

Livable Boulder

World Café Process Report



1 CONTENTS

2	Introduction.....	3
3	Table Conversation Summaries	4
3.1	Table 1	4
	Question: How big should boulder be, and how fast should it get to that size?	4
3.2	Table 2	6
	Question: What are the costs associated with growth and who should pay those costs?	6
3.3	Table 3	6
	Question: Where does the power in Boulder currently reside and how can we empower ourselves, the citizens?.....	6
4	Synthesis.....	7
5	Recommendations By Topic	8
5.1	Mindmapping and Brainstorming as Creativity Tools.....	8
5.2	Visioning Suggestions	8
5.3	Learning Networks.....	9
5.4	Matching Network Design to Desired Outcome	10
5.5	Social Movements and Alliances	10
5.6	Initiating a Movement or Alliance	11
5.7	Sustaining social movement	12
5.8	Leveraging social media.....	13
6	Conclusion	15
7	Appendices	16
7.1	Appendix A – Sources and Suggested Readings	16
7.2	Appendix B – Event Photos.....	17

Report authored by ENV5 5100 Environmental Collaboration, The University of Colorado at Boulder Program in Environmental Studies, Fall 2014. *In alphabetical order:* Clint Augustson, Angela Boag, Ashley Collier, Bruce Goldstein, Deanna Heard, Juhi Huda, Sarah Judkins, Jordan Kincaid, Jeremiah Osborne-Gowey, & Sandra Starkweather.

2 INTRODUCTION

Boulder is a wonderful place to call home; known for its open space, small town warmth, and proximity to all that the Rocky Mountains offer. However, Boulder is also experiencing rapid growth. Many people are moving to Boulder for the same reasons long-time residents value their city and the results are growth in all job sectors and an increased demand for housing. While there are benefits to growth, there are also trade-offs. For example, new construction may change the look and dynamic of a city. Growth can also impact the quality of life in a city, be it positively or negatively. Residents of Boulder have a range of stances and perspectives regarding this growth, particularly those who have lived in Boulder the longest. Some of these residents (our citizen hosts for the World Café Process) were interested in bringing together citizens of Boulder to discuss the issues facing their city. Our group from University of Colorado, Boulder offered our assistance in planning and facilitating an event that would meet this need. Our class has been studying environmental collaboration and facilitation under Bruce Goldstein (Associate Professor in Environmental Design, UCB) and was eager to both offer assistance with an issue important to so many in Boulder, and practice the skills and concepts we have studied.

To begin to address these issues and understand the depth of support for slow/no growth in Boulder, University of Colorado students hosted a World Café process on November 13, 2014. The World Café process encouraged dialogue and idea sharing and exchange to answer deep and difficult questions regarding the growth and development in Boulder. Participants took part in conversations addressing each of three questions:

- (1) How big should Boulder be and how fast should it get to that size?
- (2) What are the costs associated with growth and who should pay those costs?
- (3) Where does the power in Boulder currently reside and how can we empower ourselves, the citizens?

During each round of conversation, facilitators took notes, which were then posted on walls around the room. After the final round of conversation, participants participated in a gallery tour of the notes from the three rounds of conversations. Participants could place dots next to ideas they thought were important, intriguing, and worth further conversation. A final round of conversation discussed what participants learned during the conversations and potential next steps. The highlights of these conversations were shared with the entire group.

This report captures the highlights of conversations regarding the three questions posed, synthesizes the lessons learned and potential next steps, and provides recommendations for next steps based on literature regarding utilizing networks and social movements to create change and enhance capacities for resilience, adaptation, and transformation.

3 TABLE CONVERSATION SUMMARIES

The following section is a summary of the conversations that took place around each of the three questions determined by our citizen partners. Table facilitator notes, as well as, photos from the event are available in the appendix.

3.1 TABLE 1

QUESTION: HOW BIG SHOULD BOULDER BE, AND HOW FAST SHOULD IT GET TO THAT SIZE?

There was broad recognition within both table group discussions that **Boulder's growth rate is already too high, Boulder may already be too big, growth should be slowed and any future growth needs to be carefully evaluated. There also appeared to be widespread concern that Boulder has already lost some of the character that made it unique and is losing more of that character and sense of community with continued growth.** There was general agreement that while residential growth was probably too high, employment growth has skyrocketed and is currently unsustainable and unacceptable. Specific suggestions about how to work with growth and development included capping the resident population around the 100,000 mark (no more than 125K). One participant suggested limiting growth to 150 new bedrooms per year (until 2100) to go along with a requirement that there be 150 parking spaces per year to go with the new bedrooms. This participant handed out a flyer detailing his development plan. Others proposed limiting growth to less than 1% per year. There was some discussion that if Boulder can hold on to what makes it Boulder (and unique), then perhaps the question of growth is less important; the quality of life here may be more important than the size of the city. Another suggestion was to limit development in and west of Goss Grove (to limit potential future flood exposure/losses).

