

**THE ROLE OF SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT IN URBAN
PLANNING: A CASE STUDY OF WOLSELEY SCHOOL, WINNIPEG,
MANITOBA**

BY
DOUGLAS DOBCHUK

A Practicum
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of City Planning

Department of City Planning
University of Manitoba
Winnipeg Manitoba

(c) September, 2000



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-56119-4

**THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA
FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE**

**THE ROLE OF SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT IN URBAN PLANNING: A CASE
STUDY OF WOLSELEY SCHOOL, WINNIPEG, MANITOBA**

BY

DOUGLAS DOBCHUK

**A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University
of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree
of
MASTER OF CITY PLANNING**

DOUGLAS DOBCHUK ©2000

Permission has been granted to the Library of The University of Manitoba to lend or sell copies of this thesis/practicum, to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and to Dissertations Abstracts International to publish an abstract of this thesis/practicum.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither this thesis/practicum nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	2
Chapter 1. Social Impact Assessment	3
1. A. Description	4
1. B. Defining Characteristic	5
Chapter 2. Historical Development of SIA	14
Chapter 3. Theoretical Dimensions of SIA	27
3.1. Critiques	31
Chapter 4. Methodology	38
4. A. Methodology of SIA	40
4. B. Case Study Methodology	52
Chapter 5. Wolseley School Case Study	61
5. A. Wolseley School Situation	63
5. B. Study Description	65
5. C. History	68
5. D. Stakeholders	71
5. E. Decision Making Process	75
5. F. Community Building Committee	85
5. G. Profile	89
5. H. Projection	93
5. I. Assessment	97
5. J. Evaluation	98
Chapter 6. Conclusions	100
6. A. Case Study	101
6. B. SIA and Planning	102
6. C. Recommendations	104
References	109
Appendix 1 Wolseley Community Survey	113
Appendix 2 Documents Reviewed	117
Appendix 3 Interview Questions	119
Appendix 4 Focus Group Questions	120
Appendix 5 Time Line of Events	121
Map One	122

Abstract.

This practicum is an examination of the role which social impact assessment (SIA) can play in urban planning. The intention of this exercise was to explore the applicability of social impact assessment methods to issues of urban planning, utilizing a local school planning issue as an illustrative test case.

The opening chapters present an introduction to social impact assessment and illustrate some of the parallels and commonalities between SIA and urban planning. These chapters include a description of social impact assessment, identification of its defining characteristics, an overview of its historical development and theoretical basis and an exploration of the basic methodology involved in social impact assessment.

Chapter 5 is the case study of the situation at Wolseley School. The case study is an attempt at linking the methodological and theoretical components presented in the opening chapters to a practical application. The study is intended to be an illustration of what a social impact assessment could be in relation to an urban planning issue and is in and of itself not a definitive social impact assessment.

Chapter 6 contains conclusions drawn from the case study. The process established by the School Division for situations such as that at Wolseley School revealed several areas of weakness, most notably in the area of public accessibility. The weaknesses were addressed by the application of social impact assessment principles and theory, resulting in the development of several recommendations for changes to the School Divisions' process. The recommendations centre around the development of a Social Impact Assessment Committee which would play a central role in investigation and decision making on future projects.

The conducting of the case study SIA and the subsequent development of the recommendations for change illustrated the positive contribution of social impact assessment methods to the field of urban planning.

**THE ROLE OF SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT IN URBAN
PLANNING: A CASE STUDY OF WOLSELEY SCHOOL, WINNIPEG,
MANITOBA.**

CHAPTER 1. SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

Introduction.

This practicum is an exploration of the role of social impact assessment (SIA) in urban planning. Accomplishing this project required the development of an understanding of the subject of social impact assessment. This was achieved by examining the subject in all its dimensions, including the historical, methodological and theoretical. This exercise was followed by the application of SIA theory and method to a case study involving a local planning issue, in this instance the debate surrounding the proposed demolition and rebuilding of a neighborhood school. The experience of applying SIA methods in practice allowed for the drawing of certain lessons and conclusions regarding the role of social impact assessment in urban planning.

The practicum opens with a basic description of social impact assessment along with a presentation of the characteristics which define SIA and delineate it from other methods of social research. Chapter one also notes some of the characteristics which are held in common by urban planning and social impact assessment. This basic description and definition of SIA is followed by chapter two which details the historical development of SIA as a definable method of social inquiry, highlighting some of the parallels between issues in the development of SIA and those in the planning field. Chapter three is an examination of the theoretical basis of social impact assessment including a review of some current critiques. Theory gives way to methodology in chapter four, which describes and examines the methodological basis of SIA and presents the methodology employed in the case study.

Chapter five presents the case study of the Wolseley School situation. This chapter includes a history of the situation, a description of the stakeholders involved, an explanation of the decision process, and a review of the activities of the Community Building Committee. The chapter closes with a presentation of the findings of the profiling, projection, assessment and evaluation exercises conducted in the course of the study. The practicum concludes with chapter six which includes a presentation of lessons learned in the course of conducting the case study, an opinion rendered on the role of social impact assessment and urban planning and some recommendations as to how SIA could be implemented in situations such as that at Wolseley School.

1. A. Description of Social Impact Assessment

“SIA is considered primarily to be an area of systematic inquiry, which seeks to investigate and understand the social consequences of planned change and the processes involved in that change.” (CEARC 1985: 2.)

“The primary goal of Social Impact Assessment (SIA) and assessments generally is to facilitate decision making by determining the full range of costs and benefits of alternative proposed courses of action. The most important secondary goal is to improve the design and administration of policies in order to ameliorate the disbenefits and increase the benefits.” (Finsterbusch, 1977)

These quotes highlight the major features of social impact assessment. Utilizing a multi-disciplinary approach to social research, SIA sets itself the task of determining what effects might arise from the implementation of a particular policy or project and how they might be mitigated or avoided. Termed “*ex-ante*” research because it is ideally performed prior to the actual launch of the project SIA is clearly oriented to the future. It attempts to provide a glimpse of what the future might bring if various courses of action are followed.

Methodologies employed in SIA are reflective of its multi-disciplinary nature. Research methodologies are drawn from such diverse disciplines as economics, sociology, anthropology and social psychology. This variety of methods is of great benefit to SIA, as it imparts to the SIA process a flexibility which allows it to address issues of varying degrees of complexity and size. A SIA can be devised and applied to a relatively small uncomplicated issue as readily as it can be to large complex projects and complicated policies.

An integral part of SIA is the attention paid to the process of change. SIA acknowledges that social change is an ongoing, dynamic and fluid process. Further to this, SIA also recognizes that there are many players in this process of change and that it is vitally important that all participants in the change be heard. This is crucial if the assessment process is to accurately predict which impacts are the most likely and upon whom they will impact the most.

1. B. Defining Characteristics.

There are several features which distinguish social impact assessment from other methods of social research. To begin with, SIA is expressly focused on the effects a project has on the lives of those who are affected by the project; SIA is the study of impacts on the human system. Secondly, SIA is future oriented; it is specifically used to study what the future may hold if a particular course of action is pursued. Thirdly, SIA is explicitly project focused. It is a methodology which is equally applicable to projects which have a physical dimension, such as highway development, as well as to those which do not, such as policy implementation. Fourthly, information collected in the course of the SIA is used to guide or influence the decision making process. And finally, SIA has evolved into a method which may be utilized to encourage public participation in the decision making process.

surrounding the project (Tester and Mykes 1961, Finsterbusch, Llewellyn and Wolf 1963, Carley and Bustelo 1964).

“SIA is about “people impacts” what we are doing to folks (or failing to do for them) where they live, in families and communities, as a consequence of formulating policies, instituting programs, and building projects.” (Wolf, 1983: 15)

This quote from Wolf is a very good description of social impact assessment as it introduces a fundamental premise of SIA methodology. SIA is expressly concerned with the effects policy and projects have on the human relations of those affected by their implementation and development. Much as an environmental impact assessment assesses the possible effects of a project on the natural environment social impact assessment does the same with the human side of the equation. SIA has an expressed focus on the human factors, in all their complexity, which make up the context and environment of the project area or policy target population.

There are many aspects of human relations and activities which can be studied under the SIA umbrella, as it is a methodology which accommodates both quantitative and qualitative research methods. The quantitative aspects of human relations are those activities which can be readily counted and valued. For example, indicators of human activity such as population trends, demographic shifts, and economic activity are often included in SIA studies. These are elements of human relations which are relatively easy to attach numbers and values to, and having done so, provide a perspective on human activity. The SIA approach, however, acknowledges that these quantifiable aspects of human activity provide only one perspective on human relations and in order to gain the widest possible perspective the qualitative aspects must be taken into consideration as well.

Qualitative research methods include the broader context surrounding the issue, how those involved in the issue view themselves and their world and the relationships and concerns which make up their everyday lives (Neuman 1997, Ch. 13). In contrast to quantitative research which attempts to capture features of the social world by objective and precise measurement qualitative research seeks to develop an understanding of the situation and those who are involved with it by focusing on subjective meanings, definitions and descriptions (ibid: 329). The application of this method results in a perspective on the issue which is rich in detail and description and often provides an insight into the lives of those affected that purely quantitative research cannot. The inclusion of qualitative methods in social impact assessments can result in an assessment which is much more understanding of the needs, wants and desires of the affected community.

One of the best ways of illustrating the differences in the two research approaches is to briefly examine how the methods handle and analyze their data and information. There are essentially four points of divergence in the methods as described by Neuman (1997 Ch. 16). Firstly, quantitative data collection and analysis often utilize a standardized set of procedures and methods which are determined beforehand as part of the research project design. Qualitative research is often inductive, which is to say the methods of analyses are often developed as the project proceeds rather than established beforehand. Secondly, quantitative researchers do not begin data analysis until they have collected all the data, as opposed to the qualitative process which frequently involves many iterations or cycles of analyses as the project proceeds. Thirdly, quantitative research is focused on hypothesis testing, while qualitative work frequently illustrates linkages and provides interpretation. Finally, a key difference between the two methods is the degree of distance from the social details being studied. Quantitative research is distanced from its subject by the use of

statistics and categorization, whereas qualitative work places its subject in the imprecise context of the actual social world.

The second unique feature of SIA is that it is a methodology expressly developed to consider the future. This future orientation however, is taken from a very particular perspective, and that is, prior to the implementation of the project. SIA is utilized to determine the possible effects and outcomes of a particular project or policy *a priori* to implementation (Finsterbusch 1983, Soderstrom 1981). Since its inception as a defined mode of research in the late 1960 and early 1970, SIA has been distinguished from other research methods by this *ex ante* and anticipatory nature.

Ex ante, or anticipatory research means;

“the systematic *advanced* appraisal of the impacts on the day-to-day quality of life of persons and communities when the environment is affected by development or policy change.” (Burdge 1987: 141)

There are several reasons why this anticipatory aspect of SIA is critical. In the first instance, it allows for the discovery of possible impacts and their projection into the future. This future projection of potential impacts allows for the possibility of development of project alternatives should they be required. In the second instance, the process of impact discovery and evaluation allows for the direct involvement of those whose lives will be impacted by the project. In this sense, SIA can become a source of citizen involvement and empowerment as the process evolves.

The third defining characteristic of SIA is the fact that it is expressly focused on a particular project. This project orientation is often placed within the broader context of technological development and its effects on human ecology (Soderstrom, 1981, Carley, 1984). As technological interventions became more commonplace and of ever increasing

scale and magnitude, there developed a concurrent concern in many sectors for the need to develop some form of analytical framework from which to assess its impacts and effects. To this end, the SIA methodology was developed for the express purpose of determining the effects of a project on those persons to whom it was directed.

A unique aspect of this project orientation of SIA is the fact that the focus can be either a project which has primarily physical dimensions, such as highway development or one which is primarily policy oriented, such as changes in health care delivery. The SIA approach and methodology recognizes that there are effects and impacts, both immediate and long term, of both types of projects. The impacts on the human system as a result of the introduction of a new or altered policy may be as dramatic as the siting of a large resource development project. Both interventions will have effects and impacts upon those who live in the area or who are the target population. Fortunately, the multidimensional approach employed by SIA allows it to be an effective tool for analyses and guidance under both circumstances.

Within this defining characteristic of being expressly project focused lies another of SIA's advantages, and that is the fact that it can be applied to a project of almost any size. An SIA can be conducted on a relatively small project, for example a single building, as well as on a larger more complex project such as a hydro dam. The only bearing the size of the project has is on the degree of complexity and scope of the SIA; the larger the project the more complex the study. The multidimensional nature of SIA allows for the research project to be tailored to fit almost any size of project and any degree of complexity with equal effectiveness.

The fourth defining characteristic of SIA is its ability to inform the decision making process involved with the project (Tester and Mykes 1978, Carley and Bustelo 1984). The *ex ante* nature of SIA work allows for the collection of relevant information prior to the actual commencement or launch of the project. Under ideal circumstances, this information can be fed back to the decision makers allowing them to make adjustments to the project. This capacity for SIA to provide feedback and guidance is based on its ability to project outcomes and impacts into the future, theoretically allowing decision makers the opportunity to avoid negative outcomes of the project.

The fifth and final defining characteristic of SIA is its application as a method of public participation (Caran and Hennessy 1985, Lane, Ross and Dale 1997). While this was not a central feature of SIA in the early years, it has today evolved into one of its defining characteristics. This element of public participation stems from the fact that many of the circumstances which call for an SIA are highly contentious and controversial. Large scale interventions such as resource development projects and highway installations often have profound and wide ranging impacts on the surrounding areas and the people which inhabit them. The inhabitants, the people whose lives will be effected, are naturally interested in having a say in the future course of their lives but frequently do not have an organized means of intervening in the process. Social impact assessments can offer the local population a means of organizing themselves in order to be heard in the process and have influence in the outcome of the project (Runyan 1977, Burdge and Robertson 1990).

Public participation in the impact assessment plays another role aside from allowing the local population a means of intervening in the process. Public involvement in the process can play a key role in determining which information is collected and how it is utilized and disseminated. A properly conducted SIA can address these concerns by consulting with the

local population to find out what their concerns are and what information they require and thereby incorporate this into the study (Peattie 1983). When local information needs have been established it is possible to involve local residents in the information collection process itself. Once needs have been established and the information collection process completed, it is quite possible to conduct all manner of meetings and forums in order to disseminate the information and findings. In many cases, these public forums become a form of feedback loop, raising more questions and concerns which in turn inform the next round of research and action (Dale and Lane 1994).

The defining characteristics of social impact assessment have parallels in the field of urban planning. SIA's focus on the human impacts of project development and policy implementation parallels planning practice in the most basic sense that urban planners work within the context of the urban social system. Urban planning is in many respects the practice of intervention in the urban system; planner's actions involve such diverse activities as economic planning, social planning and environmental planning (Friedmann 1987: 26). The implication of this is the fact that what planners do in their day to day activities will have impacts upon that system, and as the system is composed of people there will therefore be impacts on the human system (Klosterman 1980).

Social impact assessment's concern with human impacts combined with its focus on the future is exemplified in urban planning via the theme of sustainability. Sustainability in the field of urban planning looks to the future in the sense that it is concerned with the future impacts of decisions made today (Rees and Roseland 1991). Sustainability in the field of urban planning is a concept which addresses the future from various perspectives. Not only are there considerations for the health of the natural ecosystem, the human system is given considerable attention as well. Considerations such as the physical and organization

form of sustainable communities and matters of social equity and justice are factors which are considered under the concept of sustainability (*ibid*). The incorporation of factors such as these is reflective of one aspect of urban planning's focus on human elements and the future.

The importance of public participation is a value which planning shares with social impact assessment as well. The importance of public input and participation in the planning process is recognized as central to a fair and equitable planning process (Friedmann 1987, Gerecke and Reid 1991, Alexander and Calliou 1991). Planning is recognized as a social activity which in turn has impacts upon the social structure within which it operates. It follows from this then that those who stand to be affected by the plan should have a say in its development and execution (Hodge 1991, Ch. 13). The inclusion of the public in the decision making process surrounding the project is a feature of urban planning which is shared with social impact assessment.

This chapter has presented a basic introduction to social impact assessment and presented some of the key points which define SIA as a distinct method of social inquiry. The defining characteristics of SIA include: a specific focus on the human impacts of development and policy initiatives; an expressed concern with future impacts of actions taken today; a clear focus on an individual project or policy initiative; the ability to inform the decision making process; and the importance of public participation in the process. These points were then related to the field of urban planning by illustrating the parallels between urban planning and SIA. Linkages between planning and SIA were highlighted by illustrating planning's concern with the impacts on the human systems in question, showing planning's direct focus on the future as demonstrated by sustainable development planning and demonstrating that the issue of public involvement is central to the urban planning field

as well. The following chapter will examine some of the key aspects of the historical development of SIA, with a view to further articulating the parallels between the development of SIA and related themes in urban planning.

CHAPTER 2. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF SIA

There is general consensus that social impact assessment as a defined method of social research was given birth by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in the United States in 1969 (Tester and Mykes 1978, Finsterbusch 1980, Carley and Bustelo 1984). The NEPA mandated that environmental impact assessments (EIA) be conducted on all projects involving federal government funds, most of which were large-scale resource development and infrastructure projects. A subsection (102) mandated that social impacts be given due consideration in the project evaluation process as well as the environmental. The introduction of the NEPA at the federal level and the subsequent introduction of similar acts in other countries and jurisdictions focused attention on the need to study the social impacts of proposed projects. This recognition of the importance of social factors in project evaluation provided a major impetus for the development of social impact assessment methods and practice (Meidinger & Schnallberg 1980).

While SIA was recognized as an important element of environmental impact assessment, the methodologies employed by the EIA process were lacking when it came to social impact assessment. The problem was that the rational scientific paradigm which dominated the social sciences at the time did not have the ability to accurately describe or assess the human relations aspect of the problem. The emphasis on scientific method, including hypothesis testing and reproducibility of results were found to be wanting when applied to the study of human systems (Dandekar 1986, Friedmann 1987, Forester 1989). The scientific approach required a reliance on data which was readily quantifiable and easily assembled into data sets which could be readily communicated. The problem confronting researchers was the fact that the study of human beings and their relations do not lend themselves to such readily quantifiable categories.

This scientific influence in early SIA work soon came to be criticized for its overly technical approach and inability to accurately define and describe the human factors which could be affected by the project. In other words, criteria based on quantifiable data alone could not provide much insight into quality of life issues and the factors which contributed to human behavior (Carley and Bustelo, 1984, Dandekar 1986). The quantitatively based research was unable to address such issues as what constituted an acceptable quality of life, what people's attitudes were towards the quality of their lives, what elements of this quality they were willing to trade off for anticipated benefits, and so forth. SIA practitioners realized that these less quantifiable aspects of the issue at hand were in many cases what determined the success or failure of the project, as they are critical factors in people's decision making process (Dandekar 1986).

One of the shortcomings of the scientifically driven methodology was its inability to address the basic question; "Who benefits and who pays?" (Soderstrom 1981, Wolf 1983). As practitioners of SIA gained knowledge and experience, it soon became apparent that the question of the differential nature of the costs related to the project were of central importance to any SIA. The quantitative approach of early SIA work was appropriate for providing a general sense of costs and benefits of the overall project. For example, it was relatively easy to determine that a resource extraction project would provide added revenues for the local population and governments of all levels. It was also relatively easy to determine where the economic costs of the project would fall in terms of who would pay for the project and how. What was less clear was the question of the social costs of the project. What were the social consequences and costs of this project and upon whose shoulders would they fall?

The response to the limitations of a quantitative approach to SIA was the increasing inclusion of qualitative methods in SIA projects. These methods, drawn from such diverse disciplines as anthropology and sociology, included techniques such as interviewing, participant observation and historical analyses. The advantage of the adoption of these methods is the fact that they are able to move beyond the merely descriptive stance common to quantitative work. Qualitative methods and analyses allows for the discovery of information as opposed to data; for the discovery of how and why as opposed to what and how much. The difference between information and data is that information can provide insight into the linkages and connections of people's lives; it can provide a snapshot of life "as it is" on a day-to-day basis for those impacted by the project. Data, on the other hand, can only provide a uni-dimensional point of view, usually fixed at one point in time, which is reflective of only selected indicators and factors.

