University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

GSE Publications | Graduate School of Education

1-1-2005

Deliberative City Planning on the Philadelphia Waterfront

Harris Sokoloff
University of Pennsylvania, HARRISS@GSE.UPENN.EDU

Harris M. Steinberg
University of Pennsylvania, harrisst@design.upenn.edu

Reprinted from *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook : Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine (San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, 2005), pages 185-196.

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/58
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Deliberative City Planning on the Philadelphia Waterfront

Abstract
Development and revitalization in Philadelphia has suffered for years under the weight of a political culture that discourages public input. Backroom deals and personal relationships have often seemed to define the "public interest." This is the story of one attempt to give the public a voice in city planning and development.

Comments
Reprinted from *The Deliberative Democracy Handbook : Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century*, edited by John Gastil and Peter Levine (San Francisco:Jossey-Bass, 2005), pages 185-196.

This book chapter is available at ScholarlyCommons: http://repository.upenn.edu/gse_pubs/58

@RHR:Deliberative City Planning on the Philadelphia Waterfront

@RHL:The Deliberative Democracy Handbook

@CN:CHAPTER THIRTEEN

@CT:DELIBERATIVE CITY PLANNING ON THE PHILADELPHIA WATERFRONT

@CAU:Harris Sokoloff, Harris M. Steinberg, Steven N. Pyser

@CIT:Development and revitalization in Philadelphia has suffered for years under the weight of a political culture that discourages public input. Backroom deals and personal relationships have often seemed to define the "public interest." This is the story of one attempt to give the public a voice in city planning and development.

@TX: For over thirty years, the Philadelphia waterfront at Penn's Landing has been stuck at the intersection of public interest and private development. A landfill built in 1976 as public space on the Delaware River, Penn's Landing was conceived as a major destination that would bring visitors to the region.[1] The intervening years have seen many attempts to develop the site. Still, Penn's Landing remains a mere vestige of urban renewal's best intentions. Disconnected from the city by ten lanes of highway, the site has continually defied development.

The summer of 2002 saw the sixth failed development proposal,[2] and Mayor John F. Street and his development team quickly set about finding a new developer for the site. This process brought Penn Praxis a special program in the University of Pennsylvania School of Design) into a partnership with the editorial board of *The Philadelphia Inquirer* (the region's largest daily newspaper), the Center for School Study Councils (at the

University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education), and the Design Advocacy Group of Philadelphia, which provided program support. Together, the partners crafted a public process to engage the people of Philadelphia in a public conversation about the future of their waterfront.[4]

For fifty days in the winter of 2003, Philadelphians engaged in a robust public dialogue about the future of the Philadelphia waterfront at Penn's Landing. Held with the participation and support of Mayor Street's administration, The Penn's Landing Forums consisted of a series of four events on the future of the landing that included expert presentations on waterfront development, facilitated citizen deliberations on the landing's future, and a design charrette.[5] Over eight-hundred people participated in this mutually respectful civic relationship between expert knowledge and citizen response, resulting in the *Penn's Landing Principles*, a fundamental set of values that any development on Penn's Landing must honor. The forums allowed Philadelphians to be a constructive voice in a city where public opinion is all too often viewed as an opportunity to say "No" rather than "What if?"

@H1:Background on The Penn's Landing Forums

@TX:The Penn's Landing Forums grew out of a desire to create engagement that is more public in Philadelphia's isolated political and development culture.

@H2:Origins and Purpose

@TX:Given the history of failed development efforts at Penn's landing, Philadelphians had reason to feel largely ignored in matters of civic design and planning. In the past, the "pay-to-play" power structure of the city had demonstrated little tolerance for listening to citizen expressions of what to build at Penn's Landing or elsewhere. City leaders and

powerful developers were not about to relinquish control over how to determine who should receive development rights and public subsidies at important sites. Thus, this project sought to give citizens a formative, not a determinative role in shaping the future of Philadelphia's central waterfront. With the active participation of the editorial board of the *Inquirer*, the public's voice was assured a platform. The design principles were published both in the *Inquirer*'s editorial pages and on its Web site.