There was substantial discussion about the capability of infrastructure with respect to growth. One suggestion that received several nods, was that Boulder should have ZERO growth now (negative growth, even) as **there is already substantial difficulty meeting transportation needs.** There was also some suggestion of only opening the potential for growth conversation *after* the *transportation* infrastructure is improved. The rapid rise in employment has fueled increased use (and deterioration) of transportation infrastructure – this town wasn't designed to handle the huge daily influx of people driving into the city for jobs. Further discussion included **limiting growth and matching it with the 'size' of the land, resources (e.g., water), and city services (water, sewer, transportation, etc.) that it can support.** Current growth and future growth projections do not appear well-situated to consider this (e.g., lack of quality growth data, by sector).

There appeared to be a general agreement that **perhaps this question was not the most appropriate** given the widespread agreement that Boulder's growth rate was already too high and Boulder already too big. Additionally, concerns were raised that **the question was too ambiguous and oversimplified, not accounting for the various growth sectors. All growth discussions need to include distinctions between residential, commercial industrial and employment growth,** accounting for

differences between day and night population size when calculating and accounting for growth. Another important distinction raised was of that between economic viability and growth. Additionally, growth discussions need to differentiate between overall growth and redevelopment—redevelopment being a good thing, if it is done well (e.g., aesthetically pleasing buildings that add value to neighborhoods).

Participants eventually moved to discuss the most obvious problems they see and possible solutions. **All participants felt there was a problem with actions of the current city council and regulators. They agreed that too many exceptions are being made to the current growth management plan (e.g., development disregarding the height ordinances).** Additionally, these exceptions appear to be inconsistent and their reasons left un-communicated. **Generally, people feel established rules and recommendations are not being followed, and decisions made by the city council do not reflect the opinions of long-time residents.** For example, new projects, such as the Baseline zero project, are burdening their surrounding neighborhoods. One problem with current rules and regulations may be their complexity/ambiguity; perhaps if they were simplified, they would be followed. There was some concern that the current 2% growth cap was being ignored. There was also some concern that the planning reserve may be under outside pressure from industry to disregard current rules and regulations.

Another major problem is transparency and available information. Participants expressed concern there is no simple way to stay informed as to what developments are taking place or are proposed, and there is no good information on current growth and the details of how Boulder is changing. It was suggested that better metrics on growth and analysis of these metrics (e.g., through visualizations) might be extremely valuable in the decision making process. Participants want a simple way to stay informed. **Other solutions being discussed included the development of new rules/regulations/ordinances, for example a city charter amendment, or a moratorium on growth – capping it.** There was some discussion about creating a Boulder City Bill of Rights, or crafting an Initiated Ordinance, as it could not be repealed. **It was also suggested that maybe actions could begin at a neighborhood level.** The Goss Grove neighborhood was suggested as a good example of a bottom-up movement to control growth. Additionally, many participants expressed support for limiting/controlling growth in the floodplain. Overall, participants seem to feel that the values that attract people to Boulder are not being maintained; there is a sense of urgency to preserve what people value in the Boulder community (aesthetics, neighborliness, open space, etc....).

Take Home Messages:

- Current growth is too fast, and is negatively impacting quality of life in Boulder
- How fast, exactly, is Boulder growing? It's not easy to tell without good data
- Citizens need to take action now to limit growth, there needs to be a simple, accessible way to stay informed
- An amendment to the city charter may be the best option for limiting growth
- Having the right people on the city council (and planning commission?) is important for limiting growth, and residents need to communicate regularly with these people
- Boulder can't (or shouldn't) grow faster than the resources and infrastructure can support

3.2 TABLE 2

QUESTION: WHAT ARE THE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH GROWTH AND WHO SHOULD PAY THOSE COSTS?