It bears noting at this point that the emergence of qualitative methods into SIA, generally in the late 1970 and early 1980, was not an easy transition. The introduction of qualitative research methods in response to the shortcomings of the quantitative generated a great deal of debate in the field. Proponents for the use of qualitative methods found themselves involved in a debate which was carried on essentially at two levels. Firstly, they had to make the case that qualitative methods could indeed fill the methodological gap which existed at the time, and secondly, that qualitative methods were valid and legitimate.

Generally, the arguments for inclusion were often part and parcel of the arguments which defended the validity of the methodology against criticisms of non-scientific approach and flawed methodology. That is to say that at the same time as proponents of qualitative methods were making the case for its inclusion into SIA, they would also give examples of how this could be done. Peattie (1983) places the quantitative vs. qualitative

debate in the context of third world housing planning and in an anthropological perspective. In her work with housing projects in the third world, Peattie employed the technique of interviewing informants, namely those persons who were the target of the policy and program. In the course of her research, she discovered that the perspective of these people was often vastly different from those who were devising and implementing the policies and programs.

Peattie attributes this difference of perspective to the different types of methodologies employed. The bureaucratic structures responsible for housing relied heavily on quantitative data based primarily on standardized categories and a narrow conception of what constituted adequate housing. The data gathered from this perspective led them to a certain set of conclusions which turned out to be erroneous when implemented as policy. Peattie's research, based on interviews with people living in the area and directly affected by the policy, was able to produce information which was much more reflective of actual conditions and concerns.

Runyan (1977) makes an effective argument for the inclusion of community managed impact assessment in the planning process. His contention is that a community managed SIA can act as a vehicle for community members to bring their values, experience and perspectives to the planning process. According to Runyan, there are at least two advantages to the local community for involvement with the SIA process: firstly, local groups know best their own perceptions and therefore are better served if they can speak for themselves, and secondly, this unique local knowledge allows them to comment upon and critique proposals and projects which will affect them. Placed within the quantitative vs. qualitative debate, this argument lends credence to the collection and use of local

information and perspectives as an integral part of the planning and decision making process.

The debate surrounding the inclusion of qualitative factors into SIAs was reflective of another type of debate which has been an integral part of the evolution of SIA. The debate at this level centres around the role that SIA plays in the decision making and planning process and is essentially characterized by the attitude of the SIA and its practitioners adopt towards those affected by the project (Rickson, Western and Burdge, 1990, Craig, 1990). On the one hand are those practitioners who view SIA as an essentially technical process designed to collect relevant data for use by the decision making authorities. On the other side are those who believe that the SIA is an inclusive process in and of itself; the SIA is a means of encouraging participation in the planning process on the part of those affected by the project.

There are many parallels between the quantitative/qualitative debate and the technical vs. inclusive SIA debate. The proponents of the technical orientation towards SIA argue that quantitative data is better suited for the decision making process for several reasons. To begin with, quantitative data is seen to be value free, neutral and not subject to opinion; it is fact only (Klosterman, 1983). The implication in this instance is that because the data has not been biased by emotion or prejudice, it is therefore much more applicable to a rational decision making process. As well, quantifiable data by its nature can be readily assembled, ranked and ordered. Data which has been clearly ordered, ranked and weighted makes the decision making process much easier as it can contribute clarity to complicated situations (Lawrence 1994). Within the scope of this position, there is no need for a participatory SIA process because those responsible for making the decisions have all the data they require to make the right ones, and nothing more should be required.

On the other side of the equation lie those who believe that the SIA is in itself a process for decision making. In this view, those affected by the project ideally are included in the design and construction of the SIA as well as in the conducting of the research (Runyan 1977, Carniol, Gutnick, and Ryan 1981, Canan and Hennessy 1985). There are several general features of the participatory model which make it distinct from the technical: firstly, there is an explicit recognition that all data and information are value laden; secondly, there is the belief that those who are affected by the project should have some say in the matter, and thirdly, that the decision making process must involve those affected in a very real way (Craig 1990).

A fundamental point of departure between those who hold to the technical model and those who subscribe to the participatory is the question of the objectivity of the data and information. Those who hold to the participatory model recognize that all data and information are value laden, whether the values and biases be expressed and obvious or not (Klosterman 1983, Dandekar 1986, Lawrence 1993). The crucial difference is that those who embrace the participatory model recognize that the value laden nature of data and information is in and of itself information. Value laden information and data can tell a researcher many things about the project and those who are affected. Among other things, it can gauge opinion and sentiment toward the project, it can highlight in greater detail who is affected and how, and it can bring to the fore counterproposals and alternative ideas from those who stand to be the most impacted.

A key component of the participatory model is the belief that those affected by the project in question have a say in the planning process (Carley and Bustelo 1984, Canan and

Hennessy 1985, Craig 1990). Burdge and Robertson (1990), list five reasons why they feel public involvement is essential for the SIA process:

1. Public involvement can serve to educate the community about the project in all its dimensions.
2. It gives the community a means of input before final decisions are reached.
3. The public involvement process can allow for community self evaluation and a greater understanding of how it may cope with the proposed change.
4. Public involvement functions as an ongoing data and information gathering process, informing the decision making process as it progresses.
5. It can lead to the formation of alternatives to the proposed plan.

These five points quite nicely illustrate the third and final main point of departure between the technical and participatory attitudes towards SIA, which is the point of public participation in the decision making process. It is not enough to merely allow those impacted to participate in the study and definition of the project, they must also have the ability to participate in the decision making process regarding the project. An SIA process is not seen to be complete unless those who are impacted by the project, and who have contributed to its definition and development, have a say in the final decisions (Runyan 1977, Burningham 1995, Lane, Ross and Dale 1997). As opposed to the technical model which says decisions are made *for* people, the participatory model says that decisions are made *with* people.

The value and necessity of public participation and the ensuing wealth of qualitative information provided in the process is widely recognized. The experience of more than two decades of practice has resulted in this point essentially being enshrined in basic social impact assessment methodology. Indeed, the first step for conducting a social impact assessment as outlined in the Guidelines and Principles for Social Impact Assessment is: "Public Involvement-Develop an Effective Public Involvement Plan to Involve all Potentially

Affected Publics.”¹ It has become recognized over time that the inclusion of the public, especially of those affected by the project in question, is a crucial component of a social impact assessment. The inclusion of the affected publics from the outset not only increases the accuracy of the impact assessment itself, it also increases the likelihood that the decisions made concerning the project will truly be in the best interests of those most affected by it (Dale and Lane, 1994).

There is another feature of contemporary SIA which differentiates it from its predecessors, and that is the increasing inclusion of social impact assessment in legislation. In the US, sections of the original National Environmental Policy Act which govern the application of SIAs have been strengthened. These changes have resulted in SIA assuming a greater role in the environmental impact assessments conducted on resource related projects in the US. In effect, the results of SIAs are now given as much weight in the decision making process as are environmental and economic factors (Burdge and Vancly, 1996). SIAs have also been included in legislation in Australia governing a wide range of activities, including town planning, resource development and health-care planning (Dale, Chapman and McDonald 1997).

The inclusion of social impact assessment as a distinct form of inquiry into legislation governing various developmental activities is a marked change from the early years of SIA. Social impact assessments in the early years were all too often appendages to environmental impact assessments, if they were conducted at all. The infrequency of SIAs was compounded by the fact that the legislation which did mandate their use was often fairly narrowly focused. The early legislation was often restricted to resource development activities and large infrastructure projects, thereby limiting the scope of SIA activity. The

¹ The Guidelines and Principles were developed and adopted by the Interorganizational Committee on Guidelines and Principles for Social Impact Assessment, 1995.

contemporary expansion of the legislative bases for SIA into other areas of social activity such as housing, health-care, and aboriginal rights has greatly expanded the terrain for SIA activity.

Elements of the historical development of social impact assessment have parallels in urban planning as well. This may be particularly illustrated by the presence of the qualitative versus quantitative, and the technical versus participatory approaches in the field of planning. As with social impact assessment qualitative methods have had some degree of struggle for legitimacy in the field of urban planning. This has been attributed to the early rational/scientific influences in planning theory and practice which privileged scientific method and quantitative data (Madsen 1983, Dandekar 1986). The application of these methods frequently resulted in the development of large-scale comprehensive plans which contained little reference to social conditions and were often destructive in their application (Friedmann 1987, Beauregard 1990).

Much as with social impact assessment, planners found the quantitative methods limited in their ability to provide a complete picture of the situation under study (Peattie 1983, Gaber 1993, Gaber and Gaber 1997). The scientific methods were not ideally suited to the needs of planning in the sense that they could not divulge such important elements as a description of the systems involved in the situation or the diversity of relationships involved. In order to address these weaknesses in the quantitative methods planners began to incorporate qualitative methods into their practice. Methods such as field interviews, windshield surveys, and micro case studies have become integrated as part of the methods planners use in their practice. The application of these methods allows for the development of a much more accurate picture of the issue in question, especially when combined with the traditional quantitative methods (Dandekar 1986).

The dissatisfaction with scientifically oriented planning resulted in an increasing focus on public participation in the planning process. The scientific approach dictated that the planner be a technocrat isolated from the object of research, whereas the inclusion of qualitative methods into planning practice necessitated that the planner become actively involved in the situation under study (Checkoway 1994). The path to involvement in the issue under study was via public participation processes being included into the planning process. Actual activities included under the heading of public participation can vary a great deal. Included under forms of public participation are activities such as public meetings and forums, the establishment of neighborhood and community planning organizations, and the development of ad-hoc committees related to specific projects (Hodge 1991).

Methodologies employed are another case of parallels between urban planning and social impact assessment. Much like SIA, the field of urban planning utilizes a mixed method approach when applying research techniques as it is also a field which benefits from both quantitative and qualitative methodologies. The wide range of activities considered under the banner of urban planning necessitate the use of various types of information and data in order to understand the question at hand (Dandekar 1982). Planners commonly require information from a number of distinct yet related categories including, spatial, social, economic, political and historical, (*ibid* Ch. 1).

Examples of qualitative methods adopted in planning practice are the various techniques which allow a planner to gather information in the field. These methods include site reconnaissance, windshield surveys, interviews (structured or not) and participant observation (Dandekar 1982). When utilizing these methods, the planner enters the field and engages the situation by talking, listening, and observing in order to develop a sense and

feel for the context of the issue. The methods traditionally include the documentation of observations and findings in some fashion, including simple note-taking, tape-recordings, sketches, and pictures. The application of these field-based methods allows for the development of an intimate understanding of the problem within its context, therefore allowing for the appropriate mitigation strategy to be developed and applied.

A second area of application of qualitative methods is in the area of public participation in the planning process. Planning today is recognized as being an interactive process with those who stand to be impacted by the plans being made (Warner 1983). There are various forms of public participation utilized in the planning field, some of the most common of which are public meetings and forums, hearings, workshops and task forces (*ibid.* 131). The application of public involvement methods has a number of benefits for planners; it improves communication with those who will be affected by the plan, it can aid in developing an understanding of the issue by clarifying interests and identifying affected sectors of the public, and they can become a means of empowering the public by encouraging participation and involvement in the process (*ibid.* 127).

There are also a wide variety of quantitative methods which are applied in the planning field. These methods are commonly based on the collection and manipulation of statistical data, frequently in the realm of population data and economic characteristics. In the realm of population data a frequently utilized method is the extrapolation technique. Extrapolation techniques are conceptually very simple; firstly the existing data is plotted to determine any overall trends or patterns, and these trends are then extrapolated into the future for a particular period of time (Klosterman 1990, Ch. 1). The application of this method produces a general indication of the direction the population is moving, assuming that other factors remain constant. These types of analyses are useful to planners as they

can provide an overview of general trends and tendencies with an eye towards what the future may hold.

The second area where quantitative methods play a role for planning is in the area of economic analyses. A commonly applied method for analyses for the structure of the local economy is the economic base technique (Klosterman 1990, Ch. 9). This technique examines the structure of the economy from the perspectives of basic and non basic. Basic components are those whose activity is dependent on the regional or national economies. Non-basic components are those firms whose activity is dependent on the local economy (ibid: 114). The classic example offered to illustrate this concept is the one-industry town, where the economic life of the town centers on one major employer (basic) whose fortunes are tied to the larger national or international economies. The non-basic sector of this economy would be the local stores and services which spring up to support those employed by the major employer.

The application of the economic base method allows planners to develop a fairly detailed understanding of the local economy. This is often very important for planners as the fortunes of the local and regional economies often dictate the types of concerns a planner deals with. A booming economy can create housing and land use pressures which the planner must deal with, and a slumping economy can create problems such as abandonment of facilities and lack of employment opportunities (Klosterman Ch. 9). If planners have a clear picture of the structure of the local economy, it is then possible to determine areas of weakness or risk. Once these areas have been identified it becomes possible to plan interventions into the structure in order to create greater stability.

Chapter 2 has detailed the historical development of social impact assessment from the perspective of its legislative history as well as from the perspective of some of the debates which characterized its development. The quantitative versus qualitative conflict was detailed as well as the accompanying debate around the question of whether SIA was a primarily technical exercise or a method of developing and encouraging public participation in the decision making and project development process. Parallels were drawn to the field of urban planning on both counts. The quantitative/qualitative debate is an element of planning discourse as well and the matter of public involvement is as central to urban planning as it is to SIA. The following chapter will examine some of the theoretical dimensions of social impact assessment including some relevant critiques.

CHAPTER 3. THEORETICAL DIMENSIONS

The theoretical dimensions of SIA pose quite a challenge to describe due to its interdisciplinary composition, which implies that SIA is supported by various theories related to its contributing disciplines. However, as SIA is considered to be a method of social science inquiry, it therefore follows that its primary theoretical basis be derived from the social sciences. A review of the literature indicates that theories relating to the disciplines of sociology and economics are of particular relevance to social impact assessment (Madsen 1983, Canan & Hennessy 1985, Craig 1990). Of these two areas, it is the sociological theories which appear to be the most relevant, as they are focused on describing the larger contextual relationships of the issue, as well as relating to the focus of SIA on inclusion and public participation.

When theory is specifically referred to in the literature on social impact assessment it is frequently in terms of the contribution of sociological theories (Meidinger & Schnailberg 1980, Canan & Hennessy 1985, Rickson, Western & Burdge 1990, Burdge & Vanclay 1996, Becker 1997). Theories from the discipline of sociology informing SIA are primarily those which are concerned with providing a theoretical framework for the description and analysis of the social context. These theories attempt to provide a systematic analysis of the social structure of the affected community and the relationships within this structure. The theories are variously referred to in the literature as systems theory (Becker 1997), structural analyses and structural functionalism (Disanto *et al.* 1978).

The focus of these theories is the study and interpretation of the organizational and structural aspects of the community in question. Systems theories look at a community as a system of interconnected and interdependent organizations and groups (Disanto *et al.* 1978, Becker 1997). Inherent to these theories is the premise that no one part of the system can be

understood in isolation from the others, and therefore an impact upon one aspect of the system will have affects on the others (Wallace and Wolf 1991). Following this, systems theories postulate that if a system is disrupted in some fashion, it will struggle back towards a state of equilibrium (*Ibid.* 16). This supposition is based on the concept of shared values, which is to say that the values held in common by the members of the system under study will ensure its return to a stable state (*Ibid.* 18).

Systems theories are commonly applied on a macro -level scale as a means of developing an overall understanding of the context of the issue. They tend to emphasize the major factors and influences in the system and the concurrent relationships which exist. They need not, however, be limited to this application as they can also be utilized to produce a finer-grained and more detailed understanding of the system in question (Becker 1997). Once the major actors and relationships have been identified in the system, it is possible to proceed to a more detailed examination of the social context in terms of identifying other characteristics such as minor actors and their behaviors and the subsystems which function in the larger system (*Ibid.* 9).

Some specific examples of sociological theories which are utilized to support SIA endeavors are theories of community studies and organizational analysis (Rickson, Western & Burdge 1990). Community studies, or community analysis, is a theory which is reflective of systems theory, as it is concerned with the description of the actors involved on the community stage. Community analysis studies the social makeup of a community with an eye towards discovering who the groups and individuals are who make up the impacted community. In keeping with systems theory, community analysis also explores the community in question from various perspectives, including the individual, the family, social groupings and any organizations which exist in the community, including governmental

(ibid 3). Included as part of the community analysis is an exploration of the relationships and linkages between the groups identified.

Organizational analysis is a rather broad field of theory as it can be applied to many organizational forms and can involve the study of the internal characteristics of the organization as well as its external activities (Rickson, Western & Burdge 1990). Organizational analyses can be applied to an organization to determine if it is functioning effectively in terms of its internal relationships and communication, as well as to determine if it is meeting its external obligations to its clients or members. Organizational theory links to community analysis in that it provides a theoretical framework within which the organizations which are active in the community can be studied. Community analysis assists in developing a picture of who the actors in the community are and how they are organized, and organizational analysis provides a means for studying and interpreting the relationships among and between the organizations in question (ibid 3).

Theories which address the structural and organizational aspects of society are especially relevant to social impact assessment due to their ability to define, describe and assist in the analyses of conflict (Lerner 1978, Canan and Hennessy 1985, Rickson, Western & Burdge 1990). Understanding the nature of conflict is essential for social impact assessment practitioners, as conflict is a central theme in many projects under impact assessment study. In order to determine the basic question of who benefits and who pays, and to understand where and how the impacts will fall into the community, a researcher's understanding of the community must be as accurate as possible. Systems theories assist in the development of this understanding by identifying the various groups and relationships which exist within the community. This understanding thereby allows the researcher to develop firstly a sense of what the impacts of the project may be on the social system, and

secondly to develop mitigation strategies to alleviate the disbenefits of the project (Rickson Western & Burdge 1990).

A secondary area of social theory which has contributed to the theoretical bases of social impact assessment is the field of economics (Carley and Derow 1980, Carley and Bustelo 1984, Wildman 1990). Specific examples of economic theories applied to social impact assessment are cost-benefit analysis (Sassone 1977, Neuman 1997) and input-output research (Runyan 1977). The cost-benefit analysis theory in application is very straightforward. The estimated costs of the project, including such difficult to quantify factors as risk to health and crime rates are assigned a monetary value. This same process is repeated for the anticipated benefits the project may deliver and the two figures are then compared to determine if there is any economic advantage to the project or not. The information discovered in this process is then utilized to inform the decision making process surrounding the project (Neuman 1997: 27).

Input-output analysis examines the structure of the regional economy by determining and studying its component parts. Factors such as purchases and sales, production and consumption, and income and employment are examined in order to develop an understanding of the economic structure (Blakely 1994 Ch. 5). As the process of identifying the components of the structure progresses, so too does the identification of the relationships between and amongst the components. Once these relationships have been discovered the researcher is in a position to determine where and how a project might have impacts in the local economy (Runyan 1977).

The influence of economic theory is reflected in social impact assessment methods and practice as well. This is evidenced by the fact that some form of economic analysis and

data gathering appear to be inherent to the conducting of social impact assessments. For example, the Canadian Environmental Research Council suggests such items as patterns of employment, the municipal tax base and local business viability be considered as part of a social impact assessment (CEARC 1986: 2.) The notion of community economic viability, including its relationship to the larger regional and national economies is also suggested as an integral part of SIA (Craig 1990). Lane, Ross & Dale (1997) highlight the importance of linking economic factors to social and cultural issues when projects are considered for areas which have a mixed cultural makeup (Lane, Ross & Dale 1997: 306).

3. 1. Critiques of Social Impact Assessment Theory.

An exploration of the theoretical dimensions of social impact assessment requires some exposition of the critiques of the theories which underlie social impact assessment methodology and practice. These critiques raised about SIA practice and methodology have primarily focused on the positivist/rational tradition of the theories which are incorporated into social impact assessment (Carter 1978, Madsen 1983, Dale, Chapman & McDonald 1997). There are several features of positivism which bear directly on the nature of social science inquiry. Firstly, positivism views the natural and social worlds as being essentially the same. Secondly, it holds that for any given situation, there is one truth and one version of reality. Thirdly, this truth and reality are discoverable by the application of objective scientific methods (Stanley and Wise 1969).