This project acknowledges that the role of a citizen in a representative democracy is to be informed and then, in turn, to inform the work of policymakers[6]. Typically, citizens educate themselves by referring to newspapers and other print and electronic media and attending lectures and other information sessions. Citizens then inform their elected representatives by contacting them directly or through an intermediary, such as a special-interest or lobbying group. Often, representatives conduct polls to find out what the public is thinking.

Each of these modes of becoming informed and informing has weaknesses. Individual learning can be isolated and limited to one or two narrow perspectives on an issue. Often, individual citizens fail to recognize how their positions conflict with the positions of other citizens. Polling suffers from problems of inconsistency and variability of responses over time. Thus, polling provides scant or inaccurate information on underlying public opinions.[7]

@H2:Distinctive Features[ok OK, too

@TX:The Penn's Landing Forums overcame the failings of individual learning and polling by creating opportunities for citizens with different perspectives to come together, learn from experts, share concerns and hopes, and develop a coherent direction. The

process was designed to enable them to work together to coproduce[8] a unified voice that might inform the work of developers and policymakers.

The Penn's Landing Forums had much in common with the deliberation processes described in the preceding chapters, but it had two distinctive features. One was the role of the design community in coming up with design ideas for the site. The other was the important role of the newspaper in convening the public gatherings, disseminating the results, and linking the broader public with the issue.

In regard to the first of these features, the *Penn's Landing Principles* served as the foundation for a daylong visioning workshop or design charrette held at the Independence Seaport Museum at Penn's Landing. Three teams composed of planners, architects, designers, engineers, economists, students, artists, and citizens each explored a different design approache for the site, each drawn from the civic discussion. The teams were charged with abiding by the *Penn's Landing Principles*. The designs produced during the charrette reflected the values and tensions inherent in the principles and framed a values-based civic conversation about the waterfront.

Second, the role played by the *Philadelphia Inquirer* was critical to the success of the forums. The *Inquirer* has the largest daily circulation in the region, and the invitation to participate was posted on its editorial page. This enabled the forum organizers to reach a wide prospective audience. In addition, the paper chronicled the course of the forums through editorials, opinion pieces, a dedicated Web page and a special Sunday editorial section that published the results of the charrette. By actively and repeatedly engaging their readers with the topic of waterfront development over the course of the forums, the *Inquirer* played a unique role as both convener and reporter. EDITOR: We don't know

how to add footnotes, so here's one we want to add: On the news side, Inga Saffron wrote a series entitled *Lost Waterfront* that preceded the charrette and established an excellent platform for our forums. Saffron was a finalist for a Pulitzer for this series. In addition, the news department of the *Inquirer* was actively reporting on-going news stories about the development process as well as the forums. All of this can be accessed through the *Philadelphia Inquirer web site: www:*

@H1:Designing and Convening the Forums

@TX:Given this background, we adapted our work in other settings to meet the needs of this project in Philadelphia. Each of the three main partners brought different backgrounds and objectives to the forum design process. The resulting forums were a collaborative effort that reflected the strengths and values of the different disciplines involved.

@H2:Meeting Design

@TX:The process consisted of four sessions designed to alternate between expert-driven and citizen-driven work. The forums began with a panel presentation that featured experts knowledgeable in real estate, waterfront design and development, the history of development on the Penn's Landing site, and successful designs at other waterfronts around the world.[9] Their presentations, along with a series of concurrent articles in the *Inquirer* and a Web site that the newspaper dedicated to the project, created a common base of knowledge for the public deliberation.

The second public meeting was dedicated to small-group public deliberations in which citizens connected the expert information to their personal experiences of the waterfront. The meeting began with an overview of the site that augmented the prior

presentations and articles, ensuring that participants in the deliberations had a rich sense of the key design issues at Penn's Landing.[10]

The second meeting was designed to develop (for future application) a set of common fundamental principles for developing Penn's Landing. Participants were randomly divided into ten small groups. Each group worked with a trained facilitator, focusing on four question areas: (1) Who uses Penn's Landing? Who are the past, present, and future users? Who isn't at the table? (2) What do people do at Penn's Landing? How do people currently use it, and what other uses do you think would work on that site? (3) What constrains people (from question 1) from engaging in those uses (from question 2)? (4) Based on the group's answers to questions 1–3, what principles does the group think ought to guide the development of Penn's Landing?