Some participants initially questioned the premise of the question in that it implied continued growth was acceptable, while others suggested that the amount of “acceptable growth” ought to be determined by the community. **There were a number of costs identified associated with growth, including financial costs, quality of life costs, and environmental costs.** Financial costs included costs to maintain, improve, and build new infrastructure and increase services to meet a higher population. A primary quality of life concern was higher traffic and congestion. Other quality of life costs included loss of identity and the “Boulder-ness” of Boulder, aesthetic costs (including ugly buildings and loss of views), loss of direct access to government, and an increase in the number of renters versus homeowners. Environmental costs included pollution, water quality, carbon emissions, and open space overuse or development. Other costs associated with growth were safety concerns, affordability of living in Boulder, and a sense that community members are more disconnected from nature and their neighbors. **Overall, there was a sense of a declining quality of life in Boulder due to growth and development. Participants agreed that costs are currently placed on existing residents, who often do not want further growth; instead, growth should pay for itself.** In particular, developers and incoming businesses should pay for these costs, potentially through higher fees associated with obtaining building permits from the city. However, there were questions about the fairness of pushing these costs onto new residents who want to move here and future generations. Furthermore, there was agreement that neighborhoods should have more of a role in the process. Finally, there was support for the idea that current residents might be willing to pay to prevent further growth.

3.3 TABLE 3

QUESTION: WHERE DOES THE POWER IN BOULDER CURRENTLY RESIDE AND HOW CAN WE EMPOWER OURSELVES, THE CITIZENS?

For most participants this was a hot-button issue. Responses were similar across discussions. **The primary power holders that the participants identified were the City Planning Board and City staff including the City Manager. They also identified City Council, real estate developers, the Chamber of Commerce, the University of Colorado Boulder, absent landlords, and the growing influence of private equity.** One participant argued that the people of Boulder do indeed still hold power, but that they fail to wield it. It was argued that the City Planning Board is stacked with those interested in development, and that they make exemptions to the City Code and Comprehensive Plan without warning or due process. These pro-development individuals adhere to the “New Urbanism” framework that encourages densification, and participants felt that the City completely ignores those holding alternate views. The Planning and Development Services Staff were said to be encouraging development beyond their

mandate, and are only held accountable by the City Manager instead of through external review, as they were in the past. The City Council appoints the City Planning Board and therefore citizens have little direct input regarding its members, which was offered as another example of the closed process that now characterizes city decision-making. In addition, several participants said that the recent renovation of the Council chambers and changes to Council agenda structures has made it feel like a hostile environment for public participants, with uncomfortable seating and unpredictably long waiting periods for public comment. The University was characterized as beyond public influence, and that high rental pressure was a symptom of unmitigated University growth. Finally, many participants noted that because Boulder is such a desirable place to live, in recent years many property investments have been made by financial interests from outside of Boulder, including absentee landlords.

The groups then presented ideas for re-empowering Boulder's citizens, ranging from public education to ballot initiatives. An education campaign could involve canvassing, emails, letters to the editor, and a survey in the Daily Camera to get the whole community's opinion on development. **Many also called for the reinvigoration of Neighborhood Associations and Neighborhood Liaisons, who could work directly with the City to create Community Development Plans that incorporate the views of residents. It was also suggested that a charter amendment should be on the 2015 ballot that forces the City Council and Planning Board to be more accountable to citizens.** Finally, many suggested increased political activity to support better City Council candidates, and increasing pressure by recruiting more members of the public to give public comment at Council meetings.

4 SYNTHESIS

The general consensus from the World Cafe process was that Boulder's growth rate is too high and that it is leading to a decline in quality of life. Specifically, participants noted that employment growth has skyrocketed and is overburdening transportation infrastructure and eroding the small-town character of Boulder. **Participants felt that established rules and recommendations are not being followed by the pro-growth City Planning Board Staff and City Council, resulting in decisions that do not reflect the opinions of longtime residents.** There was also a general feeling that there is a lack of transparency regarding growth and development; it is hard to get detailed information on city plans and difficult to provide public comment on projects.

Many participants stated that they were encouraged to find that they shared the same beliefs as others in the community, and were determined to maintain momentum for a slow-growth or no-growth campaign going forward. One of the most popular suggestions was a ballot initiative for the 2015 election that forces the City Council and Planning Board to be more accountable to citizens. A potential charter amendment also received a lot of attention.

