

PIPE, LAURA MAY, Ph.D. *Moving Concrete: Development, Deployment and Consumption of Skateboarding in the City* (2017)
Directed by Dr. Katherine M. Jamieson and C. Tommy Lambeth, 173 pp.

Space, often absent from kinesiological analyses, has significant impacts on how communities operationalize health (Fusco, 2007). The spatial dialogue between bodies and intentional movement directs how bodies are invited, or disinvited, to be physically active (Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2011). As communities reimagine public spaces in the name of neoliberal health (Ayo, 2012; Fusco, 2007), the challenge becomes distinguishing which forms of physical activity and movement are or are not accepted in those spaces. Thus, as bodies claim space, some bodies are ignored, regulated, or removed, while others are celebrated and designed for (Soja, 1980). Skateboarding offers a unique look at how bodies are navigating the challenging landscape of the postmodern. Particularly, skateboarding claims public space, whether or not that space was intended for its use, placing skateboarding in conversation with the municipality and community in multiple ways.

Utilizing the integration of social science frameworks (Lefebvrian Triad, edgework, publicness, and biographies) that focus on spatial relations, this project examined the regulation of human movement by municipalities through the critical reading of Seattle's Citywide Skatepark Plan (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007) and Portland's Skatepark System Plan (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008). Identifying seven key themes, a description of how cities develop, deploy, and consume skateboarding and related sports (e.g., BMX, inline) and the spaces they occupy is presented.

The analyses introduce five major assertions that describe how municipalities manage physical movement through “the city” in the name of the common good. These assertions serve to shape how communities define legal bodies and movement through cityscapes and what this means for the skateboarder and skateboarding. Specifically, the introduction of a Skating Commons and ideas of complacent resistance are explored as challenges facing the municipality and skateboarding in the creation of sociospatial networks within “the city.” The application of these assertions in the “lived” experiences of “the city” has the potential to impact how individuals understand, value, and engage in physical activity and movement.

MOVING CONCRETE: DEVELOPMENT, DEPLOYMENT AND
CONSUMPTION OF SKATEBOARDING IN THE CITY

by

Laura May Pipe

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2017

Approved by

Committee Co-Chair

Committee Co-Chair

To God.

To my Mom and Dad.

To Dave Mirra.

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation written by Laura May Pipe has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Co-Chair _____

Committee Co-Chair _____

Committee Members _____

Date of Acceptance by Committee

Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to offer my deepest gratitude to the individuals that made this work possible. I would like to thank my Chairs for their tireless and gracious work on this project with me. To Dr. Katherine M. Jamieson, who has served as a dedicated advisor, mentor, and scholar, for challenging me to be “intellectually sweaty,” to continuously push the boundaries of my work, and to at times, “slow my roll.” To C. Tommy Lambeth, who has served as mentor, friend, and scholar, for supporting me, challenging me, and partaking in my spatial curiosities. Also, I would like to thank Dr. Sarah Daynes and Dr. Diane Gill. Both have served as mentors and teachers throughout my doctoral career. Their advice, guidance, and willingness to push me to new levels of intellectual risk have been invaluable to my work, both academically and professionally.

Additionally, I would like to acknowledge my fellow Sociohistorical Studies colleagues: Dr. DeAnne Brooks, Casey Casas, Dr. Yeomi Choi, and Geumran Seo. Your friendship and collegial support have been invaluable to this process as you have served as sounding boards, advocates, and motivators. A sincere thank you to Jennifer Reich and Dr. Pat Fairfield-Artman for their friendship, insights, and continuous support. A thank you to Dr. Cathy Ennis for her support and enthusiasm for this project. A thank you to the staff at the Speedway Club at Charlotte Motor Speedway for their support, curiosity, and endless patience as I wrote this document. Above all, I thank God, my parents, and family for tireless support, love, and excitement. And a thank you to Dave Mirra, whose life served as an inspiration and blessing to so many, especially me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Defining the Spatial Conversation	4
The Case for Recreation.....	6
Significance of the Study: Why Skate? Why Now?	11
Problem Statement	13
Research Questions	14
Definition of Key Terms	14
Outline of Chapters	20
II. LITERATURE REVIEW	24
The Sociospatial Dialectic and Publicness	24
The City as a Playground	29
The Spaces of Skateboarding.....	33
Through the Skater’s Eye.....	37
From the Roots of Mayhem	42
Additional Frameworks	46
III. METHODOLOGY	52
Research Sites	53
Municipal Plans (and Policies)	55
The Lefebvrian Triad (Pierce & Martin, 2015)	57
Methods.....	60
Data Collection	62
Treatment of Data	65
Positionality	68
Trustworthiness.....	70
IV. DATA ANALYSES.....	72
Overall Analyses.....	72
Lefebvrian Triad: A Critical Lens.....	76

V. DISCUSSION: SKATEBOARDING AND THE SKATEBOARDER	99
Returning to the Problem Statement and Research Questions.....	100
Constructing Assertions	105
Turning Assertions into Recommendations: Community Skatepark Development	121
Skatepark Implications for Action-Related Sports	124
Project Scope and Potential for Future Research.....	126
What Becomes of Public Space and Physical Activity?	129
REFERENCES	131
APPENDIX A. COMPLETE LIST OF MEDIATED LITERATURE.....	147
APPENDIX B. SAMPLE CODED DOCUMENT	153
APPENDIX C. CODE BREAK DOWN	173

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Methods and Data Sources	63
Table 2. Specific Data Sources	65
Table 3. Axial Coding	66
Table 4. Open Coding	68
Table 5. Key Themes	74
Table 6. City Comparison Data	126

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Imagining the American (U.S.) “skatepark as a neoliberal playground” (Howell, 2008, p. 475) can be a challenging visualization. However, when observing skateparks, one will likely see a varying community of active bodies weaving among one another. In Seattle, Washington’s Center Park there sits a skatepark in the shadows of Key Arena, the Pacific Science Center, and the famed Space Needle of the 1962 World’s Fair. Early one July 2016 summer morning, the sound of wheels on the pavement cuts the warm ocean air. This is the scene at the Seattle Center Skatepark, as I walked upon a group of “dads” skateboarding while their children were at a local museum for summer theater camp.

In contrast, consider the local indoor pay-to-play skatepark that is frequented by such a diverse population that the space resembles a community recreation center more than the pages of *Thrasher* magazine. Four teenage male skaters encircle a six-year-old girl learning to skate as they protect her from the zooming avalanche of a hectic Saturday morning skate session. Imagine the public skatepark where a number of professional bicycle motocross (BMX) riders practice daily and give pointers to the local kids on everything from bicycle brakes to middle school.

These are the bodies that occupy the modern American (U.S.) skatepark. Diverse, expressive, and active bodies that operate as intergenerational communities of risk in

public and private spaces. However, these bodies can be eerily absent from the reports on physical activity and community health. The spaces they occupy are often absent from our classroom conversations and missing from our imagined physically active communities. This is significant when turning to the central questions of Kinesiology. Identifying these central questions has sometimes been a struggle (Henry, 1964; Reeve, 2007; Sawson & Massengale, 1997). The field has grappled with a litany of foci including health and wellness, physical education, sport, and human movement, but still struggled to identify a central claim. The reality of Kinesiology has in some ways avoided a miscellany of possibilities, notably, mixing intentional human movement with social space. The work of understanding the social inequity of space in human movement has been neglected, or worse, simply assumed. However, there is an imperative in our communities today for the combined dialogues of health, access, and space to be better understood.

The ways municipalities shape, nurture, and limit community health are directly impacted by the ways municipalities shape, nurture, and limit public space (Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2011; Park, 1952). Soja (1980) claims that “Urban planning was critically examined [by Marx] as a tool of the state, serving the dominant classes by organizing and reorganizing urban space for the benefit of capital accumulation and crisis management” (213). Space is the key to how communities operationalize, contextualize, and organize bodies (Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2012). No two bodies are the

same, and no two people have the same needs. To shape public spaces on the conception of singular needs limits how bodies are invited and disinvited to move and live in the “city.”

However, some may argue that this is the point - municipalities are tasked with the “common good,” which in turn can elevate the significance of some groups and devalue others. Throughout the course of history empires and municipalities have been making a case for physical health as a public good, thus allowing for public health and public space to be regulated in the name of the “common good.” From the Roman to the Victorian eras, municipalities have held that “the health of the people is the highest law” (Worpole, 2007, p. 11). This conception of health as a public good can also be problematic, as municipalities struggle with inequity to determine who and whom should be included in conceptions of citizenship. Thus, some bodies become invisible, often purposefully, to the municipality.

These are bodies often systematically erased from the public milieu. These bodies are the poor, the other, and those who do not fit the “ideal” narrative of the municipality. Unfortunately, by hiding or ignoring these bodies, communities also disregard the health of these bodies and leave them to struggle at the margins. Thus, when returning to Kinesiology’s central questions, the field, responsible for the arts and sciences of intentional human movement (Barrett, personal communication, Nov 2015), has an imperative to understand the spatial dialogues of physical activity at the margins of neoliberal constructions of health. This project is an examination of spatial dialogues of the body and movement in the city.

Defining the Spatial Conversation

It is significant to pause and consider how the term “spatial” has been limited in interpretation. Soja (1980) notes, “spatial typically evokes the image of something physical and external to the social context and social action... a part of the ‘environment,’ a context for society - its container - rather than a structure created by society” (p. 210). The idea that bodies are in conversation with the space around them requires the reader to consider that space can be constructed by the individuals that live within it. However, the consideration must continue to the dialectic¹ properties of space and the body - the ongoing conversation between the two that allows the body to influence space and space to influence the body. This is not new, as Tuan (1977) argues that movement is an essential component of space. It is an intertwining of these conversations that propels this project - the spatial conversations of bodies and the dynamic human movement throughout space.

The work of French philosopher and sociologist Henri Lefebvre, who is often called the father of the spatial dialectic (Shields, 1999), is significant in defining the sociospatial dialectic being examined in this project. “If space has an air of neutrality and indifference... it is precisely because it has been occupied and used, and has already been the focus of past processes whose traces are not always evident on the landscape” (Lefebvre, 1976, p. 31). Space is not an unbiased object, free from subjectivity, it is in

¹ Dialectic is a method of examining ideas and concepts, often perceived as contradicting or conflicting, in conversation with each other towards greater truths (Scott & Marshall, 2009; Soja, 1980).

continuous dialogue with its social surroundings. Specifically, space and the construction of space through movement have been so present in the day-to-day lives of individuals that with great ease space can be seen apolitical, absent of histories and narratives. However, space and its construction are not absent of meanings and conceptions. Space is both produced by and producing of human movement.

The work of Lefebvre is enhanced by the continuing work of Edward Soja, who expands the definitions and context of the spatial dialectic to the sociospatial. “[T]he fundamental premise of the sociospatial dialectic: that social and spatial relationships are dialectically inter-reactive, interdependent; that social relations of production are both space-forming and space contingent” (Soja, 1980, p. 211). Space and the social world are in tandem, pushing and pulling upon one another in visible and not so visible ways. There exists an action and reaction between the social world and space it occupies, with both in dialectic production and reproduction of one another. Thus, physical activity as a part of the social world, and the spaces it occupies are influenced and influencing by the movement of individuals in those spaces.

Therefore, to neglect space, ignoring its social construction is to neglect the full weight and significance of the central questions of Kinesiology. Since space is politically and socially constructed, shaped by the policies, ordinances, and social actions of the municipality, questions over who has access to public space become key. However, these are not the only questions raised by the construction of space. Bodies are also managed, observed, and directed in these spaces. Lefebvre (2003) is asking the reader to question all the aspects of this shared dialogue between space and the body. His work is not

limited to the access of space, but also the enacting of space. The expansion of Lefebvre's work by Soja (1980; 2010) moves the spatial conversation forward from one of production to a conversation of production, construction, consumption, and reproduction. Space is part of the reproduction of social actions of inequity and marginalization.