The last question made an essential move from the concrete to the abstract, from the particular to the universal. It recognized elected officials' responsibility to listen to public input while also recognizing the public's responsibility to provide informed input to their policymakers. This enabled individual citizens to look beyond their own interests to recognize the tensions that might exist between their interests and the interests of others. Coproducing a set of principles that embraced those tensions created common ground on which developers could build.

The small-group work led to the development of the following *Penn's Landing Principles*, which any development on the site must honor.[11]

@SA:

@TX:*Distinctively Philadelphia, with pride.* Create a signature space for Philadelphia, a "front door" to the world to which its citizens can point with pride.

It's the river, stupid. Enhance citizens' enjoyment of the Delaware River. Make Penn's Landing

the focal point of a growing Philadelphia identity as a "river city."

Get the connections right. Master the connections with Center City, Camden, and the scattered amenities along the Philadelphia waterfront. Address the Interstate 95 barrier, parking, and mass transit.

Bolster "Destination Philadelphia." Treat Penn's Landing as a regional attraction as well as a local park.

Make it affordable and sustainable. Be realistic about the economic potential and environmental limitations of Penn's Landing.

Keep it a public space. Preserve Penn's Landing as a fundamentally public space.

Use a public process. Ensure that the region's taxpayers have a timely say in its future.

@SA:

@TX:The order of the principles does not imply any ranking. Tensions exist among the principles; therefore, no single plan could honor them all equally.

The ideas and values discussed in the expert presentations and in the citizen deliberations were used to develop three design scenarios that became the basis for the third meeting, the design charrette. The charrette was not open to the public and was organized with the aid of the Design Advocacy Group of Philadelphia. Participants included well-known local architects, planners, landscape architects, engineers, economists, artists, students and faculty members.

@SA:

@TX: *Scenario 1: A respite from the city.* Show how to update Penn's Landing as a truly public place, one providing both daily access to the river for nearby residents and workers and a venue where the region can gather for big civic events.

Scenario 2: A vibrant new neighborhood. Explore how, if the barriers between the river and Center City neighborhoods could be eased, Penn's Landing might become the heart of a new riverfront neighborhood.

Scenario 3: Making Independence Harbor work. Consider how Penn's Landing could complement Center City's historic sites, as well as Camden's waterfront attractions, to achieve the goal of Independence Harbor, a regional tourist attraction that embraces both sides of the river.

@SA:

@TX: The results of the charrette were published the weekend before the final public meeting in the Sunday editorial section of the Inquirer and posted on their Web site. The design scenarios were conceptual and schematic, intended to reflect how the principles might be translated into development scenarios. The design principles, on the other hand, were intended to provide advice to policymakers. Indeed, the principles continued to be used after the project ended.

This was evident in the final public meeting, which was announced on the editorial pages of The Philadelphia Inquirer and to which all participants in previous meetings were invited via e-mail. Over 350 Philadelphians attended the final session held at the Independence Seaport Museum at Penn’s Landing. Following a presentation of each of the three design scenarios and a recap of the principles, participants were randomly assigned to small groups. Each group discussed each scenario for its fidelity to

the principles. The small group work ended with each participant rating each scenario for the way in which it honored the principles as well as what they would want to see built on Penn's Landing . At the end of the evening, the final ratings were reported to the assembled group.

All of the meetings and deliberative sessions were face-to-face encounters and were supported by a special Web site that was created by the *Inquirer* and devoted to Penn's Landing. The Web site included a three-week poll of the design suggestions put forth by the charrette. The poll received over five thousand responses. In addition, the newspaper received over three hundred letters about Penn's Landing during the forums, a number that was second only to the number of letters received about the pending war in Iraq.

Meeting places for forums such as The Penn's Landing Forums are important for their symbolic value. The first two forums were held at the University of Pennsylvania, which the public viewed as an independent convener of the process. The final forum was held on the site of Penn's Landing and drew the largest crowd.