5 RECOMMENDATIONS BY TOPIC

Detailed recommendations from the UCB student coursework are outlined in the following section. In brief, they point to the importance of recognizing, engaging with and strengthening the value connections that bring this group together. This might occur through crafting a common vision statement or following best practices for group facilitation. Vision statements should be built around *good issues* - those that orient group members towards what they **do** want rather than what they **don't** want. Also of value is recognizing the greater landscape in which the Boulder growth issues are situated - both locally and nationally. This might be accomplished through visualization tools like "mind maps" of power structures or connecting with peer groups in other cities from which Boulder could learn and share experiences. The theme of power will remain an important focus for this group. The UCB students recognize some opportunities to reflect on different types of power and how this group could empower itself moving forward. Social media will surely play an important role in civic empowerment and the diverse options that best fit this group should be considered.

Sustaining Livable Boulder's shared vision is not "a fixed address." Confronting Boulder's growth issues in a meaningful, sustainable way will require an inclusive and *resilient* organization that can engage in dialog, adapt to changing conditions, and take action within the sometimes paradoxical world of social transformation. (Note, there are citations available in the sources section for all of the works discussed in the following section.)

5.1 MIND-MAPPING AND BRAINSTORMING AS CREATIVITY TOOLS

When facilitating any meeting, it is important to keep four specific verbs in mind: encourage, promote, foster, and cultivate. Doing these things as a facilitator, help when moving forward with new ideas. Some steps to take for idea production are as follows: defer judgment, encourage wild ideas, build on collective ideas, stay focused, be visual, have one conversation at a time, and go for quantity initially. It is important to get everyone's ideas on the table in order for group participants to feel validated. A good saying by IDEO, an innovative design company, is "fail often in order to succeed sooner." Brainstorming can be, at times, in opposition to conventional methods, and it is important to note that premature criticism has its negative costs. Three good rules for brainstorming are as follows. First, every contribution is worthwhile. Second, suspend judgment. Third, the process can be modified before it starts or after it ends but not during. With these rules in place, any brainstorming approach can have better results.

5.2 VISIONING SUGGESTIONS

Creating a vision for the future can be a predecessor to success for organizations and communities. A vision can help guide future actions and efforts through sharing a compelling vision of the future. As one pair of authors suggest, "a community with vision is enabled, whereas a community

without vision is at risk.” The same holds true for organizations and campaigns. A visioning process can help clarify deep values and motivations and can help an organization define itself through a positive vision of the future, rather than as an organization against something. Additionally, imagining a variety of scenarios for the future under different situations and dynamics can be helpful in rooting a vision in reality and may more readily allow for compromises and working with, rather than against, those with opposing ideas. Furthermore, the visioning process itself can produce a number of benefits, including enriching public involvement through an inclusive visioning process, fostering new leadership, promoting active partnerships, and strengthening cohesion and social capital.

A successful visioning process has several key characteristics. First, the visioning process should be inclusive and seek to understand the constituency of the organization. Second, it should reflect core community values and promote a vision of the future that aligns with those values. Third, it should address emerging trends and issues. Fourth, it should imagine a preferred future that is reflective of preferences and values of the constituents. Finally, the visioning process should promote local action and produce a road map for moving toward the imagined future.

One model for a visioning process is the New Oregon model, which asks five key questions: (1) Where are we now? (2) Where are we going on our current trajectory? (3) Where do we want to go and be? (4) How do we get there? (5) Are we getting there? This model has been used across the country to evaluate a community’s current trajectory and to create an imagined vision in the alternative future, including a plan of how to get there. A visioning process would be useful for this group in order to clarify its imagined future for Boulder and to help create a path to achievement.

5.3 LEARNING NETWORKS

Learning networks can help organizations avoid re-inventing the wheel by providing a way of sharing experience and encouraging communication between groups and individuals working to solve similar problems. One type of learning network is a ‘community of practice’. What defines a community of practice is their purpose, which is not to solve problems but rather to cultivate knowledge and expertise around a given domain or topic. A community of practice can exist on a different scale than your organization. For example your organization may work locally to influence city planning and growth, however, if some members were to **seek out regional or national communities of practice that focus on planning, development, and managing growth** it might extend your organization’s access to resources and expertise. One example is the **Smart Growth Network**. It might also be worthwhile to **research examples of citizen intervention in other cities** that have experienced similar rapid growth to discover what lessons have been learned. Finally, you could **seek out groups in other cities currently working toward similar aims and make contact**. Building a small network could be as simple as establishing regular contact, but it has the potential to expand the capacity of your own organization through new knowledge and potentially resources.

