction in new spaces (Sucher, 1995)
- Communities are built to support living and working environments; these communities also act as support systems to promote positive interaction (Putnam, 1995)
- Diversity of housing allows for diverse living demographics; a mix of inhabitants increase opportunity for paths to cross at different times (Condon, 2009)
- Corridors support business and pedestrian traffic; services located along a natural, public corridor experiences economic durability (Gehl, 2006)

### Economic Value
- Development increases along transit corridors because pedestrian traffic ensures business vitality; services are attracted to the consistent traffic (Bernick et al., 1997)
- Additional route options are available so businesses and services are ensured constant access by users (Condon, 2009)
- Businesses and services place less focus on parking and more focus on pedestrian realm in right-of-way (Gehl, 2006)
- People can invest more in living instead of commuting; real estate security (Sucher, 1995)
- Business diversity increases with diverse demographic living opportunities; businesses have more options for locations (Condon, 2009)
- The symbiotic relationship between work and living supports a secure job force for emerging businesses and services (Bernick et al., 1997)
- Businesses located in areas with multiple accessibility options have more through traffic exposure and potential for discovery (Moughtin, 2003)

### Economic Investment
- Transit corridors expand with city growth; as transit routes expand growth opportunity occurs for adjacent businesses/services (Condon, 2009)

### Economic Growth
- Transit corridors expand with city growth; as transit routes expand growth opportunity occurs for adjacent businesses/services (Condon, 2009)
Nikki Ball

The rooftops on top the building the lux

- Just blocks from the river and all that
- Old town square
- All of downtown space
- Naftzger is so great and explore
- Waterwalk park apartments with landscaped
- Food truck rallies there and everyone comes and gather stay eat
- People sit on the grass and there sit a lot of interaction
- Dangers downtown

Kansas

- Flint hills are just amazing

A: do you have nay specific places or special outdoor places/spaces/cities

N: the rooftops of the Lux; just blocks from the river so she enjoys that; as well as old town square. All of downtown is an outdoor space. She also loves Naftzger Park. She thinks it’s so neat. People call it Bum Park but they love it. Also on the west of waterwalk apartment is awesome b/c of the pond and space for people to fish and foot truck rallies once a month. “It’s like a downtown is supposed to be” people sit on the grass and on the sidewalk and eat and talk and it’s like a downtown is supposed to be.

A: do you have any specific special or favorite outdoor spaces?

N: (quick to answer) the rooftops on my building (laughing) and were just blocks from the river and um old town square;
all of downtown is an outdoor space (taking her time just talking out loud); also Naftzger park we love that park. Also the waterwalk apartments (narrates and describes the landscape) (even talks about the surrounding buildings) they will do food truck rallies and is gorgeous and is like a downtown is supposed to do that. (continues to elaborate about other spaces she goes with her daughter with no prompt) And people interact and sit on the ground and interact. (laughing)

A: what about outside of Wichita?
N: favorite FAVORITE FAVORITE place is Boston commons” and San Francisco. And here along the bay and bridge in San Francisco are awesome. She just loves the beach.
N: my favorite (emphasized over and over again) Boston commons. Outside the flint hills. Then san Francisco along the bridge and beach (quick to answer and has dreamy look in her eye) “those are her happy places”

A: I love those too!

Boston Common Park and San Francisco along the bay

- Boston is home and these are my people
- Just be in Boston and not one negative I I had to say; you can’t complain about traffic
- The train

- The north end was tremendous; bakery with best “you ever had in
- Austin
  - 6th street
  - restaurants and musing and FOOD
  - you sit and drink all day long and too much to do
  - san Antonio is good too river walk and

N: the weather are awesome. Feels like Boston is the place she was meant to be. Except Wichita…
N: feels at home in Boston and that is where she is supposed to be; loves the weather. Cost of living is a little steep

A: yeah I visited her the first time last year
A: yes I visited it here the first time last year
N: “there was not one negative thing about Boston. Can’t complain about traffic because there is public transit. “You can get anywhere in like 40 minutes for 5 bucks on the train”. Cost of living in Boston is a little steep. So shell stay in Wichita, too many event planners so she couldn’t go there and start up. The north end was her favorite. Specific bakery named by name with the BEST __ in all the world. Her daughter likes it too. She likes NY but Boston is the best.

N: (interjected with agreeance) (excited to answer and talk about Boston) there isn’t anything to dislike about Boston. “There is just not one negative thing about Boston. We can get anywhere in 45 mins for 5 bucks” You can get anywhere. (Continuing to elaborate on all her favorite things about Boston and laughing) her daughter loves Boston and now she wants to go to New York.

PAUSE

N: and Austin. 6th street is just amazing. All the restaurants, and food is tremendous and you and go and eat outside. There is too much to do”. Just gives her a reason to go back over and over and over again. San Antonio is nice too. Within driving distance and really the river walk is so much fun and has so many good restaurants.