@H2:Convening the Public Meetings

@TX:The Penn's Landing Forums were an adaptation of the National Issues Forums approach (see Chapter Three). In this case, the common ground was a set of planning principles and designs that incorporated public deliberation. The process was tightly structured, with clearly stated goals and a fixed schedule of tasks, events, and products.

The protocols for this public process were customized for the task and structured to elicit fact finding, reflective dialogue, and evaluation. All facilitators were experienced dialogue practitioners, with specialties in conflict resolution, dialogue and deliberation,

education, political science, or law. Many drew from their experience as faculty for the National Issues Forums, Public Policy Institute at the University of Pennsylvania and elsewhere around the county.

The facilitation team carefully prepared for the forums by studying the subject of waterfront development at Penn's Landing and imagining the broad range of stakeholders who might attend, with the expectation that the forums would be emotionally charged. Guidelines and ground rules to cover contingencies were prepared and shared with the participants. As it turned out, all the public dialogue was respectful and productive. The high level of preparation and the group guidelines played an important role in the success of the events.

An open call for forum participants was part of a series of editorials and news stories published in the fall of 2003 by the *Inquirer*.[12] The articles provided a historical context in order to help identify the interests of all stakeholders. This public call to action was met with interest and commitment to participate from a broad range of citizens, developers, policymakers, topic experts, and interest groups from Pennsylvania and New Jersey, all of whom completed a simple registration form.[13] Whereas participants represented broad diversity in ages and roles, including students and senior citizens, an overwhelming number of the participants were white and lived near the site. Thus, the group did not come close to matching the demographics of the 2000 Philadelphia census.[14] The lack of minority participation suggests the need for more targeted recruitment in the future.

Forum participants were invited to attend three public events over the fifty-day period of the project. Before the meeting, all participants received an e-mail that clearly

spelled out stated goals and the problem-solving mission of the forums. The process, timing, and sequence of the forums were also explained at the beginning of each event, and they were explained by facilitators when the participants moved into their small-group dialogues.

Although the forum process followed a specific protocol, facilitators were flexible in leading the dialogue, in order to encourage full participation.[15] The dialogue groups used a poster of the National Issues Forums guidelines, and some facilitators supplemented those ground rules with additional rules. Facilitators worked with their groups to clarify what public participation and involvement meant, discussing the nature of the ideal actions of participants.

Participants were invited to contribute to the forum through various forms of talk, including personal recollections and stories. Participants were encouraged to share stories about personal experiences at Penn's Landing and their own thoughts about future development. The pace was fast, groups were energized, and the dialogue was lively and passionate. Focus and a definiteness of purpose were needed because of the ambitious agenda and the limited time to deliberate.

Facilitators used time-tested techniques for checking for tensions between different ideas and clarifying differences. In retrospect, part of the success of the forums flowed from inviting participants to work with one another by sharing information. This created fertile ground for the participants to integrate their values and ideals with other types of expertise provided by the organizers.

@H1:The Impact of the Forums

@TX:The Penn's Landing Forums had an immediate and significant impact that has implications for how Philadelphia will engage in civic conversations about public planning in the future. Previously, the history of Penn's Landing had consisted of closed-door, politically driven development deals. The *Penn's Landing Forums* provided the first opportunity for real civic engagement and feedback about the future of the waterfront. In response, Philadelphians expressed their interest and appreciation through letters to the editor of the *Inquirer*, e-mails to the organizers, and participation in an on-line survey.

Most significantly, the project had an immediate and important impact on the selection and design process for the Penn's Landing site. As Mayor Street and his development team sought proposals to develop the site, they stopped their process to allow the *Penn's Landing Forums* to run their course.[16] Key members of the administration participated in all of the public events. A report was delivered to the mayor at the culmination of the process, and the organizers were invited to brief the mayor on the outcomes and recommendations. The Street administration included the *Penn's Landing Principles* in the material given to developers who were interested in bidding on the site and required developers to use the principles to explain their projects. Once proposals were submitted, Harris Steinberg and Harris Sokoloff responded to the design proposals in an *Inquirer* commentary article that reviewed the proposals in accordance with their compliance with the principles.[17]

The *Penn's Landing Forums* created the expectation that Philadelphians should be included in a constructive civic dialogue with their public officials about how to design the public realm. The discussion about the site continues to this day, and Mayor Street

recently announced plans to invest $500 million to spur development of new waterfront communities in Philadelphia,[18] and has rejected all development proposals for the site. Penn's Landing remains the keystone to this "river city" concept, and the *Penn's Landing Forums* have helped Philadelphians communicate with their elected officials about the importance of a public planning process in the pursuit of excellence in urban design.