Another concept important to collaboration and learning networks is the idea of a ‘powerful stranger’. A powerful stranger is an individual or group that might have control over a particular resource (e.g., money, social power, etc....), or exist as an unlikely collaborator. This is a useful concept because a key ingredient of successful movements is cross-boundary representation. This means that

your group will be more powerful if it includes participants from all sectors - private, public, and nonprofit, and different demographics. Therefore, try and involve some businesses, public figures, organizations, and people of different ages and backgrounds. Through self-reflection your organization can ensure it is **remaining aware of all potential opportunities to grow through collaboration.**

One final note, another key to successful movements is excellent communication amongst participants, and good facilitation by those in leadership roles. Ensure that all members are on the same page about goals, progress and deadlines through email, meetings etc., and that communications are respectful and focused.

5.4 MATCHING NETWORK DESIGN TO DESIRED OUTCOME

The Monitor Institute's recommendations derived from its case study of the RE-AMP network [1] seem to be of great relevance to this group. Three recommendations in particular resonate:

“Start by understanding the system you are trying to change.”

Based on the feedback from the power question, it would be informative to see the group design what it considers a Power Map. Not just showing the centers of power, but also showing the linkages through which that power flows. A group exercise, resulting in a graphical depiction, would bring coherence to the groups understanding of what they are up against and suggest opportunities for empowering groups viewed as “outside” the current power structure to enter into the dynamic. It would also serve as a learning tool for community outreach.

“Design for a network, not an organization—and invest in collective infrastructure.”

AND

“Cultivate leadership at many levels.”

The group should consider how a network, with many self-organized clusters of interest and distributed leadership could support its objectives—as opposed to a traditional organizational structure with centralized leadership. Some of these clusters probably already exist and could serve as models for other clusters that might currently be amorphous. The group should review readily available cyber-infrastructure tools that it could adapt under its own labels and brands (e.g. starting a Facebook group). Putting energy into collaborative infrastructure – combined with traditional ways of connecting – will support scaling as the group grows.

5.5 SOCIAL MOVEMENTS AND ALLIANCES

One of the questions raised during the group discussion was “Where does the power in Boulder currently reside and how can we empower ourselves, the citizens?” “Power over” someone is one of the

most commonly recognized forms of power. However, it usually comes with negative associations such as force, coercion, discrimination, abuse, etc. There are alternatives—power with, power to, and power within—which can be harnessed as the group works towards building equitable relationships while dealing with Boulder’s growth issues.

1. It would be useful to **develop ‘power with’ those who have different interests** in order to find common ground and build collective strength. This would help to transform or reduce social conflict that might arise.
2. Empowerment involves individual discovery and change. And **‘power to’ specifically refers to the potential of every individual to shape his or her world**. In this case, when such power is based upon mutual support, cultivating power to oneself will open up possibilities of joint action—an inherent feature to launch a successful movement.
3. **‘Power within’ refers to an individual’s recognition of his or her own self-worth**. Self-knowledge would allow recognition of individual differences while respecting others.

Using these three alternatives of power would allow advocates of Boulder’s growth issues to change the entrenched dynamics of power and bring about positive change.

Some recommendations for advocacy strategies to counter powerlessness and exclusion:

- Holding regular meetings—sharing stories, speaking out and connecting with others, affirming resistance, linking daily concrete problems with rights
- Strengthening coalitions, accountable leaders, mobilizing around shared agendas, demonstrating clout through direct action
- Lobbying and monitoring, marches and demonstrations, collaboration, etc.

5.6 INITIATING A MOVEMENT OR ALLIANCE

Regarding strategies to build a movement or alliance, a few key takeaways stand out:

Frame the movement around *good issues*. Good issues are simple to comprehend, suggest concrete and immediate action, relate to self-interest and communal experience, involve both intellectual and emotional attachment, offer those who benefit a way to participate, promote community unity, respond to the needs of the organization, provide moderate challenge, limit the risks of failure, and capture the imagination. Conversely, bad issues are vague or theoretical, lack a clear resolution, delay action, are outside local frames of reference, lack an emotional attachment, limit participation to a few individuals, promote division, ignore organizational needs, offer far too much or far too little difficulty, entail high cost for failure, and fail to capture the imagination. Framing the discussion around strong issues ensures greater commitment and recruitment. Each movement will face a number of issues, including recruitment, long-range, and maintenance issues (Homan 2004).

There are several *leadership actions* that can be cultivated to improve group effectiveness. On a task level, these include offering opinions and information regularly, seeking out these elements from other members, calling attention to tasks and assigning responsibilities, summarizing and restating ideas expressed, and encouraging group members to achieve hard goals. Competencies in relationship building and group maintenance include emphasizing the value of member contributions, making sure all members understand each element, ensuring meetings are fun and occasionally free of tension, observing group processes to find how it can be improved, inner-group conflict mediation, and providing support and praise for group members (Homan 2004).