The Case for Recreation

Starting with the earliest philosophers, Plato and Hippocrates began debating the role of physical activity and citizenship (Park 1981), with Hippocrates arguing that the "citizen" has a duty to be able to defend the nation-state. Centuries later, Foucault (2014) would assert that health had become a public matter in the 18th century - that an individual's health had become part of the municipal gaze. In the following century, John Dewey (Swanson & Massengale 1997) would struggle with the role of education in the health of the public, debating if education should take a frame of health for the whole person or education through health. The debate of "citizens," "non-citizens," and health continue to be the focus of modern day political schema. From the Presidential Physical Fitness programs to the modern day "move" campaigns, the municipality constructs the definitions of health and healthy. For better or worse, clinically and socially "health" has become the representation of consumer-based visions of the ideal body.

In these cases, the responsibility for the physically-fit body becomes a struggle between the "state" and the individual. In the modern neoliberal era, the responsibility appears to fall to the individual, however, in actuality this responsibility becomes more complex than individual versus state (de)construction of health. The municipality (a state

agent), through the construction of space, policies, and resource allocation, shapes the individual's understanding, access, and construction of their own health. Thus, neoliberalism creates an illusion of individual responsibility for health to drive economic consumption, but the municipality still has a strong grasp on how this consumption can and “should be” deployed.

Therefore, the “state” shapes and directs the responsibility of individual health, and has an obligation to develop and deploy public space for physical activity in the name of healthy communities. However, policies and ordinances have been developed and deployed to shape physical activity as a “citizenry” obligation. These shift the perception of responsibility for health to the individual – not the state (Ayo, 2012), confusing the obligation of public space and physical activity. This is compounded by current conversations related to obesity and health care, government interventions in the areas of nutrition and physical fitness, and the role of public education over parents in making these decisions for youth. As the U.S. state enters a new era of conservatism, this perception of responsibility will continue to shift, remaining fluid and confused for both the local municipality and the individual. This is particularly true as the term “citizen” becomes more narrowly defined for the municipality by the “state,” and the roles of citizenry (obligations of and to) become more exclusionary in practice.

The design of space for recreation, and in turn physical activity, matters significantly when the “state” has an obligation to the “citizenry.” However, the design of space for public use becomes even more impactful when the boundaries and access to the title of citizen become narrow. Creating space with the ideals of limitation make health

inaccessible to individuals who do not fulfill the now narrower definition and are not a priority of the municipality. Fredrick Law Olmstead, the famed American (U.S.) landscape architect of the 19th century, wrote of the significance of recreation and public parks in the growth and development of cities for the individual. In his writing on *Public Parks and the Enlargement of Towns*, Olmstead wrote (1971):

We come then to the question: What accommodations for recreation can we provide which shall be so agreeable and so accessible as to be efficiently attractive to the great body of citizens, and which, while giving decided gratification, shall also cause those who resort to them for pleasure to subject themselves for the time being, to conditions strongly counteractive to the special enervating conditions of the town? (p. 73)

The idea that city life was and is exhausting and that physical recreation is essential to the life of growing cities is at the heart of Olmstead's designs. Arguably, through the sociospatial dialectic, the role of public recreation space is essential to the growing life of the individual.

In this same article, Olmstead (1971) notes the need for distributing small public recreation spaces throughout the city so that they would be easily accessible. For, if these spaces "could be easily reached by a short walk from every house, [it] would be more desirable than a single area of great extent, however rich in landscape attraction it may be" (p. 74). The argument from the sociospatial dialectic shifts to one of accessibility of spaces throughout municipal areas when considering physically active communities. This becomes ever more apparent when community spaces are "claimed" by the municipality

or consumers through the act of gentrification, thus displacing current bodies' claims on recreation in their area of the city.

As noted by Kinesiologists Swanson and Massengale (1997), who documented the history of the field, the municipalities of the early 20th century focused on having physically fit and engaged U.S. "citizens." It is important to note that the aim of the municipality was not the health of the individual or, in many cases, even the community. The focus of the municipality has been on the citizen, continuing to leave some bodies to the margins of physical activity and physical health. This ideology of healthy citizens was so important that, after high rejection rates from the World War I draft, many states began requiring physical education in public schools. Cranz (1980) notes that prior to World War II, physical activity was considered incredibly important in public space as a crime deterrent, particularly if the activity consisted of women walking with their families in public parks. It was somewhere in the 1980s, amidst Reaganomics, that the responsibility of a "good" bio-citizen fell to the individual (Ayo, 2012), as it was no longer the state's responsibility. At the same time, public parks and public spaces for physical activity were being removed (Bale, 1993; Cranz, 1980). This shift immediately changed access to physical activity – who has a right to physical activity is the one who can afford to purchase the space, the product, or the packaged health, has a right to physical activity. As citizenship is the concern of municipalities, then who counts as a citizen and what obligation the municipality has to bodies beyond those with formalized citizenship become necessary questions for the field of Kinesiology.

As noted by Park, Burgess and McKenzie (1925), the “state” uses the development of parks and organized recreation as a control for growth and reform. Part of this process is determining for whom the space is being planned for and/or against whom the space is being planned (Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2011). In many instances, specific bodies are excluded from engaging in use of the space – either through soft or hard controls². This same exclusionary design is deployed against several bodies – citizen and non-citizen alike – who do not meet the criteria of the municipality for “positive” contribution to the common good. As Woolley and Johns (2001) and Carr (2010) noted, often it is marginalized populations, like the homeless and skateboarders, which are linked together and limited in spaces, because they are perceived as using and engaging with public space without having economic engagement with the city. As Kinesiologists, there exists a realization and obligation to pose questions regarding social conditions and how bodies are therefore limited in their engagement with public spaces. These limitations can be in the form of rules and policies regarding public park access, such as parks closing at dusk, or social actions deployed to prevent diverse bodies from accessing specific socially segregated public spaces.

As more communities are beginning to see physical activity as a necessary component of community health, a focus on the creation of “fit city” plans and “re-greening” of communities has taken shape. This focus on the reclaiming public green

² Loukaitou-Sideris and Ehrenfeucht (2011) explain soft controls as the governing structures that dictate use (laws, policies, structures). Hard controls, however, are the physical barriers put in place to control use – in terms of skateboarding or homelessness (e.g., barriers built on benches and railings).

space has also allowed for the reclaiming of once lost public recreation spaces (Fusco, 2007). Additionally, with the curtailment of physical education within the U.S. public school system, heavier focus on adult-controlled organized sport over “play,” and public focus on health trends, public recreation has moved to the forefront of “healthy community” conversations in the U.S. (The Aspen Institute, 2015). The challenge then becomes the identifying of physical activity and movement forms that are accepted in public spaces.

Significance of the Study: Why Skate? Why Now?

The popularity of skateboarding and other action sports has exploded in the United States over the last two decades. One might argue that ESPN’s the X Games had a significant role in action sports taking a central place in the American (U.S.) cultural consumer landscape. However, the reality is a much more complicated one and is often a mix of origin stories, spatial conquests, and mainstream physical activity mingled into a complex network of social expectations. The question, what counts as physical activity, is then entangled with definitions of public space and the contained access of some bodies to the “city.” Fusco (2007) notes an increased policing and militarizing of space in Western communities for the public good that shifts how public space is consumed and consuming. The reality and weight of these questions transform the single question central to skateboarding to a larger social issue. Where to skate becomes a larger question in who has access to public space.

In the mythical origins of spatial conquest for skateboarding sits a history of defining physical activity. The sport offers the potential to encourage youth to become

active in a time when physical activity seems to be at its lowest among America's (U.S.) youth. This potential is complicated by those same mythical origins as some municipalities have taken to containing rather than embracing these activities. Carr (2010) argues that through observations of skateboarding's relationship with "the city" and the municipality "we may see reflected the ostensibly neutral, dispassionate, and orderly system of laws by which the city is governed" (p. 988). It is this tangle of spatial justice, human movement, and public access that is reflected in the sociospatial dialectic of cities.

Why skatespots? Németh (2012) notes that

some urban scholars argue that prioritizing security and private interests over broader social concerns can threaten civil liberties and diminish diversity in public space, transforming public spaces into highly regulated sites of consumption-based activity. (p. 811)

Skateboarding and related action sports not only occupy public space but in many situations, they appropriate this space in ways that are not considered intentional use. Moreover, skateboarders often find themselves at odds with the municipal authority (be it police or others) receiving punitive action for skating in public spaces. As Németh (2012) continues, "Associated legal, physical, and cultural practices serve to control who uses public space and how, threatening the notion that public space is for all to enjoy" (p. 812). However, these notions of control are conflicting in operation, creating the appearance of maintaining order for equitable use and simultaneously excluding bodies to maintain preferred order.

The delicate balance between identifying criminal and individual is the foundation of rights to the city, particularly maintaining the social order while acknowledging the needs and rights of the individual (Mead, 1936). This struggle can be seen throughout critical analyses of public institutions and the criminalization of specific bodies, be they traditionally marginalized or simply non-conforming. For example, the recent social unrest throughout the U.S. regarding the deployment of inequitable authoritative force against some bodies over others is a direct demonstration of this struggle between perceived social order and the rights of the individual. These are very present enactments of this tension between criminal, individual, and the structural forces that shape daily life. It is with skateboarding that this project aims to explore a physical manifestation of these tensions. The focus of this project is on how two cities navigate the sociospatial networks of sport and “the city” in terms of access and rights to space.

Problem Statement

The overarching question that guides this project focuses on how municipalities regulate human movement in the “City.” Specifically, as cities reclaim green spaces and public spaces in the name of health – how are policies and plans developed, deployed, and consumed in the regulation of human movement throughout these spaces? Does this create larger implications for human movement throughout the community?

Using policies and plans developed to shape public spaces for “appropriate” utilization by skateboarding as a case study, this project aims to unpack and examine the role of municipal directives in the regulation of human movement. Many of the sports associated with the term action sports, such as BMX, parkour, inline skating, etc., often

are not explicitly included in formal municipal policies and ordinances. Nevertheless, these sports are included in the “lived” manifestations of these policies, often through their presence in these spaces and the regulation of these spaces. For example, the municipality would have a difficult time regulating BMX and skateboarding similarly without having to account for cycling at large. However, freestyle BMX is present in the very spaces appropriated by skateboarding, as well as the spaces developed by the municipality for skateboarding. Therefore, examining policies and plans developed for skateboarding and skateparks provides for a broader examination of how municipalities regulate human movement across many action sports present in both “appropriate” and “appropriated” spaces within the city.

Research Questions

- 1) How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding developed in the “City?” (Physical/Conceived)
- 2) How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding deployed in the “City?” (Code/Perceived)
- 3) How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding consumed in the “City?” (Content/Lived)
- 4) How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding encompassing of other action sports in the “City?”

Definition of Key Terms

Action sports. Often called extreme sports in popular culture, action sports encompass physical activities or sports that are not considered part of a Westernized,

team-based sporting culture (Striler, 2010; Wheaton, 2014). Typically, these include sports such as skateboarding, surfing, bicycle motocross, motocross, snowboarding, kitesurfing, etc. Though some of these activities have gained mainstream popularity in the last two decades (notably skateboarding, surfing, and snowboarding), some aspects of these activities remain in the margins.

Appropriated spaces. The appropriation of space is a key cultural aspect of skateboarding and BMX in urban spaces. Though these activities sometimes occur in purposefully-built skateboarding spaces, it is in the found spaces that skateboarding and BMX appropriate space, even if for a small amount of time. Franck and Stevens (2007) refer to this as loose space, “space that has been appropriated by citizens to pursue activities not set by a predetermined program” (p. 29).

BMX. Bicycle motocross appeared as a sport in the United States in the 1970s, first in the form of BMX racing and later in the form of freestyle BMX. The sport originally developed as an economic alternative to motocross (MX), but since has become a broader action sport with competitions throughout the Western world.

Broken Windows Theory. The Broken Windows Theory was developed by Kelling and Wilson (1982). The premise of the theory is that by policing and preventing small crimes and nuisances (“quality of life crimes” (Fluda, 2010)) within the “city,” communities institutionalized authority, in particular, can prevent major crime before it happens. This is problematic as it assumes a direct causation between minor incidents and larger crime – all disruptions of institutionalized norms are considered deviant and therefore need to be policed (Fulda, 2010).