N: (continues to keep going about places after I try to move on) oh and Austin I love Austin. The food is awesome and you can sit and drink all day long “there is just too much to do” and it gives you a reason to go back. Even San Antonio is 9.5 hours and you’re good to go.

N: the best place in Austin is __. Anywhere in San Francisco is amazing for food.

A: yeah I’ve heard awesome thing about san Antonio

N: (interjects) the riverwalk is so good and so many good restaurants. I’m just going to shut down my business and go travel for a few months (giggling) (keeps talking about the food in Austin and all the different places to eat in all the cities just mentioned)

commute

- driving and going to in between meeting and you’ll just walk if you 10-12 blocks
- and the weather is important

A: how do you get around in Wichita?

N: for the most part b/c of what she does she has to drive (meetings, and visiting between vendors). She will walk if it’s within 10-12 blocks. Weather does have a bit to do with it but really she will pretty much walk anywhere in downtown.

N: (slowly) it depends b/c I usually have to drive from vendors. If I have the time thought I like to walk. 10-12 blocks. Kind of hesitant again) and the weather. I prefer to walk downtown
A: what brought you to live downtown?

derby

- was about as far outside of Wichita you can get
- the son was out living there and so they
- needed to get out of the house and Ramsey took her around; has dogs and lxl was shown
- wanted to live and work in the same building
- lux became home and it was where they needed to be
- just as much space
- just fantastic and everything we need to do is downtown and we never go to derby anymore and if we go
  some there its 15 mins away
- the neighborhood in suburbs was nonexistent ‘community
- feel
- she loves living down here
- She misses the yard.. she plays by the river and
- just better here
- son, 19, didn’t want to live downtown they live here in the apartment above them and it’s the most
  affordable option they could find

N: well we were in derby about as far outside of Wichita as you can get. Her son was in school still. He is 19 now and her
daughter is now in Montessori school (so she could go anywhere b/c it’s not a school district). Primary reason was she
needed to get some office space. She worked from home and the office continued to climb up the stairs. So they were
touring downtown looking for an office space for the business. Came down to the lux and Ramsey personally took her
around. And they talked about the kid’s age and dogs and once she saw this apartment she immediately knew this is
where she wanted to be. After two weeks of deliberation they pack everything up in a week and moved. Craziest decision
ever. She never goes to derby anymore. Everything she does is downtown. She moved in with a husband son and
a daughter, dog cat and frog and NOW its down to a cat and daughter. Everything she does is downtown. Suburbia is supposed to be so nice and all
especially after 13 years of living there. But now she comes here and she walk 2 blocks without seeing 5 people she
knows. Sat in Panera for 2.5 hours with realtor and never once in that time did anyone say hi.

N: laughs and starts telling like a story) they lived in derby and son was in school and daughter was in Montessori
school. She actually started b/c she was looking for additional office space. And she came down and looked at the
space and Ramsey showed her around (speaks very personally about Ramsey and you can tell she respects/likes him)
two weeks before Christmas they commit and by January 2nd they had already moved (super excited) and it was the best
decision every! And we have just as much space. She moved in with a family and now it’s just daughter and cat.

(laughs)

JUST KEEPS talking about how much she loves living downtown and all the space and all the benefits)

N: you would think when you go back to the house in derby people would be out saying hello and downtown here it’s so
friendly and “suburbia in smack dab in the middle of the city” “ you can’t walk 2 blocks without someone saying hello”
(speaks negatively every time suburbia comes up)

A: so how does your daughter like living downtown?

N: oh she loves it. Sometimes she says ‘oh I miss having a yard’ but she doesn't. She didn’t play in it when we had one.
Ever. But here they do so much more here. You would think having a sliding glass door outside you would go out more
often but they didn’t. Here they go to the river walk. “It’s just better here” Even the dogs didn’t. When they had a whole
acre to run in they would sit at the door and want to come right back in

N: (super quick) she loves it. It’s so much easier. We do so much more now. “It’s just better” so she loves it and my son
who’s 19 didn’t want to move and now they live 1 floor above them (excited to tell how they’ve changed their mind) all
the apartments are less affordable after utilities. Plus the locations is awesome. And you can walk. And they can save on
gas and have all this down here. (laughs and mocks son for being so slow to catch on to living downtown) “Really,
you’re going to live down here? Really? Ok mom didn’t know so or anything…” (laughing)

N: her son was somewhat distraught about moving downtown and didn’t want to be here. Was afraid he wouldn’t know
anyone and no one would come visit him. But now he and his girlfriend live one floor up above them. They live here b/c
it’s the affordable thing they could find. The duplexes and apartments were all water trash and all so much extra with
utilities. Unless you want super fast wifi or cab. E. “its all here” you can walk to the movies, save on gas. They told her
and she laughed b/c it was so ironic and funny. Mom ended up knowing best but I don’t want to admit it.
A: what do you do for groceries?