Early on in the process of forming a movement, it is valuable to have multiple members conduct a “*scavenger hunt*” on the issue lasting no more than 3 hours using traditional information gathering methods in order to determine what information on the subject is readily available to community, what is often discussed, and what needs to be developed further. This information should be synthesized in some of the first group meetings in order to provide a plan of action for effective messaging and resource development (Monitor Institute 2009).

One of our readings emphasized the merits of developing “*flow*”: a concept of finding the movements and rhythms of a community already in place and aligning one’s activities with these currents. This requires leaders to worry less about total control and mastery, emphasizing instead the ability to read and channel the chaos of the moment to draw forth a new strain of action in an emergent capacity. It emphasizes patience, openness, and keen sight, as well as the willingness to allow each member of an organization some freedom as well as direction in harnessing their capacities (Westley et. al. 2007).

5.7 SUSTAINING SOCIAL MOVEMENT

Initiating a slow growth social movement is challenging. But sustaining it is even more difficult. Rapid urban growth has become central to the modern idea of socioeconomic progress. Presumed almost entirely without question, most can’t imagine a model of society in which rapid growth is not taken for granted. Champions of slow growth and livable, human-scaled urban life contradict the dominant paradigm about development; social inertia urges rapid growth. To be sure, the task at hand will not be easy. In the face of adversity, Livable Boulder may encounter three paradoxical challenges to sustaining social movement.

“**Success is not a fixed address**” (Westley, Zimmerman & Patton, 2007). Starting a social movement takes drive toward a particular, shared vision of success. But in order to be sustainable, social movement must be *resilient* and *adaptive* to transforming circumstances and conditions. That is, what “*success*” means to Livable Boulder, pushing forward, will depend on the context and environment of the movement. A particular vision of success gets the trip underway, but the initial destination may not be the journey’s ultimate meaning. For unlike fixed maps, the road beneath social movement constantly changes. Social movement begins and ends with a grand vision, but the path in between is rarely predictable. Indeed, failure often paves the way for, or redefines, success (Westley, Zimmerman & Patton, 2007). We may not know where we’re going until we’re on our way. And once we’re there, the

destination may change again. If Livable Boulder is to sustain, it must be conscientious of circumstances and conditions to which it must adapt and transform its vision of success.

“It is never enough...there is always so much more to do” (Westley, Zimmerman & Patton, 2007). The sense of responsibility accompanying social movement can be overwhelming. No matter the accomplishments, successes, and achievements of social movement, more work is always needed. Like Sisyphus, bound to push a boulder up a mountain for all eternity, the task of social movement is perennial. Frustration, discouragement, and resignation to the absurd may threaten the sustainability of social movement. But as Camus (1942) reminds us, we must imagine Sisyphus happy, for he *chooses* to take on the impossible task, not despite its façade of futility, but *in spite* of it. By choosing to push the boulder—in taking responsibility for human progress, no matter its enormity—social movement auto-validates its direction, purpose, importance, and meaning in existence. In spite of overwhelming odds, obstacles, and potential dejection that may threaten social movement sustainability, collective choice, commitment and responsibility empowers its resilience.

The paradox of slow growth social movement

Slow growth social movement, if successful, could entail paradoxical results. Limiting growth may improve Boulder’s quality of life, yet Boulder’s high quality of life is precisely what’s spurs undesirable growth. People want to live in Boulder. And making Boulder more livable may motivate more people to live here—it may intensify the impetus for rapid growth. Slow growth is a noble grand vision in contrast to the dominant social paradigm of rapid development. But absolute dedication to grand vision without pragmatics—“ruthless commitment to staring reality in the face”—may yield unintended, unwelcome consequences. Though “staring reality in the face” does not mean concession. It simply underscores this truth: For all the success of social movement, “it is never enough...there is always so much more to do” because “success is not a fixed address.”

5.8 LEVERAGING SOCIAL MEDIA

Social media - the collection of websites and applications that enables users to create and share content or to participate in social networking - can be a valuable component of any social movement or campaign. The primary value derived from adopting social media depends on the goals of the organization or campaign and can vary widely from growing a network and fostering established relationships to recruiting new people or simply communicating with people outside of your network. What is clear in this digital age, however, is that having an online presence not only adds legitimacy to an organization (if handled correctly) but, in many cases, is a critical component of any successful organization or movement.