In addition, the forums captured the imagination of the public and created the opportunity for additional forums on other significant planning issues. Praxis and the Center for Schools Study Councils have since employed the expert-citizen deliberative process for a community and high school project focusing on the Bensalem waterfront,[19] which is just north of Philadelphia on the Delaware River, and in West Philadelphia in the creation of planning principles for the evolution of the main street that joins the University of Pennsylvania and the local community.[20] The team of Praxis, the *Inquirer*, the Center for Schools Study Councils, and the Design Advocacy Group has been asked by a local foundation to lead a series of forums, deliberative sessions, and design charrettes on the future of school design in Philadelphia.[21]

The significance of the forums has also been recognized by professional associations. The project received a 2003 Citation for Architectural Excellence from the Pennsylvania chapter of the American Institute of Architects[22] and the 2004 Clearwater Award from the Waterfront Center. [EDITOR: Pleaes Add footnote: 2004 Clearwater Award, Waterfront Center, http://www.waterfrontcenter.org/awards/awards2004.html#clearwater. In March 2004, the project was presented as a best practice at Grassroots 2004, the national American Institute of Architects leadership conference.[23] In addition, the project was a finalist for a

2003 Batten Award for Civic Journalism and was presented in Washington, D.C., at the Press Club in September 2003.[24]

@H1:Reflections

@TX:Participants in *Penn's Landing Forums* worked through an ambitious set of tasks. The need for productive dialogue was measured against the political reality of the city putting the Penn's Landing development on a fast track. Therefore, it was necessary to move to dialogue in a single evening. A more sustained conversation over time would have allowed for richer discussions.

Basic contact information was collected when citizens registered to participate. To make the registration process seamless and easy, detailed demographic information was not collected. When participants arrived for the events, they were assigned to groups based solely on their arrival time. On further reflection, we see that more detailed registration information could have enabled more purposeful assignment to work groups.

There are challenges in bringing this model of dialogue and deliberation into more frequent use. The first barrier is citizen alienation and moving people to step out of their individual comfort zone to share their perspectives in a public dialogue. At the same time, we should note that these forums and subsequent forums on urban design underscore a thirst for this kind of public dialogue in Philadelphia. The second challenge is educating the public about how citizen voices can influence public decisions about their future. Most people feel powerless against well-organized lobbies, and many are currently disconnected from representative government. Against this backdrop, formal government continues to operate from a position of strength in comparison with a traditionally silent electorate.

The Penn's Landing Forum process can be seen as a form of generative dialogue and deliberation, in which a deliberative public process generated principles and designs. Traditional governmental agencies may be reluctant to engage in such deliberation because it exposes them to public review and accountability, although it does hold the potential for generating broad public support. The *Penn's Landing Forums* provides a model process in which experts and citizens work together to inform public policy. Most important, the principles generated during the forums create common ground for ongoing deliberation.

@NH:Notes

@NT: 1. Ed Bacon, Philadelphia's legendary post–World War II city planner, in collaboration with Oskar Stonorov, first proposed the idea for a revitalized waterfront park in 1947.

2. The 2002 development proposal was for a 600,000-square-foot entertainment complex with above-ground parking proposed by the Simon Property Group of Indianapolis.

4. This partnership was inspired, in part, by the landmark *Listening to the City* event that had been convened in New York City during the summer of 2002, in which over four thousand citizens responded to preliminary plans put forward to replace the decimated World Trade Center. See Chapter Ten and Pyser, S., and Figallo, C. (2004, Spring). "The 'Listening to the City' Online Dialogues Experience: The Impact of a Full Value Contract." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly, 21*(3), 382.