grocery

- just as long to get food then it did at suburbs
- daughter
- LOVES cowens salws deli
- Parking garage just west of the building
- Building inside the building
- All inventory and storage is all in the same building

N: takes just as long to a store here than it does here downtown. In fact it actually takes less time b/c now she can do it on the way to or from getting her daughter b/c it’s on the way. There is this deli downtown that’s SOO good and they go to the farmers market and stock up on milk and eggs and stuff o they can just go here if its for the necessities. It would be good to have a grocery but it’s not a huge issue

N: (interjects and describes very nonchalantly) that’s the only thing; but it takes just as long to get there now as it did then. (laughs and starts describing how convenient it is now) a grocery store down here would be awesome” but we have the deli and the braums market but yeah it’s just maybe 10 mins away

A: do you have a garage or anything for the building

N: parking here is something you have to spend money on to have it on a garage but not really a concern. The have basement space for all her extra storage stuff or business stuff

N: too expensive to park there (very blunt not interested)(definitely didn’t seem like an issue or something worth discussing) I also have storage space for my office and business stuff; she parks on the first floor just a block away and it’s the cheapest option and she feels super safe with that.

A: how does it work living and working in the safe place?

- All in the same building and its convenient and it does stay separate by being on different floors
  - Very Wichita specific
  - Entitled inferiority; everyone should want to be here and we should have it
  - So many unique things that here
  - Very different places; the crowd that works and those that play downtown
The people downtown are the weird and oddballs

You can live and work in different places small minded, simple people, lot of really good things that are in Wichita

Expression on the goo go

N: Is SO nice; it’s so easy to keep it separate and her work to not take over he home live. She just go a 3-D printer. She is so excited to use and play with all this stuff and now it’s not all in the same room. Excited to use her printer for her business to customize everything. Really could be fun for all her events.

N: (smiling and slowly starts and keeps getting louder the more she elaborates) “it’s so nice” I love it. It’s all in one building but it’s separated. “I to work from home and keep it separate and keep all my works stuff from taking over” I have all my projects and it’s not like I just have files or anything. Actually I just bought a 3-D printer that’s sitting upstairs that I’m waiting to use.

A: wow what are you going to use it for

N: SO excited, clapping hands) there is so many options and I just want it” I can personalize anything. Last spring she was at a conference and she saw some things people custom printed and knew she wanted to start saving then.

A: yeah we have one at school and some of the tings coming from it is really creative and cool

N: (wants to talk about what she could make and all its capabilities)

A: do you feel Wichita has an identity?

A: if you felt if Wichita or anywhere in Wichita might have an identity. What would you call it or could you identify anything specific to Wichita? Or even a certain characteristic?

N: uh that’s hard. It’s hard b/c they have this weird little identify crisis ant we have for a long time b/c its Wichita specific, not kanas. It’s like entitled inferiority. Not the identity we want to project. Everyone should want to be in Wichita but then everyone that’s here says we suck. So when doesn’t know. We suck in the dignity we should have. Austin is weird and so unique. But it doest show. It’s hard and very segregated. So many different places to identify. B/c the people who live and work downtown and the people who play downtown is very different .people are very much in their won pod and don’t cross over.

N: (ugh that’s hard (making groaning noises. And super slow to answer) we have an identity crisis and I don’t understand. Its Wichita specific” “entitled inferiority” “and it’s not the identity we want to project” everyone should love it but everyone that’s here says they suck. “we suck is not the identity we should have” (speaking passionately) “there are
Weird identity crisis (long pause and slow)

A: is it something that’s physical or social?

A: you think it’s physical or social?

N: very much district west side/ east side. The people from downtown are the strange oddballs. B/c they go everywhere
don’t identify themselves as anywhere specific. "Were the strange’ in the eyes of the community. ‘Keep Wichita strange’. It’s not weird in a bad way. It’s an attractive measure.

People from here tend t. I don’t know small minded. Simple thinkers, I didn’t say that. We just have a lot of stuff to do they just don’t do it. We did a stay-cation the other years and had a goddamn blast. We went to the zoo, went to a show at century 2, ate at all the restaurants, and stayed down by the river. There is just so much to do and no one takes advantage of it.

N: slowly answer and answer very detailed about types of people) east side and west side are in their own pod and they don’t intermingle. District defining lines. The people that live downtown are the oddballs b/c they go everywhere. You can live on one side and live on the other but you don’t do the same thing in the same place. The people that live downtown are strange. It’s not weird in a bad way.

PAUSE

N: yeah I don’t know, small minded kind of simple (laughing and talking quietly) yeah I didn’t say that. There is a lot of cool things to do. We did a stay-cation and we stayed downtown and we went to the movies and the zoo and everywhere we could go and went to century 2 and went to all the restaurants and did all the things. There is so much entertainment and so much to do but people just don’t do it. (Laughing and talking more exciting and loudly the more she narrates the experience). We went everywhere you can go. And then we ran home to let the dogs out b/c we could get any neighbors to watch the dogs in the suburbs.