The positivist view holds that the world of nature and the social world of humans can be viewed as one and the same. This view is predicated on the belief that nature is a series of discrete elements which function together as a system. In order to understand the system, it merely requires that it be broken down into its component parts and studied thoroughly. The positivist view of human society is extrapolated from this perspective in the

sense that human actions are seen as discrete and knowable in the same fashion as their natural counterparts (Friedmann 1967). In keeping with this view, it is then possible to break down the components of the human system in order to arrive at an understanding of how and why they function as they do.

Concurrent with the development of the positivist view was the development of the scientific method. A central feature of this methodology was the notion of scientific objectivity. As part of the positivist mindset was the notion of the superiority of the human over the natural, it was therefore assumed that humans were capable of divorcing themselves from the subject of their attentions. In other words, it was believed that humans had the capacity to be objective and that this objectivity could be reflected in human inquiry. From this arose the conception that science could be an objective and clinical study, and if this objectivity could be applied to natural systems, it could be applied to the human as well, allowing for the discovery of objective truth and reality related to human interactions.

The positivist based approach to social inquiry was reflected in social impact assessment by an emphasis on research based on economic theory and quantitative methods (Carley and Derow 1980, Carley and Bustelo 1984, Dandekar 1986). The steps of an economically based research endeavor are by their nature focused on indicators which can be readily quantified in terms of dollars and cents. In this scenario, all indicators selected must be able to be converted into some form of monetary value and ideally be placed in a free market context (Sassone 1977). While this may be readily accomplished for many features of a project, such as its physical inputs and resource requirements, the issue becomes decidedly less clear when this approach is applied to the human side of the equation. The emphasis of cost-benefit analysis on reducing complex endeavors to an

economic equation highlighted one of the major flaws of positivist theory in the social sciences.

Classic economic theories are predicated on the notion of the supremacy of the free market and the philosophy of free will and choice (Friedmann 1987). These theories essentially state that the market will act in a manner which is in the best interests of the majority, and that this majority has the freedom to choose both the degree of its participation in the market and which of its benefits it will utilize. While there may be a limited degree of truth to this position, some very serious flaws in the theory become evident when it is applied as a method of social research. The assumption of the "level playing field" of the market ignores the practical fact that many people are disadvantaged by factors such as class, race and gender. The unquestioning application of these theories in SIA via economic research models severely limited the ability of many SIAs to address the distributional nature of costs and benefits (Soderstrom 1981, Burningham 1995).

Theories from the field of sociology were also not immune to criticism in the SIA context. The systems theories which underlay much of social impact assessment research were being reviewed from a perspective which de-emphasized structural factors and focused instead on the communication inherent in the process and its relationship to information development and dissemination. These critiques were much more concerned with the development of meaning and the social construction and interpretation of reality rather than the structural components of society.

Kate Burningham places these issues directly in the SIA camp with her exposition of the role of attitudes in the determination of impacts (Burningham 1995). Burningham places the role of attitudinal research within the context of the debates surrounding

quantitative vs. qualitative methodologies and the related debate concerning objective vs. subjective information. Burningham's position is that more attention needs to be given to the role of subjective, qualitative information in the SIA process, and that one method of accomplishing this would be the increased use of research on the attitudes of those impacted by the project (*ibid.*: 100).

Traditional methods of attitudinal research generally involve some form of interview or survey conducted either in person or by arms-length methods such as telephone or mail. One of the major flaws in this type of research, according to Burningham, is that it is premised on the belief in the neutrality of language. In the traditional view and methodology of the social sciences, language is seen to be merely reflective of a state of reality; it is expressive and descriptive only. Burningham's approach is radically different as she subscribes to a theory of discourse analyses which views language as an active state; language does not reflect reality, it is an active participant in its construction (*ibid.*: 106).

This point merits some elaboration, as it is a departure from the accepted vision of language as descriptive of reality. In the discourse analyses view, it is acknowledged that there are a variety of options available to people when they describe a given event. Thus, when people are requested to give their opinion on something, they are involved in a process of selecting how they will describe the event or object. The implication then, is that a description of reality is a construction of that reality through the use of language. As well, not only are people's versions of reality a construct, they are often a construct with specific intentions. This is to say that the manner in which something is presented depends in many cases on who the audience is and what the vested interests of the presenter are.

Given the above, it would seem that attitudinal research based on discourse analysis would not be very useful, as it merely appears to be a collection of widely disparate views and opinions based on motivated self-interest. However, this is in part the point that Burningham makes; attitudes and opinions are not set in stone, and therein lies a good portion of their value (*ibid.* 109). They are highly variable and volatile issues which are subjected to social forces through the vehicle of language. Attitudes are a reflection of the complexity of the social dynamic in which they reside. However, under the discourse analyses theory, they are more than this as they also play a role in the development and continuation of the social dynamic.

In Burningham's view, discourse analysis has something to offer SIA, as the understanding that realities are constructed socially could lead to more effective means of communication. Communication is essential to an SIA process, given that most SIAs are done under highly conflictual and controversial circumstances. Within this atmosphere, the social construction of realities and their communication becomes of paramount importance. The understanding of how these realities are constructed and communicated could allow the planners and citizens involved to become more effective at communicating their intentions and desires. If this can be accomplished, it is possible that the development of the project including the management of impacts, could become more of an exercise in co-development and co-operation rather than sustained conflict.

This notion of the primacy of communication and the information embedded in it is echoed by Judith E. Innes who postulates three alternative views of information in the field of urban planning. Innes postulates that planners influence public action through their practice which she views as an essentially communicative act (Innes 1996). The first postulate is that information influences by becoming embedded in understandings, practices

and institutions rather than as evidence (*Ibid*: 52). In this notion, the very process of collecting and assembling the information brings about a change not only in those persons involved in the collection, but to the institutions in which they operate. This change occurs in a very subtle fashion, as those involved in the collection process begin to assimilate the information into their private symbolic meaning systems. Once this process begins, the information begins to guide and influence their thinking and decision making. This very personal process is in turn often reflected in institutional changes, as people alter their behaviors in keeping with their new belief structures.

The second point that Innes makes in regards to communication and information is that the process by which the information is produced must arise as a result of mutual agreement (*Ibid*: 56). It is not a given that information will become embedded in the people and institutions which produce it. The key factor which ensures that it will become imbedded, and therefore play a transformational role, is whether or not it is socially constructed. Socially constructed information is generally arrived at after a long process of negotiation, argument and debate which is essential for the development of a consensus regarding the information. Consensus is a critical factor in determining whether or not the information becomes embedded into personal and institutional make-up. It is a critical factor because once consensus is achieved people feel invested in the process and in the information and are more likely to take it to heart.

The third and final element of Innes' postulates regarding information and communication is that there are many types of information other than "objective", and that they all have merit (*Ibid*: 58). In the studies which substantiate the formulation of these three postulates, Innes noted that many types of information were taken into consideration in the process of developing a consensus. Scientific and technical information was an important

component of many of the issues under consideration, but it was not privileged over other forms such as experiential and anecdotal. It is interesting to note that in the situations examined by Innes, what people thought and believed was as important as scientifically verifiable information, and in many cases was the deciding factor in the adoption of a particular plan of action.

This chapter has provided some detail on the social science theories which underlie social impact assessment. The contributions of the fields of sociology and economics are noted, particularly in the area of systems theories and cost-benefit analysis. Also reviewed are some of the critiques of these theories, detailing in particular the influence of the positivistic/rational schools of thought and the attendant shortcomings of the scientific method when applied to social research. Two specific critiques were presented, one on the part of Kate Burningham who suggests that discourse analysis could play a role in social impact assessment, and a second by Judith Innes who presents a similar argument for urban planning. The review of the theoretical underpinnings of social impact assessment and some of the critiques involved lays the groundwork for an exploration of the social impact assessment methodology.

CHAPTER 4. METHODOLOGY

Introduction.

The interdisciplinary nature of social impact assessment means that the methodological basis of SIA is derived from a wide variety of sources, namely those disciplines which contribute to its makeup. This multi-dimensional makeup allows SIA to function as a research method which can incorporate and process a wide range of factors and variables. If there is a downside to the multi-disciplinary approach of SIA, it is the fact that this diversity makes for a difficult subject to discuss. The implication of a multi-disciplinary approach is the fact that almost any method of social science research can be deployed under the SIA banner, meaning that the sheer number of methodological approaches available for SIA research almost defy description. To illustrate, Finsterbusch and Wolf list some 26 methodologies which they feel are directly applicable to SIA work (Finsterbusch and Wolf, 1977, preface), and Carley and Bustelo list some 28 references for information on general methodological approaches to SIA (Carley and Bustelo, 1984).

However, within this complexity of methodological approaches it is still possible to present an overview of what the basic methodological approach of SIA involves. The early years of SIA practice resulted in the development of a generalized methodological approach for the conduct of social impact assessments. This general approach is often broken down into four steps or stages including: 1. profiling, 2. projection, 3. assessment and 4. evaluation (Finsterbusch and Wolf 1977, Tester and Mykes 1981). The four steps have been expanded upon and refined over the years as SIA practitioners gained experience and knowledge. The result of this has been the introduction of steps such as the development of mitigation plans to deal with the project outcomes and the establishment of monitoring programs in order to track impacts and effects over the long term (Burdge *et al* 1995).

In addition to the refinement of the basic steps involved in social impact assessment current SIA practice emphasizes the necessity of public participation in all phases of the social impact assessment (Burdge 1987, Burdge & Robertson 1990, Burdge *et al* 1995). If the purpose of social impact assessment is to determine the impacts of a project on the human system, then it is crucial that the picture of the social system be as accurate as possible, and this can only be accomplished with the involvement of those who will be impacted by the project (Carley 1983; Lane, Ross & Dale 1997).

Public involvement in SIA introduces elements of communicative action to the process. Methods of public involvement provide a forum where ideas and information can be presented, refined and exchanged. This process of exchange and debate provides opportunities for the creation of new knowledge as people begin to assimilate and process the information (Innes 1998). This development and creation of new knowledge reflects in turn on the decision making process, as the application of the new knowledge can result in people altering their beliefs and behaviors.

Public involvement and the ensuing communicative interplay involved are very useful to the SIA process as they provide a means by which such important yet difficult to quantify matters such as values can be brought forward (Canan and Hennessy 1985; Craig 1990). Values play a vital role in people's decision-making process, yet are very difficult to categorize and analyze as they are often emotionally based. Because they are essentially sensed and intuitive, values are an intensely individual issue and can vary widely from person to person and group to group. Public involvement in the social impact assessment process can provide a forum for the definition and articulation of values and allow for their inclusion in the decision-making process.

A related area of concern for social impact assessment is the question of which public's values will be considered (Finsterbusch and Wolf 1977, Lawrence 1993). In the course of conducting the SIA, it often becomes clear that the population which stands to be impacted by the project is not homogeneous or unified. In most cases there are numerous stakeholders and interested parties with specific areas of interest and preferences (Lane, Ross & Dale 1997). As it is important for SIA to consider the inputs of all concerned, the question arises as to how to evaluate the needs and desires of these often competing forces. The application of public involvement techniques can assist in the determination of the values involved in the situation as well as providing insight into which interests could be given priority consideration (*ibid*).

4. A. The Basic Methodological Approach of SIA.

1. Profiling.

“Profiling is the process of describing the initial conditions of an impact situation.” (Finsterbusch and Wolf 1977, Pg. 153)

Profiling is considered the first step in an SIA study for the simple reason that if change is to be measured and monitored, then there must be something to measure change against. The situation “as it is” prior to the introduction of the project must be described and detailed as accurately as possible, otherwise, it will be very difficult to determine what changes are occurring and the degree of impact experienced by those who must live with the consequences of the project. The provision of an accurate baseline description of the situation prior to the introduction of the project is one of the main reasons for conducting profiling exercises. However, the provision of an accurate baseline against which change can be measured is not the only reason for creating a profile or “before” picture.

Of key importance in a social profile are the variables which are to be measured and monitored. The selection of variables during the profiling phase is of crucial importance because it is movement or change in these variables which allows the researchers to determine which impacts are occurring, where they are occurring, and the degree or magnitude of change (Finstelbusch and Wolf 1977). If the variables selected are wrong in the profiling phase, then not only is the profile liable to be inaccurate, it will also be next to impossible to accurately determine and measure the impacts occurring. In this sense then, the profiling phase of the SIA is crucial for two reasons; one, the provision of an accurate "before the project" picture, and two, the establishment of indicators which will become the actual measures of future change.

There are various suggestions as to what should be included as variables in an SIA study. For example, Conner details 6 areas of potential impacts which should be considered in the profiling stage: 1. The economy, 2. Government, 3. Education, 4. Physical and social services, 5. Community organization, and 6. The personal and community goals of the residents (Conner, 1978). The Canadian Environmental Research Council details four areas of social change which are usually investigated in an SIA: 1. Demographic, 2. Economic, 3. Resource and Environmental, and 4. Cultural (CEARC 1985). Burdge details 26 variables which he believes should be included in an SIA study. The 26 variables are grouped into 5 categories for classification; 1. Population impacts, 2. Community and institutional arrangements, 3. Conflicts between locals and newcomers, 4. Individual and family level impacts, and 5. Community infrastructure needs (Burdge, 1987).

While there are differences evident in the categories of variables presented, it is worthwhile noting the similarities. It is clear that the baseline profile should contain some amount of data on population characteristics and demographic makeup of the population in

question, as well as some amount of basic economic data. Further to this, the profile should contain as much information as possible on the social relations and organization of the affected population. As well, the profile should contain as much information as possible on the role of government in the lives of those affected. It is entirely conceivable that an accurate profile of the lives of those affected by the proposed project could be developed when data and information from these various categories is compiled in a conscientious manner.

Population and Demographic Makeup:

Each of the four general areas of information and data contains many discrete variables which are available for study, and there are many different methodologies applicable for securing the information and data related to the variables. In the category of population and demographic data included would be such variables as a basic population count where this population resides, type of domicile (rent or own), population mobility data, an age profile of the population, and any other factors which would be deemed relevant for the SIA (Dietz and Dunning 1983). In terms of specific methodologies for securing this data, this is not very difficult in this computerized age. In the developed world at least accurate census data has been collected for decades and is currently available in computerized data banks. For this portion of the profiling phase, it is often a relatively simple matter of retrieving the data required from these data banks.

Economic Profile:

Variables selected for the profile to determine the economic structure and makeup of the affected population would include such variables as employment and unemployment statistics, information on sectors of employment including self-employment, status of employment (full-time, part-time or seasonal) and as much information as can be gathered

on other sources of income such as pensions, unemployment benefits and welfare rates (Soderstrom 1961). In terms of securing this data, economically based data today is very similar to population and demographic data in the sense that much basic economic information is contained in the census data, and it is a relatively straightforward procedure to retrieve it from the data banks.

This does not, however, complete the picture of the economy of the area under study. Proceeding in the manner described above would give a very good sense of what the economic status of the residents, but would not shed much light on the economic structure of the area under study. The statistical information on the economic status of the residents would have to be complemented by at least a minimal analysis of the economic structure of the area. This aspect of the profile would have to contain such data and information as to what constitutes the economic base of the area (agriculture? retail? industrial? other?) who the employers in the area are (large industrial? small retail? large retail? mixed? etc.) and, ideally, some sense of the linkages among the local businesses and with the larger regional or national economy. An understanding of the bases of the local economy is essential in order to understand what economic variables may be prone to change and to what degree this could impact the local population (Finsterbusch, 1980, Chs. 6 & 7).

The collection of profile data and information on the economic base of the study area usually requires the application of various methodological approaches. In most cases a good starting point is to search the locally available data banks, such as the census bureau, in order to secure a basic statistical picture of the local economy. As well, it is important to perform literature searches and reviews with local universities and libraries to determine if there are records of any previous studies done on the area. It is also worthwhile to investigate governmental sources for information. Many times various branches of

government at all levels have conducted research and investigations on issues which may be of interest to the SIA researcher, and are willing to share their information and data. Information on the local and regional economies can also be collected by fieldwork techniques as well. Methods such as the interviewing of key informants knowledgeable about the local economy can provide a wealth of information and insight into local conditions.

Community Organization and Social Structure:

The social structure and organization of the area under study is an area of primary concern for the SIA, for the simple reason that impacts on the social structure are the central focus of SIA study. In order to begin the profile of the social relationships and organization, the essential first step is to determine how to categorize something as complex as social organization. To this end, there are various perspectives from which social organization and relationships may be analyzed, including the individual, the family, the community, established organizations within the community, and on the bases of commonality of interest (Finsterbusch 1977, Flynn *et al* 1983, Burdge 1983). These various perspectives are important not only because they can be studied as relatively discrete variables, but also because they are reflective of the levels of complexity in the human organization. Understandably, there are various methodological approaches available for the study of each of these categories of variables.

Basic statistical research methodology also plays a role in this part of the profile, as it is useful to gain some data on elements of community structure and activity such as school enrollment's, usage of community facilities, participation levels in leisure activities, distribution and usage of health services and so on (Burdge 1983, 1987). This type of data is useful to the researcher because it illustrates certain aspects and elements of community

relations and organization. Data of this type can begin to shed light on how the community is organized by highlighting areas of activity and involvement. The data can also provide the researcher with insights into any existing disparities in services, thereby drawing the researchers' attention to possibly marginalized or excluded elements of the community.

A second commonly applied methodology is that of various forms of survey research. Properly constructed and directed surveys allow for the collection of a great deal of useful and insightful information about the relationships which exist in the community. One commonly applied form of survey methodology is that of key informant or leadership interviews (Savatsky and Freilich 1977, Burdge 1983). In this method, persons who are believed to have specific or particular knowledge of the community in question are interviewed in order to gain their perspective on the social organization of the community and its constituent groups. In most cases, these people hold some position of responsibility or importance in the community, such as elected or hired officials, community activists, religious leaders and prominent business persons. This method allows SIA researchers to very quickly develop a picture of what the constituent groups are in the community and to begin to develop a sense of the conflicts in the community as well as to gain a sense of the degree of community cohesion.

The other basic form of survey methodology commonly applied in SIA research is the written form. A written form of the questionnaire in this case applies to those surveys which are delivered to the respondent, the respondent completes the survey which is then returned to the researcher for analysis. Surveys of this type can be utilized to gain a wide range of information and data on the local social relations and organization. With the skilful use of surveys it is possible to gain insight into what the key relationships are in a respondent's life and the degree of importance of the relationship. This information may be

secured not only on the respondent's personal relations such as family and workplace, but also on broader quality of life issues such as attachment to community and security of place (Finsterbusch 1980, Soderstrom 1981).

Role of Government:

The fourth general element of the profiling stage of the SIA is the role of the various levels of government. As with most aspects of SIA work, this is a particularly complicated set of relationships to define and detail. Many areas of social responsibility fall to the government such as health care, education, infrastructure, economic promotion and various social programs to assist the marginalized. When these various aspects of the governments' role are placed in the context of a citizen's life, it becomes clear that much of a citizen's life is influenced and affected by the activities of government. This, however, makes it all the more important to develop a picture of what these influences and affects are and how they may be altered by the project.

Particular features of government which may be examined in the course of an SIA profile would begin by identifying the existing forms of government in the study area. Included in this step would be such basic information as the form of organization of the local government and its areas of responsibility, including taxation, regulation, enforcement and service delivery. These features of government are important to define, especially if there is any indication that the proposed project could place any stress on existing services or facilities (Flynn *et al* 1983). The degree of stress placed upon governmental services and facilities can in many cases be directly translated into impacts felt by the local population, as it is they who will experience the consequences first-hand.

As well as understanding the role of local and regional government as described, it is often necessary to develop a sense of the linkages among the local and national levels of government (Burdge *et al* 1995). Given the fact that responsibilities for services and facilities, as well as funding arrangements, are often divided between several levels of government, it follows that in many cases an issue at one level is an issue for others. For example, the implementation of a project may require adjustments to infrastructure which are beyond the capability of the local government. The local government will then be forced to appeal to the senior levels for assistance, in effect adding another "player" to the project scenario. It is therefore crucial that these linkages be understood in the profiling phase, because the more linkages there are, the greater the possibility of complication and confusion in the project.