5. See the Web site that the *Inquirer* dedicated to the *Penn's Landing Forums* and other related material at http://go.philly.com/pennslanding.

6. David Mathews has suggested that there are four roles that only the public can play in a democracy: (1) defining the public interest; (2) building common ground for action; (3) supporting consistent government over the long term; and (4) transforming private individuals into public citizens.

7. Yankelovich, D. (1991). *Coming to Public Judgment: Making Democracy Work in a Complex World.* Syracuse, N.Y.: Syracuse University Press.

8. Susskind, L. (1983). *Paternalism, Conflict, and Coproduction: Learning from Citizen Action and Citizen Participation in Western Europe.* New York: Plenum Press.

9. The five experts were James Corner (professor and chair, Department of Landscape Architecture, University of Pennsylvania), Witold Rybczynski (Martin & Margy Meyerson Professor of Urbanism and professor of real estate, University of Pennsylvania), Peter D. Linneman (Albert Sussman Professor of Real Estate and professor of finance and business and public policy, University of Pennsylvania), James Cuorato (commerce director, City of Philadelphia) and Gary Hack (Paley Professor and dean of the School of Design, University of Pennsylvania).

10. Denise Scott-Brown, an internationally renowned architect and planner and a principal in the firm of Venturi Scott Brown and Associates, gave this presentation and focused on such topics as access, land use, transportation, symbolism, imagery, and context.

11. The full version of the principles is as follows: (1) *Distinctively Philadelphia, with pride*: Create a signature space for Philadelphia, a “front door” to the world to which its citizens can point with pride. Do not ape any other city’s riverfront

plan. Penn's Landing should not be a "chain store" place, but a Philadelphia place. This means it should reflect the city's virtues, such as: Center City's human scale and walkability; a sense of history (particularly on this spot where the seed was planted for William Penn's great experiment); a tradition of first-class urban design; and diverse populations. There is a public thirst for the site to include an "iconic" building or gesture—some item that could join the Liberty Bell, Billy Penn's hat and the Art Museum steps as a signature image of the city. (2) *It's the river, stupid*: Enhance, do not diminish, citizens' enjoyment of the Delaware River. Give people more ways to connect with the water—looking at it, walking alongside it, doing things in it (fishing, boating, etc.) Penn's Landing should become a focal point of a growing Philadelphia identity as a "river city," with a network of riverside walkways and parks. But do this with respect for the Delaware as a "serious" river; Philadelphia's status as a hard-working port city should not be ignored or sanitized. (3) *Get the connections right*: Understand that Penn's Landing is the key to mastering two sets of vital connections: (1) east-west, between Camden's burgeoning waterfront and Center City; (2) north-south, among Philadelphia's now-fragmented waterfront amenities. Get the connections right, and the whole can become greater than the parts. Get the connections right, and a proper balance of public, commercial and residential uses becomes easier to achieve. Conversely, any plan for Penn's Landing that doesn't address the site's isolation is doomed. A good plan must include strategies for dealing with the Interstate 95 barrier, parking, mass transit and links to the Camden waterfront and the scattered amenities along the Philadelphia waterfront. (4) *Bolster "Destination Philadelphia"*: Treat Penn's Landing as a regional attraction as well as a local park. Use it to consolidate the visitor appeal generated in recent years by

