GROWING BRIDGES: COMMUNITY GARDENS AND CIVIC GOVERNMENTS (A SYNOPSIS)

By

ALEX CHISHOLM

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

In

LEADERSHIP

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

……..
Devorah Kahn, BScN, Project Sponsor

……
Michael Keller, MT, MA, Project Supervisor

……...
P. Gerry Nixon, PhD, Committee Chair

ROYAL ROADS UNIVERSITY
December 2008

© Alex Chisholm, 2008

THESIS SYNOPSIS

Focus and Framing

Community gardens and other forms of urban agriculture have an important, though still somewhat undervalued role to play in the urban environment. Nonetheless, awareness of the environmental, recreational, social development and food security benefits is generating a growing acceptance of community gardens and other forms of urban agriculture. However, despite the growing interest in modern community gardens, there are still many obstacles and barriers to its progress. Streamlining government procedures, building community and organizational capacity, securing land and funding, and other impediments are important challenges facing the future of community gardens. Inspired gardeners still accrue on growing waiting lists for a limited number of available garden plots, land remains underutilized or feral, and opportunities for food security, recreation, and community building are missed.

In order to stimulate the growth of new community garden developments, community organizers and other key stakeholders are rallying to find solutions. Some of these community organizers believe that some type of umbrella or intermediary group needs to be created in order to solve the problem of too few gardens being built. Creating an umbrella organization that can bridge the civic system with garden organizers is being considered as a solution by some groups.

An umbrella organization that advocates and negotiates for land access and favourable government policies on behalf of growers could be an effective tool for increasing urban agriculture within the City of Vancouver. Acting as an intermediary, an umbrella organization could navigate the requirements of civic administrators and other land stewards on behalf of growers. This research project took on the challenge to engage community garden stakeholders in understanding how an umbrella organization in the City of Vancouver might work and how it might interface with the civic structures and systems. Specifically, the project, sponsored by Devorah Kahn with the City of Vancouver's Social Policy unit, engaged in an action research project to examine civic systems and the intermediary socio-political functions an umbrella garden organization could perform to increase agriculture in the City of Vancouver.

Although an umbrella organization holds promise for community gardeners, this research also identified other options for overcoming key barriers to creating community gardens by identifying alternate governance models, mechanisms, or practices that would encourage new garden building. As well, the research investigated the rationales and benefits for supporting and promoting an increase in UA and community gardening. Finally, the research sought ways grassroots leadership and community capacity could be leveraged to build new gardens. Researching how this umbrella organization could act as an intermediary and identifying other mechanisms for building community gardens presents a valuable opportunity for the city, the gardening community, and the residents of Vancouver to reap the rewards of an increase in urban greening and agriculture.

Literature Review

Building new community gardens require considerable understanding of the benefits that stimulate urban agriculture development, how to generate community capacity, and ways to govern these kinds of initiatives. Chapter two of this project identified the available literature in these three main areas.

Topic one, the benefits of UA, looks at the reasons it is worth developing the various forms of UA and community gardens. Wide-scale UA can have an important positive effect on food security, economic health, preservation and development of green space, physical and recreational activities, reducing stress on overburdened storm-water sewer systems, moderating urban climates, purifying the air, building an engaged community, and beautifying neighbourhoods (Blair et al., 1991; Johnson, 2005; Kaethler, 2006; Lui, 2002; Mazereeuw, 2005; Mougeot, 2006; Smit, 2008; Strutynski, 2005). For example, in her study on rooftop gardens, Lui (2002) stated that, "if widely adopted, rooftop gardens can reduce the [city's] heat island, which would decrease smog episodes, problems associated with heat stress and further lower energy consumption" (¶ 2).

Topic two reveals a detailed description of methods and strategies for engaging community members to participate, volunteer, and take leadership in building and managing community gardens.

Finally, in topic three, various practices for promoting community gardens by other civic governments are explored. Crucial elements of this chapter are reiterated in the research findings, conclusions and recommendations, however, for a complete review of these topics obtain the unedited version of this thesis.