- Go the monarch
  - The public
  - The movie theater
  - Go to the century 2
The boathouse, been here for like over a hundred years and it’s on the river
Donut home, maple bacon donuts, inside is very nice

- Lux
  - 1 and 2 floors are

- tallgrass film fest
  - very cool
  - she will get 10-12 passes the filmmakers are here
  - very all movies are downtown and there’s movies
  - how many films they select
  - 1 VIP opening night
  - 5 days starting at 8
  - galas every night

A: what place in downtown do you frequent the most?
A: what places in downtown to you go to the most?
N: espresso to go go all the time. Go to the public and river city, go to century 2. It’s different though b/c my job requires me t do all these things that are more event based and not an individual discovery thing. We go to the boathouse all the time and it’s awesome. Its downtown and right across from the __ it’s been here all the time and soo historic and they do event and stuff. Its fun b/c I get to do more than the average person in some of these places.
N: espresso a go go. All the time. (got distracted by neighbor) (Slow to answer and lists) go to the public, river city, and century two, river walk, and the boat house.
A: what is the boat house
N: SO ECITED!) One of my favorite places. Oh my gosh it’s amazing. Right across from the water walk building. It’s gorgeous and the Kansas sports hall of fame is there. And they do events there. I get to do a little more than most people. And the donut hole. (keeps bringing up more places and lists favorite things about each; wants to describe character of each place) (laughing) yes maple bacon.... and inside is just oh

N: there’s government on the 2nd floor they’re just the defense contract government agency and for sure they’re the CIA; they’re very nice just different people
N: speaking softly and gossipy) the oddest little people live on the 2nd floor, government agency people
A: what is the building layout?
A: how does the building layout work here?
N: 1 and 2 is commercial and the hospitality room and auditorium in the 1st floor and the open room is here on the first floor ant the tallgrass comes in for the VIP on the first floor. Tallgrass is her favorite event. It’s so much fun. If you like movies and the idea is really cool. She generally sponsors the VIP lounge and she usually gets 10-12 passes for free. It gets you into the passes and parties. The filmmakers are here and super eager.
N: authoritative) 1st and 2nd are commercial. And smaller hospitality room and auditorium. And there is a space up front here that is just open right now. The tallgrass film festival here does this and “It’s one of my favorite events all year long. It’s so fun” I generally sponsor one of the VIP lounges. It’s just so much fun. (Eager to talk about her role and what goes on and who comes) all the filmmakers are here. And if you like movies you have to come.

A: how is it organized? And what is the schedule? And location schedule?
A: how does it work with timing and movie showings?
N: depends on the number of films and their lengths. They’ll start movies, 1 VIP open night gala. It’s not a gala if you wear blue jeans. Aka a Wichita gala. For the next 5 days it starts at 8 and goes till 7. They’ll have a closing night gala. And it makes her twitch calling it a gala. If you’re not wearing shoes that hurt and a dress that’s too tight it’s not a gala. They get a small grass thing going. It’s just like tallgrass except it’s for little kids. And now they do it after the film fest b/c that way adults get to see the movies and they can go to them without alcohol being present.
N: (quick to answer) it’s all downtown and at the gravy center, there is movies here and at the Orpheum (comments on liking it when people use their car horns) they do one VIP opening night gala and admits it’s a Wichita gala. “I twitch when they call it a gala. It’s not a gala if you’re wearing blue jeans” (laughing while describing) if you’re not wearing a tie and wearing a tight dress it’s just a party; and now they do a small grass. (laughs and describes events)

A: What open/green space do you frequent?
A: What park spaces do you like or use?
A: where do you take your dog?
N: they like the watewalk. Within a block there are several grassy spaces. It’s really not that hard. Just across the street there are small green patches ether is even a parking lot and a little thing just a block away so it of course and there are people in there they’re looking outside like oh my…
N: old town square has a nice grassy area
N: very casually) you take a baggy and bring him across the street with grassy patches. There is even a parking lot in the building just north of here and they have a grassy area. Of course the business men are looking at you

N: everyone here looks at us very strangely for living here. Even for the past 8 months people are still whispering about us living down there. They are not worried about it. But people keep asking how it’s possible. “We’re going to live, I don’t understand the big deal.”

N: (talking slow and somewhat astonished) they actually did a story on us in the paper. “They whispered it like it was a bad thing” (sarcastically laughing explaining what they may do once they move downtown “well we’re going to get rid of the dogs and leave the kids”

A: I thought it was actually kind of strange they put your story in the paper but in general I guess I understand how strange it may seem to others?
N: I’ve got friend that brought their newborns home in cabs and that’s just what you do. It’s your home and that’s what you do and that’s part of living and working in NY.