impressive cultural and entertainment investments on Camden's riverfront and in historic Philadelphia. Make Penn's Landing a transition point where the multigenerational appeal of Camden meshes with the historic riches of Philadelphia. (5) *Make it affordable and sustainable*: Don't fall into the grandiose overreaching that doomed three decades of plans for Penn's Landing. Be realistic about its economic potential and environmental limitations. To avoid the pitfall of cramming more onto the site than it can bear, treat it as one piece of a broader plan for the central waterfront. Don't approach riverfront development as a once-and-done event, but as a patient, generational enterprise. Learn from and capitalize on existing successes along the riverfront. Anticipate I-95's likely obsolescence within 15 years. (6) *Keep it a public space*: Preserve Penn's Landing as a fundamentally public space. Commercial uses should not overwhelm or preclude public uses. Citizens place high value on the site's role as a gathering place for major public events along the river, preferring it to the Festival Pier. The current design of the Great Plaza need not be maintained, but its function must be. City residents also value Penn's Landing highly as a safe spot where individuals and families can connect daily with the river. So the event space should not intimidate or prevent individuals from enjoying the river on ordinary days. (7) *Use a public process*: Ensure that the region's taxpayers, who paid to create Penn's Landing, have a timely, genuine say in its future. The public clearly does not want the fate of Penn's Landing to be determined by the city's habitual "pay-to-play" wheeling and dealing. Plans based on an authentic public process are more likely to generate community pride and support.

12. The Inquirer Web site at http://go.philly.com/pennslanding contains an archive of stories and editorials.

13. Although it was never statistically evaluated, we feel that word-of-mouth promotion by participants also generated participation in the forums. Electronic list serves of organizations such as the Philadelphia City Planning Commission, the local chapter of the Urban Land Institute, the Philadelphia chapter of the American Institute of Architects, and the Design Advocacy Group of Philadelphia greatly aided the organizers in reaching specific constituencies.

14. Ethnically, Philadelphia is 43 percent white, 41 percent black, 9 percent Hispanic, 5 percent Asian American, and 2 percent other.

15. The facilitators met before each of the deliberative sessions, to help ensure a productive environment.

16. Indeed, one of our goals as fourm organizers was to slow down fast-track "politics as usual" in order to allow meaningful public engagement to be incorporated as part of the decision-making process.

17. Steinberg, Harris and Sokoloff, Harris:. "Developers plans and the public voice." The Philadelphia Inquirer, October 23, 2003. [http://www.philly.com/mld/inquirer/news/editorial/7079394.htm].

18. Mayor Street's budget address refers to a $500 millioninvestment fund that will underwrite an unprecedented investment in the thirty-eight miles of waterfront along the Delaware and Schuylkill Rivers [http://www.phila.gov/pdfs/budget_04_speech.pdf].

19. See Mcginnis, James, "Students Present Riverfront Dreams." [http://www.phillyburbs.com/pb-dyn/news/113-10102003-175392.html].

20. See the Friends of 40th Street Web site on the community planning process at www.40thSt.org.

21. Based on the success of the Penn's Landing Forums, the William Penn Foundation is funding a series of forums intended to foster a civic dialogue about the Philadelphia School District's proposed $1.5 billion plan to build and renovate schools over the next decade.

22. AIA Pennsylvania 2003 Design Awards, [http://www.aiapa.org/special_events/honor_award/2003Winners.htm].

23. Harris Steinberg and Chris Satullo presented *Giving the Public a Voice: The Penn's Landing Forums* in March 2004 in Washington, DC at Grassroots 2004, a national architectural leadership conference of the American Institute of Architects..

24. 2003 Batten Awards for Innovations in Journalism Notable Entry, "The Philadelphia Inquirer – Redevelopment of Penn's Landing", [http://www.j-lab.org/coolb2003.html].

References

National Issues Forums. (2000–2004). "National Issues Forums: The Forums." [http://www.nifi.org/forums/about.aspx]. Accessed May 1, 2004.

Pyser, S. & Figallo, C. "The "Listening to the City" Online Dialogues Experience: The Impact of a Full Value Contract." *Conflict Resolution Quarterly* 21, no. 3 (Spring 2004): 381–393.

"Redevelopment of Penn's Landing." (2003) [http://www.philly.com/mld/inquirer/news/special_packages/penns_landing/]. Accessed May 1, 2004

Satullo, C. (2003).

[http://www.philly.com/mld/inquirer/news/special_packages/penns_landing/5174576.htm

?1c]. Accessed May 1, 2003.

Philadelphia Inquirer Editorial Board. (2003)

"Editorial: Penn's Standing." ***Philadelphia Inquirer,***

[http://www.philly.com/mld/inquirer/news/special_packages/penns_landing/5401077

.htm?]. Accessed May 1, 2004.