Conduct of the research

I solicited considerable collaboration and participation from a diverse stakeholder group through the practice of action research. Action research is an emergent process where change is attempted through a cooperative cycle of inquiry to solve a problem (Stringer, 2007, p. 9). In this process, the "researcher and client engage in collaborative cycles of planning, taking action and evaluating" (Coghlan & Brannick, 2005, p. 14).

Ultimately, the gardening community understands the garden community best. It is through their participation that this research gains its validity and relevance. In this way, the community gardening leaders or stakeholders became partners in the research process and helped direct each stage of the research planning, data collection, data analysis, and recommendations. The participants were identified because they all have considerable advanced knowledge of the intricacies involved in local urban agriculture governance practices and problems. They also brought a variety of contrasting and useful perspectives, while providing passion for the research topic.

There were three stages of community participation. These were, data collection design, data collection and data analysis. Six consultants helped design the data collection design which included the interview questionnaire design.

The data-gathering phase included six one-on-one interviews and one focus group. Both the interviews and the focus group used a combination of quantitative and qualitative questions. The quantitative questions were the same for the interviews and the focus group. Six qualitative questions plus sub-questions for the focus group were derived from 11 interview questions; this mirroring of questions helped facilitate a triangulation of the data.

In all there were 102 cumulative years of experience among the total of 9 participants for the interviews and focus group. They represented participation in 37 community gardens of various kinds. The interviews varied in length from half an hour to one and a half hours, producing seven and a half hours of recordings and over 120 pages of double-spaced transcripts. In all, the focus group produced 40 double-spaced pages of exceptionally insightful data.

The analysis procedure was a process of examining the data for patterns and themes, and then coding and sorting these themes into categories. There were more than 130 coded themes derived from 160 pages of data. Four community consultants helped with the analysis of the data and development of recommendations.

Findings and conclusions

A primary thrust of this research was intended to identify what function an umbrella organisation would perform to create more community gardens in Vancouver. However, in order to learn how an umbrella organization could be effective at building new community gardens, it was essential to understand what the barriers are to building new gardens, how an umbrella organization might overcome these barriers, and what mechanisms are beyond an umbrella organization's control. In the findings and conclusions of this research summary I focus on what elements would produce the most efficient umbrella organization as well as what the key barriers are to producing community gardens in Vancouver and ways to overcome them.

Barriers and overcoming them

The questions regarding barriers by far produced the strongest responses and the greatest amount of data in this research. Access to land was identified as the primary obstacle or barrier to overcome when building community gardens. Although there are many potential sources of land for community gardens, civically owned land is generally relied on more heavily than other sources (Herbach, 1998) and therefore was a focus of much of the data collection.

A majority of participants were concerned that there was not one clear central group or person to contact and coordinate with at the city level. Many participants found

it confusing to know which department they needed to work with to develop gardens. Although Montreal and Seattle have different governance models than does Vancouver, having a central coordinator with the ability to negotiate and coordinate with the diverse civic stakeholders has brought these cities advantages.

The participants also identified the lack of a clear central policy as a barrier to building new gardens. Among the solutions mentioned by the participants was to develop a unified citywide policy that covered all departments including parks, real estate, engineering and schools, and would clarify all the processes involved and the expectations for organizers.

Among the related policy solutions was a suggestion to develop criteria for approving land tenure. As Arnstein (1969) say's, the process needs to be made transparent. Another interesting solution discussed was the need to establish objectives for the number of gardens sought after on city land. A similar initiative was implemented in Seattle, where a plan called for one community garden development for every 2,500 households (MacNair, 2002).

Participants wanted improved communication between city departments. A desire for better communication between city departments and new garden organizers was also identified and they wanted better service coordination between and from various departments. To create the conditions that improve communication across departments, civic governments can support civic workers and garden organizers in a variety of ways. For example, to overcome similar issues Seattle's city council passed a resolution to formally support its gardening program, align related policies, and promote cooperation and collaboration across all departments (City of Seattle, 1992).