The Chicago School of Sociology. When discussing the Chicago School of Sociology, this project is primarily focused on the School's Golden Era (1918-1925). The focus of the School during this time was heavily influenced by the work of Park, Burgess, and McKenzie (1925) that specifically considered the spatial and the temporal in locating social facts. The premise of their work was based on the belief that "the city" served as an ideal laboratory for the study of human relationships. They were dedicated to the methods of social surveying, and Park (Lutters & Auckermann, 1996; Merriman, 2015; Park, 1952) believed in direct observation as a key methodology.

The city. "The city" is the ecosystem in which all other components (the individual, the municipality, the activity) reside. This is best illustrated in the work of Lefebvre (1996) and his account of near order and far order. Near order is the close relationships between individuals and communities, far order is the structural institutions that shape these relationships. Lefebvre believed that "the city" served as the mediator between the two orders, as "the city" contains the near order, but was contained by the far order. In terms of this project, "the city" refers to the municipal spaces and community which is often urban but much larger in concept. "the city" includes public and private spaces and communities.

The Commons. The Commons is a space that is collectively owned, with shared resources and governance. Németh (2012) defines the Commons as "any collectively owned resource held in joint use or possession to which anyone has access without obtaining permission of anyone else" (Németh, 2012, p. 815). The Commons started first

with property rights (Wall, 2014) and since has been expanded and applied to intellectual (Hess & Ostrom, 2007), social, and cultural (Muñoz, 2013) spaces.

Deviance within the context of this project. Deviance within sport and physical activity often takes multiple forms – from general rule breaking to cheating to non-dominant behaviors. However, in relation to this project, deviance is conceived within four categories that are often present in popularized understandings of skateboarding: resistance to mainstream ideas (Atkinson & Young, 2008; Beal & Wilson, 2004; Davis, 2004), non-conformist behaviors (Beal & Weidman, 2003), rule-breaking behavior (Davis, 2004; Rinehart & Sydnor, 2003; Rundquist, 2007), and progression beyond understood cultural boundaries (Lyng, 2005).

Histories. Both popular histories and collective memories are examined in this analysis. Popular histories are the popularly accepted histories of a specific community. In this instance, skateboarding has a popular history, the origin story of Dogtown, that is incorporated into larger cultural understandings of the skateboarding community. On the other hand, collective memories are not always the popular histories of a community. This are the published histories (still often by the dominate perspective), but can differ widely from the popularized histories. In the case of this analysis, collective memories appear as the histories published and maintained by the community, (i.e. the Delridge area and Burnside area histories as told from their local historical foundations).

Intentional human movement. The field of Kinesiology examines the arts and sciences of intentional human movement – how bodies move, who is moving them, and what forces are acting upon them in movement. Three main components describe the

physical movement examined: voluntary, intentional, and directed. The movement must be conducted toward achieving a goal in movement (often, but not limited to, sport or exercise) (Hoffman & Harris, 2013).

The Municipality. The municipality, sometimes confused with “the city,” is the governing and organizing structure of “the city.” This is often an elective government in the United States, but the municipality is the policy generating and enforcing aspects of the community. The municipality serves to deliver governmental service to the community (Parry, 1982), often in the name of the common good (Worpole, 2007).

Non-purposefully built spaces. Terms related to public and private ownership of space become significant when looking at where skating takes place (see more below). For the purposes of this work, non-purposefully built spaces are any space that is not intentionally constructed for consumption or use by these sports (e.g., backyard pools, city plazas, etc.).

Purposefully built spaces. Purposefully built spaces are spaces built specifically with the intention of consumption and use by these sports (e.g., skateparks, skate plazas, etc.).

Public and private. The definition of public and private spaces begins with the conception of property. Property in terms of this project is considered “absolute possession with the right to exclude” (Carr, 2010). Therefore, public and private become compounded concepts – public is property owned by the municipality, with private being property owned by any entity other than the municipality. However, in many ways,

public property is treated as private property, (i.e., sidewalks) (Loukitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2012), thus complicating these definitions.

Public space (and right to). The concepts expressed by “rights to the city” are heavily influenced by the work of Lefebvre (1996). In his work, Lefebvre describes rights as “social customs” that are shaped by social forces with “man” at the center. He specifically describes the right to “the city” (that I have expanded to focus on public space) through a list of rights: “right to freedom, to individualization in socialization, to habitat and to inhabit” (1996, p. 174).

Recreation. Henderson, Uhler, and Greer (1990) defined physical recreation “as freely chosen, enjoyable activity which involves movement of the body and includes active sport, exercise, fitness, dance and, outdoor activities” (p. 41).

Skateboarding. Skateboarding became popular in the United States throughout the 20th century. However, it was in the 1970s that the urethane wheel was created and allowed the sport to grow significantly. The creation of the urethane wheel allowed for surfers to adopt the activity and recreate wave-like motions on land. This is often associated with the members of Dogtown’s Z Boys in Venice Beach, California, but was also happening simultaneously on the east coast of the U.S. in South Florida (Snyder, 2015). The sport has grown in popularity with skateboarding and surfing joining the Olympics in 2020. However, skateboarding is still struggling to adapt to a changing identity. The constant presence of skateboarding’s foundations in perceived anarchy and conformity are still at the surface of the sport’s identities.

Social control within the context of this project. Much like deviance, social control has diverse and multi-form definitions. At the foundation of this project, an examination of consumption of the “city”, often seen as property - “absolute possession with the right to exclude” (Carr, 2010), are conducted. Therefore, this examination defines social control in terms of this project. Social control, within the guise of this work, is the mechanism used to contain, direct, shape, or exclude certain individuals in certain spaces and instances.

Sociological Imagination. C. Wright Mills (1959) called for the field of sociology to begin deploying what he termed the “Sociological Imagination,” an intertwining of biography and history as sociological imperatives. This imagination is shaped by moving personal troubles to social issues. Social issues are explored through the lenses of three sensitivities: culture, history and structure.

Space and place. “Space and place are the basic components of the lived world” (Tuan, 1977, p. 3). Tuan (1977), explains that space and place hold different conceptions in the world. Space being more abstract, place lived with feelings and moments. Tuan explains the difference with the example of a castle. The physical castle in its everyday view is a space until it is announced that the castle is Hamlet’s castle, then it has become a space filled with emotion and meaning and is now a place. Keep in mind, in Tuan’s work, place is an object like many others that fill space.

Outline of Chapters

This dissertation has five chapters: introduction, review of literature, methodology, data analysis, and discussion. In Chapter One, the significance of space in

defining the central questions for the field of Kinesiology was introduced with the intentions of shaping the framework of this project. Second, I defined the sociospatial dialectic as put forth by Lefebvre and Soja, as the dialectic forms the foundation of my questions in the field of Kinesiology - the spatial dialogues between body and movement. Third, I shaped for the reader the winding path of recreation, public space, and the common good. This informs the argument for physical health and wellness with respect to the development of public spaces. Fourth, I introduced the reader to a marginalized sport (skateboarding) that utilizes public space, but is often in conflict with how municipalities define rights to the city. This sport, along with other action sports, serve as a means for providing insight into how some populations navigate within space to gain or demand access to the city. Lastly, I provided the reader with a listing of key terms that shape the elements of this project.

In the second chapter, I provide the reader with a review of the current literature. First, delving deeper into the work of the sociospatial dialectic and the foundation of the “urban.” Second, I describe the “city” as a playground and how play interprets and challenges rights to the “city.” Third, I chronicle the histories of skateboarding, specifically outlining their acquisition of public space. Fourth, I outline the misguided use of the Broken Windows Theory (Kelling & Wilson, 1982) that shapes legislation regarding rights to the city throughout the United States. Lastly, I present the additional theoretical frameworks that informed this project: methodologies from the Chicago School of Sociology (Parks, Burgess, & McKenzie, 1925), edgework (Lyng, 2005), and the Sociological Imagination (Mills, 1959).

Next, in Chapter Three, I present the methodology for examining the sociospatial dialectic through the sport of skateboarding. I address key decisions in the selected frames, methods, and positions for this research. I discuss the selected sites for this work, why they were selected, and how they further develop the sociospatial dialectic between this sport and the “city.” I then put forth how frameworks were utilized to analysis these skatespaces.

In Chapter Four, the presentation of data begins with the overall analyses of the Seattle Citywide Skatepark Plan (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007) and the Portland Skatepark System Plan (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008). The analyses included a critical reading of the plans, associated policies, mediated literature (i.e. magazines and newspapers) related to the plans and subsequent skatepark builds, images of four skateparks referenced in the plans, and the collective memories of communities where the four skateparks are located. I present the themes constructed from the analyses outlining how each city developed, deployed, and consumed public spaces for suggested “community health.” These themes directly address the central questions of this project related to the regulation of intentional human movement: how the cities developed plans (conceived), how the cities deployed the plans (perceived), how the plans are consumed by the city (lived), and what this means for other sports who occupy these spaces.

Lastly, in Chapter Five, I conclude by integrating social science frameworks related to spatial relations (Lefebvrian Triad, edgework, publicness, and biographies) with the key themes identified in the analyses I present a description of how cities develop, deploy, and consume skateboarding and related sports (e.g., BMX, inline

skating) and the spaces they occupy. I address the identified research questions, and provide recommendations for municipalities planning skatespaces, including key opportunities for the considering multiple end-users in these spaces. Finally, I offer recommendations for future research and possible applications beyond skatepark development.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, I introduce the major literature supporting this project and the frameworks necessary for analyzing the sociospatial dialectic. First, I provide the reader with a deeper understanding of the sociospatial dialectic and the foundation of the “urban.” Second, I discuss how the “city” can be described as a playground for physical activity and physical culture. Third, I put forth the value of histories as artifacts of the sociospatial process and outline the histories of skateboarding. Fourth, I introduced the Broken Windows Theory (Kelling & Wilson, 1982) that is often used as a supporting argument for legislation regarding rights to the city throughout the United States. Finally, I present the three additional theoretical frameworks that inform this project: methodologies from the Chicago School of Sociology (Parks, Burgess, & McKenzie, 1925), edgework (Lyng, 2005), and the Sociological Imagination (Mills, 1959).

The Sociospatial Dialectic and Publicness

The concepts of space and the spatial are somewhat muddled in the popular imagination. Since we live in space in our day-to-day, it is easy to see space as part of the background and neglect the finer nuanced impacts of the spatial. Henri Lefebvre (Pierce & Martin, 2015; Soja, 2010) conceptualizes space as social. By taking up the concept of

social space, the understanding of space can be expanded to a dialectic between space and the social world (Soja, 2010). By engaging in a dialectic, there is an acknowledgment of the push and pull dynamic relationship between space and people within that space. Space acts upon the social and the social acts upon the space.

When transitioning to the concept of the spatial dialectic (transforming thought to the idea that space is in dynamic interaction with the social world) one can begin to unpack the social world in new ways. Particularly when examining intentional human movement, the spatial dialectic moves the field of Kinesiology forward from singular methodologies to multifaceted, integrated methods of understanding. There exists an imbalance in the field of Kinesiology, one that privileges the scientific method of measurement and positivist forms. As Friedman and van Ingen (2011) note, using a Lefebvrian informed perspective, in which the body is a central component, the body can be better understood if “the environment and social relations are analyzed through spatial/bodily practices, conceptions of space, and lived space” (p. 85).