N: yeah well I’ve always travelled since I could drive” (frankly speaking and telling it how it is) (laughing) you just do what you need to do. You do the same things you do just in a city and you take a cab and it’s not a big deal

A: yeah I don’t understand it at all. I tried last semester not to drive my car and people thought that was crazy.
N: the building owner Ramsey doesn’t have a car. He doesn’t have a car and walk everywhere and when he can’t he gets on the bus.
N: well the building owner doesn’t even have a car he walks everywhere and if he needs to go somewhere he gets on the bus (respectfully and enthusiastically)

A: yeah I want to live somewhere after school where I don’t need a car
N: I know people in there 30s that never even had a license. She didn’t have to haul all the shit she has to haul she could get rid of her car in a heartbeat. You can get on the bus but it’s not efficient. If they would rework it and rethink about the stop. Cabs are allowed to wait. So you will have to wait an hour. If you call them its takes 45 mins to get here. But the city doesn’t allow for the cabs to idle. She has an issue with it with her business b/c the people will have to wait forever.

N: interrupts ) I know people in their 30s that still don’t have a license b/c they can just get on the train or bus; if I didn’t have to haul all the stuff I have to haul I wouldn’t own a car either. “Wichita does not make it very easy transportation.
N: in the city you can get on the bus but it’s not easy and takes a while. Also if they would let cabs wait. You can’t whistle for a cab (frustratingly describes cab situation) she would like it for living and work. She would like to be able to hail a cab and it be there without having to wait 45 mins for one.

(stops to say how much she loves her neighbors and laughs with a smile on her face)

N: those are our neighbors. She is a not working. He is fa professor. She is from Canada they have the best conversations during fire drills. Fire drills are a time for neighbors to chit chat. They have had one at night. It was right after her surgery. 3 days after and it was freezing and her son helped her get her coat on and. she vocalized it on twitter how bitchy she was but Ramsey saw it and immediately said something. She became the building fire drill chief. They were allowed to wait in the lobby b/c it was a drill. She just became the mom of the building

N: he is professor and they are so much fun and they’re from Canada and we have the best conversations during fire drills. (talks well about the building) we’ve only had one at night and it just so happened it was right after her surgery and it was freezing cold and her son was able to help her (mimics her agitation the time) she tweeted her frustration and Ramsey apologized right away on the media; she became the fire patrol leader (talks like the building mom); it was just a drill so we moved into the lobby. (Light sarcastic laughing and mocked the scenario and firemen)

A: had you been involved or been following the design prior to the charrette?
A: had you been involved in the development of the pop up park before the charrette?

Douglas pop up park

- Know it was going on
- Didn’t realize that bokeh development
- Ramsey is the reason that her office and house is here
- He lives here too on the 7th floor
- Forces people to get out of their comfort zones
- There is so much and
- 

The pit

- Multiple time a week
• Downtown all the time
• Loves the ideas of the sidewalk barrier and less than something somehow could sleep on
• Venue for a small wedding
• Small intimate wine tasting
• Got to be a space for kids
• Lots of tables and chairs and places for people to sit and play handball goal is to attract young professionals

N: I know it was there and that it was a pop-up park but she hadn’t heard about it until that day. She didn’t know bokeh was a part of it she knew it would be good and she wanted to be involved.

N: I knew it sounded exciting and I had heard about it (slow to start but picked up speed when starting to narrate relationship with Bokeh) but I didn’t know anything really about it other than it being a pop-up park before going. Hadn’t heard about it specifically until that afternoon. As soon as she learned about bokeh development she knew it was going to be good.

A: yeah I think Ramsey is awesome
A: yeah Ramsey seems super awesome

N: Ramsey is the reason she got this space at the lux. She asked a friend down on Douglas next to naftzger and espresso to go go. Her friend told her to call Ramsey. She did and didn’t hear back for a long time and so she just figured he was super busy and probably not going to be much help. And she emailed him too. She left her card and before she couple even call again he called her and apologized and told her how sorry he was. And she explained how much on a budget she was. And she got an amazing deal that’s on a space that’s just perfect for her. He is just amazing. They’re good people. She loves the office and apartment space. He just moved in on the 7th floor. It says something knowing the person is living in the same building he developed. He knows everything that’s going on all the time. And it’s so open to everyone’s ideas. And he is so on top of his stuff and knows what’s going on at all of his numerous properties.

N: he’s actually the reason I moved in here. I was looking further down Douglas but was directed to contact Ramsey. She calls and tries to contact him (telling portion like a story) (really emphasizing point by talking with gusto when appropriate. Mimicking how the story actually played out). Heard back from Ramsey and was very frank with him about
her budget and business needs (laughs) she gave her an amazing deal and a space that’s perfect for her. “he’s just, he’s amazing”

PAUSE

N: “they’re good people” and they just moved into the 7th floor. Something respectable about living in the building you’re owning.