Participants felt discouraged by the barriers they experience. One significant barrier is the challenge of building community capacity. Many found the civic process difficult and lead to a loss of momentum and failure of community capacity building because volunteers often gave up. Therefore, they sought more encouragement and support at a civic level. One participant explained that the "bureaucratic hurdles are too high" at the civic level. Hartley (2005) tells us, people need to feel that they are having some success in order to carry on. What the participants reported is that many feel disempowered and discouraged by the process of securing civic land for community gardens. Hall (1996) confirmed that long delays in the development process discourages organizers, who then move on to more fruitful endeavors.

One key issue that was brought up in a number of guises by participants was resources and funding in general. The costs of gardens can be limiting, particularly in the start-up phase. According to Cosgrove (1998), departmental budgets in Toronto were aligned to encourage the development of new gardens. Departments with particular resources or expertise can provide services, supplies, or financial assistance. Help with insurance, start-up costs for non-profits, and assistance with publicity were specifically identified, but one could imagine delivery of soils, assistance with water hook-up and

drainage, building and maintenance of pathways, soil testing, and other forms of assistance and financing.

Alternative solutions included a significant interest among participants to lobby politicians for more support of community garden development and a number of participants suggested guerrilla gardening as a solution to land tenure barriers.

Finding an Umbrella Model

Among other questions related to an umbrella organization the participants were asked what the advantages and disadvantages of the following models were:

A) A central umbrella organization that "sponsors" and coordinates the development of all new community gardens.
B) A central umbrella organization that either directly coordinates and "sponsors" new community gardens, or supports others in developing new independently run community gardens.
C) A loose association of small umbrella like groups that "sponsor" and coordinate the development of community gardens.
D) A non-umbrella system or "other system".

Two major yet contradictory themes emerged from the data on this and other related questions. Simply put, the key contradiction is that a central umbrella model is good in that it would create efficiency and consistency, and at the same time, it would be bad because it was not flexible or diverse.

Community gardens in Vancouver are largely governed at a local level. The local non-profit society becomes responsible for most decisions about how the garden is designed and managed. This ability gives the society a considerable amount of freedom and diversity in the way the gardens develop. This freedom is prized by the gardeners, as can be evidenced by the strong rejection of a system that could possibly threaten it – that is, by model A, a central system that might restrict this freedom and diversity.

Furthermore, as outlined previously, gardeners are apprehensive of the civic government bureaucracy. A central organization that might increase or create a second level of bureaucracy becomes a threat. There was also evidence, according to some participants, that keeping governance local develops a more robust capacity among the organizers. In other words, being challenged to overcome obstacles and adversity on the way to building community gardens builds skills and resilience in the community (Lukasik, 2003). As well, the ongoing management of the gardens increases abilities and develops camaraderie among the leaders and members of the garden. The risk of losing these assets by giving over control to another organization, according to the participants, is clearly not worth the price of good central management.

On the other hand, an organized and efficient central organization would be useful for starting up gardens. Such an organization would have a better understanding of the bureaucratic structures involved in starting gardens and could be more effective at

establishing new gardens. As several participants described, the central umbrella would also be a one-stop shop, with one phone number and an efficient, streamlined, and coordinated organization. However, as one interviewee explained it, "The disadvantage of [model] C, and I suppose the relative advantage of [models] A and B, is that if the standardization is good, then it could be really good." The implication here is that if the standardization is bad, then it could be really bad. If the gardeners give over control to a central organization and the standardization is poor, then the gardens are in trouble. The other implication in this statement is that model C is at a disadvantage, presumably because it entails a loose organization and is probably relatively disorganized at a citywide level. There is no central phone number or Web site, and no clear and organized protocol. As other participants put it, it is "messy," "disorganized," and "fragmented." Therefore, the central organization can bring some benefits that the more diverse model may not – but again, not without risks.

A number of other risks may threaten a central umbrella organization as well. Participants identified takeover or appropriation, loss of institutional memory, overwhelm as a result of over-control, collapse, a drain on community garden energy, and the undermining of community capacity as significant risks. Not paying attention to these issues could be perilous.