If Livable Boulder wants to appeal to a broader audience to establish relationships and build community support for reworking Boulder’s growth, then it should create a website that conveys its message (e.g., creating and maintaining a town with desirable living qualities/attributes). Even with having a personable leader or group of leaders carrying the torch, having an online presence helps bring your message to a broader audience.

We also suggest having a regularly updated Facebook page (e.g., every few days to weekly; not a Facebook group). Regular updates allow viewers to see a degree of freshness and energy that lends an air of momentum to the cause. While social media often tends to be thought of in terms of appealing primarily to the younger generations, one of the fastest growing demographics in social media usage is among the 55-64 year olds. Thus, a Facebook page brings appeal to a wide age range of audiences and may be the best social media platform for this group to adopt.

Aside from maintaining a webpage, adoption of social media should be approached much like you would any other face-to-face conversation and other two-way interactions, not a simple one-way blast. Think of it as an extension of the communication you already do. Being responsive to user comments and regularly posting content gives users a sense of personal connection to you, the group, and the message being relayed. You need not post new content every day on your Facebook page but posting content every couple/few days or at least once a week gives your group the opportunity to disseminate information pertinent to the cause and allows viewers to feel more connected than simply viewing information on a website - information that usually changes little over the course of weeks or even months. What is the best content to share? Share what's relevant to your group and its mission, what your group is passionate about and stands for, and what your group is good at (your expertise). Maybe it's spreading the news about an upcoming public meeting. Or perhaps it's sharing information about who to contact to get your message heard. Whatever you share, make sure it's topic-relevant and the message is clear.

Additionally, regularly maintaining a Facebook page is a good way to not only increase the reach of your message but also draw in and recruit new people to your cause. If this group decides that recruiting members is one of their priorities, having an already-established and active Facebook page will help with that effort.

To help you decide which additional online avenues might work best for your efforts, we have included in the appendix a handy cheat sheet (http://brandandmarket.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/CMO_Guide_to_Social_Media-Marketing_Landscape.pdf) with the relative strengths of several of the most popular social media sites.

Finally, owing in part to the relatively flat organizational structure of this group and the potential for coordinating numerous tasks across your network, we recommend utilizing some online document coordination and project management websites. There are a number of such sites but the best ones also happen to be some of the longest running ones and also free (with additional premium paid features also available). Google Drive (<https://www.google.com/drive/>) or Microsoft OneDrive (<https://onedrive.live.com/>) allow private groups to work collectively on a document(s) (e.g., charter amendments, letters to the editor, budget spreadsheets, etc.) simultaneously and from multiple locations. Some of the best group project management sites (e.g., Asana (<https://asana.com/>), Trello (<https://trello.com/>), Evernote (<https://evernote.com/>), etc.) combine task management and project management (e.g., milestones, notes, comments, etc.) activities. LifeHacker (<http://lifelacker.com/five-best-personal-project-management-tools-1441334694>) put together a simple and quick post comparing some of the best online project management tools.

6 CONCLUSION

Winston Churchill, in an address to the House of Commons in 1947, famously said, “Many forms of Government have been tried... No one pretends that democracy is perfect or all-wise. Indeed it has been said that democracy is the worst form of Government except for all those other forms that have been tried.” For all its problems, however, a deliberative democracy - governance that incorporates purposeful discourse and elements of consensus decision-making and majority rule - is arguably the best we currently have. As such, participation of the citizenry is key to ensuring a range of perspectives and thought processes are included at the decision-making table and to fulfilling the democratic process.

The process begun in this World Cafe represents many of the best elements of deliberative democracy. We have seen that there is much support in the community of Boulder for a unified movement that takes action to ensure that the future of this remarkable community truly represents the will of the citizens. Already action is being taken by members of the world cafe process to plan out a path to a fully livable Boulder. This report offers some observations that may prove useful in the steps ahead. Two of the key pieces in the collaborative process are recognition of where power centers and the key places for engagement. Much of this was discussed during the World Cafe process indicating your group appears to be well on its way to figuring out the best ways in which to engage. To affect meaningful change, some of the next steps necessarily include understanding the breadth of issues and concerns of the larger community to identify areas of common understanding/issue overlap. Doing so will help in forging relationships and alliances that are critical for bringing issues to the front of the discussion landscape and overcoming stasis in the status quo. It is also critical to understand and play to the strengths of the collaborative process (e.g., shared vision, skilled leadership, member-driven agenda, diversity [internally and externally], accountability/transparency, etc.). Internally and for cohesion, it will also be important to continue fostering strong ties within the group. This will help maintain the energy and cohesion your group already has. Building on this, it will be important for the group to maintain transparency, at least internally, to the decision-making process. It is also important to remember that both strong (internal) on weak (external) ties are important for bringing social movements to bear. Social movements endure when leaders foster an environment where new ideas and fresh identity are part of a shared ownership.