A: yeah I think he is so progressive and forward thinking.

A: I agree its setting a precedent

N: he brings so many good things to downtown and it forces people to get out of their comfort zone and try things they haven’t yet.

N: interrupts) yeah there is something about that personal investment and he is on top of all his properties. Even in the charrette you can tell he is open to everyone’s ideas (speaking empathetically about Ramsey’s dedication to his roles)

N: (methodically chooses words and speaks more boldly and forcefully) he brings so many good thing down here and forces people to think outside their comfort zones and there is just so much downtown and yeah

A: how often do you feel like you might interact with the ‘pit’

A: how often do you interact with the ‘pit’?

N: oh gosh, multiple times a week. She doesn’t just come down here and work and go back home to the suburbs.

N: she would be down there more. She would go to there for meetings. She does them on the rooftop now with clients on the garden.

N: I loved the idea having something right on the sidewalk and gets people interacting and creates that barrier and small enough people can sleep under it. I think it would be so cool to have an even there. Like a wine tasting. There are weird outdoor drinking ordinances. She just needs some tables and chairs. As long as it’s privately owned it should be fine with a licensed bartender. It’s obnoxious how crazy these restrictions are. You have to have a fence around the space if its outside

N: laughing and interrupting) oh gosh a few times a week. And again I don’t just come to downtown and leave I’m here all the time. I would be down there more (laughing) “I would go down there for meetings” “I loved the idea for something people could lean on and eat on” it gets people interacting and creates barrier (slowly) and less for people to sleep on. I think it would be an amazing venue” ”small weddings or small intimate wine tasting” (slowly explaining how she could use the site for business; thinking out loud about possibilities specifically about alcohol laws) it’s the most ridiculous
thing. I know how to protect my bartenders... (laughing loudly) you also have to have space for kids to play*
(passionately and forcedly) “something accessible for the little ones” “goal is to attract college grads to work, live, and
grow” “you can do all of that down here and get people in the mindset you can stay and live down here

A: what would have to go into this for you to have meetings and stuff like you thought?
A: yeah I wish they focused more on attracting early family. How do you keep the starter family to stay?
N: its fine you can do that. It’s frustrating before they moved down here b/c she would come down here with the kids and
do things downtown and all her neighbors would be like what?? Why? There is nothing to do down here. There is a group
of like 20 years old that go together and wanted to see what they could do in downtown. It was frustrating b/c the 18 year
olds didn’t thing there was anything for them to do until they are 21. And that’s bullshit! It’s a perception problem and
then it’s a marketing problem”
N: (interrupts and mocks current perception of living downtown) (scoffs and frustrated with situation) it was frustrating
before we even moved down here. People didn’t understand why I would ever take my kids downtown. There is nothing
to do downtown. (starts speaking a little slower and quieter) There is a group of young adults group that was supposed
to do an event here and downtown but they didn’t do it well. And they didn’t have a lot of follow through. But even
amongst that group it was frustrating “that’s such bullshit” you just need to look and experience and do it. (she laughs
and speaks with her hands) “it’s a perception problem and it’s a marketing problem”

A: well until people get down here how do you do that?
N: there also has to be space for kids to play. There was a lot of talk about places to sit but there has to be something
that accessible for kids. Eventually people my age will be coming down there b/c their goal is to attract that type of
people. And so as these people’s lives grow and their families can grow down here.
N: (slow to answer) I don’t know; if you don’t give the people a reason to come down I think you need a whole new
generation of people with a new attitude. It’s frustrating. There are more empty nesters that are coming down and finding
places to live and finding things they didn’t know how they could do this in Wichita (trails off) it’s frustrating

A: yeah I agree the DDC does so many awesome things but I do think they forget about attracting the early family. B/c
what happens to the young professionals? They leave once they start their families?

Young college age
• 18 year old say there is nothing
• marketing and perception problem
• if the campaign doesn’t go well then it’s just a big waste
• a whole new generation of people that need to come in with a new attitude
• it’s frustrating
• empty nesters; enjoying and coming down to live here; will help get their kids to understand
• water gun fight on the 3rd floor

A: yeah, what else do you think would help that?
A: well that could help seeing your parents living downtown
N: yeah I don’t even know. It’s so hard. Even marketing doesn’t work if you don’t give the people a good reason to come
down and try it a few times. I think it has to do with the people. There are more the empty nesters that are coming down
here and enjoying it. And I think that might help. Maybe their kids will see it and start liking it too