Methodologies employed in developing an understanding of the various levels of government and their responsibilities and linkages are relatively straightforward. Much of this investigative work can be accomplished by contacting the various government departments and reviews of public documents such as departmental annual reports. As well interviews with selected government officials can be employed to secure more detailed and first-hand information and data. It is also a good idea to consult with interested third parties such as academics who follow such issues and community activists who deal with various levels of government on a regular bases.

2. Projection.

"The projection step focuses on the kind and quantity of change in profile features that would occur were one or another planning alternatives to be implemented." (C. P. Wolf 1983)

In terms of the planning alternatives, there are two which are common to all projects; one, that the project proceed as planned, and two, that it not proceed at all. These are the two basic alternatives upon which future projections are based at this point in the SIA, and there are several methodological approaches which can be employed to develop projections.

One of the most basic and commonly applied of the quantitative methods for futures projection is that of a simple trend analysis or extrapolation. In this method the basic data collected in the profiling stage is analyzed for trends and cycles which are then extended into the future (Carley and Bustelo 1984). The basic example of this would be the population and demographic figures. In this example, trend extrapolation would be able to provide insight into such basic questions as whether the population is expected to grow, stagnate, or decline, and if there are any demographic changes expected in the makeup of the population. Based on the information provided by the trend extrapolation, certain key features of future impacts may be indicated, for example trend extrapolation can indicate changes in such areas as infrastructure requirements, housing, and levels of governmental services needed.

Participative and qualitative methods play a role in the projection stage as well. The development of an accurate projection can be assisted by such techniques as the interviewing of key informants. These interviews are conducted primarily to receive information first-hand from those who are involved with the project or related to it in some fashion. Interview subjects can include project organizers, interested experts and observers as well as those who stand to be directly impacted by the project. The use of key informant interviews can very quickly provide a sense of what impacts may be expected from the project from those whose perspective may be unique or privileged (Burdge *et al* 1995).

Projections can also be developed utilizing such means of public interaction as focus groups and community forums (Burdge & Robertson 1990). Members of the public can be drawn together with the intention of developing future scenarios and impact projections based on available information and data. One of the values of exercises such as these is that they allow for the collection of projection information first-hand from those most involved and affected. However, there is another advantage to exercises of this sort which is that the interaction of people, ideas, and values can result in the discovery of unforeseen issues and impacts. The dynamic set in motion by the face to face interaction of people often results in the discovery of new information and the presentation of new ideas which contribute to the SIA process (Runyan 1977).

3. Assessment.

“The task for assessment is to compare the potential impacts of the full set of reasonable alternatives under the range of assumptions about future conditions.”
(C. P. Wolf 1983)

The objective of the assessment step of the SIA is essentially to compare the alternative futures discovered in the projection step. The comparison of the various alternatives is based on the predicted changes each of the alternatives could have on the impact categories which have been selected in the profiling stage. In effect each future alternative is played out against the impact categories to see which one appears as the most possible and plausible. The assessment stage is essentially an exercise in determining which of the projected alternatives is the most desirable.

As is common in SIA work, the methodologies employed in the assessment stage can be divided into those which are quantitatively oriented and those which focus on qualitative features. The quantitative methods are those which focus primarily on the

assessment of the statistical data related to the projections, most commonly the demographic, economic, and fiscal data. The qualitative methods are those which tend to focus on issues such as quality of life factors, attitudes, behaviors, and preferences. Again, as is common to SIA, there are numerous specific methodologies which fall under each general category. One example has been selected from each of the general categories in order to illustrate a more specific methodological approach to the assessment stage.

Cost-benefit analysis is a commonly applied quantitative method utilized in the assessment stage of the SIA. In this application, cost-benefit analysis first determines the costs and benefits to the area in question, assuming no change in the base-line, or profile, conditions (Sassone 1977). This type of analysis would essentially detail the societal costs and benefits which currently exist in the base-line. Criteria such as employment/unemployment rates, costs of social services, average incomes, and rates of taxation are a few examples of what can be considered at this stage of the research. In effect this would be an analysis of the "no project" or "do nothing" alternative. Utilizing the same criteria, a similar exercise would be conducted on the "with project" scenario in an attempt to develop a picture of what societal costs and benefits might exist in the future. This analysis is then compared to the base-line or "no project" scenario in order to determine where changes might occur, and if they would be of a positive or negative influence. This type of basic comparison can provide valuable information for the researcher in the assessment stage of the SIA.

A commonly utilized method of assessment for qualitative factors is an impact tree, also referred to as a relevance tree (Finsterbusch 1977). This method begins by listing the general categories which will be affected by the project including the household, the community, groups and organizations, and the institutional structures. These general

categories are then broken down into component areas of potential impacts, including the economic, political, social, and cultural. The component areas can then in turn be further broken down into more specific impact categories, such as individual organizations and groups and specific categories of information such as frequency of use. In other words, the impact tree method moves from the general to the specific in terms of how it details the impact categories.

The end result when these categories are detailed in diagram form is a schematic which appears very much like a tree, with the general categories as the base or roots, and the more detailed categorizations forming the branches. The lines in the diagram linking the impact categories allow the researcher to quickly ascertain how an impact might “flow” from one category to another. For example, it may be seen how the individuals who comprise a household might be affected by changes in economic circumstances, which will impact their consumption patterns, which will in turn impact on the local economy, and so forth. The impact tree allows the researcher to quickly “scan” a very complex set of relationships in order to identify where and how impacts might occur (Wildman 1990). This method is very useful in the assessment stage where it is necessary to determine the degree of impacts for the various alternatives.

4. Evaluation.

“In this stage who benefits, and who pays, and how much by whom are assessed... Preferred alternatives can be based on not only who gains and who loses but how much groups and individuals feel they are gaining and losing.”
(Burdge and Robertson 1990)

The evaluation stage of the SIA is concerned with the selection of the most desirable alternative arrived at in the assessment stage. While this may appear to be a relatively straightforward exercise, it is often far from that in practice. One of the major reasons why

the evaluation stage is difficult is the fact that the interests of all the various stakeholders in the situation must be considered. This is complicated by the fact that in all likelihood the benefits and negative impacts of the project will not fall equitably on the affected population (*Ibid*). In most cases, some stand to win more than others and some stand to pay more than the next. The difficulty faced at this point in the SIA is to determine what the trade-offs will be, in other words, to determine who will benefit and who will pay.

The methodologies employed in the evaluation process are similar to those already discussed. In the course of conducting the SIA, it usually becomes apparent who the interested groups and organizations are and their input can be solicited in various fashions. In-person interviews and surveying is one good approach, as is the use of a more widely distributed survey in the case of a larger group or definable population. An effective complement to the interview and survey method is, again, some form of public participation process whereby the concerned groups are able to come together and present their concerns and suggestions for public debate.

4. B. Wolseley School Case Study Methodology

Methods Statement

The methodology employed in the case study of Wolseley School is reflective of the current state of SIA methodology in the sense that it incorporates participatory elements and aspects of communicative action in combination with the four basic steps of SIA. Participatory elements are exhibited in the use of key informant interviews and a focus group, as well as the researcher assuming the status of observer at Community Committee meetings. Elements of the case study methodology reflective of communicative action and discourse analysis are the application of content analysis to project files; survey responses; and the minutes of community meetings. An additional factor in the research was the fact

that the researcher is a long-time resident of the neighborhood and was therefore able to bring personal experience to bear on the project as well.

Research Process.

The process for conducting the research began with finding out who the contacts were for the local community organization. Having located the contact persons and community organization, they were approached and asked if they were amenable to participating in a case study. The next step in the process was to secure permission from the Community Committee to sit in on their meetings as an observer and to gain access to any written information they may have. As the Committee was considerate enough to agree to these requests, it was possible to begin the real work on the case study.

The review of the Committee's files provided the background information needed in order to understand the complexities and nuances of the issue, as well as highlighting avenues for further research. One of the main benefits of reviewing the files was the ability to determine who the major stakeholders were in the issue as well as to gain some sense of what their interests and positions were. Based on this information, and information from Committee meetings, it was determined that a number of interviews would have to be conducted with major stakeholders in order to clarify and confirm their roles and positions. A review of the files also revealed a lack of statistical data such as enrolment projections and other basic statistical information on the neighborhood. This discovery necessitated the procurement of relevant data from the School Division and other sources.

As well, the files contained information on a survey which had been conducted on the issue in the previous year. An analysis of the survey results yielded valuable information on the issue, including indications of which option the community was in favor of and what

factors they considered to be important in the issue. Also included in the files were reports on two community meetings which had been held on the issue. Information contained in these reports was a valuable supplement to that contained in the survey results as it too provided indications of the community's concerns and sentiments. As this case study was commenced some time after the survey had been conducted and the public meetings held, it was determined that it was necessary to validate this information. A decision was made to conduct a small focus group on the issue as a means of determining if public sentiment had shifted on the issue, or if new concerns had arisen.

The research process culminated in the drawing of a set of conclusions as well as the development of a series of recommendations. The conclusions presented relate in the first instance to the lessons learned from conducting the case study itself, and in the second instance to the larger context of the role of social impact assessment in urban planning. The recommendations developed are targeted specifically to the School Division in terms of how social impact assessment could be utilized in situations such as that described in the case study.

Case Study Methodology.

The starting point for most social impact assessments is the determination of the profile categories, as it is changes in these categories which indicate potential impacts upon the subject population. In the case of the *Waiseley School* study, the following categories of variables were selected for study: population and demographic figures, economic data, and evidence of community cohesion. The three categories were selected in accordance with the basic SIA profiling methodology previously described. The fourth aspect of basic SIA methodology, that of the role of government, was not selected as a separate profile category for the simple reason that the role of government or its administrative bodies, is a theme

throughout the entire case study. The situation at Wolseley School revolves entirely around the conflict between the community and the role of various governmental bodies, such as the School Division and the Public Schools Finance Board.

As SIA work necessitates the utilization of both qualitative information and quantitative data, a variety of research methods are employed. In this case, quantitative data regarding the profile categories was derived from Statistics Canada material and the Winnipeg School Division Number Ones' Research Department. The Division's data are derived from a combination of Statistics Canada material and its own administrative data base. The geographic location for the collection of statistical data for the purposes of developing a neighborhood profile was the school's catchment area, as this is the area most likely to be impacted by the project. As well, the Division collects its data based on school catchment areas, thereby providing a ready-made data set for analysis.

This data is presented in a simple comparative fashion in the sense that wherever possible figures utilized in the description of the characteristics of the school's catchment area are compared to the larger unit of the City of Winnipeg. The presentation of the data in this fashion allows for the development of a sense of the neighborhood within a broader context. The comparative presentation of data allows the subject of the study to be held up against something else in order to determine what the similarities and differences are (Levin and Fox 1991, Ch. 2). When similarities and differences are noted, it is then possible to begin extracting a certain amount of basic inferential information such as: is this neighborhood richer/poorer than the city at large, or, is the population of this neighborhood older/younger than the rest of the city?

There was also a secondary source of statistical information derived from a survey which the Community Building Committee conducted in 1996 (Appendix 1). While the survey was not intended to be a scientific instrument as such but rather a method of sampling community sentiment and ideas, it was nonetheless possible to derive a certain amount of statistical information from the results. The responses to the open-ended questions asked on the survey were first reviewed in order to determine if there were any common categories of responses. Once common themes or categories of responses were noted, the individual responses were then grouped under their respective headings and counted in order to develop some sense of the magnitude of interest and concern (Levin and Fox 1991, Ch. 2).

The Building Committee's survey contributed significantly to the qualitative information necessary for the case study as well. As the survey asked open-ended questions which solicited people's thoughts, opinions and ideas on the issue, it was therefore possible to extract from this a sense of how neighborhood residents thought not only of the school but also of their community at large. An analysis of the content of survey responses therefore afforded the opportunity to develop a picture of what the residents valued about their community, along with a sense of the degree of interest and commitment which existed in the community (Neuman 1997, Ch. 16).

The emphasis on quality-of-life factors which emerged from the survey proved to be of benefit to the case study research in another fashion as well. The information arising from the survey and community meetings clearly illustrated the community's preference for factors of value and aesthetic regard as opposed to mere financial prudence. This information thereby provided a standard against which the possible effects of the two project options could be compared. As the input and desires of the community are

considered to be essential for social impact assessment in this instance knowing what the community valued was an invaluable asset to the process of impact projection, assessment and evaluation in the case study (Burdge 1987, Dale and Lane 1994, Burdge *et al* 1995).

Access was also granted to the personal files of one of the Community Building Committee members. These files contained copies of most of the correspondence between the Committee and the various bodies with which it was dealing, as well as copies of the minutes of School Division Committee Meetings and Board of Trustees meetings (Appendix 2). The files also contained a copy of the Building Condition and Utilization Report and the Community Committee's response to it. This documentation was supplemented by written information received from the Public Schools Finance Board and the School Division regarding their respective structures and processes. The contents of these files represented one of the primary sources of information used to develop an understanding of the issues and the stakeholders involved.

As there are many stakeholders involved in the situation, each with specific duties, interests, and responsibilities, it was decided to conduct in-person interviews in order to collect information first-hand (Appendix 3). The most likely candidates for interviewing were those functionaries who were directly involved in the issue, including the Director of Buildings and the Area Superintendent for the Division, along with a representative of the Public Schools Finance Board. Other persons central to the issue and therefore interviewed included the School Trustee for the ward where Wolseley School is located, the Chair of the Community Building Committee, and the Principal of Wolseley School.

Interviews with Division and PSFB personnel were conducted primarily to develop a clearer sense of their respective duties and responsibilities and to clarify questions on the

ongoing administrative process. The Chair of the Community Building Committee was interviewed to gain insight into the perspective of the community and to receive the Committees' perspective on the administrative process. An interview with the Ward Trustee was conducted as this was an ongoing issue in the Ward. The Principal of the school was interviewed as well in order to receive the perspective of the primary users of the facility. The information gathered from the interviews proved invaluable in terms of developing an understanding of the process as well as gaining insight into the sentiments of those involved.

The interviews were conducted using primarily field research techniques for interviewing (Neuman 1997, Ch. 6). Some questions were prepared prior to the interview based on the information on hand and the specific position or duties of the person involved. The actual interview would be a combination of these questions along with the pursuit of any other information which came up in the course of the session. In other words, the interview was not confined to a set series of questions as in a survey format, but was allowed the freedom to pursue other avenues of information as they arose. In effect, the interviews were often a form of guided conversation as opposed to a question and answer session.

The researcher was also granted permission to sit in on the Community Building Committee meetings as an observer (Kirby and McKenna 1989, Ch. 3). The status of observer afforded the unique opportunity to witness firsthand the internal workings of the Community Committee. The position allowed the researcher to be privy to debates regarding the Committee's strategies for dealing with the other stakeholders in the process, as well as lending some insight into the internal debates amongst the Committee members.

The position of observer allowed for the collection of qualitative information on the issue which otherwise may not have been available.

The case study research also included conducting a focus group on the subject (Appendix 4). The best sources of information regarding the community's sentiments on the project were derived from minutes of the public meeting in 1998 and the results of the Community Building Committee survey of the same year. As both sources of information were a year and a half old by the time the project study was launched, it was necessary to find some way of verifying the information and to determine if community sentiments had shifted in some way.

To this end, some neighborhood residents were gathered together one evening for the purpose of discussing the situation at Wolseley School. The group was conducted essentially as a form of group interview with the researcher acting as facilitator/participant (Morgan 1997). Part of the evening was structured in the sense that participants were asked some specific questions on the issue, such as to give an opinion about which option they felt was the best under the circumstances, and to give the reasons why they felt it was the best option. Beyond this basic structured inquiry, discussion was allowed to flow in a directed fashion around the points which had emerged during the initial inquiry. This method allowed the researcher to address some concerns specific to the case study in terms of the accuracy of dated information, as well as allowing for new information and concerns to arise.

As a final point on the methods employed in the course of the research, it bears mentioning that the author has lived and worked in the neighborhood for some 10 years. As a result he has an extended network of contacts in the neighborhood which enables him to

keep in touch with what people are thinking and feeling. The Wolseley neighborhood is a fairly sociable community; many of the residents are connected to each other by friendships, family ties, work and volunteer connections and by other means such as their children's school friendships. As a result there is not much which occurs in the public sphere of the neighborhood which is unknown to the residents. Issues and problems are discussed openly on the street and in the parks and front yards. Being part of this system of communication was an invaluable resource in the conduct of the case study, as it gave the researcher ready access to contacts and people with whom the issue could be knowledgeably discussed.

This chapter has attempted an explication of the methodological basis of social impact assessment along with a demonstration of its application in a case study context. The complexity of SIA methodology was synthesized into four commonly utilized steps or phases. This basic approach was then linked to prevailing SIA practice comprising an increased emphasis on public participation methods and the inclusion of communicative action analysis. The usefulness of public participation was highlighted in terms of its ability to assist in the decoding of complex factors such as the issues of values and divergent interests which are common to SIA. The chapter concludes with the illustration of the application of these methods to the case study of the Wolseley School. The methodological approach utilized in the case study is detailed, including an explanation of the research process and a detailed description of how the methods were applied in the case study. The following chapter on the case study serves as a demonstration of social impact assessment methods in practice.

CHAPTER 5. CASE STUDY OF THE WOLSELEY SCHOOL

Introduction.

The case study is an attempt at putting the theory and methodology of SIA to a practical test. As the title of the thesis indicates, this is to be an exploration of the role of social impact assessment in urban planning. Given this, it is not sufficient to merely describe and define social impact assessment, it should ideally be tested in practice in a planning context. The following case study is a demonstration of the application of social impact assessment to a neighborhood planning issue.

The issue facing the residents of the Wolseley neighborhood is the fact that their local grade school has reached the point where a decision must be made whether to repair and renovate the existing building or demolish it and build a new one. Initially constructed in 1921 to provide relief from overcrowding in neighboring schools, Wolseley School is presently at capacity in terms of enrolment and programming space requirements. Problems and concerns with the building today fall into two general categories: the physical state of the building in terms of repairs and maintenance required, and the building's deficiencies as a learning facility due to its age.

The situation with Wolseley School has not gone unnoticed, as it has been on the Winnipeg School Division Number Ones replacement list since at least 1997, and indeed it was in that year that the Division made public their intention to replace the school. This decision was based primarily on the physical condition of the building, which indicated that replacement was in order, and enrolment projections which indicated that the school age population in the school's catchment area would continue to increase slightly. However, when the decision to replace the school became public, there was an immediate reaction from the school's Parent Council. Concerned that they had not been consulted or included

in the decision to replace the school, the Parent Council formed the Wolseley School Building Committee in order to give concerned parents and the broader community a voice in the process.

The Community Building Committee called a public information meeting on the issue in June of 1997. Invited to the meeting were the Superintendent of Schools for the Winnipeg School Division #1, 3 members of the Board of Trustees for the School Division, members of the Division's Buildings and Transportation Committee, the Principal of Wolseley School and the local City Councilor. The intention of the meeting was to allow the School Division officials to present their position on the issue, as well as allowing local residents a chance to ask questions and solicit information. What emerged from this first meeting was the fact that the majority of those in attendance were not in favor of proceeding with demolishing the old school without first exploring other options, including renovation.

The opposition to the replacement option expressed by the neighborhood had the effect of postponing the Division's decision to demolish, as they realized that they would encounter a great deal of opposition were they to proceed as planned. Rather than risking conflict, the Division began to work with the Community Building Committee in order to resolve the situation. This decision initiated a lengthy and complicated process involving several official bodies and the community. Aside from the School Division' which administers the school, and the Community Building Committee, there is: the Public Schools Finance Board, which funds the project; the Provincial Department of Education, which sets policy and ultimately holds the purse strings; and the City of Winnipeg, which will assume an active role in terms of regulatory issues once the project is launched.