Lefebvre (1991) theorized that space is composed of three parts (known as a Lefebvrian Triad): conceived, perceived, and lived (Friedman & van Ingen, 2011; Pierce & Martin, 2015; Soja, 2010; van Ingen, 2003). Thus, Lefebvrian Triad positions space as the object that is not only moving, but being moved by the way it is deployed, shaped, and reshaped. Conceived space, or as van Ingen (2003) describes as “representations of space,” is space as represented in the abstract view (often by the designers and architects) or through discourse, conceptualizing how a space will be used. Perceived space, or as

van Ingen (2003) describes as “spatial practice,” is space as represented by the day-to-day conceptions of the people in that space. Lived space, or as van Ingen (2003) describes as “spaces of representations,” is how space is lived, how people interact and engage with the space, and how the space is operationalized by the people within it (Friedman & van Ingen, 2011; Lefebvre, 1991; Pierce & Martin, 2015; Soja, 2010; van Ingen, 2003). These compositions are happening simultaneously with one another and shaping each other throughout interactions in the space (Lefebvre, 1991). The significance of Lefebvre’s work is that he was not concerned with defining space, but understanding the production of space (Pierce & Martin, 2015).

This conception of the spatial dialectic leads to the sociospatial dialect that even more explicitly emphasizes the continuous motion and production of the social spatial and the social order (Soja, 1980). Thus, Soja (1980; Pierce & Martin 2015) begins seeing space as being composed of and produced by the Lefebvrian Triad, moving from Lefebvre’s singular production framework. Moreover, Soja (2010) argues for the need to take-up the spatial turn to prevent the privileging of the temporal over the spatial in analysis. The spatial analysis, Soja (2010) notes, is critical in examining the modern social condition.

However, Jessop, Brenner, and Jones (2008) suggest that even Soja’s (1980) understanding of the sociospatial dialectic is incomplete. They argue that the past two decades have been marked by a number of spatial turns throughout the academy, Jessop, et al. (2008) pushes beyond a singular examination of the “sociospatial” through the

sociospatial lenses of territory, space, place, or network. They assert the need to move to a methodology that pulls from all four lenses, thus bringing sociospatial territory, space, place, and networks into interaction with each other. Territory pulls on the borders of the sociospatial relations, looking at boundaries. Space explains the hierarchies and differentiations of sociospatial relations. Place examines the proximity of sociospatial relations. Networks describe the interconnectivity and interdependence of sociospatial relations (Jessop et al., 2008). This four-part framework expands the sociospatial landscape to a multi-dimensional understanding that allows the researcher to explore how space is produced, constructed, consumed, and reproduced.

Theorizing publicness. In 2012, Németh attempted to apply Lessig's (2001) work on the internet as a public "commons" to the material world. This work set out to assess the feasibility of Lessig's work to serve as a framework for analyzing the publicness of space. Németh (2012) states simply, "publicness is always subjective" reminding the reader that "the dimensions and extent of its publicness are highly differentiated from instance to instance" (p. 813). Németh defines the "Commons" in part with Lessig's (2001) definition, but also using his own based on the adaption for the material world. He states that the Commons "is any collectively owned resource held in joint use or possession to which anyone has access without obtaining permission of anyone else" (Németh, 2012, p. 815). This definition is expanded beyond resources to spaces and culture communities by the work of Ostrom and Dolšák (2003), Muñoz (2013), and Wall (2014).

Specifically, the work of Németh (2012) serves as a key reference point for expanding the Lefebvrian Triad (Lefebvre, 1991; Pierce & Martin, 2015; Soja, 1980) to incorporate the concepts of public/private identity of space within the production and consumption of space. In his study analyzing the publicness of the Independence National Historical Park post 9/11, Németh (2012) identifies three layers in Lessig's work: physical, code, and content. Each translates from internet-centric to physical interpretations that align with the Lefebvrian Triad. The physical, like Lefebvre's conceived, consists of the geographic and design of space, of which Németh utilizes maps and municipally published design information. The code (like Lefebvre's perceived) consists of the laws, regulations, and policies, of which Németh analyzes municipal literature and conducts site observations. The content, like Lefebvre's lived, examines the use, behavior, interactions, and meanings within the space, of which Németh utilizes interviews, observations, and public comment analysis.

However, Németh (2012) asserts that the trickiness of publicness lies not in the conception of the "commons" but in the conditionality of these spaces. The conditional publicness of space is that public space comes with conditions of behaviors and standards of use that can be enacted to limit access. "And yet it is these conditions placed on public access and behavior that limit who uses a space and how" (Németh, 2012, p. 813). It is this tension between the rights of the individual and municipal security that construct the conflicts between defining and developing public space. Németh (2012) cautions, "Urban space is the playing field for protest and dissent, so closing or limiting access to an

appropriate public challenges these First Amendment rights and liberties” (p. 812).

Alternatively, as Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht (2011) stated, “Openness has always been limited, and the struggle over public spaces is about constraints and acceptable activities and users” (p. 10). Furthermore, Bale (1993) notes that the ability to control, fill, and empty space are forms of bio-power. Yet, people “with their bodies ... lay claim to public spaces” (Franck & Stevens, 2007, p. 35) by the activities they perform in those spaces, often when those spaces were not designed for those activities (Franck & Stevens, 2007).

The City as a Playground

First, an understanding of “the city” and its role in the regulation or deregulation of publicness need to be considered. The municipality shapes public spaces for the organization of the city and bodies within the city, as much as for public use (Irvine & Taysom, 1998). Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht (2011) note that “planners and urbanists have suggested that vibrant public spaces can control undesirable people and activities” (p. 5). The municipality, as noted by Németh (2012) and Lefebvre (1991), has often constructed space for specific purposes. For generations the world over, societies have been building cityscapes to organize, define, and categorize people and things. These scapes kept out the bad, showcased the good, and convicted the uncivilized. Cities often create micro-cities, places within the city that contain specific ideals, people, and purposes – neighborhoods. A “red light” district for the unsavory, an “economic” district for commerce, an “industrial” district for work, and a “recreational” district for play

(Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2011). “[S]kateboarding is one practice which can be seen to disrupt the consumptive logic of the city... first, by reinventing the city as *terrain* ... second, by moving across geographic demarcations” (Irvine & Taysom, 1998, p. 25).

Therefore, when we construct the city as a playground of sorts, there is a central importance in the thought process about how these spaces may be shaped for some and not for others. “When public spaces are redeveloped, some people are planned for as target users while others are planned against, and redevelopment projects are meant to exclude as much as attract” (Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2011, p. 5). For example, this draws attention to how children once used city streets as part of their physical presence – street ball, pick-up games, and walking to school. All of this has shifted, with some scholars noting security and safety as the ascribed reason (Németh, 2012) and others noting the perception of unattended children as “disorder” and neglect (Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2011). Schools and public spaces have been reorganized to increase youth surveillance, or what Fusco (2007) describes as “spatial surveillance” (p. 46). This shift is significant, as city spaces have served as significant components of a “public” landscape. “[I]nvoking danger helps solidify a ‘problem’ that can be eliminated, but it also reduces the discussion about more complicated social conditions and alternatives” (Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2011, p. 221). The idea of the city not being safe allows for actions to be taken to protect the populace from potential danger—returning to the municipal role for the common good.

Fixing of windows. In the early 1980s, George Kelling and James Wilson published an article in *The Atlantic* entitled “Broken Windows: The Police and Neighborhood Safety” (1982). Their article called for a return to the era of the town watchman when the role of the police was not to investigate and solve crime but to maintain order. They argued that as the American (U.S.) police force evolved to investigate and solve crime, they have lost their ability to help communities establish moral standards and self-regulate order. Kelling and Wilson referenced the experiences of people in three large urban areas in the 1970s: New York City, Philadelphia, and Washington, D.C. These cities had determined that having police patrol communities in police cars or on foot produced varying benefits. Overwhelmingly, Kelling and Wilson argue that foot patrols are more effective at maintaining order and surveilling the community because the police are seen as part of the community.

In their article, Kelling and Wilson (1982) specifically referenced the presence of broken windows and other signs of neglect as a signal to criminals that a community will not regulate or address negative activity. Therefore, by nature of compliancy, the community opens itself to the criminal mind as a lucrative space. In this neglect, Kelling and Wilson included “drunks,” “vagrants,” “teenagers,” and “the homeless” – all of which the authors believed “frightened” the “good” citizen and prevented them from acting against negative behavior. Here is one specific scenario:

Teenagers gather in front of the corner store. The merchant asks them to move; they refuse. Fights occur. Litter accumulates. People start drinking in front of the grocery; in time, an inebriate slumps to the sidewalk and is allowed to sleep it off. Pedestrians are approached by panhandlers (Kelling & Wilson, 1982, para. 14).

The greatest assumption made here is that there is a direct causation between “disturbances” and major crime. The authors paint a picture that minor social infractions or social discomforts lead directly to “...an inhospitable and frightening jungle” (Kelling & Wilson, 1982, para. 14), where the “good folks” of the community are pushed to the margins by the “obstreperous teenager or drunken panhandler” (para. 17). In this space, the criminal is invited into the community and ceremonially welcomed by inaction. Teenaphobia, as Taylor and Khan (2011) describe it, is at the root of skateboarding’s connections to the Broken Windows Theory.

Skateboarding, often performed by youth in public urban spaces, disrupt the moral order of the community (Irvine & Taysom, 1998). Therefore, communities have begun creating and developing skateparks as a means to “control” and “contain” the “inhospitable” behavior. As noted by Bale (1996), sport space can often invoke fear as much as affection. He uses the specific example of large crowds – they are feared until they are contained. Skateparks, as noted by Taylor and Khan (2011), are seen to address the teenage need to hang out and the community’s needs to maintain social order. However, this becomes problematic. The foundation of the Broken Windows Theory is still based in fear and socially defined moral order. Police and the municipality have utilized this theory to justify the monitoring and control of public youth activities as

means to prevent crime and maintain order (Fulda, 2010). For example, consider the public basketball court initiatives of New York City in the late 1980s/early 1990s. The creation of this space was to surveil bodies that were determined to be a “danger” or “nuisance” to the common good. The question, however, is who determines the moral values of a community and should those values be challenged when they are not inclusive or are prejudicial in nature?

It is important to remember what access to public space means for bodies, “Access to public spaces also is a mechanism by which urban dwellers assert their right to participate in society, and these struggles over the right to use public spaces take different forms” (Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2011, p. 7). Rights to the city, particularly the city as a space where peoples’ lives are lived³, often directly translate into one’s rights of community within a given municipality.

The Spaces of Skateboarding

“Space and place are the basic components of the lived world” (Tuan 1977, p. 3). Or as Bale (1996) notes that Tuan takes it a step further to argue that space and place make up the components of good life.

³ Intentionally, the term “lived” here invokes the work of Friedman and van Ingen (2011). “[S]paces of representation, people live their lives, express themselves and perhaps, use spaces in ways different from the purposes of designers, and in so doing, transform a space, its meanings and uses” (p. 96).

Tuan regards popular attitudes towards the good life as being made up of two broad aspirations. The first is the search for certain environmental settings – the garden, the house, the city square... The second (which many people would probably put first) is a range of ideal activities. (Bale, 1996, p. 168)

Both are operating conceptions of skateboarding (Borden, 2001) that brings the participant to the notion of place. As noted in Chapter One, limited research on BMX' (and other action sports') cultural conceptions and interactions with space have been conducted. However, many of the sports within the action sports community share similar positionality within American (U.S.) culture (Wheaton, 2014). Therefore, the cultural conceptions and interactions of skateboarding with space could provide foundational insight for BMX and other action sports.

Skateboarders often assimilate a given space and make it a place for a given moment. “[S]katers exploit the ambiguity of the ownership and function of public space. They often use spaces when they have no other use, and in doing so create a meaning for that space” (Woolley & Johns, 2001, p. 215). There is a feeling of space “empathy and engagement” that makes the space a place when the skateboarder is moving through. This moves beyond Bale’s (1996) interpretation of Tuan’s topophilia⁴. Borden (2001) called this understanding the “wallness of the wall” and sensing the feeling of the space. Carr (2010) argues, skateboarders see all space equally and uniformly – simply, everything is skateable. Carr argues that skateboarders are continuously deconstructing space at the

⁴ According to Bale (1996), the application of Tuan’s topophilia to sport and sporting spaces can be interpreted by affection to a space, such as a football fan’s affection for their team’s home stadium.

micro-level and seeing lips, bumps, ledges, and rails – skateable space in all terrains. This is also demonstrated in the work of Chui (2009) and Borden (2001).