A: yeah I could see that being a draw that could work
N: if your parents are having more fun and a better social life than you are I think you need to rethink it. I think Ramsey is
awesome b/c now his kids come back from college and they see him living down here. My daughter will definitely be
someone that stays downtown. All her friends always want to come down here and stay in Alex’s building! Yeah we had
a water gun fight on the 3rd floor. One night I saw one of the neighbors were having a light saber fight on the Wichita
rooftop in downtown. How many times does that happen in suburbia that it starts in a basement and you suggest you
take it outside?
N: during answer and interjecting) yeah if you’re parents have a better social life than you would think you would catch
on. But you have to see that there are things to do. (Excitedly) yeah I know my daughter will want to live here and all her
friends want to come over.
N: excited and animated) one of my neighbors had a light saber battle out on the roof. And how many times do you do
that when it starts happened in your basement in suburbia would you say oh lets go do it outside (reflective or remissive)

A: yeah I think that’s so real. The idea of having a backyard is awesome but when do you use it?
A: yeah the idea of backyard sounds so great but how much did you use it?
N: yeah we even used to live across from an elementary school with an awesome playground and we never used it. Now
we can just walk outside and do all this stuff. Now we have a GIANT backyard

N: matter of factly) yeah and we used to have a playground just across the street and we never want. But here we do all this stuff. We have a giant backyard

A: yeah I wish as a kid I would’ve lived downtown b/c I could’ve just went and walked around more
A: yeah and you can walk around more down here
N: yeah and it’s not like it used to be. You can let your kids run wild anywhere. I wouldn’t let her walk alone now b/c she is ten but in five years yeah she can walk down tot the movie theater. Yeah and at least if she goes and drinks when she is 15 she will stumble home and don’t attempting to drive home.

N: slowly) now living in suburban neighborhood you still don’t let your kids go run around. And you can’t do that and let them run while or do whatever. 5 years from now she could walk to the movies with her friend

A: what do you think about the safety?

safety

  • not unsafe
  • only had 1 issue after 13 months of living down here
  • two men that lived within four blocks of suburban house doing indecent things

A: and it’s not safer doing that?

N: I really don’t feel it’s dangerous. She is so tired of this negativity about downtown in this way. In the thirteen months she’s been downtown she kind of got into once. A guy wanted some food for him and his wife and daughter. She said she would drive a mile out of her way and they can all go get food together. And he didn’t want that. And so she said no b/c she wasn’t just going to give him money. And so he kept yelling stuff then and got mouthy. But even then she didn’t fee like her life was threatened. On 2nd street there is a Methodist open door thing and another building that’s kind of shady. So at night she just avoids the area. She had two child molesters living within 4 blocks of her in suburbia. She felt just as unsafe there. She feels more unsafe walking at night in derby. At lease here someone is going to see or hear something wrong here in downtown. People are too private in the suburbs and shut in their homes not paying attention.

N: oh absolutely; (laughing) and she can stumble home instead of driving if she starts drinking

N: (interrupts and starts over several times) it’s not unsafe. I’ve only had one incident in 13 months down here. And that’s my fault (mimicking the way it happened and speaking confidently) she would go and get food for the man and his family and wouldn’t give him money and he said no b/c he wanted money and so she walked off. And even that wasn’t
bad’ and I walk through an empty parking garage. After 5 o’clock it’s a ghost town down here and I don’t ever feel unsafe (speaks a little softer and slower) and on 2nd street I won’t walk there on midnight but I will just walk a block over (getting louder) I had two men living within 4 blocks of us for indecent instances with a child. “yeah its everywhere” “if I go for a walk at night I felt more unsafe there then I do now” (laughing) b/c down here at least someone will hear you scream and pay attention

A: how do you feel about the temporary park?

temporary

- pop-up park like the idea of it moving
- more profess here and growth and development
- bringing that vitality from places
- so much construction going on
- continue that spirit in the same”
- late year there was a youth baseball thing ‘league 42’ and they play over at 13th and 135
  o this park has three baseball diamonds
  o where men’s fast pitch started in Wichita
  o old men that come out every night and they watching these kids being so excited about thee 300 kids out here playing the

A: how do you perceive the temporality of the park?

N: I think it’s awesome” the whole idea of it moving is really cool. She likes the possibility of it being here and then moving and bring that vitality in downtown that’s going on. There are so many places that could use it with all the construction happening.

N: excitedly and quickly) I think it’s awesome ” I like the possibility of it moving” “I like the possibility of it moving after 4 years and bringing the vitality to a new neighborhood” (claps hands) “I think it’s a great idea”

A: what happens when they take it out? Will people be upset?
A: what will happen when I leaves?

N: I think it will be part of continuing that spirit in other places. She is on the board of this baseball group that got started at 13th and 135 and it’s at McGavins Park. This park has 3 baseball diamonds. Nothing has happened in that neighborhood in forever. The idea is to bring these kids that are more in the inner city and help them take a better path.

These old men come out every night and watch and say they haven’t had activity in this park for years and now there are
300 kids out here playing ball. More people are taking ownership. She thinks the temp park will spur this same type of vitality down here. It’s the play part that downtown struggles with.