5. A. SIA and the Wolseley School Situation.

It may be worthwhile at this point to briefly review some of the basics and fundamentals of social impact assessment in order to understand how the Wolseley School situation could benefit from an SIA exercise. Perhaps the best way of doing so is to return to the five defining characteristics of SIA as detailed in Chapter 1. To refresh, the five characteristics of Social Impact Assessment are firstly; it is expressly focused on the effects a given project has on the human beings which must live with the consequences of the project. Secondly, SIA is future oriented in the sense that it seeks to determine what the future may hold given a particular course of action. Thirdly, social impact assessment is explicitly focused on a given project or policy incentive. Fourthly, information gathered in the course of conducting an SIA can be used to inform the decision making process, and fifthly; the social impact assessment process can itself be utilized as a means of encouraging public participation in the decision-making process surrounding the project.

Regarding the first point, that of a project's affects on those who must live with it there is no doubt that the proposed Wolseley School project will have impacts. Even prior to conducting any sort of in-depth investigation, it can be readily surmised that the project would at least impact the students, their families, school staff, and the immediate neighborhood. However, questions such as what types of impacts, their severity and duration are questions which could be addressed by a social impact assessment. The definition and description of potential impacts represents a key strength of SIA.

The future-oriented perspective of social impact assessment is valuable in this instance as well, as an investment in a school, whether new or renovated, is an investment in the future in more ways than one. Aside from the obvious financial investment which accompanies a large project, the establishment of a new or upgraded facility may have other

ramifications for the future as well. However, what these ramifications, or impacts, could be requires some framework for investigation, and this is where SIA enters the picture. The projection of future impacts of both the positive and negative variety provide fertile ground for social impact assessment and analyses.

The expressed focus of SIA on a specific project fits neatly with the Wolseley School issue. There is no doubt that there is some kind of project afoot for the school, the only question which remains is what type of project it will be. The options available are either the construction of a new school, or the renovation of the old. Regardless of which option is selected, there would be a defined project available for SIA analysis.

Intimately related to the focus of SIA on a specific project is the question of making decisions related to the project. Aside from the basic question of whether to undertake the project or not, there are always a multitude of other issues which must be addressed in order for the project to materialize. Inherent to most projects are factors such as constraints of time and funding, the weighing of the interests of those who are touched by the project, and a seemingly endless number of details dealing with design and construction. This multitude of factors produces an environment which can appear to be overwhelming with complex details, an environment in which making an informed decision is very difficult. A social impact assessment could assist in the decision-making process by providing accurate and up to date information as the process unfolds.

SIA can play an important role in an issue by encouraging and assisting public participation in the process. Most projects have a great many people associated with them: functionaries responsible for the projects execution, politicians, architects, designers, trades persons, citizens who will be affected by the project and often the general public. Of these

various groups it is the latter two which generally experience the most difficulty in having their voices heard. The citizens affected and the general public often experience difficulty in being heard on an issue because they do not generally have an inherent organizational form with the accompanying ability to collect, analyze and disseminate information. The development and conduct of a social impact assessment can become a focal point for encouraging public participation in the issue. Public input can be solicited for the development of the SIA, as well as in its conduct, thereby allowing those affected by the project a measure of influence.

5. B. Study Description.

The case study social impact assessment conducted on the current Wolseley School situation is modeled after the general SIA format of profiling, projecting, assessing and evaluating. However, as is the case with many social impact assessments, there are many important aspects of the issue which do not fit neatly into one of the four general categories of SIA methodology. In this case, relevant elements such as details concerning the physical properties of the building, the various parties involved in the situation and their respective positions on the matter and funding formulas employed in this type of circumstance are all important components of the issue. It is important to detail such features as they are crucial to understanding the complexities of the issue and explaining the context in which the decision making process occurs. It has therefore been necessary to begin the study with a segment which provides these relevant background details in order to establish the context of the issue.

Included in this background and contextual segment is an introduction which describes the basic issue and introduces the stakeholders involved. This section is followed by a brief history of the School, which includes noting some of the architectural features

which contribute to its uniqueness as well as an outline of some of the physical problems with the building. The segment also contains a description of the major stakeholders in the issue and their respective roles. It has also been necessary in this section to describe in some detail the official decision-making process set up by the School Division, as this process was central to the issue. This segment of the study concludes with an overview of the activities of the Wolseley School Community Building Committee, as it was this Committee which represented the community in the process and was therefore central to the issue.

Upon completion of the introductory and background segment the study proceeds along traditional SIA lines of profiling, projecting, assessing and evaluating. The profile section of the study contains data on the population and demographic factors of the school's catchment area. This includes total population figures for the area, noting what changes, if any, have occurred over time. Also included in this section are some basic data on the number of families in the area, and how many of these families contain school-age children. This section also contains information about the school's enrollment figures and enrollment projections, as these are key figures in any debate concerning the fate of a school.

The economic information provided as part of the profile includes data about average incomes and unemployment rates for the area, as well as data concerning incidences of low income. This section also contains information regarding housing and forms of tenure in the area. The total number of housing units is detailed, along with figures noting how many are rented and how many are owned. There are also figures provided which show how many households, both rental and owned, are paying more than 30% of their incomes

towards housing. The section concludes with information about the age of the housing stock and its condition.

The section on community cohesion highlights the ways in which the Wolseley neighborhood is linked in terms of various forms of social organization. The neighborhood supports an active Community Club and has had a Residents' Association for many years. It is also "home base" for several broadly-based environmental activist groups, and Wolseley School itself is the centre of activity for those involved in the Schools Parent Council and its various activities. As well, this section of the study addresses the degree of interest in the issue expressed by the community as evidenced by participation in public meetings and the results of a survey conducted by the Community Building Committee.

The projection of impacts section is broken down into two sections based on the two options available to the community, namely to either renovate or replace the old school. Each option is analyzed for its anticipated impacts on the profile categories. For example, population factors are examined to determine what impacts, if any, could be expected from a renovation project and a similar analysis is performed for the replacement option.

The development of projections based on the two options available forms the basis for the next section, which is the assessment of projected impacts for each option. In this section the anticipated impacts of the two options on the profile categories are compared against each other. This is, in a sense, the section where the available options are "scored", in terms of their potential impacts, both positive and negative. The assessment of potential impacts for each option is an important step in determining which option may be the most feasible.

The assessment of impacts is followed by a section which evaluates the options from a particular perspective. This is an important step in SIA work, as it does not necessarily follow that the option which scores the best in the assessment stage is that which is desired by those impacted by the project. In terms of this case study, the options and their impacts are examined from two perspectives; that of the financial considerations of the bureaucracies involved, and then in terms of the interests and desires as expressed by the Wolseley Community.

5. C. History and Features of Wolseley School.

Wolseley School is located, appropriately, in the Wolseley area of Winnipeg, an inner-city, primarily residential area which was developed in the early 1900. The site is rather remarkable in the sense that the lot itself is very large, comprising some 1.5 hectares of land, and extends from Wolseley Avenue almost to Portage Avenue. The location of the building on the lot is unique, as the school is placed atop a small hill situated in the middle of the lot and well away from any busy street. The area in front of the school bordering on Wolseley Avenue is a large grassed playground which contains a large children's play structure and a soccer pitch. This playground is well utilized by the neighborhood when school is not in session. The rear of the lot behind the school is paved over and is leased to the City of Winnipeg as a recreational facility. This area contains three tennis courts and a wading pool and doubles as a play area for the school's students.

The school was constructed in 1921 as a temporary facility to relieve overcrowding at neighboring schools due to a rapidly expanding population. It is a one storey bungalow style building constructed with local brick and, for its day, minimal yet striking ornamentation. Architectural features of the structure include large windows, stone capped parapets, projected entranceways accented with stone arches, stone crests, and interesting

gable works and buttresses. The interior is finished with dark wood trim and maple floors. The one storey design allows the structure to fit comfortably in a residential neighborhood, while the external architectural features and its placement on the lot cause it to be very pleasing to the eye

The original structure had an area of approximately 14,600 square feet and was designed for grades nursery to six. Continued enrollment pressures and constant expansion of the education system in terms of programming developments and subsequent space requirements led to the construction of a 3,900 square foot addition in 1959, and the addition of two portable classrooms in 1974 and 1988. This brought the total square footage of the facility to the current level of some 21,780 square feet.

There are currently seven active regular classrooms at the school for grades 1-6 with another dedicated to Nursery and Kindergarten classes. A multi-purpose room also serves as a gymnasium, and one of the portable units houses a computer education program while a converted classroom serves as a library. There are also classrooms dedicated for music, French language education and resource programs. Aside from these regular activities, the school also provides room for a child guidance clinic social worker, psychologist, reading clinician, speech and language therapists, and a public health nurse. Programmatic initiatives include an Alternative Education Program which places additional demands on the school's resources and space.

The school is one of five remaining of the sixteen which were built in the period between 1918 and 1921. Of these five, one is slated to be demolished, two are in use as active schools as part of the Winnipeg School Division Number Ones facilities and two are used by other educational institutions. Given the fact that the building is representative of a

certain architectural style related to Winnipeg's history, and the fact that it will soon be only one of four remaining, there is some interest in acquiring a historical designation for the building.

The building is in need of some basic repairs and upgrading of mechanical systems. There are serious problems with the outdated heating and ventilation systems, resulting in classroom temperatures which are excessively high during certain months of the year. There appear to be two key components to this problem, that of the original windows which neither insulate nor ventilate well, and the original steam heating system which is difficult to regulate. The building is also in need of some structural repairs, as the west wall needs shoring up and there is some concern that the floor and roof framing may have weakened over time as well. There is also a concern that dampness in the crawlspace under the building may be causing excessive mold growth resulting in unhealthy air quality inside the building.

In terms of the age related deficiencies of the building, the existing gymnasium heads the list of complaints, as it is considered to be too small for the needs of the present population and curriculum requirements. There are other serious considerations of usable space, since the archaic design and layout of the building does not fit well with contemporary educational needs. This is evidenced by the fact that there is not adequate space in the existing building for proper computer education facilities, special education facilities, counseling and consulting staff, or an adequate library. There are also related considerations such as inadequate storage space for students clothing and personal belongings, a lack of "extra" space where special projects can be worked on, and a shortage of staff and visitor parking.

5. D. Stakeholders in the Issue.

There are essentially three major "players" in this situation: the Wolseley School Community Building Committee, the Public Schools Finance Board, and the Winnipeg School Division #1. The Provincial Department of Education is not involved in the issue on a day-to-day basis, as an issue such as this is considered the jurisdiction of the local School Board and the Public Schools Finance Board. The Department's role in a situation such as this is generally reserved for approval of overall budgets and provision of ancillary funds should they be required. The City of Winnipeg is also not an active player in the situation at this time, however, they are sure to be once the project is launched as they will be responsible for enforcement of building code regulations and permit requirements. There is another potential role for the City of Winnipeg in this situation, as there is a possibility that the Community Building Committee may apply for a historical properties designation for the school. If the Committee were to proceed with this application, it would have to go before City Council for approval.

The Wolseley School Community Building Committee

The Wolseley School Community Building Committee was formed in 1997 by a group of parents who were concerned that they, and the community at large, had not been consulted in the decision to replace the old school. The Community Building Committee was an offshoot of the Wolseley School Parent Council, as it was decided that a separate committee was required to deal with an issue as large and complex as this. Membership in the Committee is open to all interested persons and has representatives from the School Parent Council, the local Community Club, and the Wolseley Residents' Association. The role of the Committee was initially conceived of as being primarily informational in terms of keeping the community informed as to what was going on and providing a channel for community input into the process. However, as the process evolved so did the Committee's

role in the issue. As a result of the community's strong interest in renovating the old school, the Committee's role has shifted from being primarily informative to that of actively advocating and lobbying for a renovated school on behalf of the community.²

The Public Schools Finance Board.

The Public Schools Finance Board (PSFB) is a 5 member board appointed by the provincial government of the day and is responsible to the Provincial Minister of Education. The duties and responsibilities of the Board are laid out in the Public Schools Finance Act of the Province of Manitoba (1967). They essentially consist of the development and administration of capital support programs for the public school system across the Province. It is this Board which authorizes the funding for the replacement, renovation or major repair of all public schools in Manitoba. The Board works in concert with the Department of Education, school boards and the local school when there is an issue of major repair, renovation or replacement. The process by which this is accomplished is as follows: each year the Board receives from the Divisions their project requests. These requests are then researched by the PSFB staff of engineers and architects and assembled into a prioritized list of projects. This list of projects forms the basis for a capital budget document which is then forwarded to the Provincial Government's Treasury Department for budgetary approval. Once the budget document has been approved by the Treasury Department it becomes the basis for the PSFB's current five year capital plan. Subsequently, the School Divisions are informed that they may proceed with projects which are approved as part of the five year plan.³

² Interview with Community Building Committee chair, 04/15/00

³ Interview with members of PSFB, 05/02/00

Winnipeg School Division Number 1.

The operation of Winnipeg School Division # One (WSD. #1) is overseen by a 9 member Board of Trustees who are elected every 4 years as part of the civic elections. The Boards are charged with responsibility for administering most aspects of the educational system, including facilities maintenance and development and curriculum delivery as mandated by the Provincial Government. Aside from monthly general meetings, Trustees also participate in standing committees which are responsible for decision-making on specific issues. One of these standing committees, the Buildings and Transportation Committee, is a factor in the Wolseley School issue. This three member sub-committee of the Board of Trustees is charged with making decisions regarding facility replacement and renovation in the Division. It is this Committee which decides which facilities need attention, what kind of attention they are to receive, and when they are to receive it. Once it has completed its investigations and analysis on a case-by-case basis, the Committee brings forth their recommendations for the consideration of the Board of Trustees for final approval, rejection, or amendment.⁴

In a situation such as that with Wolseley School, there is another committee of the Division which is struck. In a circumstance where a major project such as renovation or replacement is being considered, the Division strikes a separate Building Committee related to the specific project. In the case of Wolseley School, the committee is comprised of three parent representatives, the Principal of the school along with two teachers, and the Division's Director of Buildings and Contract Administrator. These Committees are unique to WSD #1 and play a role in the initial project development and planning by providing a forum for discussion of ideas and issues between the Division and the users of the facility.⁵

⁴ Interview with local school Trustee, 05/03/00

⁵ Interview with WSD Superintendent of Schools for Central Area, 04/25/00

It is important to note that this committee is a creation of the Division and is not to be confused with the Community Building Committee which is a separate entity.

The School Board of W S D #1 oversees the operation of a large administrative structure which carries out the day-to-day operations of the Division. Two of these administrative positions are central to the Wolseley School issue. The Director of Buildings is charged with the management of the built environment in which the delivery of education takes place. As such, it is the Director's responsibility to ensure that all necessary maintenance, repair and renovation work is carried out on the Division's properties. In a situation such as that facing Wolseley School, the Director of Buildings participates in the Division's Building Committee, lending experience and knowledge to the process of developing the initial project outline and plan. Once a project is approved, it is this department which is responsible for the development and execution of the project including the hiring of the architects and final plan development and approval. As such, in many respects the work of the Director of Buildings really begins once the project is approved.⁶

The second position which is central to the Wolseley issue is that of the Superintendent of Schools for the Central Area, which includes Wolseley School. The Superintendent of Schools is charged with responsibility for the overall operations of the schools in a given area, including maintenance and property development, programming and staffing. The Superintendent's responsibility in regards to a situation such as that at Wolseley School is to ensure that the needs of all are being considered, and that any decision made reflects the long-term interests and plans of the entire Division as well as the school's catchment area and immediate neighborhood. There is frequently a contradiction

⁶ Interview with WSD # 1 Director of Buildings, 04/27/00

inherent in this situation; often the financial responsibilities of the Division are at odds with the desires of the school's catchment area and neighborhood. An example of this would be a situation where it is fiscally prudent in the Division's analysis to close a school, but the neighborhood is not in agreement, placing the Superintendent and the Department in the unenviable position of having to implement an unpopular decision.⁷

5. E. The Decision Making Process.

The School Division has a generalized 11 step process which has been established for the development of new or renovated facilities. ⁸The first step in the process is the Division's request to the Public Schools Finance Board that a particular project be assessed for inclusion in the five year Capital Plan. These requests are developed by the School Division's Director of Buildings in concert with the school's Principal and the Area Superintendent. It was this step in the process which landed Wolseley School in the spotlight when it was approved for replacement in 1997.

2. Assuming that the PSFB accepts the School Division's request for consideration in the five-year plan, the next step in the process is the production of a Building Condition and Utilization Report. This is a report produced by the Division making the request and details the physical condition of the building, including any shortcomings it may have as an educational facility in terms of space requirements and layout. Aside from the physical attributes of the structure, other factors such as enrollment projections are taken into consideration when these reports are produced. It is also common for the reports to also contain some preliminary cost estimates for the project.

⁷ Interview with WSD # 1 Superintendent of Schools for Central Area, 04/25/00

⁸ Document received as part of Community Building Committee member files

The section of the Building Condition and Utilization Report for Walseley School which dealt with the physical condition of the building was prepared by a local engineering firm and was completed in April of 1998. (Building Condition and Utilization Report, WSD #1, May 1998) The report detailed the physical condition of the structural, architectural, mechanical and electrical systems of the building. The intent of this section of the report was to determine not only what repairs the building needed, but also what was required to bring the buildings systems up to current building code standards. It is important that a summation of the report be presented, as its contents are key to much of the debate surrounding the question of renovation versus new construction.

The report did indeed identify many areas which were in need of repair and upgrading, as may be expected with a building of this age. In terms of the structural condition of the building, it was determined that the building required some major work to shore up a sagging wall and reinforce some sections of the floor and roof systems which were thought to be under built in terms of complying with current building code requirements. The estimated costs of these repairs was \$630,000. (Building Condition and Utilization Report, WSD #1, May 1998 Pg. 3)

The major recommendations involving the architectural framework of the building revolved primarily around issues of water damage due to flashing and veneer failures, poor energy efficiency of the windows, and the poor air seal and vapor barrier qualities of the original building materials. It was also noted that there was inadequate firestopping capabilities in many sections of the building and that this situation should be rectified in order to meet current building code requirements. The estimated cost for repairs and upgrading as required was \$572,000. (*Ibid.*: 3)

Major recommendations regarding the mechanical systems of the building included several which related to improving the quality of air and air flow in the building, replacement of the old original heating system along with the old plumbing, and that a fire sprinkler system be installed. The estimated cost of these repairs and upgrades was estimated to be \$446,000. (*Ibid*: 4)

In terms of the electrical system, major recommendations included replacement of the existing electrical system to accommodate current power requirements along with upgrading the exterior lighting and fire alarm systems. Estimated cost of these improvements was \$65,000. (*Ibid*: 4)

The total cost of a repaired and upgraded facility, including a 20% contingency fee, was \$2,055,600. This was not, however, the sum of the recommendations and estimates included in the report. As the existing building has some deficiencies in terms of space utilization and layout, the engineering firm also provided cost estimates for additions and renovations which would address these deficiencies. Additions included such items as a new gym and change rooms, as well as special education and resource rooms. Renovations included the library, conversion of the old gym to a multi-purpose facility, and the conversion of one of the existing classrooms to a science room. The inclusion of these costs and contingencies pushed the estimated cost of a renovated and repaired facility to \$3,109,925. (*Ibid*: 8)

The Building Condition and Utilization Report also contained cost estimates for a new building because replacement of the existing building was being seriously considered at the time the report was produced. The estimated cost of construction of a new school according to Public Schools Finance Board space requirements for the existing school

population was \$2,388,295 or about \$721,630 less than the estimated cost of a repaired and renovated facility.

3. Step three of the process consists of two separate yet intimately related components. The first component is the review of the Building Condition and Utilization Report with parent and staff representatives, and the second is the review of the Public Schools Finance Board funding criteria and guidelines, again with the input of parent and staff representatives. In regards to the first point as the Wolseley School Community Building Committee was acting as contact for the community at this time, the Committee requested a copy of the report in order to review the findings firsthand. The Committee received a copy of the report in May of 1998 and immediately began a review of the recommendations and cost estimates in order to determine if the renovation option could not be made more feasible than was presented in the report. All of the information and figures which follow are from an opinion paper on the Building Condition and Utilization Report produced by the Wolseley School Community Building Committee in the summer of 1998.

After a careful review of the report, the Community Building Committee offered the following suggestions to the School Division regarding how the cost of renovation could be brought down significantly. In terms of the structural recommendations in the report, the Building Committee suggested that repairs to the floor were not necessary at this time, as the underpinning work to the structure would probably relieve some of the stresses off the floor joists. As well, due to the fact that the roof, as well as the floor, had held up for some 77 years it too was not in danger of collapsing in the foreseeable future and did not need to be repaired to the extent which was recommended in the report. Deletion of these two items from the estimates would recognize a cost savings of \$320,000.