Chui (2009) interviewed skateboarders in New York City after the city passed a formal skateboarding policy in 2007. The policy allowed for the creation of public skateparks with the hope of eliminating skateboarding in other public spaces. However, Chui's work found that this too was a contested concept for skateboarders – again bringing to light the push and pull within the skate community. In his interviews, Chui found a mix of opinions – from skateboarders who enjoyed the hassle-free space of allocated skateparks to the skateboarders that likened the public skatepark to “the modern zoo.” The skaters argued that the public skatepark was little more than a “caged environment” meant to observe them. Howell (2008) calls the “Skatepark Revolution” of the 2000s part of the “hidden youth program” created by cities. While still others, (Carr, 2010) argue that skateparks are just another evolution in skateboarding's ability to adapt and survive in the political landscape that it traverses. However, Woolley and Johns (2001) note “there will always be a significant number of skaters with a desire to skate natural terrain, no matter how many skate parks are opened in the locality” (p. 227).

Overall, Woolley and Johns (2001) argue that skateboarders look for four characteristics when selecting a space, regardless of the legality or intentionality of the space for skateboarding: accessibility, sociability, trickability, and compatibility. This also appeared in Chui's (2009) work with New York City skateboarders. The accessibility is straightforward - can one get to the space. Sociability is a key component

of the skateboarding experience. Campo (2013) noted that as part of the Shantytown build (more below), skateboarders had found abandoned furniture specifically so spectators could be present – calling it “urban theater.” The space must accommodate spectators and fellow skateboarders alike (Campo 2013; Chui 2009). Trickability is the ability to physically skate the space and cultivate tricks. Compatibility refers to the level of anti-skateboarding enforcement that occurs in the space – Carr (2010) noted that you cannot skate at Westlake Plaza in Seattle, Washington as the security guard (at the time of his interviews) would eject you immediately.

Woolley & Johns’ (2001) work examines how American (U.S.) youth engage with public space. They argue that youth look for open spaces that allow them to make a claim on the space. However, open spaces are deeply regulated with ordinances and city codes that are often developed with the intent of limiting youth access (Carr, 2010; Woolley & Johns, 2001). This is also true of skateboarders. However, Woolley and Johns (2001) argue that skateboarders seek space in the urban core instead of open space and that the sociability is as much about symbolic ownership of a given space as it is about “hanging out.” The urban core (Park, Burgess, & McKenzie, 1925) is the space where commerce occurs, the culture center is maintained, manufacturing takes place, and the daily operation of the city transpires. Skateboarding poses a challenge when attempting to maintain city order, as skateboarders are perceived as disrupting and impeding essential movement through these spaces. This essential movement is for the purposes of economic growth (Carr, 2010; Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2011; Woolley &

Johns, 2001). Thus, skateboarders are often grouped with individuals who are experiencing homelessness as bodies who engage with the public space without contributing economically to the city (Borden, 2001; Carr, 2010; Campo, 2013; Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2011; Woolley & Johns, 2001). Indeed, the creation of defensive architecture, both hard and soft⁵, that limit movement through a given public space, is often aimed at both groups (Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2011). This includes brackets placed on ledges and benches preventing “grinds” or sleeping.

Through the Skater’s Eye⁶

It is Carr (2010) that reminds the reader that the beauty of marginalized groups in public spaces is that these groups have the potential to shift the meaning of the space, challenging power structures of a given space (Friedman & van Ingen, 2011). Specifically, Carr (2010) argues that skateboarding leaves both physical marks on the pavement and on case law. Through continuously skateboarding in public spaces, skateboarders push the edges of legality. “[S]kateboarders by their mere presence create a crisis for public space” (Carr, 2010, p. 993). He argues that skateboarders find the gaps in “the seams” of the law and are continuously evolving the legal understanding of public versus private ownership. Woolley and Johns (2001) note more specifically that

⁵ Hard defensive architecture would include physical barriers (e.g., brackets on ledges). Soft defensive architecture are laws and governance mechanisms (Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2011)

⁶ The skater’s eye is the ability to look at any given space and see the skateable lines throughout (Borden, 2001; Carr, 2010; Chui, 2009; Woolley & Johns, 2001).

“[s]katers use unconventional hours to skate, exploiting the streets, squares and street furniture that others rarely use or notice” (p. 228).

These concepts become essential when turning to the work of Mills (1959), who asks the reader to think about personal troubles as implications of larger social issues. This is true of skateboarding in the search for space. The personal trouble of where to skate is a much larger social issue of who has access to space and rights to the city. Chui (2009) argues that skateboarding challenges the social and political structures that define access and rights to the city. All three bring to light the power inequity that exists in the use of public space in the city that skateboarding can, and often, challenges.

Several examples exist of skateboarders reclaiming, appropriating, or calling to light the need for public space to be accessible to all bodies. Carr (2010) wrote of the skateboarding community in Seattle, Washington, who fought the city municipality in the early 2000s to keep a user-designed and built skatepark (the Ballard Bowl). Modeling their work after the Burnside Skatepark in Portland, Oregon, skateboarders in Seattle built a “do-it-yourself” (DYI) skatepark in a public city park – Ballard. Later a second park would be built at Marginal Way, an underpass in the SoDo (South of Downtown) district of Seattle. However, it was the Ballard Bowl that brought to light significant questions of equity of space. As the city municipality aimed to close the Ballard Bowl during the Ballard Park renovations, they were also closing Seattle’s public skatepark – SeaSk8, located at the Seattle Center. The SeaSk8 park was being closed to accommodate the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. It was through the work of skateboarders

protesting that as part of the sale of land to the Gates Foundation, a portion of the sale would go to building a new skatepark near the City's center (this is would be the park noted at the beginning of Chapter One). The work of the skateboarders eventually led to a larger Citywide Skatepark Plan being developed (Carr, 2010), of which Carr served as a taskforce member. The Ballard Bowl, however, was closed and a smaller skatepark was built in its place. Carr (2010) refers to user-designed and built skateparks (DYI) as guerrilla skateparks, and these have popped up across the U.S. in major cities. This guerrilla skatepark movement was happening on the East Coast as well as the West Coast, highlighted by Campo's (2013) work with skateboarders in New York City and Németh's (2006) work with skateboarders in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Recently, a guerrilla skatepark was discovered below Interstate 85 (I-85) in Atlanta, Georgia near a section of highway that had collapsed (Haney, 2017)

Shantytown, NYC. New York City has been an epicenter of skateboarding space appropriation for decades – highlighting the differences between “East Coast” and “West Coast” skateboarding (Campo, 2013). The East Coast skateboarding style is one that takes on more of an urban linear edge. It is about angles and street skate, compared to the West Coast that is more about emulating surfing styles. Campo (2013) explored the development and community of Shantytown in Brooklyn, New York. On the banks of the Hudson River, Shantytown was a manifestation of a guerrilla skatepark in the then abandoned Brooklyn Eastern Terminal District (BETD). BETD was an open slab of concrete, flat and covered in trash collected throughout decades. In the 1990s,

skateboarders, along with artists, individuals who were homeless, beggars, and other marginalized groups, began using the BETD. The skaters first started using the flat surface of the open slab to skate. They then progressed to moving pieces of trash to create makeshift ramps and obstacles, an old metal filing cabinet here, a metal pillion there. By the early 2000s, Shantytown became a “Skate Mecca⁷,” a space like LOVE Park in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Campo, 2013; Németh, 2006), where skateboarders from around the world knew and traveled to skate.

Shantytown, like many “Skate Meccas,” was a found space that was not in use by the city, but not quite public. Woolley and Johns (2001) call this the ambiguous space between public and private where Carr (2010) refers to this as the seams in legality. Both refer to this as a part of skateboarding culture. This is a claiming of space when it is no longer in use or not being used: a plaza at night, abandoned parking lots, or empty businesses (Borden, 2001; Campo, 2013; Carr, 2010; Chui, 2009). Shantytown was this claiming of unused space, and throughout the 1990s and early 2000s, local skateboarders began building permeant concrete structures, like the Volcano (a makeshift cone-like structure with trash at its center and covered in concrete). It was in 2001 when New York University acquired the BETD and Shantytown was torn down by the municipality. Prior to this point, the municipality had not enforced trespassing ordinances at the BETD. However, after this point, the municipality began issuing trespassing tickets and

⁷ Skate Meccas are internationally known skate spots made famous through film or print media, skated regularly and often traveled to. These include spaces like Philadelphia’s LOVE Park, NYC’s Brooklyn Banks, etc.

skateboarders, artists, individuals who were homeless, and others were pushed out of the area (Campo, 2013). This is not uncommon as some municipalities will allow skateboarders to use space until an economic or social need arises for them to be removed.

This concept of claimed space is not new to New York City. In the early 1990s, skateboarders began skating an area called “Brooklyn Banks,” a sloped underpass on the Manhattan side of the Brooklyn Bridge. Brooklyn Banks became such a skatespot that after September 11, 2001, police shut down the park in fear that the location would be an ideal and accessible terrorist target. Local skateboarders negotiated with municipality, and Brooklyn Banks reopened and is now included in a larger city renovation plan for the area (Campo, 2013).

For the love of LOVE Park. Németh (2006) had a very different outcome when he worked with skateboarders in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Skateboarders have had a longstanding love for LOVE Park. The statue created by Robert Indiana and the surrounding park offered ideal lines for skateboarding, with flat surfaces for flatland tricks and open space to maneuver. The connection between skateboarding and LOVE Park was so great that it motivated ESPN to choose Philadelphia as home to the X Games during its early years (once moving from Rhode Island). Németh (2006) chronicled the benefits the City of Philadelphia received as host to the X Games in the late 1990s and the dismantling of a key “Skate Mecca” in 2002. The municipality started a long-term renovation plan for the park in 2000, of which removing the skateboarders was a

component. It was argued that the skateboarders created \$60,000 in ongoing damages to the park (though Németh estimated that the City received \$1 million in profit from the X Games). Skateboarders protested the ban and the skate industry offered up funds to repair the damage to keep the space open. The municipality refused, maintaining the ban and offering to build a skatepark outside of LOVE Park. Skateboarders and the skateboarding industry were displeased with this compromise, and ESPN eventually moved the X Games to San Francisco (Németh, 2006).

From the Roots of Mayhem

These histories of skateboarding in claimed public spaces are significant, Mills (1959) notes in his *Sociological Imagination*, as history and biography are intertwined. The history of the spaces where skateboarding occurs, along with the history of the sport, are significant in the understanding of how these spaces are conceived and lived. The uniqueness of where the sports developed and “thrived” provide a narrative of how the spaces they occupied throughout time have been transformed or informed by their presence. In the work of Carr (2010), Chui (2009), Németh (2006), Woolley and Johns (2001), and the history of skateboarding is enriched by further descriptions of the histories of the spaces where the activities were taking place. In his writing, *Reflections on the Politics of Space*, Lefebvre (1976) cautions against studying space “isolated from context” (p. 30) as it was in the 1960s. Specially, he urges researchers to move away from “the scientism and the spatiality” (p. 30) that presents space as apolitical and absent of the very dialectic discussed throughout this project.

In a time of skateboarding. Though it can be argued that skateboarding's origins began as far back as 1779 (Zarka, 2011), the preferred origin stories often teeter between Fort Lauderdale, Florida (Snyder, 2015) and Santa Monica, California (Davis, 2004; Friedman, Nemeth, Ostroff, & Peralta, 2001). Prior to the 1960s, skateboarding in the U.S. was destined to become a child's plaything – clay roller skate wheels nailed to planks of wood. However, it was the creation of the urethane wheel that changed the destiny of the wheel and board. The urethane wheel allowed surfers to emulate their fluid-wave like motions on land (Snyder, 2015). Thus, the sometimes-tricky relationship between surfing and skateboarding began.