The path to building any collaborative will be long, with difficulties both expected and unexpected. A challenge that seems minor in one meeting may balloon into a point of true difficulty later. Gaining funding, membership retention and recruitment through periods of slow progress, challenges from powerful forces, and potential misunderstandings from the larger community all present roadblocks to real progress. Yet we have seen in case study after case study that groups which persevere through times of doubt and resistance have the chance to emerge stronger, forming a true force for change within the community. The democratic process requires immense patience, the capacity for carefully cultivated communication, and the ability to forge ahead amidst uncertainty. We have seen the power of careful reflection on the issues at hand and how to structure our ideas, of joining forces with related movements and power sources in an increasingly interconnected network, of cultivating a host of leadership capacities to enhance group cohesion, and of the willingness to change

with the tides while holding on to a core message. Your growing movement is an important part of this process.

7 APPENDICES

7.1 APPENDIX A – SOURCES AND SUGGESTED READINGS

Throughout

- Westley, Francis, Zimmerman, Brenda, and Michael Quinn Patton. (2007). *Getting to Maybe: How the World Has Changed*. Random House Canada.

Mindmapping and Brainstorming as Creativity Tools

- Kaner. (2007). *Facilitator's Guide to Participatory Decision Making*, Chapter 8: "Brainstorming: The Theory and Technique of Suspended Judgment."
- "Why The New Yorker's Claim That Brainstorming "Doesn't Work" Is An Overstatement and Possible Wrong" (2012). Available at http://bobsutton.typepad.com/my_weblog/2012/01/why-the-new-yorkers-claim-that-brainstorming-doesnt-work-is-an-overstatement-and-possibly-wrong.html

Visioning

- Holman et al. (2007). *The Change Handbook*, Chapter 33 "Future Search: Common Ground Under Complex Conditions" (pp. 316-330), and Chapter 34 "Scenario Thinking" (pp. 331-374)
- Schwarz et al. (2005). *The Skilled Facilitator Fieldbook*. Chapter 17 "Developing Shared Vision & Values" pp. 149-157
- "What If? The Art of Scenario Thinking for Nonprofits." (2004.) Monitor Institute.

Learning Networks

- Goldstein, Bruce Evan and Butler, William Hale. (2010). "Expanding the Scope and Impact of Collaborative Planning," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 76: 2, 238 — 249
- William M. Snyder and Etienne Wenger. 2004. *Our World as a Learning System: a Communities-of-Practice Approach*. In: *Create a Learning Culture: Strategy, Practice, and Technology*. Marcia L. Conner, James G. Clawson (editors). Cambridge University Press

Matching Network Design to Desired Outcomes

- "Transformer: How to Build a Network to Change a System." (2010). Monitor Institute.

Social Movements and Alliances

- VeneKlasen, L., Miller, V. (2002). Power and empowerment. *PLA Notes*, 43: 39-41

Initiating a Movement or Alliance

- "Community Information Toolkit." (2009). Monitor Institute. Retrieved from infotoolkit.org

- Homan, M.S. (2004). "Chapter 12: Building the Organized Effort." *Promoting Community Change 3rd ed.* Thompson 2004.

Sustaining Social Movement

Westley, F., Patton, M. Q., & Zimmerman, B. (2006). *Getting to maybe: How the world is changed.* Toronto: Random House Canada.

Leveraging Social Media

Online project/document management websites to consider adopting:

- Google Drive: <https://www.google.com/drive/>
- Microsoft OneDrive: <https://onedrive.live.com/>
- Asana: <https://asana.com/>
- Trello: <https://trello.com/>
- Evernote: <https://evernote.com/>

Additional resources:

- The social landscape: http://brandandmarket.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/CMO_Guide_to_Social_Media-Marketing_Landscape.pdf
- Five best personal project management tools: <http://lifehacker.com/five-best-personal-project-management-tools-1441334694>

7.2 APPENDIX B – EVENT PHOTOS

*(see attached zip folder)