The Committee felt that the figure of \$130,000 was excessive to make repairs to the crawlspace under the building. The Committee wondered if there were not more cost effective ways of treating a moisture problem, such as the planting of moisture loving trees and shrubs next to the foundation. As well, if the ventilation system of the building were to be upgraded, that should make a significant contribution to the air quality within the building. If these suggestions were followed up on, a potential savings of \$110,000 could be realized.

In terms of the mechanical systems of the building, the Committee questioned the need to include a price for replacement of a boiler system which the report acknowledged was working well. The Committee felt that alternatives such as the addition of a backup boiler to assist the original system had not been thoroughly considered. The deletion of a new heating system would reduce the estimates for mechanical system upgrading by \$190,000.

The Committee also questioned the need for a renovation budget to contain an item such as replacement of roofing material. The Committee felt that the replacement of the roofing material should come from the Division's internal maintenance budget, as they had deferred maintenance on the roof for several years in anticipation that the building would be replaced. There were also several other items in the budget which could be considered to be expenses of the Division utilizing the same "effects of deferred maintenance" argument. Such expenses as repairs to water damaged areas of the walls, flashing and parapets are ready examples. In terms of cost savings, the deletion of the roofing repairs alone from the renovation budget would amount to a savings of \$125,000.

As well, the Community Building Committee also suggested that several items included in the renovations portion of the cost estimates could be deemed expendable or negotiable. Items included under this heading were the renovation of the library and the conversion of the old gym to a multi-purpose room and the conversion of a classroom to a designated science room. Further to this, the Committee determined in the course of its' investigations that the 20% contingency fee on the part of the engineering firm was on the high end of the scale and could probably be reduced to 15%. If the suggested items were deleted and the contingency reduced, the total estimated cost of renovation and addition would be lowered to \$1,939,475. The following sections will illustrate why the Community Building Committee felt it was very important to reduce the estimated cost of renovations.

The second component of step three is the review of the Public Schools Finance Board project funding guidelines with parent and staff representatives. The PSFB has many funding formulae and programs which apply to various situations. The two which are relevant in this case are the criteria which relate to the funding of repair and renovation projects and new construction. If it is determined that a new building is required, the PSFB applies a pre-determined set of criteria which relate the size of the structure required to the student population and programming requirements. For example, a standard classroom is determined to require 70 square meters of space; a kindergarten classroom, 93 square meters and so forth for all the various types of space a school require (PSFB School Building Space Guidelines, 1992).

Each type of space requirement is allocated a certain dollar figure in order to calculate new construction expenses. For example, an art room is determined to cost \$337.92 per square meter of space, and a kindergarten room is determined to cost \$127.00 per square meter of space (PSFB Capital Support Program, 1998 Edition). It was this

standard method of calculation which resulted in a figure of \$2,388,295 for the construction of a new Wolseley School.

The allowable cost for a renovation and upgrading project under the PSFB formula is 50% of the estimated total cost of constructing a new building, or 80% of the estimated cost of new construction if the building under consideration is a heritage building and is deemed to be structurally sound. It is this formula and its interpretation which has proven to be central to the issue surrounding Wolseley School. To begin with, it was clear from the outset that the 50% proviso would not be adequate to finance the degree of renovation and repair which the old building required. This realization forced the Community Building Committee into the situation of having to advocate for the 80% funding option. However, in order to be eligible for the 80% funding formula, the building had to be found to be structurally sound and eligible for a heritage designation. The eligibility for heritage designation is not a problem, as the Community Building Committee has been assured that such a designation would be granted should they decide to apply. However, the issue of structural soundness was another question altogether.

The structural soundness of a school building is determined by criteria set by the Public School Finance Board. However, in this instance the PSFB did not feel that they had a clear definition of structural soundness to work with and therefore embarked on a process to develop a new definition. To accomplish this, the PSFB worked in cooperation with Civic, Provincial and Federal departments in order to develop a policy definition for structural soundness which was acceptable to all levels of Government. This process of policy development and definition took approximately eight months, from February 1999 until October 1999, and accounts for one of the longest delays in the process.

The revised definition states that a school building can be considered to be basically structurally sound if the cost of repairs or replacement of foundation, floors, walls and roof to meet current structural code requirements does not exceed 80% of the cost of constructing a new building (PSFB Revised Funding Guidelines, 1999). For the case of Wolseley School, the application of this formula would mean that some \$2,487,940 would be available to fund the total renovation and upgrading project or about \$621,985 short of the \$3,109,925 estimated in the Building Condition and Utilization report. However, the development of this definition did not mean the end of the Community Building Committee's efforts to secure a renovated school for their community. At the time of writing, the Committee is contesting the application of this formula to Wolseley School on the basis that many items included in the structural features section of the Building Condition and Utilization Report are open to challenge and interpretation.

4. In step four, the Division's School Building Committee develops a recommendation based on the information provided from the community and Division staff for the consideration by the School Division's Building & Transportation Committee. It must be emphasized that the Committee referred to here is not the Wolseley School Community Building Committee, but the committee referred to in step 10 of this process. The creation by the School Division of a School Building Committee generally occurs much further along in the process, however in this instance, the fact that the Community Building Committee was already active on the issue sparked the Division to proceed with the establishment of a formal Building Committee earlier in the process.

The membership of the Division's Building Committee consists of three parent members, the Principal of the school along with two teachers, and at least two members of the Division's staff. The earliest record of this committee's existence which could be found

was June of 1998. This would be logical considering the Building Condition and Utilization Report which would form the basis for discussion in the committee, was released in May of that year. However, it was not until January of 1999 when the Committee made its recommendation to the Division's Buildings and Transportation Committee, at which point it recommended that the School be renovated as opposed to demolished. (Wolseley School Building Project Committee Notes, January 1999)

5. Upon receipt of the recommendation, and subject to its own deliberations, the Building and Transportation Committee makes a recommendation to the Board of Trustees of the Division. This recommendation was prepared and transmitted to the Board of Trustees in February of 1999. The Building and Transportation Committee recommendation concurred with that of the Division's Building Committee in that it recommended in principle the renovation of the existing school along with an unspecified addition. (WSD #1 Building/Transportation Committee report #1. 1999)

6. In step six the issue is in the hands of the Divisions Board of Trustees who conduct their own review and discussion of the issue. The Trustees are assisted in this task by Division staff who provide reports and background information, and the public who are allowed to present their perspective at the Board meetings. Once a decision has been reached at this point in the process it is the responsibility of the Board to produce a Notice of Intent to the Public Schools Finance Board which details the Boards' specific request. In February of 2000 the Board arrived at a decision which was to accept the recommendations of both the Building Committee and the Building and Transportation Committee for a renovated school with additions. A Notice of Intent to this effect was prepared and forwarded to the PSFB in May of 2000.

7. In step seven, the PSFB reviews the Division's request including discussions with Building Department representatives and makes a recommendation to the Minister of Education. It must be understood that the PSFB does not make a decision concerning the Notices of Intent without first conducting their own investigation. The PSFB has architects and engineers on staff which review the details of all requests to verify the factual information and to ensure that all alternatives have been reviewed. At the time of writing, (summer 2000) this is where the situation sits; all concerned are waiting for the PSFB to complete the review and make its recommendation to the Minister of Education.

8. In step eight, the Minister of Education reviews the recommendation and makes a decision on the Award. This step is pending the completion of the PSFB review and recommendation.

9. Once the Award is received from the Minister, the Division proceeds with a request for proposals for selection of an architect. This step is pending completion of steps seven and eight.

10. A formal School Building Committee in accordance with Division expectations is established. As noted, this step actually took place somewhere around step two.

11. The architect is selected and the design process begins. The design process includes the following components: schematic, sketch, working drawings, bid period, award, construction. Again, to be commenced pending project approval.

5. F. The Community Building Committee and Community Involvement.

In keeping with their initial role of informing the community, the Community Building Committee has called two public meetings on the issue. The first in June of 1997, came on the heels of the Division's announcement that the school was to be demolished and replaced. This was essentially an informational meeting where the School Division was able to present their perspective on the issue and answer questions from the community. This was an important meeting for two reasons; one, it allowed the community to express their feelings on the matter, revealing that the majority of those in attendance were not in favor of demolition without a through exploration of alternatives, and two, that there were a good many questions which did not have answers at this time and that more information was required on many aspects of the issue. Viewing the results of the meeting as a mandate to act on behalf of the community, the Community Building Committee initiated a series of actions to ensure that the community was consulted and that the required information was collected and disseminated accordingly.⁹

In order to accomplish this, the Building Committee opened up communication with the Board of Trustees, the School Division, and the Division's various sub-committees. Representatives of these organizations and committees were invited to Community Building Committee meetings when their input was required, and Community Building Committee members attended meetings of these bodies when the issue of Wolseley School was on the agenda. Specifically, the Building Committee was interested in procuring more information regarding the physical properties of the building, what repairs were required, what the costs could be, and what funding options were available.

⁹ interview with Community Building Committee chair, 04/15/00

Answering these questions required the procurement of information from several sources, the first being the Building Condition and Utilization Report provided by the School Division. A building condition and utilization report analyzes the physical condition of the building and documents any repairs required, as well as examining the building from a functional standpoint. The procurement of this report was a very important step, as these reports contain not only information on what needs repair or replacement but also the cost estimates involved. In this case, a comparative cost analysis method was employed by the engineering firm which was contracted to conduct the assessment. This method compared the cost of a repaired and renovated facility to that of a new building. With completion of this report and preliminary project cost estimates in hand, the Community Building Committee now had something specific to take back to the community for discussion and evaluation.

Now in possession of some specific information, the Community Building Committee organized a second public forum on the Wolseley School issue in November 1996 which was attended by an estimated 150-200 people. The findings of the Building Condition and Utilization Report and related cost estimates were presented as information for discussion. In the course of discussing the situation it became clear that the majority of those attending felt that renovation of the old school with the addition of features such as a new gym was preferable to demolition and construction of an entirely new building. This preference for renovation of the old as opposed to the construction of a new building was further reinforced by the results of a community survey conducted by the Building Committee. Undertaken as a means of gauging public sentiment and collecting ideas rather than "scientific" polling, the survey revealed very strong support for the renovation-with-additions option, as some 85% of those who responded favored renovation and repair of the existing building.

This strong showing of support for a renovated facility charged the Community Building Committee with a new task, namely investigating the availability of funds for a renovation project. Funding for projects such as this is under the purview of the Public Schools Finance Board (PSFB). Essentially what the Community Building Committee discovered was that the PSFB funds projects primarily on the basis of cost-benefit or cost-efficiency analyses. What this means is that the least expensive of the options presented is the one favored by the Board. An additional discovery was the fact that there are different formulae used for different situations; new construction is funded 100% by the PSFB, while renovation is financed to only 80% of the value of new construction. For example, if a new building is valued at \$1,000,000 by the PSFB, then their allowable limit for a renovation project would be \$800,000.

This information presented the Community Building Committee with several problems. To begin with, the preliminary cost analyses showed that the renovation-with-addition option could cost an estimated \$3,233,750, whereas a new building could cost an estimated \$2,388,295 (Building Condition and Utilization Report WSD #1, May 1998). However, the question of whether to renovate or build new was not as clear cut as the numbers would indicate, as there were items included in the cost of renovation estimates which were open to debate and contention. For example, there were items in the estimates which could possibly be delayed, such as heating boiler replacement and drainage systems for the crawlspace under the building. As well, some items included could be questioned on the basis of necessity, such as whether some floor and roof areas needed replacing or simply repairing. The subtraction of items such as these from the original cost estimates would bring the cost of renovation and addition much more in line with the estimated cost for construction of a new building.

At the time of writing of this report, the Community Building Committee was still very much involved in the process of negotiating and debating cost estimation and funding options with the School Board and the Public Schools Finance Board. Ostensibly, this debate revolves around two central and related points: one, the estimated cost of a new school and two, the percentage of funding which would be accorded to a renovation project. The first point, that of the replacement cost for a new school is key because it is upon this figure which the percentage allotment for renovation is based, and there is some skepticism on the part of the Building Committee that the replacement figure in the Building Condition and Utilization Report is low when compared to other recent projects.¹⁰ Understandably, it is in the Community Building Committee's best interest to see this number increased, as it is upon this figure that the funding for renovation will be based. Intimately related to this is the debate around what percentage of funding a renovation project could be accorded, as the Building Committee feels that there are good arguments to be made in favor of 100% funding as opposed to 30%.

5. G. Profile of the Wolseley School neighborhood.

Wolseley School is located at 511 Clifton Street where Clifton intersects with Wolseley Avenue. The catchment area for the school is bounded by Portage Avenue to the north, Dominion Street on the east, St. James Street on the west, and the Assiniboine River to the south (Map 1). Statistical information on the area is readily available courtesy of the Winnipeg School Division #1, which produces yearly reports on all the schools in the Division based on Statistics Canada data and the Division's student records. All data presented in this section of the report are derived from the School Division's report unless otherwise noted (WSD, #1 1997-1998 School Demographics Report July 1999).

¹⁰ Interview with Community Building Committee Chair, 05/11/00

Wolseley School's catchment area contained a total population of 2,185 persons in 1996, the year of the last census. This was an increase of 265 people or 13.8% over the 1991 census report. This is a revealing figure when compared to the Census Metropolitan Area of the City of Winnipeg which recorded only a 1% increase in population during the same period. These 2,185 people represent 560 families, 240 of which contain children under the age of 18 years. The data in the report are not detailed enough to allow for a break-down of the school-age children by age or grade attending, however, it does show that the enrollment of Wolseley School has remained stable at an average of 195 students per year since the 1992-93 school year. The Division's enrollment projections indicate that this figure should remain stable for at least several years to come. It is important to note that Wolseley School has a student stability rate averaging 93.5%, meaning that in any given school year, 93.5% of the students who began the year can be expected to be there at the end. This figure indicates that the population of the catchment area is quite stable and not subject to a great deal of movement.

The catchment area records an average income for individuals 15 years of age and over at \$24,342 and an unemployment rate of 4.8%. These figures compare favorably with the City of Winnipeg where the average individual income is \$24,809 with an unemployment rate of 7.9%. The incidence of low income for the area is somewhat lower than the City at large, with Wolseley sitting at 16.1% and the City at 18.4%. The 16.1% figure for the Wolseley School catchment area indicates that of the 560 families living in the area, some 90 families may be experiencing a notable degree of financial hardship.

The catchment area has 980 occupied private dwellings of which 675 are single-detached houses and 305 are some form of multiple-unit housing. The multiple units consist mostly of small apartment blocks located in West Wolseley at the western edge of

the catchment area across Portage Avenue from the Polo Park Shopping Centre. The remaining units are scattered throughout the catchment area and consist mostly of rented houses and suites in houses. Of the 960 total units, 155 or 15.5% are considered to be in need of major repair. This is not a problematic figure when the age of the units is taken into consideration, as 670 or 68% of the housing units in the area were constructed prior to 1946. While there is no break-down of single family versus multiple unit by age, a visual survey indicates that the majority of the units in this category are the single-detached houses.

Of the 675 houses, 635 or 94% are owner occupied with the remaining 40 being classified as rental units. Of the 635 owner-occupied houses, 90 households or 14% were paying more than 30% of their household income towards housing costs, a calculation which can indicate some degree of financial duress. The average value of the owner occupied dwellings in the area is \$90,454.

In total, 345 or 35.2% of the occupied dwellings in the area are rental units. Of these 345 rental units, 33% of the occupants were paying more than 30% of their incomes towards housing costs, a figure considerably higher than that for the owner-occupied dwellings.

There are strong indications that the neighborhood at large is quite cohesive and unified on many levels. Adjacent to the Woiseley School's catchment area is the Robert A. Steen Community Club which hosts a plethora of sports teams and clubs as well as a myriad of community events and educational programs. The neighborhood is also "home base" for environmental action and education groups such as the Coalition to Save the Elms and the Friends of Omands Creek. The Woiseley Residents' Association has been active

for some 25 years, dealing with neighborhood planning issues such as traffic problems, zoning issues and safety. Added to this, there are the activities which surround Wolseley School itself. The school has an active volunteer Parent Council which supports many of the Schools' activities by organizing fund-raisers and providing volunteers for school events. The fact that these organizations can exist, some for considerable periods of time, indicates a high level of organized commitment on the part of community members to their neighborhood.

This degree of commitment and interest in the neighborhood is well demonstrated by the community's involvement in the debate surrounding Wolseley School. The public meetings were very well attended and 67 people took the time to fill out the Community Building Committee's survey which was distributed at the November 1998 meeting. The results of this survey are a valuable contribution to the development of a profile for this neighborhood, as it provides information not only about what the respondents think about the school issue, but also what they value about their neighborhood in general.

What emerged from the Building Committee's survey was a very clear indication of the aesthetic value placed on the school by those who responded. To illustrate, there were some 209 comments listed in response to question number 1, which asked what people liked about the building. Of these 209 responses, 185 specifically referred to the aesthetic qualities of the building or its location, with the remainder referring to the building's sense of history and contribution to the neighborhood. The responses to question 3, which asked what features should be retained if the building were replaced, reflected this appreciation of the aesthetics of the building: 82 of 142 responses referred to the importance of transferring to any new structure the most striking and visible aesthetic features of the original building, such as the large windows and the brick and stone exterior. It is interesting to note that of

the 67 questionnaires completed, 27 were by respondents who did not have children currently in the school, indicating that this issue is of interest to the broader community as well as those whose lives stand to be directly impacted by the project.

What is instructive about the survey results is not only the value respondents placed on the aesthetic qualities of the building, but how these values are reflective of how the respondents see their community. What emerged from the survey was a very clear sense of what the respondents valued, not only about the existing school building, but about their neighborhood in general. Most of the comments made in regards to the value of the old building were connected in some fashion to the respondent's sense of place and quality of life. The sentiment which emerged from the survey was that the old school building was symbolic of the neighborhood and was a visual representation of the reasons why someone would choose to live there. Older, visually appealing structures which convey a sense of history and stability impart a sense of community and shared values. This sense of shared community values and interests is an important element of this community's profile.

5. H. Projection of Impacts for the Two Options.

There are in reality only two options in this situation, those being renovation or replacement of the building. Abandonment is not an option, as enrollment projections indicate that a school will be required in the neighborhood for some time to come, and dispersing Wolseley Schools population to the nearest grade schools is also not an option as they are already filled to capacity.¹¹ A "no-action" approach is also not feasible, as the physical condition of the building requires that some form of remedial action be taken

¹¹ Interview with Superintendent of Schools for the Central Area, 04/25/00

sooner rather than later. Therefore, the community and the various boards and governmental departments find themselves in the situation of debating renovation versus replacement, and it is the projection of impacts for these two options which will be examined in this section.

Replacement

The replacement of the existing building with a new one would not in all likelihood have a great deal of impact on most of the profile categories. In regards to the population and demographic makeup of the neighborhood, it is doubtful that the erection of a new school building would have a discernible impact either positively or negatively. While many residents are passionate about saving the old building, it is doubtful that any would go to the expense and trouble to leave the neighborhood if the old building were replaced.¹² By the same token, the existence of a new school is in and of itself not likely to attract a great deal of new residents. If schooling for their children is a factor for people when they are considering moving, it is the availability of schools and their quality which tend to be the factors considered, not the condition of the building itself.

It is also improbable that the erection of a new school would have any discernible effect on average incomes and unemployment rates for the neighborhood. These factors are affected by much larger macro-scale events occurring on the national and international stages, rather than by local events such as the installation of a new school building. Incomes, employment rates, and incidences of low income are affected by much larger, more complex circumstances than those which occur at the local level.