The most famous skateboarding origin story, the one that appears to have the most widespread influence, told over and over with varying accuracy, is the story of Dogtown, Venice Beach in Santa Monica. The story begins at the Zephyr Surf Shop (Friedman et al., 2001) with a group of misfit kids who have winding aspirations of professional surfing take on the streets and pools of Southern California. Some argue it was the drought of 1976 that put the Zephyr Team on the map (Friedman et al., 2001), while others argue it was the creative writing of C. R. Stecyk in *Thrasher* (Snyder, 2015). Either way, the timing, location, and attitude have become legends in the origin myths of skateboarding.

It is this Dogtown-described attitude of anti-establishment, disfranchised youth, “bad kids doing bad things” that is often referenced in general descriptions of skateboarding. Skateboarding is perceived to be deeply grounded in 1970s U.S. surf

culture, with which it shared the resistance persona often associated with the youth of that decade in the U.S. (Atkinson & Young, 2008; Davis, 2004; Rundquist, 2007). With popular skateboarders of the 1970s, often also surfers, being known for their anti-establishment, anti-law abiding, and anti-mainstream antics, skateboarding often invokes visions of disenfranchised youth that do not care and do not conform to societal standards of behavior (Howe, 2003). Atkinson and Young (2008) documented that “resistance sport [action sports] enthusiasts seemingly disavowed parent-controlled, heavily competitive, rule-bound, commercial, authoritarian and exclusionary forms of organized sport” (p. 54). However, no one watching skateboarders at a local skatepark can deny that this “other” status is moving closer and closer to the center of mainstream.

No longer can skateboarding be called “other” based on its exclusivity to non-conformists – it has been packaged, bought, and sold by companies like Monster Energy Drink, Vans, Quiksilver, and ESPN (Beal & Weidman, 2003; Rinehart & Sydnor, 2003). It is this tangle of conformity, capitalism, and nonconformity that make it difficult to pinpoint specific cultural identities of skateboarding. Take for example popular skateboarding magazines like *Thrasher*, or videos like Powell-Peralta’s “Ban this: Bones Brigade Six” (Peralta, 1989) DVD and skateboarding appears as a culture and sport contrived under angst and disharmony. Its ability to allow for creative risk taking while challenging “the man” and the world’s sensibilities are often the draw of deck and wheel (Thornton, 2013). However, by turning on a television, scanning the internet, or browsing the local mega-goods store, skateboarding is transforming from this angst-driven margin

to a somewhat commercialized center. Indeed, a current struggle between “is skateboarding a crime,” “is skateboarding a sport,” and the titles in between are unfolding amongst the elite within skateboarding – from Mike Valley to Tony Hawk.

As noted previously by Thrope (2009) and Atkinson and Young (2008), the cultural aspect of skateboarding cannot be ignored, and in 2003 Howe argued that skateboarding is a subculture and a lifestyle as much as it is a sport (if not more than). Due to skateboarding’s exclusionary practices and meanings, this culture is often reinforced and re-established through cultural products (e-zines, blogs, magazines, music) (Howe, 2003). It might be argued that these cultural products offer a view of skateboarding that serves to shape and reshape the image of skateboarding for some as the continuation of the anti-establishment view, and for others reshaping the culture to a commercially accessible one.

Outside of the elite realm of competitions (like the Dew Tour, X Games, etc.), skateboarding is still largely unregulated (with no official rules) and non-competitive. At the heart of skateboarding culture exists no rules, no coaches, no drills, and no score. The intent is to bring about a space of open creativity that is a central tenet of the sport. The ideal of the non-conformist is that the “individual” is not the group and that what “society” puts forth as a standard is not the standard by which the skateboarders live (Beal & Weidman, 2003; Beal & Wilson, 2004). In the words of Jeff Howe (2003), “Skateboarding is skateboarding is skateboarding” (p. 356). “[Authenticity] is the individual expression of self (as long as it challenges some aspect of traditional values

and norms of organized sport and society at large)” (Beal & Weidman, 2003, p. 344).

However, this is challenged as municipalities open skateparks and skateboarding is seen in public spheres – skate competitions, demos, and beyond. Thus, the term skateboarding offers symbolic meaning – both marginalized and conflicted.

Keep in mind, however, that from the diverse beginnings described in Dogtown, skateboarding struggles to create an era of inclusion. The original diversity present within skateboarding in the Venice Beach of the 1970s has been replaced with a narrowing of access by diverse bodies. Skateboarding and BMX are often occupied by white, heterosexual, male bodies – both in mediated literature and in the professional ranks. This struggle is manifested in space and how space is claimed. In many ways, the occupation of space by these sports reproduces the very inequity these sports are claiming to disrupt.

Additional Frameworks

The Chicago School of Sociology. The key to Park, Burgess, and McKenzie’s (1925; Park, 1952) work, that would then direct the sociology program at the Chicago School during the Golden Era, focuses on the concepts of time and space. The strongest premise of the Chicago School during this time is that “social facts are located in time and space” (Abbott, 1997) – that exploring the impact of one without the other limits context. It is the intertwining of the time and space as context for social interactions that fueled much of the School’s work through the 1930s (Lutters & Auckermann, 1996).

Park, Burgess, and McKenzie (1925) premise their work on the belief that “the city” serves as an ideal laboratory for studying human relationships, as, according to Park

(1952), the city is “the natural habitat of the modern man” (p. 14). They were dedicated to the methods of social surveying, and Park (Lutters & Auckermann, 1996; Merriman, 2015; Park, 1952) believed in direct observation as a key methodology.

In their observations, Park, Burgess, and McKenzie (1925) found that social interactions and the life of the city were impacted by three specific items: ecology, institutions, and perceptions (Merriman, 2015). The ecology of the city was the general working organism that was the city. This was often portrayed by concentric circles laid out on maps of the City of Chicago. At the center was the cultural and economic heart of the city, with the exchange value of land lessening as one moved outward through the city to the suburbs. Institutional impacts were the structures that shape the everyday activities within the city (churches, schools, governments). This is not unlike Mills’ (1959) use of structure as a key concept in his framework, the Sociological Imagination. Perceptual impacts were the individual relationships and social communities that people lived in (Merriman, 2015).

This framework is key when thinking about the impact of the Chicago School in studying urban space today. Ecological, institutional, and perceptual impacts align with the spatial work of Lefebvre (1996), the sociological work of Mills (1959), the architectural work of Borden (2001), and the spatial turn (Soja, 2010) as it develops within Kinesiology. Lefebvre (1996) shared a great deal with Park, Burgess, and McKenzie. The common belief that relationships between individuals shaped the city, and the city shaped these relationships is at the heart of their work. Both focused on the

impact of economic and labor outcomes on the space and daily life in the city – Lefebvre (1996) studying the biological labor, technical labor, and intellectual labor of the city, while Park, Burgess, and McKenzie (1925), consider the flow of labor throughout the concentric circles in the ecology of the city. Lefebvre's (1996) account of near order and far order is helpful. Near order refers to close relationships between individuals and communities, far order is the structural institutions that shape these relationships. Lefebvre believed that cities served as the mediators between the two, as the city contained the near order, but was contained by the far order. Lastly, Lefebvre's (1996) framework of conceived, perceived, and lived space aligns well when breaking down the ecology of the city.

Mills' (1959) conception of the Sociological Imagination, the intertwining of biography and history as sociological imperatives, aligns heavily with the framework of Park, Burgess, and McKenzie (Merriman, 2015). The alignment of Park, Burgess, and McKenzie's institutional and Mills' structural sensitivity, and the alignment of Park, Burgess, and McKenzie's perceptual and Mill's cultural sensitivity create a unique framework for viewing the social order of the city. The combination of their works could be conceived in the very circles that marked Burgess' work for so long.

The architectural work of Borden (2001) is heavily framed by the work of Lefebvre (1996), and it is Borden's description of architectural flows, not unlike Appadurai's (1990) flows and scapes, that shape skateboarding's entanglement with the city. Borden's (2001) observations of the role of skateboarding in the exchange and use

value dialogues of the city are not unlike the Chicago School's work with migrant communities (Park, Burgess, and McKenzie, 1925). Both groups were/are defined by their economic interactions with the city itself as part of their defined place within the city. Skateboarders are often branded as disruptive, dangerous, and disorderly as they engage with space, particularly at the urban core (Campo, 2013), without having economic engagement with the city (Borden, 2001; Carr, 2010; Woolley & Johns, 2001). Thus, when planning space, skateboarders are often included in the margins with individuals who are homeless as key groups to plan against or plan social controls to mitigate their behavior (Carr, 2010; Woolley & Johns, 2001). This conception of planning against key groups was also the observation of the Chicago School in their work with marginalized communities (Merriman, 2015; Park, 1952). Additionally, as Carr (2010) points out, it is the community, or neighborhood, that shapes and dictates the role of skateboarding within their part of the city. This too aligns with the work of Park, Burgess, and McKenzie (1925), as they argue that the neighborhood plays a significant role in the governing of the city. As Park, Burgess, and McKenzie (1925) assert, that it is hard to convince a person that what they observe in their local community is not happening across the city.

Mills and the Sociological Imagination. The Sociological Imagination (Mills, 1959) is a key framework for many researchers conducting sociological work. However, it is the conceptual questions that Mills asks that frames this project: who are the people who live in this community (culture), where does this community reside in human

history, and what are the structures - social and otherwise - that exist in this society?

Mills' questions frame the very nature of the work this project seeks to perform: who are these skateboarders, how do they navigate this skate community and other communities, and what are the structures that open these experiences for them or close skateboarding to them. Moreover, the very idea of personal troubles as social issues is essential to this work - where to skate (a personal trouble) becomes an example of access to space and the city (social issue).

Lyng and Edgework. Edgework is often described as activities - whether it be work, play, or thought - that push the limits of human physicality and cognition "in search of new possibilities of being" (Lyng, 2005, p. 4). It is thrill seeking situated on the edge of socially acceptable limits of risk. Skateboarding and other action sports reside in this sphere, pushing the boundaries of space, thought, and physical movement. Edgework activities, like skateboarding, are often considered to be ways to escape the structural conditions that support the marginalization of an individual's existence (Lyng, 2005).

More recent work in edgework suggests that when looking at what the U.S. culture values, edgework is often at the center of the work that the U.S. celebrates. Edgework produces the very skills and capacities needed and idealized by a Western postindustrial society. It might be argued that U.S. society is a "risk society" that values risk-taking in business, politics, and other cultural-spheres (Lyng, 2005). Lyng questions if edgework frees the participant, in this case the skateboarder, from society or if it better integrates them into the institutional environment. He suggests that it could be both.

O'Mally and Mugford (Lyng, 2005), connect Edgework to the deviance work of Norbert Elias. Elias' work chronicled a civilizing process throughout time. In this process, Elias theorized that communities progress socially and morally, but developing values that are considered progressive. For example, to sneeze or blow one's nose at the dinner table is often frowned upon in polite company in the U.S. Elias notes that not so long ago, this act was considered the social norm. As a society, we have "civilized" and progressed to this behavior being "unsanitary" and undesirable.

Elias (2000) notes that at one time the civilized were seen as the uncivilized, slowly becoming the majority. Those individuals who do not progress, in this case – continue to sneeze and clear their noses at dinner are seen to be uncivilized. They remain in the uncivilizing space that is deviant within the community. Within edgework, O'Mally and Mugford hypothesize that athletes who live a life of risk-taking and thrill-seeking are occupying the uncivilized spaces. They are deviant because they refuse to fall in line with society's normalized values of safe behavior.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Integrating key ideas from several social science and sociological frameworks (i.e. Lefebvrian Triad, edgework, publicness, and biographies) that focus on spatial relations, this project presents a critical spatial reading of two skatepark/skatespot networks within the United States: Portland (OR) and Seattle (WA). The resulting case study analyses (Creswell, 2013) allows for the development of thematic understandings and critical theorizing regarding municipal approaches to skateboarding and public space. Additionally, by utilizing methodologies related to critical observation of time (including histories) and space as put forth by the Chicago School of Sociology during the Golden Era (Park, Burgess, & McKenzie, 1925), this project expands the sociospatial dialectic (Jessop, et al, 2008; Soja, 1980) beyond the singular methods (of space or place) to multifaceted methods necessary for examining the ecology of skatescapes.