Regarding the last risk mentioned participants showed considerable concern that a central umbrella organization would undermine the capacity of the gardens. One participant rejected any model of umbrella largely for this reason. Another participant said, "Each garden would be a weaker structure and therefore more prone to pests and bureaucrats and other invasive species." As McKnight (1995) explains, in modern society, individuals often relinquish ordinary obligations to 'experts' and forfeit their own skill development and competence as a result. Contrary to this modern trend, Yukl (2006) wrote that encouraging participation and involvement in organizations by creating opportunities to develop skills should help build future leadership and resiliency in organizations.

By taking the advice of McKnight (1995) and Yukl (2006) and building capacity at the local garden level, organizers can begin to counter some of the potential risks an umbrella organization might generate. If an umbrella were to support new community gardens to operate self-sufficiently, then virtually all the risks mentioned in the previous paragraph can be minimized. If an umbrella organization was to collapse or in some other way fail, the self-sufficient gardens would be able to carry on without critical failure.

The question arises that if an umbrella organization is operating as a central controlling organization, how can it support independence and capacity building among the local gardens at the same time. This paradox is rooted in the presumption that an umbrella organization would undermine the development of self-sufficiency and stability of the individual garden. Broadly speaking, if the primary objective of an umbrella organization moved from controlling gardens to developing local community capacity so the community can control its own gardens, an umbrella organization can unravel the paradox. The umbrella model can build diversity and flexibility to safeguard against

many of the risks inherent in an inflexible, narrowly defined, centrally controlled umbrella organization. In this way, the power and governance remain with the gardens and not with a second level of bureaucracy, as some participants feared.

The next question becomes how this type of umbrella model can build in the valuable parts of a central model without generating more bureaucracy and at the same time being inclusive of all the diversity and flexibility that gardeners prefer. A hybrid model identified during the focus group holds some insight to how this preceding question could be worked out. Essentially, one focus group participant changed the wording of model B slightly, to read as "a central umbrella organization that supports others in developing new, independently run community gardens." By removing the phrase "either directly sponsors and coordinates new community gardens, or" from the original, the new statement suddenly reflects a different set of objectives.

An umbrella organization that focuses on "supporting others" would be able to incorporate many of the elements participants raised as part of their preferred umbrella model. The main themes that emerged from a question on a preferred model, were being able to give greater or lesser support as needed and providing mentorship and guidance. Accomplishing these objectives would be a straightforward process of helping organizers when it is useful and encouraging the independence of other organizers. This form of umbrella organization would be in a position to sponsor new gardens for a limited period of 1 to 2 years while the new garden developed the ability to become independent. More than half of the participants identified this temporary sponsorship as useful.

By promoting and encouraging the cooperation of existing garden organizers, such an umbrella organization could accentuate the best of "what we have now," while providing coordination when support is missing. In fact, a central organization that prioritized the development of local groups could become the mechanism that glues model C, a "loose association of small umbrella organizations" together. In this case, an overarching umbrella would support and encourage the activities of smaller mentoring groups or local umbrellas such as the Urban Diggers in east Vancouver.

While supporting the desired independence and local control of all gardens, this hybrid model could also provide all the advantages of a central organization. These advantages could include acting as a central contact, advocating on behalf of organizers, and developing the consistency and clarity of the processes involved in building new gardens.

Recommendations

The rationales for these recommendations are supported by the research findings and conclusions in chapter Four. In order to be succinct the explanation of some rationales are limited in this synopsis and a review of the unedited thesis should be conducted for a complete understanding. As mentioned earlier two major themes emerged from the findings and conclusions of the research: identifying what functions an umbrella organization could perform; and aligning civic government policies, practices,

and goals. Recommendations for an umbrella organisation will precede alignment of civic structures.