N; (interrupts) yeah it’s something that can continue; (diverges to a new topic to talk about passionately about the organization) (describes in detail the location and background of the site and background of the history) nothing has happened in this historic space and bring baseball back to the space and offer kids an opportunity (talks empathetically and articulately) these old men are excited about the activity her in the park. And now the neighborhood is improving b/c people are taking ownership again for the first time. It’s the live work and tis the play part we have problems with.

A: yeah at least the living downtown is getting better

N: there’s just. There’s a lot more people particularly younger that’s getting into that. Younger people would have so much fun. Just b/c you graduation and stuff you don’t have to buy a house and start a family.

N: (interrupts) there’s are a lot more people younger that are getting more into that. (speaks freely about the perception)

A: being a young person I can understand not wanting to move away from your friends. But really you’re not missing out on anything b/c

A: yeah I would be concerned possibly about feeling like I am moving away from my friends

N: yeah my friends always come here and then we go over to the Orpheum. And it’s so much fun. Eventually they could make a pre-party game. And when people are her for tallgrass they’re walking all over downtown. This is what it should be al the time. They used to have the museum a la carte for 40 bucks and you got a lot a wine and the bus would shuttle you from the different museums. One of the museums wanted a larger cut though so they eventually got it shut down.

N: (agreeing and commenting during my answer) (quick to comment and respond with assertion) yeah when there is a show at the Orpheum all my friends will come over and have drinks first and then we walk over. (Laughing and getting louder and exited) yeah I keep trying to convince the Orpheum owner to have them start here at the event space then walk over. “This is what it’s supposed to be like all the time. (Diverts to other event possibilities) you got wine and bus around to the museums at museum a la cart. A: I wonder why it stopped

N: well I think one museum wanted a bigger cut (disappointedly)

PAUSE TO READ TEXT

N: ugh this is why I love it here. Because I just got a text from ray. She saw me in here and let me know about a new tenant. Yeah it’s such a great neighborhood. People take better care of each other. When I had a grand opening and
have 3 neighbors coming up and helping me move all these boxes into my house. And I don’t know if that would’ve happened if I was living in a separated house.

A: yeah I miss the dorms

N: EXCITED AND passionately) yes it is! Is such more of a community feel? “this is a whole neighborhood right here” people take care of each other” (speaking emotionally and respectively about her neighbors and their help)

N: explains how she loves the community/neighborhood feel of the Lux b/c she just got a text form her building manager

A: any specific programming you would feel would be really awesome or critical to have in the pop up park?

Pit

- Nothing organized
- Some rocks and something they could use their imagination with
- You can’t throw sidewalk chalk out here and expect to stay

A: any specific programming you feel like would be awesome at the pop up park?

N: I don’t know. Nothing that’s organized play. Nota playground. But more like rocks they could play on and use their imagination and just be out here. You can’t throw sidewalk chalk out here but something they would just have to you know if some stay at home moms wanted to work down there somewhere where they can sit and talk and have the kids play. I think it would be really cool if they do like a movie in the park. Everyone just brings their lawn chairs. B/c we have concerts and they do a summer series in old town square. So I think it would be well received and well attended. And the DDC would do a good job with that. They need one of the women in that office to have kids so they understand what its like to be

N: (long pause) (thinking) hmmmm I don’t know. (still needed some help or provocation) nothing like organized play”

maybe likes some rocks or something they could use their imagination with and just be out there” (picks up pace and starts spitting out ideas) if moms want to sit and talk and the kids could use their imagination” I think would be really cool to have the movies in the park and everyone just brings their blankets an stuff

N: one of the radio stations does a concert series in the park and well attended. (interrupted to talk about more ideas) we need someone at the WDDC to have small kids so they understand more about what it’s like to have littles

A: what comes first? The people or the programming?

N: if you don’t plan for the families there not ever going to come down here. I’m not a proponent of if you build it they will come. But if you don’t build it they will never come. If you don’t have them the opportunity and have people that will use it
be there and tell their friends

N: (interrupts before I could finish) then they won’t ever come down here” “you’ll never get the in between” “if you don’t build it then they’re never coming” if you don’t provide the opportunity and tell them know it’s here they won’t know.

A: yeah I’m sorry I didn’t mean for that to be a loaded questions

N: we do that in Wichita a lot. No will like that so… getting the arena built was difficult b/c people thought it was a problem b/c it was going to be downtown and you were going to have to walk. You go anywhere else you have to walk. People walk for 48 blocks away to see some of these sports teams. It brings so much money to the city and its so much fun. There are other answers is shouldn’t say.

N: yeah that happens in Wichita a lot (frustratingly starts talking about parking situation) century two was a big deal b/c people didn’t want to have to start to walk. Brings up example of San Antonio b/c hundreds of thousands of people will walk and it brings so much money to the city. There are other answers I shouldn’t say