By overlaying the Lefebvrian Triad (Lefebvre, 1991; Pierce & Martin, 2015; Soja, 1980) with the frameworks of the Sociological Imagination (Mills, 1959), edgework (Lyng, 2005), and measures of publicness (Németh, 2012), the sociospatial networks of “the city” and rights to “the city” can be considered and investigated. Specifically, the examination of “the city” as a laboratory for observing social facts and human relationships (Park, Burgess, & McKenzie, 1925) becomes the foundation of this project.

Utilizing methodologies for observing the “lived” city (found images⁸ and mediated literature⁹), influenced by the work of Park, Burgess, and McKenzie (1925), this project analyzed the city skatepark plans. By locating these observations in both time (histories) and space, this project sought to expand “the city” from geographic boundaries to an ecological space of relationships between individuals, institutions, and movement. This engagement with the ecology of “the city,” at the heart of the Chicago School’s work in the 1920s, serves as a key enhancement to the application of the sociospatial dialectic to the two city plans. Thus, this project was able to examine the intersections of known social science frameworks (mentioned above) and theorize evolving understandings of spatial networks challenged and conformed by skateboarding in “the city.”

Research Sites

Two cities (Portland, OR and Seattle, WA) were selected for this project. These cities were selected because they represent both skate meccas and skate-adjacent spaces in the U.S with “public-facing” plans addressing skateboarding (and other actions sports) within community public spaces. The sites identified for this project were analyzed through a critical reading and review of municipal literature (i.e. plans, policies, and ordinances) and mediated literature regarding each city’s skatepark network plan. Specifically, this project analyzed the development, deployment, and consumption of

⁸ Found data sources for visual media constitute media that is produced daily, but not of the researchers control (television, print media, web sites, blogs, etc.) (Pauwels, 2012).

⁹ Mediated literature includes items from newspapers, blogs, videos, and magazines that serve as local or regional references to how life in the city is lived. For a list of the mediated literature examples, see Table 2.

the Citywide Skatepark Plan of Seattle, Washington (Skatepark Advisory Task Force, 2007) and the Portland Skatepark System Plan (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008). The inclusion of mediated literature in this project allowed for stronger analyses of the deployment and consumption of the plans within each city. Local and national newspapers, skateboarding industry magazines (*TransWorld Skateboarding* and *Thrasher*), and local community and prominent national skateboarding blogs were reviewed.

The critical reading of these documents was enhanced through an analysis of visuals (found images) from two skateparks in each city that were identified by their respective relationships to each city's plan. It should be noted that for some time the use of visual analysis has not been used or viewed as a credible primary methodology by scholars (Pauwels, 2012; Stanczak, 2007). However, several researchers (Pauwels, 2012; Rose, 2007; Stanczak, 2007) have argued that the epistemological choice to use visual analysis should be considered as an equally compared method, to more traditional methods (e.g., interviewing, document analysis), for the study of society and culture. Furthermore, when examining society and culture in ways that are fundamentally non-linear in their manifestation (e.g., space), it is arguably even more necessary to utilize a visual analysis as primary data source (Gold, 2007).

Though many skating spaces exist in each city, the Burnside skatepark and Ed Benedict skatepark (Portland), and Marginal Way skatepark and Delridge skatepark (Seattle) were identified for the visual analysis. Each site operates in line with or in conflict with the municipal plan and allowed for a stronger analysis of how these plans

are “lived.” Burnside and Marginal Way are do-it-yourself (DIY) public skateparks built by the local skateboarding community and adopted as part of their respective city plans. Ed Benedict and Delridge skateparks were purposefully-built by their respective cities for skateboarding and recreation as a result of each plan.

It should be noted that the varying histories and styles of skateboarding on the East Coast of the U.S. versus the West Coast require consideration for differing municipal perceptions of the sports, as well as differing spatial needs. However, this project sought to engage the imagined potential of public space for these sports. This imagined potential is more readily visible in the municipal spaces of the American (US) west coast due to their commitment to innovative city design and commitment to public recreation spaces (Dougherty, 2009; Owens, 2014; Raley, 2010).

Municipal Plans (and Policies)

The Citywide Skatepark Plan, Seattle, Washington. The Citywide Skatepark Plan of Seattle, Washington (Skatepark Advisory Task Force, 2007) was published in 2007 by a City task force. This was the result of community advocates petitioning the City to keep an already existing guerilla skatepark (the Ballard Bowl). This closure of the Ballard Bowl considered with new funds from a land sale to the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and an increased awareness of skateboarding as a recreation activity. The plan provides an example of surveying the urban landscape and addressing the perceived needs of a skateboarding community.

The Task Force consisted of community leaders and was tasked with identifying the skateboarding potential and the climate within the city. Through their work, the city

of Seattle established this plan to outline the potential for the siting and construction of several new public skateparks. Additionally, the Task Force identified key areas already “occupied” by the skate community, though they also openly stating that each plan was an attempt construct “legal” skateboarding spaces. Using existing skate-appropriated space, the Plan maps out a series of skateparks, skatespots, and skatedots¹⁰ throughout the urban landscape.

The Skatepark System Plan, Portland, Oregon. Similar to Seattle, Portland established an advisory task force, through the Department of Parks and Recreation, to assess the action sports climate and need within the City. The Skatepark System Plan was released in 2008, as a result of a 2002 city levy that called for the creation of a public skatepark and the mission of the Portland Department of Parks and Recreation. In their report, the City’s Parks and Recreation Program developed the full skatepark system plan with the aim of encouraging action sports (skateboarding, BMX, and inline skating) as physical activity, but also containing them to legally and purposefully assigned spaces.

Due to the lack of public facilities within Portland, many action sports enthusiasts resorted to practicing their sport on other public and private property. This activity has resulted in property damage, citations, and arrests (Portland Parks & Recreation Program, 2008, p. 4).

¹⁰ The city identified three types of skate spaces that have since been used to define skate space in other communities. Skateparks are larger and purposefully-built for skateboarding; skatespots and skatedots are smaller purposefully-built spaces, often a singular object (sculpture, bench, rail, etc).

Plans and policies. The two plans were created simultaneously, with both cities participating in the same regional conferences and conventions. Both plans made references to the other plan when presenting data on skatepark needs and use potential. Moreover, both plans referenced enacted polices and ordinances in each city that were considered significant in the drafting of each city's document. These policies and ordinances ranged from the establishment of each authoring task force to defining skateboarding as a "legitimate" recreation activity. Additionally, Portland referenced ordinances that allowed for skateboarding and BMX activities to "legally" occur in spaces where traditional cycling was already legal in the City (Dougherty, 2009).

The Lefebvrian Triad (Pierce & Martin, 2015)

The three areas of the Lefebvrian Triad (conceived, perceived, lived) heavily influenced the overarching framework for this project. The significance in understanding how spaces are produced by and composed of the Lefebvrian Triad (Friedman & van Ingen, 2011; Soja, 1980) allowed for a definitional effort and analysis of the sociospatial networks and rights within each space. The use of the Lefebvrian Triad was expanded to a fuller application by including known social science frameworks regarding publicness, risk, and biographies. The components of Németh's (2012) work with publicness allowed for a necessary bounding of the Lefebvrian Triad in the realm of public space. These intersections were amplified by components of the Sociological Imagination (Mills, 1959) and the inclusion of biographies and histories as lived and living understandings of public space. These theories combined with Lyng's (2005) conception of edgework that

expanded the connections of space, publicness, and lived understandings to the unique tapestry of skateboarding and action sports within a neoliberal postmodern era.

Conceived space. By critically reading the municipal plans of the two large cities, this project developed a better understanding of city programming for physically active communities. Exploring these spaces as conceived space is necessary for understanding how and why the city would build public space either for or against particular bodies. The conception of conceived space within physical activity settings often takes the form of how a space is designed. The intentional mapping and construction of a space for pre-determined outcomes is at the heart of how a space is conceived. This often appears in the form of how a city park or a playground are designed to maximize or minimize use.

As noted by Loukitaou-Sideris and Ehrenfeucht (2011),

Defining who can participate and how they can do so is fundamental. Municipalities enact ordinances and regulations to define acceptable uses of sidewalks, and cities and corporate actors employ design and policy strategies to achieve particular effects. (p. 10)

This includes an understanding of how non-organized physical activity (e.g., skateboarding) is being planned for or against in municipal spheres. The two large cities analyzed (Portland and Seattle) have official citywide plans outlining the municipal “public-facing” policy for skateboarding and other action sports. The plans serve as foundational components for theorizing definitions and structures of urban physical activity and the development of publicly supported physical activity initiatives and spaces.

Perceived space. The conception of perceived space examines the organization and structuring of a space. This often manifests in laws, ordinances, and municipal organization that assume how a space will be utilized and thus intervenes to encourage or correct this usage. For example, in a public park there are rules about when the park is open and when it will be closed (often at dusk). Alternatively, many places have rules that dictate how you can use a specific trail, such as to walk your dog or to go for a jog. These structuring features are not only present in the municipal document (as is the case for conceived space), but are also present in the ordinances and policies that shape the enactment of the municipal documents. Specifically, the frame of the Sociological Imagination (Mills, 1959) was used to expand and bound the structural components within this category.

Lived space. Exploring how these spaces are enacted as lived space requires observations of how the spaces are operationalized and organized in the material world. This can be observed in how bodies engage and interact with the space and with each other in the space. This required “site visits” in the form of photo analysis. Pauwels (2012) notes “visual sociology and visual anthropology are grounded in the idea that valid scientific insight can be acquired by observing, analyzing, and theorizing its visual manifestations: behavior of people and material products of culture” (p. 1). Photos were collected as “found data sources” through *Google Earth/Maps*. This provided a perspective of each park and their respective neighborhoods. All four parks had a visible presence on *Google Earth/Maps*, with the Burnside Skatepark having the most accessible photos. The collective memories of the communities where each skatespace is located

were examined. This included reviewing maps of the identified skateparks (through *Google Maps*) and each respective city's parks and recreation programs.

Methods

When considering the textual analysis of space, it is significant to first recognize that place, like many objects, can and should indeed be read as textual artifact. Tuan (1977) is clear in his work on space and place, that place is an object like many others that fill space. He described space as an abstract conception filled with places that have developed and attached meaning. Therefore, when conducting a spatial analysis, one must consider the objects within space as textual artifacts to be read. These artifacts are significant in understanding the cultural significance of the sociospatial dialectic.

Analyses were conducted across the major data sources of this project: municipal literature, photographs (found), collective memories of communities, and mediated literature. The frameworks of the Sociological Imagination (Mills, 1959) and edgework (Lyng, 2005) were used to expand the analytical power of the Lefebvrian Triad (Lefebvre, 1991). The intersections of their work with Németh's conceptions of publicness manifest a larger frame that emphasizes history and biography (connected to risk) as contributors to the sociospatial dialectic (Soja, 1980) particularly in terms of lived understandings of publicness.

This project utilized open coding (Patton, 2015; Pauwels, 2012) and axial coding (Patton, 2015) of the data collected. Open coding (see Table 4) allowed for deeper analysis of the data by letting the themes present across all collected data to be considered. The axial coding focused on the Lefebvrian Triad (Lefebvre, 1991)

(conceived, perceived, lived) and the four characteristics of spatial selection noted by Woolley and Johns (2001): accessibility, sociability, trickability, and compatibility. These axial codes were used to assess how each analyzed research site fits within the larger skateboarding cultural literature related to space use and skateboarder preference. Additionally, the Lefebvrian Triad components gave bounding direction to the newly expanded framework that included the intersections of risk (Lyng, 2005), publicness (Németh, 2012), and biographies (Mills, 1959).