Umbrella Design

The primary objective of a community garden umbrella organization in Vancouver should be to develop community capacity and leadership, so that organizers can build and independently manage their own locally controlled community gardens. The main recommendations for operating such an umbrella organization in Vancouver are as follows:

1. Develop community capacity and leadership, to enable organizers to build and independently manage their own locally controlled community gardens.
2. Operate as a central clearing house for linking people, ideas, and organizations.
3. Support community gardens to development their own community capacity.
4. Identify and mentor community mentors.
5. Encourage the development of local sponsor organizations.
6. Support fledgling organizations as needed.
7. Temporarily sponsor new gardens for up to 2 years.
8. Educate and assist gardens organisers to start and manage a non-profit society.
9. Proactively identify and develop capacity in under-serviced districts of Vancouver.
10. Build productive and supportive relationships with all levels of civic representatives.
11. Advocate on behalf of the membership.
12. Identify emerging leaders, and engage them in the civic influence-building processes.
13. Develop a standing committee that regularly convenes with civic staff.
14. Perform other tasks that do not drain energy from the garden organizations, such as the following:

a. Secure funding and resources for community gardens.
b. Increase buying power for bulk purchases.
c. Coordinate educational seminars and workshops.
d. Organize events and celebrations such as harvest celebrations.

15. Adopt a collaborative governance structure for the umbrella organization.
16. Ensure that the bulk of financial support for the umbrella organization comes from the City of Vancouver.
17. Secure other sources of funding for the umbrella organization.
18. Create a steering committee to develop plans for starting an umbrella organization.

The creation of an umbrella organization as described in this research is, in reality, at the discretion of the community it would serve. Should the gardening

community in Vancouver choose to accept the recommendations I have presented or to adapt them to suit its needs, the question arises, who among the existing stakeholders should develop it? My recommendation is for the development of a small steering committee composed of five or six key stakeholders to investigate the appetite for the umbrella model by reaching out to all stakeholders. There is no decree that this initiative should come from one community group over another. Leadership can emerge simultaneously from a number of organizations, but should include the Vancouver Food Policy Council, along with other potential stakeholders such as the Vancouver Urban Agriculture Network and City Farmer and others.

If there is an appetite to create this umbrella organization, the committee will need to invite all interested stakeholders to participate in a series of public meetings. At this point, the steering committee may want to adjust its composition to reflect interest from stakeholders. These public and steering committee meetings would help move the initiative forward to decide collaboratively on the umbrella's organizational structure, required staff, financing, and related details. This process represents an opportunity for continued cycles of action research and should be supported financially and with other resources by the City of Vancouver.

Alignment of Civic Policies, Practices, and Goals

As described earlier in this paper, the best-laid plans of an umbrella organization would be ineffective if processes at a civic level were not aligned with a goal of increased urban agriculture and community gardens. If the examples provided of support for community gardens from various civic governments – along with the benefits described in the literature and by participants – are worth pursuing, then an alignment of Vancouver's policies should be undertaken. Therefore, Vancouver's Mayor and City Council should take leadership to align objectives with all city departments and workers.

There should be a clear, unified policy that outlines the goals and purpose of this city initiative. This single citywide policy should guide all departments and workers on this issue, it should supersede all local departmental policies and procedures on this matter, and that separate departments do not create their own individual community garden policies.

The political leadership should direct the Vancouver Park Board, Engineering, Real Estate, Social Development, Planning, and other departments to work collaboratively and cooperatively with each other and with community groups, to fulfill the city's shared goals and objectives. This practice should result in timely service coordination and land tenure decisions, along with good communication between citizens, community groups, and civic departments.

As part of a unified policy development, an independent examination into specific departmental barriers, policy restrictions, and other impediments should be conducted for all key departments. Where barriers, mandates, and policies limit the development or support of community gardens, exemptions or modifications should be implemented.

Each department should identify clear, transparent criteria for deciding how to allocate land for community gardens. These criteria should also explain how land is made available or not made available, and what steps are necessary in order for land tenure for community gardens to be approved. This can lead to the community and civic leaders along with civic departments setting targets for a minimum number of community gardens either annually or over another workable time frame. Community Gardens and other forms of urban agriculture on non-city land should also be promoted.

Start-up costs can be prohibitive and should be considered as part of a civic funding package for all new community gardens. Water hook-up, soil, construction material, landscaping, pathways, soil testing, design assistance, and funding should all be considered as part of this package.