¹² Comments made at focus group, 05/24/00

The projection of impacts of a replacement school on community cohesion is difficult to determine due to the variables involved. These variables have to do primarily with the size and layout of the new building. If the new building was designed in a fashion which would allow it to be of service to the community in other than an educational capacity, then there would most likely be positive impacts experienced by the community. An example of this would be the provision of daycare facilities; there is a need for additional daycare spaces in the neighborhood and if a new building were able to provide such a service, there is no doubt that this would be a positive impact for the community.¹³ Another potentially positive impact could be the provision of a larger gym. The availability of an additional recreational facility could relieve some of the strain experienced by the local community club which is working at capacity.¹⁴

There is, however, one significant area where the erection of a new school would decidedly have an impact and that is in the area of the quality of life for the residents of the neighborhood. Throughout the entire process, the objections to a new school most frequently raised by Wolseley residents have been in the realm of qualitative issues. The old school is highly valued by the community for its aesthetic contribution to the neighborhood and the sense of history and belonging it imparts. There is a very real fear in the community that something irreplaceable would be lost forever should the old school be demolished.

Combined with this fear of loss is a sense of mistrust in the ability of the bureaucracy to deliver a new building which would be as good as the old in terms of its

¹³ The potential positive uses of a new school are recognized by many, including the Community Building Committee, people are however quite skeptical that a new building would in reality be suitable for expanded use.

¹⁴ The provision of a new gym was a theme at the public meetings and appeared frequently in the Community Building Committee survey as well; the inadequacy of the gym was echoed by the school Principal in an interview dated 05/04/00

aesthetic contributions to the neighborhood. There is a very strong belief on the part of the community that the shortcomings of the bureaucracy and the adherence to a "bottom line" will result in a school which is an architecturally unimaginative box and a detriment to the neighborhood. Many people in the course of the process voiced the opinion that they would be most displeased and upset if they had to look at bland brick, concrete and gunslit windows on their daily walks along Wolseley Avenue, or if this was the view that greeted them at their kitchen window every morning.¹⁵

Renovation:

The renovation of the old school also would not in all likelihood have a major impact on the first two impact categories. There is no reason to believe that the erection of a renovated school would have a discernible effect on population and demographic features in the neighborhood. As mentioned previously, the existence of a school and the quality of its educational programming are usually the factors considered by prospective residents, assuming that they are factors to be considered at all. There is also no reason to think that a renovated school would have any impact on employment or income levels in the neighborhood, as these factors are usually most affected by larger macro-scale changes.

Issues of community cohesion represent one area where a renovated school could very well have a positive impact upon the community. This is, however, largely dependent on the extent to which the school is renovated and what type of additions are incorporated. For example, a larger gym might allow for community access to the facility after school hours. The additional recreational facilities are needed in the neighborhood, and would create more opportunities for socialization by neighborhood residents. As well, the addition of a larger

¹⁵ This also is a recurring theme, appearing in interviews with the Community Committee chair, the participants in the focus group, and the public meetings held on the issue.

gym could afford the opportunity for increased community socialization by creating space for community meetings and social events.¹⁶

There is one area where the impact of a renovated facility is much clearer, and that is in the area of the quality of life for the neighborhood residents. The impacts of a renovated facility would be positive for the neighborhood, based on the preference for renovation the community has expressed. The neighborhood's affinity for the old school is unmistakable. This is evidenced by the fact that people went to the trouble of forming a committee to intervene in the process, and have remained committed to the project for some three years. As well, the feedback from the two public meetings was almost unanimous; the vast majority of those who spoke on the issue spoke in terms of the old building's positive contribution to the neighborhood and their lives. Added to this are the results of the community survey, which illustrated a very strong preference for preservation of the old building and all that it represents. All of these indicators point to the fact that the community would be much happier and satisfied with a renovated facility as opposed to a new one.

5. I. Assessment of Options.

Neither of the two options under consideration, new or renovated, present much difference in projected impacts in the first two impact categories. In terms of the population and demographic features of the neighborhood, neither option would appear to have a marked effect either positively or negatively. If the availability of a school is of consideration for people when they consider relocation, it is generally the actual location of the school and the quality of its programming which are the salient points, not whether it is new or renovated. It is therefore doubtful that a school, either new or renovated would have much effect on the actual population levels or demographic makeup of the neighborhood.

¹⁶ It is the sentiment of the community, as evidenced in comments made at the public meeting and the survey of November 1998, and the belief of the Community Building Committee that a new gym could

Much the same can be said for the economic characteristics of the neighborhood. The existence of a school bears very little, if any, correlation to the economic status of the residents of the neighborhood in which it is situated. As mentioned previously, the economic fortunes of people are much more closely related to larger scale, macro-level factors such as interest rates and technological change as opposed to changes at the neighborhood level. Whether the school is renovated or brand new is not likely to affect the economic status, either positively or negatively, of those who live around it or make use of its services.

The issue of the school's relationship to community cohesion appears to be a win-win situation for the community. If a new school is built it is possible that it would contain features which could encourage community involvement and thereby add to the cohesiveness of the community. As mentioned, these could be features such as a larger gym and daycare facilities. By the same token, a renovated facility could also boost community cohesion if it included the larger gym and other features which could be made available for public use. As both circumstances would be of benefit to the community, it is difficult to envision a negative impact on the community's cohesiveness regardless of which option were pursued.

It is, of course, in the area of quality of life where the difference in the two options becomes readily apparent. Public sentiment is running against the new building option and strongly in favor of renovation, and given this, there is no doubt that there would be widespread dissatisfaction in the community should a new building be constructed. Indeed, sentiments are so strong among some members of the community that there is talk of organizing acts of civil disobedience should "the powers that be" not acknowledge the

desire for a renovated school.¹⁷ There can be no clearer indication than this that the erection of a new building would have a decidedly negative effect on the community.

5. J. Evaluation of Options.

The evaluation of the two options is probably best done from two perspectives: that of the financial requirements of the projects, as well as the effects on the quality of life of those affected. These perspectives are reflective of the content of the debate surrounding the issue; on the one hand are the bureaucracies involved which take a financial "bottom line" approach to the situation, and on the other hand is the community which is basing their position essentially on quality of life arguments.

The evaluation of the financial merits of the two options appears to be quite straightforward; based upon the cost estimates provided in the Building Condition and Utilization Report it would be less costly to build a new school rather than renovate the old. However, this situation is not as clear-cut as it may seem. There is no agreement between the Community Building Committee and the School Division that the cost estimates provided in the Report are accurate. It is the position of the Community Committee that the renovation cost estimates include estimates for work which is either not required at all, or which could be deferred to some later date. On the other side of the equation, the Community Committee has a fear that the amount of money budgeted for a new school is too low. This fear is not without merit as the Committee points to the recent construction (1999) of the new Montrose School, a project which ran substantially over its estimated budget.¹⁸

¹⁷ Comments to this effect have been made to the author by many neighborhood residents and members of the Community Building Committee. This sentiment was also reflected in the discussion at the focus group.
¹⁸ Information received from the Chair of the Community Building Committee in the course of interview.

There is compelling evidence to question the merits of making a decision on which option to pursue in this situation based solely on the economics of the issue. As noted, the Community Building Committee has presented some forceful arguments which indicate that the cost of renovation could be substantially lowered, and that the cost of new construction could be underestimated. The presentation of this information and alternative recommendations has seriously challenged the accuracy of the Building Condition and Utilization Report figures. As the funding for renovation work is predicated on the cost of new construction via the P3FB funding formula, any doubt cast on the accuracy of the new construction cost automatically questions the accuracy of the figure arrived at for funding renovations. This situation indicates that making a decision on the issue based solely on cost estimates would be a questionable process.

Evaluation of the two options from the perspective of quality of life issues is somewhat easier than from the financial perspective in the sense that there is at least one clear position to evaluate here. The community is unequivocal in its desire for a renovated school and is not interested in a new school at all. It is abundantly clear from the evidence presented that many in the community feel a real attachment to the old school and that it represents and symbolizes many of the positive aspects of their neighborhood. There is no such attachment or sentiment evidenced for a new building, and indeed many refer to a new building as a potential blight and eyesore. Based upon the evidence collected in the course of the research and presented in this study, there is no doubt that were a decision to be made solely on quality of life criteria, the renovation option would be selected without reservation.

CHAPTER 6. CONCLUSIONS

The attempt to conduct a social impact assessment case study linking theory and practice has been an enlightening exercise. There were several lessons learned in the course of conducting the study which might illustrate the usefulness of SIA in an urban planning context. These lessons fall into two general categories; firstly, those lessons which arise directly from the case study itself in terms of what criteria are required in order to conduct a proper SIA, and secondly, the broader contextual links which can be drawn between social impact assessment and planning issues, specifically how School Divisions handle situations such as Wolseley School. The first point regarding the criteria required for a proper SIA, will be addressed in a form of self-critique of the case study effort, as this is an effective method for drawing conclusions and illustrating lessons learned.

6. A. The Case Study.

Perhaps the most obvious shortcoming of the Wolseley School case study is the lack of a participatory component to the project. This was due to the fact that the issue was well engaged by the time the case study was launched. The study was launched in March of 2000, almost exactly three years after the issue first arose in the community. By the time the case study was ready to proceed, the community had already established its committee of representatives, conducted a certain amount of research, and engaged in public awareness activities. The pre-existence of these actions and activities afforded little opportunity in terms of conducting activities which would have encouraged additional public participation. Indeed, it is entirely possible that the commencement of additional public participation oriented activities at this time could have confused and complicated the issue.

Under ideal circumstances, an SIA would have commenced at the time the issue first arose in the community. At that time SIA methods could have been utilized in several ways

to assist the community in their process of discovery and decision-making. In keeping with the theme of participation, it may have been possible to assemble a larger committee which could have conducted more systematic research into what the sentiments of the community were regarding the old school, as well as collected ideas on possible alternatives. It is possible that this information collection could have been accomplished using public involvement techniques such as focus groups and workshops, thereby drawing the larger community into the process. This form of involvement would also have been ideal for the identification of the potential impacts of the two options the community was faced with, as well as the planning of mitigation strategies should a worst-case scenario occur.

Steps were taken in the course of the case study in an attempt to compensate for the lack of opportunity for utilizing the SIA as a means of encouraging and organizing public participation. An effort was made to interview those connected to the project in order to discover if there were indeed various "publics" with varied interests in the issue, and to clarify the responsibilities and positions of the various bureaucracies involved. The interview format allows for the collection of first hand information as well as the recording of personal observations, sentiments and reflections of the person being interviewed. The inclusion of interview results therefore can contribute to a study which is much richer in texture and incorporating a greater depth of understanding of the issue.

The conduct of a focus group interview was another attempt at overcoming the participatory shortcoming of the case study. Focus groups provide a forum where members of the public can offer their opinions and ideas on an issue, thereby offering the researcher the opportunity to collect new information and verify old. The opportunity for the collection of new information and verification of the old was important to the case study, as the process at Wolseley School was an extremely protracted one and it was important to

determine if there had been any shifts in public opinion on the matter. A focus group is a very useful tool in a situation such as this because it provides a form of public involvement without interfering with a process which is already well engaged.

6. B. SIA and Planning: Lessons Learned.

There are certain observations which can be made about social impact assessment and school planning issues based on the experience of the case study. These observations are perhaps best presented in the context of the existing process utilized by the School Division in situations such as Wolseley School. An overview of the process engaged in by the Wolseley community and the School Division indicates that there is some degree of falling with the established process. Areas of concern with the process include the number of steps involved as well as the number of bodies, the limited opportunity for community input, and the difficulty in presenting qualitative factors for consideration.

The School Division Process.

The experience of the Community Building Committee was that the eleven step process established by the Division is overly complex and lacks clarity.¹⁹ Included in the process are the Public Schools Finance Board, the Division's Building and Transportation Committee and Building Committee, the Board of Trustees for the Division and the Minister of Education. The difficulty with this many bodies is that each has its own set of interests, agendas, and criteria to be met. This requires a great deal of effort on the part of those engaged in the process, as not only is there a good deal of preparation involved for the various meetings, but patience is also required as weeks or months can pass between the various steps. From the perspective of the community the result of this situation is that the process appears to be a never ending series of hoops to jump through and obstacles to

¹⁹ Information gathered as participant in Building Committee meetings and interviews with Committee Chair, 04/15/00 05/11/00

overcome. The sense the community is left with is that the multiple steps in the process are a deterrent to public participation and input as opposed to encouragement.²⁰

Next to the issue of the protracted nature of the process is the question of where and how the affected community can engage the process. The only official opportunity for community input into the process is via the Building Committees which the Division eventually establishes in these situations.²¹ However, it is important to note that in the official process these committees are not struck until the Minister of Education has authorized the project to proceed. What this means in effect is that the community is not invited to the table until all the major decisions concerning the project have been made, since much of the important debate and decision-making takes place earlier in the process. In the situation with Wolseley School this would have restricted community involvement to dealing with whatever project the Division decided for the School. The Community would not have had the opportunity to participate in the debate surrounding the choice of the project, which was the key issue in the situation, had the Division's process been followed to the letter.

Related to the issue of where the community can enter the process is the question of what factors are considered relevant to the debate. The Division and the PSFB were concerned with matters of financial prudence and the "bottom line" for the project whereas the Community was speaking in terms of neighborhood character and the school's aesthetic contribution to the neighborhood. One of the most obvious problems with the established process is that there is very little opportunity for the effective presentation of qualitative factors. The process is centered on discussion of the Building Condition and Utilization Report which is entirely based on technical considerations and their attendant cost estimates.

²⁰ Information received as participant on Community Building Committee meetings and from interviews with Committee Chair, 04/15/00, 05/11/00.

thereby focusing the debate on quantitative and monetary factors. The established process therefore leaves the community in the situation of having to struggle to bring qualitative factors into the debate, as well as responding to the financial and technical issues in the Building Condition and Utilization Report.

6. C. Recommendations.

It is possible that the inclusion of Social Impact Assessment methods into the School Division's process could rectify these shortcomings. Perhaps the most direct method for accomplishing this would be to alter the role of the "Building Committees" in the process. This would be a logical starting point as these Committees already exist and have a mandate to invite public participation. It would be possible to alter the form and content of these Committees such that they could in effect become the Social Impact Assessment Committees for the School Division in cases such as these.

Perhaps the first area of adjustment to consider for the Committees would be their content. Currently, the composition of the Committee is restricted to representation only; they are composed of some community people and teachers and the relevant Division staff. In order to be truly effective in a social impact assessment capacity, the composition of the Committees would have to include all those who are affected by the project or have an interest in it. This would require a much more open and inclusive committee structure, especially in regards to community membership. Membership in the Committee would have to be open to all those who wish to have input into the project and not be restricted to a select few who are chosen by an administrative body.

However, merely changing the composition of the Committees is not enough; the mandate and role of the Committees would have to be altered as well. In order to function as

²² Interview with Superintendent of Schools for the Central Region, 04/25/00

social impact assessment committees, they would have to be transformed from their current status as discussion based advisory groups to having some measure of power and authority in the process. Specifically, this would mean: the authority to conduct independent studies with the ability to determine the content of the study; the authority to conduct public meetings and other forms of public participation exercises; and free and open access to the School Division administration. Essentially, the mandate of the Committees would have to be expanded to the point where they are the central body for the collection and analysis of information and the forum for any ensuing debate and discussion on the matter.

The final adjustment which could be made to the Committees is the timing of their installation. This should be done at the earliest point in the process, ideally at that point in time where it is clear that some form of project is required in a particular situation. The Committee should be established early enough in the process so that members have adequate time to plan the investigation required for the project, as well as plan for public participation activities. The establishment of the Committee at the outset of the process allows members time to determine such crucial issues as what factors are to be considered for study, and what degree of consideration or value they are to be accorded. Essentially what is being suggested here is that if the Committees are to be effective in what they do, then they need time to do it. Therefore it is imperative that they be established early in the process so they have as much time as possible to conduct their activities.

The implementation of these suggestions based on social impact assessment methods could go a long way towards improving the School Division's current planning process. The current process is overly complex and protracted, something which could be alleviated by the creation of an expanded Building Committee which would be the locus of debate and decision making. Rather than having numerous committees meeting on different

schedules and with different agendas, it would be possible to centralize the debate on the issue into a single committee. There are several advantages to doing this, the most obvious being a reduction in the level of confusion with the process as the number of committees and meetings would be drastically reduced. A second advantage would be the fact that a single committee would put all those who are interested and responsible into the same room at the same time. This would result in an increase in efficiency as less time would be lost arranging meetings and transferring information from one person to another or one committee to another.

The establishment of the expanded Building Committee would have other benefits to the School Division's planning efforts as well. The limited community access to the existing process is of grave concern for those who wish to have input into it. The implementation of an expanded Building Committee would address this shortcoming in the process by providing a structure which was accessible and open to all. The expanded Committee would ensure that all those who are interested would have a place to go to voice their concerns and ideas, as well as a mechanism by which they could participate in the development of the project itself. This situation would ensure that the Division heard from all those concerned in some type of organized fashion, and would also provide a forum from which the Division could receive feedback on their proposals, gather new ideas and explore alternatives.

There is another area in which the adoption of SIA methods would be of benefit to the School Division's planning efforts, and that is in the realm of the social factors involved in the issue. Currently, the Division and its staff appear to be very good on quantitative factors such as project costs and student enrollments, but very weak on qualitative factors such as the reasons for a neighborhoods attachment to its school. The adoption of the

expanded Building Committee would do much to shift this imbalance, as it would provide a venue for the serious consideration of qualitative matters. The Committee would be able to provide the Division with a much clearer sense of what the qualitative concerns and interests of the affected population were. More than this, however, is the probability that the Committee would become the place where discussion of these concerns would lead to a resolution of the problem or an acceptable mitigation plan.

Conclusion.

The intention of the practicum was to explore the role of social impact assessment in urban planning. The role of SIA in planning issues was tested by the application of a social impact assessment to a local issue, that of the Wolseley School. The most basic conclusion which can be drawn is that SIA is indeed useful for addressing planning issues. The conduct of an SIA on the Wolseley School situation illustrated the usefulness of social impact assessment, especially in terms of its ability to bring qualitative matters to the forefront. The Division's research efforts are commendable, however, they are limited in situations such as this because they are focused on technical, quantitative matters. The limitations of a technical, dollars and cents approach is clearly demonstrated in the Wolseley School debate; the Division was talking money, the Community was talking quality of life factors and therein lay the roots of the conflict. Had the Division activated some form of social impact assessment as part of their investigative process, it is quite possible that they would have become aware of the depth of the community's attachment to the old school and the entire process would have taken a different tack.

The benefits of social impact assessment were evident in another fashion as well, and that was in providing a means of critiquing the School Division's decision making process. The methodology of social impact assessment, especially its focus on listening to

the people affected, proved to be very useful in developing an awareness of the limitations of the existing process. The conduct of the SIA case study therefore revealed a number of weaknesses in the Division's process for handling situations such as Wolseley. The application of SIA principles and methods, combined with information gathered in the course of the case study, allowed for the existing process to be reviewed with an eye towards making the process more open, inclusive, and responsible.

This critique of the process based on SIA principles allowed for the development of recommendations which would see the inclusion of social impact assessment into the School Division's review and decision making process. The development of the recommendations drew upon several principles inherent in SIA such as the necessity for the inclusion of all those potentially affected by the project, the need for those participating to be empowered by the process rather than marginalized, and the importance of starting early enough in the process so that in-depth investigation and informed discussion can take place. These elements, which are readily contained within SIA, can be considered to be a necessary part of contemporary planning practice, a further illustration of the "fit" between SIA and urban planning.