Establishing a team of civic representatives from each stakeholder department would help coordinate and align projects, services, and planning for community garden initiatives and upkeep. Such a team would facilitate and guide community leaders and project coordinators in the land and resource acquisition process, coordinate services, and brainstorm solutions to emerging issues. By having aligned objectives, this team would work collaboratively, network with partners, and advocate for gardens. The team would also work collaboratively with the umbrella standing committee to develop and maintain good communication between civic workers and the community.

Coordination of this team would be accomplished through at least one full-time city staff member who is dedicated to administering community gardens in Vancouver. This staff member should be a champion for community gardens. To reflect the community's desires, the position should have freedom and authority to make decisions and permit flexibility on restrictive policies and guidelines, where exceptions would support community garden initiatives. To generate this authority and because many of the functions of a community garden coordinator would not easily fit into the mandate of other departments, this position would benefit from an independent, high-ranking reporting structure. To avoid silos, this coordinator should work closely with, and both support and be supported by, other city staff members involved in urban agriculture and food security initiatives.

The development of a unified citywide policy on community gardening will require considerable investigation. The process should be transparent and be coordinated by a committee made up of equal membership from key community stakeholders and city staff. This committee should work collaboratively to achieve its goals. It would be best if it were led and administered by one full-time city staff member with a record of championing community gardening and UA in Vancouver. The committee should hold no fewer than two city wide open public consultations. It is critical that this committee be charged by the political leadership with authority to study, probe, and scrutinize the current civic systems, and research and develop more aligned policies and practices. A practical budget should be provided to enable the committee to fully carry out its mandate.

Postscript

While lost in downtown Seattle during a personal trip in December 2007 I stumbled onto the Kobe Terrace and the Danny Woo Community Gardens. This was an unlikely community garden built on a steep slope and snuggled between Seattle's 15 lane interstate highway and the outskirts of China Town. With time on my hands and several months of my thesis research under my belt I took the opportunity to explore this unusual community garden.

I was deeply moved by the creativity, innovation and exceptionally sophisticated design elements. The garden employed few straight lines. Pathways wound uphill through switchbacks and stairs along stone retaining walls, under trellises and arbours, and along side espalier apple trees. Though it was mid winter the gardens were animated with groups of people casually walking through, eating lunch or resting on one of the many cleverly placed benches. The plots conformed to the shape of the cribs, rolled gently uphill and around corners. Small shrubs, manicured bushes and espalier trees marked the borders and margins of the plots. Brussels sprouts, garlic and other winter vegetables popped up next to winter mulch and rye grasses. The garden carefully balanced well thought out design elements and skilled manicuring with neatly and creatively maintained plots while terraces, patios, trellised vines and garden ornaments dotted the hillside. This garden was as well designed and maintained as any professionally developed garden.

I was inspired to spend two hours writing notes and reflections in my journal. At one point I had to pull off the highway as new insights and visions needed to be written down. There was so much to learn and be inspired by from these gardens. Did community gardens need to be strictly functional? Were grid systems the only way to design community gardens? Was it possible to create art, character and mystery through the design of a community garden? How could community gardens attract people to regularly visit them? What could be done differently to make community gardens more inspirational and beautiful? These questions and more swirled through my head.

Although this postscript was not part of the original thesis I felt compelled to include it at the conclusion of the official research. For me, the creation of gardens is not strictly functional. Yes, urban agriculture has many benefits from a functional environmental and food security point of view but because I have a background in the arts aesthetics is equally if not more important to me. There is a great deal we need to learn from the Danny Woo Gardens and Kobe Terrace. Can we build gardens that create and inspire communities to grow; gardens that have interesting features, shapes and designs; gardens that are more than grids with a fence? I hope my research makes some contribution to the development of urban agriculture and community gardens but I deeply hope the progress of urban agriculture goes beyond the functional. Too often I see gardens that are built in strictly practical rectangular shapes with little or no attention to greater visual interest. I hope garden organisers and civic governments remember that a vibrant, dynamic and alive urban environment needs to include rich aesthetics and creativity as well. Using the inspiration of the Danny Woo Gardens and the Kobe Terrace there is an opportunity to build community gardens that are interesting, beautiful, and inspire people to be creative, make the most of the urban environment and become active members of their community.