REFERENCES:

- Alexander, Donald and Sharilyn Calliou. *Planner as Educator: A Vision of a New Practitioner Plan Canada* 31.6 November 1991 pp. 38-44.
- Beauregard, Robert A. Bringing the City Back In *Journal of the American Planning Association* Spring 1990 pp. 210-214.
- Becker, Henk A. *Social impact assessment: method and experience in Europe, North America and the Developing World* UCL Press, 1997.
- Blakely, Edward J. *Planning Local Economic Development, Theory and Practice*, 2nd Ed. Sage Publications 1994.
- Burdge, R. J. Peter Fricke, Kurt Finsterbusch, William R. Freudenberg, Robert Gramling, Arnold Holden, Lynn Llewellyn, John S. Petterson, James Thompson, Gary Williams. Guidelines and Principles for Social Impact Assessment. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 1995; 15:11-43.
- Burdge, Rabel J. and Robert A. Robertson. Social Impact Assessment and the Public Involvement Process. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 1990; 10:81-90.
- Burdge, R. J. The Social Impact Assessment Model in the Planning Process. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 7. 1987 141-50.
- Burdge, Rabel J. and Frank Vanclay. Social Impact Assessment: A Contribution to the State of the Art Series. *Impact Assessment* Volume 14 March 1996 pp. 59-85.
- Burningham, K. Attitudes, Accounts and Impact Assessment. *Sociological Review* 43 1. 1995 pp. 100-122.
- Canadian Environmental Assessment Research Council. *Social Impact Assessment: A Research Prospectus*. CEARC, Ottawa 1986.
- Canan, Penelope and Hennessy, Michael. Education in Social Impact Assessment and Planning. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 4 3 1985 pp. 157-163.
- Carley, Michael J. In Finsterbusch, Llewellyn and Wolf. *Social Impact Assessment Methods* Sage publications 1983.
- Carley, Michael J. Eduardo S. Bustelo. *Social Impact Assessment and Monitoring: A guide to the Literature*. Westview Press, 1984.
- Carley, Michael J., Ellen Odiorne Derow. *Social Impact Assessment: A Cross Disciplinary Guide to the Literature*. Policy Studies Institute, 1980.
- Carniol, Ben, Nelson Gutnick and Joan Ryan. In Tester and Mykes. *Social Impact Assessment: Theory, Method and Practice*. University of Calgary 1981.
- Carter, Nova. SIA: Old Wine in New Bottles in Tester and Mykes *Social Impact Assessment: Theory Method and Practice* Detselig Enterprises Ltd. Calgary 1978.
- Checkoway, Barry. Paul Davidoff and Advocacy Planning in Retrospect *American Planning Association Journal* Spring 1994 pp. 139-142.

Craig, Donna. Social Impact Assessment: Politically Oriented Approaches and Applications. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 1990; 10:37-54.

Dale, Allen P. and Marcus B. Lane. Strategic Perspectives Analyses: A Procedure for Participatory and Political Social Impact Assessment. *Society and Natural Resources* volume 7, pp. 253-267 1994.

Dale, Allen P. Peter Chapman and Morag L. McDonald. Social Impact Assessment in Queensland: Why Practice Lags Behind Legislative Opportunity. *Impact Assessment* Volume 15, March 1997 pp. 159-179.

Dandekar, Hernalata. Some uses and potentials of qualitative methods in planning. *The Journal of Planning Education and Research* 6. 1. 1986 pp. 42-49.

Dandekar, H C ed. *The Planners Use of Information: Techniques for Collection, Organization, and Communication*. Stroudsburg, Pa. Hutchinson Press. 1982.

Dietz, Thomas and C. Mark Dunning. In Finsterbusch Llewellyn and Wolf 1983.

Disanto, Joseph E. James Frederes, Usher Fleising and Sheldon Goldenberg. In Tester and Mykes *Social Impact Assessment: Theory Method and Practice* Detselig Enterprises Ltd. Calgary 1976.

Finsterbusch, K. In Finsterbusch, Llewellyn and Wolf. *Social Impact Assessment Methods* Sage Publications 1983.

Finsterbusch, K. In Finsterbusch, and Wolf, *Methodology of Social Impact Assessment* Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross Inc. 1977.

Finsterbusch, K, Lynn G. Llewellyn, C. P. Wolf Eds. *Social Impact Assessment Methods* Sage publications, 1983 Beverly Hills.

Flynn, Cynthia B. et al. In Finsterbusch Llewellyn and Wolf *Social Impact Assessment Methods* 1983.

Forester, John. *Planning in the Face of Power*. University of California Press 1989.

Forester, John. Critical theory and planning practice. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 46 3 July 1980 pp. 275-286.

Friedmann, John. *Planning in the Public Domain: From Knowledge to Action*. Princeton University Press 1987.

Gaber, John and Sharon L. Gaber. Utilizing Mixed Method Research Designs in Planning: The Case of 14th Street in New York City. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 17 1997 pp. 95-109.

Gaber, John. Reasserting the importance of qualitative methods in planning. *Landscape and Urban Planning* 26. 1993 pp. 137-148.

Gerecke, Kent and Barton Reid. Planning, Power and Ethics. *Plan Canada*, 31:6 November 1991 pp. 59-74

- Heder, Lajos and Mark Francis. In Finsterbusch and Wolf *Methodology of Social Impact Assessment* 1977.
- Hodge, Gerald *Planning Canadian Communities* 2nd. Ed. Nelson Canada 1991.
- Innes, Judith E. Information in Communicative Planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 64, 1, 1998 pp. 52-63.
- Levin, Jack and James Allen Fox. *Elementary Statistics in Social Research* Harper Collins, 1991.
- Kirby, Sandra and Kate McKenna. *Experience, Research, Social Change: Methods From the Margins* Garamond Press 1989.
- Klosterman, Richard. Facts and Values in Planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 49, 1983 pp. 216-225.
- Klosterman, Richard. A Public Interest Criterion. *APA Journal* July 1980 pp. 323-333.
- Klosterman, Richard. *Community Analysis and Planning Techniques* Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc. 1990.
- Lane, Marcus B. Helen Ross, Allan P. Dale. Social Impact Assessment: Integrating the Technical, Political and Planning Paradigms. *Human Organization*. 56, 3 1997 pp. 302-10.
- Lawrence, David P. The Characteristics and Aims of Environmental Impact Assessment. *Plan Canada* March, 1994 pp. 6-10.
- Lerner, Sally C. SIA in an Era of Relative Scarcities in Tester and Mykes *Social Impact Assessment: Theory, Methods and Practice*. Detselig Enterprises Ltd. Calgary 1978.
- Levin, Jack and James Allen Fox. *Elementary Statistics in Social Research* Harper Collins 1991
- Litchfield, N. *Community Impact Evaluation*. UCL London 1996.
- Madsen, Rojean. Use of Evaluation Research Methods in Planning and Policy Contexts. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*. 2 2 1983. pp. 115-121.
- Meidinger, E. and Schmailberg, A. Social Impact Assessment as Evaluation Research: Claimants and Claims. *Evaluation Review*. 4 4 August, 1980. pp. 507-535.
- Morgan, David L. *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research* 2nd. Ed. Sage Publications 1997.
- Neuman, Lawrence W. *Social Research Methods Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* Allyn and Bacon 1997.
- Peattie, Lisa. Realistic Planning and Qualitative Research. *Habitat Int* 7 no. 5-6 1983 pp. 227-234.
- Public Schools Finance Board. Capital Support Program Manitoba Education and Training 1998.

Public Schools Finance Board. Revised Funding Guidelines. Manitoba Education and Training. 1999.

Public Schools Finance Board. School Building Space Guidelines. Manitoba Education and Training. 1999.

Rees, William and Mark Roseland. Sustainable Communities: Planning for the 21st Century *Plan Canada* 31.3 pp. 15-25 May 1991.

Rickson, Roy E. John S. Western and Rabel J. Burdge. Social Impact Assessment: Knowledge and Development. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review* 1990; 10:1-10

Runyan, D. Tools for community managed impact assessment. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*. 43. 2 1977 pp. 125-135.

Sassone, Peter G. in Finsterbusch and Wolf *Methodology of Social Impact Assessment* 1977.

Savatsky, Pamela Dee and Elva Dianne Freilich. In Finsterbusch and Wolf 1977. *Methodology of Social Impact Assessment*

Soderstrom, E. J. *Social Impact Assessment: Experimental Methods and Approaches* Praeger Publishers, New York. 1981.

Stanley and Wise in Kirby and McKenna *Experience, Research, Social Change: Methods from the Margins* Garamond Press 1989.

Tester, F. J. and Mykes, W. *Social Impact Assessment: Theory, Method and Practice*. Detselig Enterprises Ltd., Calgary. 1978.

Wallace, Ruth A. and Alison Wolf *Contemporary Sociological Theory* Prentice Hall 1991.

Warner, Katherine P. Public Involvement as Planning Communication in Dandekar 1982 *The Planners Use of Information*

Wildman, Paul. Methodological and Social Policy Issues in Social Impact Assessment. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 1990; 10:69-79

Willeke, Gene. In Finsterbusch and Wolf *Methods of Social Impact Assessment* 1977.

Winnipeg School Division Number One. 1997-1998 School Demographics Report

Winnipeg School Division Number One. Building Condition and Utilization Report (re. Wolseley School) May 1998.

Winnipeg School Division Building and Transportation Committee Report #1, February 1999.

Wolf, C. P. in Finsterbusch, Llewellyn and Wolf. *Social Impact Assessment Methods* Sage Publications 1983.

Appendix 1.

Walsley Community Building Committee Survey Summary.

67 responses received after distribution at the public meeting of November 1998.

Question 1. What do you like about the existing building?

Responses:

Heritage look/character/architecture. 46
Large windows. 34
Hardwood floors. 32
Wide hallways. 26
Location (sited on hill) 19
Big field (greenspace). 17
Sense of history and age. 15
Single story structure (scale). 11
Sense of neighborhood. 9

Total: 209 responses.

Question 2. Is there anything you don't like about the present building?

Responses:

Gym inadequate. 41
Poor temperature control/air circulation. 25
Computer facilities inadequate. 16
Library inadequate. 10
Poor layout. 6
Inadequate storage. 5
Needs repairs. 4
Small classrooms. 3
Inadequate resource area. 3
Poor windows. 5

Total: 118 responses.

Question 3. If the school is replaced can you think of any features or qualities that are important to you?

Responses:

Windows/natural light. 27
Brick and stone exterior/facade/appearance. 26
Larger gym. 24
Maintenance of green space/siting. 19
Climate control/energy efficiency. 12
Computer lab. 11
Wide hallways. 10
Enhanced library facilities. 7
Safety features; i.e. more exits, sprinklers etc. 4
Storage space. 2

Total: 112 responses.

Question 4. If the school is renovated can you think of any features or qualities that are important to you?

Responses:

New gym. 37

Climate control/energy efficiency/ventilation. 22
Upgraded windows. 19
Retention of facade/appearance. 17
New computer room. 11
Make required repairs e.g. roof, underpinning, heating/cooling systems etc. 10
Storage space. 3

Total: 119 responses.

Question 5. If the community supports a renovated school, do you think the community should find sources of revenue to cover some costs?

Yes: 17

No: 20

Maybe: 23

Comments:

Pay enough taxes. 10

Division should pay. 6

School has been neglected by those responsible; not communities fault. 6

Community could fund one aspect of the renovation e.g. windows. 6

Opportunity for community cooperation. 4

Grants should be available e.g. heritage. 5

Province should contribute. 3

Question 6. Do you have a child or children in the school this year (fall 1996)?

Yes. 38 (58.5%)

No. 27 (41.5%)

Total: 65 responses.

Question 7. With the information you have right now, please check one of the following two choices:

Renovated: 57 (86.4%)

Replaced: 7 (10.6%)

Undecided or other: 2 (3%)

Total: 66 responses.

Of the 27 respondents who indicated they did not have children attending the school, 25 were in agreement with renovation, 1 said no, and 1 was undecided.

Summary of results:

Ques. 1. It is clear that aesthetic considerations are the major attraction of the existing school. All of the responses to question one refer to issues of siting, greenspace, architectural features, and sense of neighborhood, history and place, giving a clear indication that the school is highly valued by the respondents for its aesthetic contribution to the neighborhood.

Ques. 2. Equally clear are the responses to question two in terms of their reference to deficiencies in the facility itself, in particular the inadequacies of the existing gym and the shortcomings of the heating/ventilating system. While the school may be loved aesthetically, it is clear that it has many deficiencies as a learning facility.

- Ques. 3. Question three is reflective of the respondents concerns with the aesthetic values of the existing structure, as issues of retention of original character and charm head the wish list for a new school. However, the desire for retention of character is combined with a clearly indicated need for an upgraded facility incorporating such necessities as a new gym, library and resource areas, and modern climate control mechanisms.
- Ques. 4. The responses to question 4 illustrate where the respondents concerns lie in terms of what is required to bring the existing structure up to contemporary standards. A new gym heads the list, followed by improved heating and ventilation systems, upgrading the old windows, and making the necessary repairs to the structure and its facade.
- Ques. 5. Responses to question 5 are interesting in the sense that there is no decisive preference illustrated, as the responses to the Yes, No and Maybe choices are all very close. However, a review of the comments volunteered as part of the response indicates a clear preference for state funding, and state responsibility for the project in some form or another.
- Ques. 6. Question 6 is revealing in the sense that it indicates a strong interest in the school issue not only from those who have a vested interest in the school because their children attend, but also from the larger community. This interest is illustrated by the fact that of the 27 respondents (38% of the total responses received) who indicated they did not have children attending the school at this time, 25 responded that they were in favor of renovation.
- Ques. 7. This is one question where there is no room for speculation and inference; renovation wins hands down over a new facility by some 85%.

Conclusions based on survey results:

The survey indicates a clear preference for renovation of the existing structure based primarily on aesthetic considerations. Responses to questions one and three bear this out as much reference is made to character, amenities and architectural detail. However, attached to this desire for preservation of the existing character of the school is a pressing need to upgrade the facility so it is more efficient, comfortable, and therefore conducive to learning. This is particularly evident in the responses to questions two and four where the issues of the inadequate gym and the outdated heating and ventilation systems are constantly mentioned.

In regards to responsibility for the issue in terms of who should fund the project the responses to question 5 indicate some degree of ambiguity and contradiction. As mentioned there is no clear preference indicated in terms of the responses to the Yes, No, or Maybe section of the question. This lack of clarity may be attributed to the fact that the question was perhaps too open ended in the sense that "sources of revenue" may be interpreted to mean many different things. This is born out by a review of the comments section of the question where suggestions for fundraising ranged from submitting grant applications to organizing community socials. This variety of comments indicates that respondents had widely diverging interpretations of what constituted "sources of revenue". There is however, an interesting aspect to this part of question 5 and that is the number of respondents who replied with a "Maybe". Of the 60 responses to this question, 23 or 38% responded with "Maybe", giving rise to speculation that the potential for fundraising for

the project could be higher than indicated if the means of fundraising appealed to this 38% of undecided respondents.

Referring again to the comments section of question 5, there is a clear indication that many of the respondents felt that responsibility for the issue lie with the government in some fashion, and therefore they should fund the project. This desire is reflected in the comments made, as many respondents referred to the amount of taxes they already pay, or to school board or school division financial responsibility. While it is not readily apparent from the responses precisely which governmental department or administrative body should fund the project, it is clear from the comments that the prevailing sentiment is that some form of state financial responsibility is expected.

Appendix 2.

List of Documents Reviewed.

- New/renovated facility assessment and award process (WSD #1).
- Notice of intent re: Wolseley School (WSD #1.)
- Listing of actions taken in the course of the process. (Community Building Committee)
- Buildings and Transportation Committee Agenda, Thursday March 25, 1999.
- Wolseley Elementary School Facility Assessment Report May 1998. (WSD #1.)
- WSD # 1. Building Committee Agenda, June 2, 1998.
- A history of the "structurally sound" issue. (Community Building Committee)
- Copy of letter from Public Schools Finance Board to Director of Buildings for WSD # 1. re: issue of structural soundness (October 6, 1999).
- Wolseley Building Committee report on community meeting and survey (January 1999).
- Building and Transportation Committee report No. 4-97 raising issue of Wolseley School (April 29, 1997).
- Building and Transportation Committee Report No. 1-98 re: investigation into issue launched by Public Schools Finance Board (January 20, 1998).
- Building and Transportation Committee Report No. 1-99 re: supporting in principle the renovation of the school (February 18, 1999).
- Building and Transportation Committee Report No. 2-99 re: funding shortfall for renovation project (March 25, 1999).
- Building and Transportation Committee Report No. 6-99 re: structurally sound issue (October 6, 1999)
- Building and Transportation Committee Report No. 2-2000 re: Community Building Committee members attending Public Schools Finance Board meeting with WSD Trustees (April 18 2000).
- Copy of letter from Chief Superintendent to members of the Building and Transportation Committee re: funding shortfall for renovation project (March 25 1999).
- Document describing the process for selection of architectural firms (WSD # 1. February 1999).
- Letter from WSD # 1 Director of Buildings to Superintendent of Central Region re: feasibility of deferral of certain items (April 12, 1999).
- Letter from engineering firm to Contract Administrator for WSD # 1 re: feasibility of deferral of certain items (April 5, 1999).
- Letter from WSD # 1 to engineering firm requesting definition of structural soundness (July 22, 1999).

- Letter from Public Schools Finance Board to WSD # 1 Director of Buildings with definition of structural soundness (October 6, 1999).
- Document describing the situation at Wolseley School including history and funding issues (Community Building Committee)
- Agenda for Community Building Committee meeting July, 1997.
- WSD # 1 Buildings and Transportation Committee agenda Thursday May 29, 1997.
- Minutes of Community Building Committee meeting October 1, 1997.
- Letter from Chair of WSD # 1 Trustees to Community Building Committee inviting participation on the WSD's Building Committee (August 12, 1997).
- Letter from Chair of WSD # 1 Trustees advising formation of WSD's Building Committee is on hold pending Ministerial approval of the project (September 4, 1997).
- Notes from community meeting of June 12 1997 prepared by Community Building Committee.
- Notes from community meeting of November 23 1998, prepared by Community Building Committee.
- Minutes of Community Building Committee meeting May 13 1998.
- Opinion paper re. Engineers report contained in Facilities Assessment Report, prepared by Community Building Committee.
- Letter from engineering firm responding to opinion paper, November 10, 1998.
- Wolseley School staff meeting minutes, October 6 1998.
- Letter from City of Winnipeg Community Services Department to Wolseley Residents Association advising as to possibility of inclusion of Wolseley School onto Buildings Conservation List (January 22, 1997).
- History of Wolseley School prepared by City of Winnipeg Community Services Department.

Appendix 3.

Interview Questions.

1. My understanding is that the issue facing the Wolseley School is the question of whether it should be rebuilt or renovated. Is that correct?
2. Can you briefly describe for me how you view the situation with the school?
3. What is your (and/or your organizations) role in the issue?
4. What is your (and/or your organizations) position on the issue?
5. What do you think are the factors which need to be considered in the situation? e.g. needs of the students, needs of the teaching staff, costs, neighborhood desires, etc.
6. What do you (or your organization) consider to be the most important factors?
7. What conflicts, if any, do you see in the issue?
8. How would you propose to resolve these conflicts?
9. In your opinion, what is the best process for resolution of the conflicts?
10. What do you foresee as impacts for the community under each alternative?
11. Do you have any studies, reports or other information which I can use in my research?

Appendix 4.

Focus Group Questions:

Directed questions to focus the discussion:

1. What do you think the effects on the community would be if a new school be built?
2. What do think the effects would be if the school were renovated?

Sample of responses:

- New school would be loss of character for the neighborhood; it would not "fit" in with the neighborhoods' character.

-Schools are landmarks for the neighborhood.

-Neighborhood is walkable and landmarks are part of this.

-Old school is symbol of community identity; old look could be what attracts people to older neighborhood.

-Renovation sends positive message of reuse and recycling.

-Neighborhood is very diverse and heterogeneous which is part of its attraction; this is part of why people choose to live here.

-Community would possibly physically participate in renovating the old school; could become method of encouraging community.

Appendix 5.

Timeline/Sequence of Events:

March 97: School Division announces plans to replace school.

June 97: First public meeting held.

October 97: Community Building Committee formalized (as separate from the School Parent Council)

May 98: Building Condition and Utilization report issued.

June 98: Division's Building Committee struck.

November 98: Second public meeting held and community survey conducted: message is clear; no replacement wanted.

January 99: Division's Building Committee recommendation to Division's Building and Transportation Committee is to renovate.

February 99: Building and Transportation Committee recommends renovation-with-addition to Board of Trustees.

*** Decision making process was delayed from February 99 until October 99 pending definition of "structurally sound" and its relationship to funding formulae.

February 00: Board of Trustees recommends renovation-with-addition to the PSFB.

May 00: Notice of intent to this effect is sent to PSFB by Board of Trustees.

Current: Issue under investigation by PSFB.

Map One