References

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). *A ladder of citizen engagement*. Retrieved July 1, 2008, from http://lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.html

Blair, D., Giesecke, C. C., & Sherman, S. (1991). Dietary, social and economic evaluation of the Philadelphia urban gardening project [Electronic version]. *Journal of Nutrition Education, 23*(4), 161-167. Retrieved November 18, 2007, from http://www.sarep.ucdavis.edu/newsltr/v7n3/sa-10.htm

City of Seattle. (1992, September 14). *Resolution -28610*. Retrieved September 15, 2008, from the Prevention Institute Web site: http://www.preventioninstitute.org/sa/policies/pdftext/Seattle_p-patch.pdf

Coghlan, D., & Brannick, T. (2005). *Doing action research in your own organization*. London: SAGE.

Cosgrove, S. (1998). Community gardening in major Canadian cities: Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver compared. *Urban Agriculture Notes*. Retrieved September 22, 2007, from http://www.cityfarmer.org/canadaCC.html

Hall, D. (1996). *Community gardens as an urban planning issue* (Master's thesis, University of British Columbia, 1996). Retrieved August 4, 2008, from http://www.cityfarmer.org/dianaCGplanning.html

Hartley, T. (2005). *Effective participation in anti-poverty and regenerative work and research*. Retrieved October 7, 2008, from http://www.alacsy.org.uk/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=47&Itemid=66

Johnson, T. D. (2005, April). *Entrepreneurial urban agriculture* (Bachelor's paper, Ryerson University, 2005). Retrieved November 15, 2007, from http://www.cityfarmer.org/tarathesis.html

Kaethler, T. M. (2006, August). *Growing space: The potential for urban agriculture in the city of Vancouver* (Master's thesis, University of British Columbia, 2006). Retrieved October 21, 2007, from http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/commsvcs/socialplanning/initiatives/foodpolicy/tools/pdf/Growing_Space_Rpt.pdf

Lui, K. K. Y. (2002). Energy efficiency and environmental benefits of rooftop gardens [Electronic version]. *Construction Canada, 44*(2), 17, 20-23. Retrieved September 22, 2007, from http://irc.nrccnrc.gc.ca/pubs/fulltext/prac/nrcc45345/nrcc45345.pdf

Lukasik, L. (2003, June). *Theoretical understandings of citizen engagement*. Retrieved March 3, 2008, from http://www.hcf.on.ca/pdf/theoretical_understandings_of_citizen_engagement.pdf

Mazereeuw, B. (2005, November). *Urban agriculture report*. Report prepared for the Region of Waterloo Growth Management Strategy, Ontario. Retrieved November 16, 2007, from http://chd.region.waterloo.on.ca/web/health.nsf/4f4813c75e78d71385256e5a0057f5e1/54ED787F44ACA44C852571410056AEB0/$file/UA_Feasibility.pdf?openelement

McKnight, J. (1995). *The careless society: Community and its counterfeits*. New York: Basic Books.

MacNair, E. (2002). *Seeds of success: Growing healthy communities through community gardening*. Victoria, BC: POLIS Project on Ecological Governance, University of Victoria. Retrieved April 23, 2008, from http://www.polisproject.org/polis2/PDFs/seeds%20of%20success.pdf

Mougeot, L. J. A. (2006). *Growing better cities: Urban agriculture for sustainable development* [Electronic version]. Retrieved November 11, 2007, from the ebrary database.

Smit, J. (2008). From the desk of Jac Smit – "Urban agriculture." *Urban Agriculture Notes*. Retrieved November 15, 2007, from http://www.cityfarmer.org/deskSmit.html

Strutynski, N. (2005, December 20s). *Edible landscaping project: Final report*. Vancouver, BC: City of Vancouver, Social Planning Department. Retrieved November 17, 2005, from http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/commsvcs/socialplanning/initiatives/foodpolicy/tools/pdf/EL_FinalReport.pdf

Stringer, E. (2007). *Action research* (3rd ed.). Los Angeles: SAGE.

Yukl, G. (2006). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Boston: Prentice Hall.