Specifically, Németh's (2012) framework for analyzing publicness was utilized to address the limitations of the Lefebvrian Triad (Lefebvre, 1991; Pierce & Martin, 2015; Soja, 1980). Lefebvre's (1991; Pierce & Martin, 2015) work, and by extension his triad, examines the production of space as it is deployed and redeployed. This is expanded under the work of Soja (1980; 2010), but as noted by Jessop et al. (2008), the analysis takes on a singular examination of spatial production. This limitation accounts for how space is occupied, but lacks a conceptual analysis of the public/private aspects of the modern municipality. The expansion of Lefebvre's (1991; Pierce & Martin, 2015) and Soja's (1980; 2010) work via Németh's (2012) research on publicness begins to address the changing understandings of property in a post-analog world.

Németh (2012) did note several limitations of the framework in his initial pilot. There is overlap in method and analysis for each of the three components: physical (conceived), code (perceived), and content (lived). He suggests that for each component to be more deeply analyzed, researchers should include additional data sources at each layer: in the physical, understanding the use of the surrounding or adjacent area; in the

code, longer-term observations; and in the content, interviewing additional members of the community (park workers and neighbors). Each of these have been included in the methodology of this project, particularly through the examination of histories (biographies). First, the use of aerial maps and found literature were used to address the adjacent areas of each site. Second, the use of mediated literature and collective memories of the sites served to provide longitudinal observations of the space (from secondary resources). Lastly, in place of formal interviews, mediated literature and photos provided artifacts for understanding how the spaces were consumed (lived). Lyng's (2005) conceptions of edgework allowed for the inclusion of cultural values and understandings of risk-taking and risk behavior.

Data Collection

This project utilized multiple sources of data (see Table 1) as noted above to ensure credibility of the analyses. Five major sources were used: two municipal plans, mediated literature, the collective memories of skatespaces, and *Google Earth/Maps* photos from four skateparks. The popular histories of skateboarding were used to expand the historical relationships between skateboarding and “the city,” but did not take a primary focus in this project. The two municipal plans, Seattle's *Citywide Skatepark Plan* (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007) and Portland's *Skatepark System Plan* (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008), were the main municipal documents read in this project. Additional municipal documents outlining policies and ordinances that influenced the establishment and shaping of the plans were considered, with two policies and one

ordinance being included in the analyses. These represented the foundations of the conceived and perceived space for these municipalities.

Table 1

Methods and Data Sources

Research Questions:	Method	Data Source
How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding developed in the “City?” (Physical/Conceived)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content reading of municipal and mediated artifacts related to the development of space for skateboarding • Analysis of geographic histories of the skatespaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Found artifacts (photos, maps) on site locations, selections, and builds • Plans and ordinances
How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding deployed in the “City?” (Code/Perceived)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content reading of mediated artifacts related to the regulation of space for skateboarding 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Found artifacts (literature, photos) on site locations, community (local and skateboarding) perceptions • Plans and policies
How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding consumed in the “City?” (Content/Lived)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Content reading of found artifacts regarding use and “lived” interpretations (including histories) of the spaces 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Found artifacts (mediated literature, photos) on how the spaces are being used and enacted
How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding encompassing of other action sports in the “City?”		

Mediated literature (found artifacts) included skateboarding industry publications, namely *TransWorld Skateboarding* and *Thrasher*. These two publications were chosen due to their circulation numbers (AdSprouts.com, 2016) and longstanding history within action sports. Published community literature related to the plans and parks (identified through LexisNexis and *Google*) were included (total $n=27$). For example, these documents took the form of local historical databases (*The Delridge History Project*, Portland’s *Museum of the City*), community master plans (*East Portland Action Plan*,

Duwamish Policy and Land Use Study, The Urban Grind, Seattleskateparks.org, Skateoregon.com), and local community news outlets (*The Stranger, Seattle Magazine, Oregon's Daily Journal of Commerce, The Seattle Times, West Seattle Herald, Capitol Hill Seattle*, and transcripts from local radio – *KUOW*). Lastly, mediated coverage of each skatepark plan was reviewed (*Lexis Nexis, Google News, and Google*, see Table 2 for keyword search), including ($n=15$) *Next City, ESPN.com, The Wall Street Journal, PBS Newshour, Rolling Stones, Project for Public Space – Placemaking, and States News Service*, as well as skateboarding digital media (*skatepark.org, Skate & Annoy*). (See Appendix A for a full list of mediated literature used).

The materials were collected in relation to the release of each plan. For Seattle's *Citywide Skatepark Plan* materials were read from 2004-2017 and for Portland's *Skatepark System Plan* materials were read from 2005-2017. The bounding dates correspond with early community surveys conducted in both cities regarding community needs and current use information. Both plans were created simultaneously throughout this time and referenced each other throughout the decision-making process therefore the dates overlap.

Table 2

Specific Data Sources

Research Questions:	Data Source	Data Source	Keyword Search Items ¹¹
How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding developed in the “City?” (Physical/Conceived)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans and ordinances • Found artifacts (photos, maps) on site locations, selections, and builds • Maps 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans ($n=2$) and ordinances ($n=3$) • <i>Google News</i>, <i>Google</i>, and LexisNexis search (Northwest) ($n=42$) • <i>Google Maps</i>; parks and recreation program maps ($n=14$) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portland Skatepark System Plan • Seattle Citywide Skatepark Plan • Portland Skatepark • Portland Skate Park • Seattle Skatepark • Seattle Skate Park
How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding deployed in the “City?” (Code/Perceived)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Found artifacts (literature, photos) on site locations, community perceptions (local and skateboarding) • Plans and policies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plans ($n=2$) and ordinances ($n=3$) • <i>Google News</i>, <i>Google</i>, and LexisNexis search (Northwest) ($n=42$) • <i>TransWorld Skateboarding</i>, <i>Thrasher</i> ($n=3$) • <i>Google Earth/Maps</i> ($n=52$) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Burnside Skatepark • Burnside Skate Park • Ed Benedict Skatepark • Ed Benedict Skate Park • “Marginal Way” Skatepark • “Marginal Way” Skate Park • Delridge Skatepark • Delridge Skate Park
How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding consumed in the “City?” (Content/Lived)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Found artifacts (mediated literature, photos) on how the spaces are being used and enacted 		
How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding encompassing of other action sports in the “City?”			

Treatment of Data

To have a deeper analysis of the lived components of these spaces, photos ($n=52$) were analyzed to better understand behavior and surrounding components of these

¹¹ The term skatepark and skate park are used interchangeably in many places. Therefore, both terms need to be used in keyword searches. For both municipal plans, the term was searched as used by each plan.

spaces. The analysis consisted of found photos using *Google Earth/Maps*, and included photos from the surrounding community. This inclusion addressed Németh’s (2012) noted limitations in the categories of code and content. Additionally, as noted in the work of Lefebvre (1976) and Mills (1959), the histories of these spaces were included. The use of collective memories of the respective spaces were also present in the work of Woolley and John (2010) in their examination of skateboarding spaces in Great Britain and Németh’s (2006) work with LOVE Park in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The histories provided an additional analysis to community literature related to the plans and parks, specifically in providing context.

Table 3

Axial Coding

Axial Coding		
Conceived Perceived Lived	Lefebvrian Triad	
Accessibility Compatibility Sociability Trickability	Woolley & Johns (2001)	These four items demonstrate how skateboarders actively operate and live within the spaces. Therefore, these support an analysis of “lived” aspects of the skatepark plans.

The addition of histories also addressed Németh’s (2012) concern regarding a lack of longitudinal observation of the researched spaces. The same keyword search terms were used for locating photos as mediated literature.

Data were organized and analyzed using Atlas.ti qualitative software. As noted previously, axial and open coding were used. The axial codes included seven items: the

Lefebvrian Triad (conceived, perceived, lived) (Lefebvre, 1991) and the four characteristics of spatial selection noted by Woolley and Johns (2001) (accessibility, compatibility, sociability, trickability). The work of Woolley and Johns (2001), as introduced in Chapter Two, determined that skateboarders select spaces to skate (both purposefully-built and appropriated) through four characteristics: are they able to get to the space (accessibility), are they allowed to skate the space (compatibility), can spectators and friends be present (sociability), and is the space physically skateable (trickability).

By including these four items as axial codes, the analysis allowed for the consideration of how the city plans incorporated or did not incorporate the “typical” skateboarders space selection-process in the development, deployment, and consumption of the plans. The open coding process identified 33 additional codes (see Table 4) that could be categorized into eight code groups: activity, administration, community of action sports, community at large, degenerate/deviant behavior, legality, money, and surveillance.

Table 4

Open Coding

Open Coding	Grouped
Health Injuries Physical Activity Recreation	Activity
Administrativia Environment Goals Maintenance Mission of Parks and Rec Ordinance Policy Process Purpose	Administration
Action Sports BMX Community – of the Skateboarders	Community of Action Sports
Community- about the Diversity	Community at Large
Crime Graffiti Noise Trash	Degenerate/Deviant Behavior Outlined in the documents, and by Kelling and Wilson (1982), the municipalities are reading these four individual behaviors as “canary-like” indications of societal issues.
Legal Liability Property Safety	Legality
Funding of Making of Money	Money
Observe Spectator	Surveillance

Positionality

When considering the poststructuralist context in which we live, it is important to note that the context for inquiry and analysis has shifted from a singular to multifaceted approach. In Jessop et al.’s (2008) critique of Lefebvre and Soja, they argued for this shift

to multifaceted approach. Also, this is supported by the work of Richardson (2000). Richardson notes the significance of “doubt[ing] that any method or theory, discourse or genre, tradition or novelty, has a universal and general claim as the ‘right’ or privileged form of authoritative knowledge” (2000, p. 8). Exploring the work of the sociospatial dialectic and the physical components of skateboarding and other action sports, singular visions of truth are not adequate. As sports are rooted in histories of multifaceted and varying relationships of social truths and authorities, skateboarding requires a critical and multidimensional analysis.

Moreover, as Richardson (2000) goes on to note, the role of the researcher (in her words, the writer) must include a reflective understanding of self and positioning. “Knowing the self and knowing about the subject are intertwined, partial, historical, local knowledges” (Richardson, 2000, p. 9). As she continues, Richardson notes that separating the knower from the known is difficult, if not impossible.

In order to fully undertake this project, I first considered my own understanding of self and my role in the knowledge production of this work. At the time of this research, I had been a member of the skateboarding community for over 22 years and the BMX community for over 17 years. Assuredly, the relationship with both communities shaped my analyses and impacted my work. When considering the questions and desires to push the field of Kinesiology forward as an interdisciplinary study of intentional human movement, my prior professional work with interdisciplinary discourse and pedagogy become central in shaping this project. Having spent the early part of my academic career developing and cultivating integrated and interdisciplinary learning spaces, my questions

are as much shaped by the known literature of Kinesiology as the established literature of integrated learning. Particularly, it is the work of the American (U.S.) political scientist Alexander Meiklejohn (1932) that has influenced my understanding and position as a researcher in seeking to push disciplinary boundaries for richer and more inclusive conceptions of knowledge and methods of inquiry. It is Meiklejohn's description of the U.S. academy in the early part of the 20th century, and in particular his call for radical transformation of the academy, that shape the work I do and plan to do. In 1932, Meiklejohn was highly critical of disciplinary boundaries within the academy, believing that they stifle the inquiry necessary for true scholarship. Specifically, he argues that limitation has ethical implications on the academy's role in educating the community. He notes "the closeness of connection between the character of a society and the character of its education cannot be too strongly stressed" (1932, p. xi). It is in this ideology that my reflection and understanding of self are formed and demand multiple forms of inquiry inclusive of multiple narratives across bodies and spaces.

Trustworthiness

In order to address questions of credibility, triangulation (Patton, 2015) was deployed through the use of multiple data sources: photographs, municipal literature, and mediated literature. However, it should be noted that triangulation does not fully grasp all aspects of the narratives present (Richardson, 2000), and it could be argued that triangulation only provides additional perspectives but is still not inclusive of all perspectives. As Richardson (2000) argues, triangulation assumes there are fixed points that can be measured therefore neglecting other possibilities. By using multiple

methodologies, frameworks, and data sources, I compared findings from several approaches thus verifying findings and ensuring a credible analysis of topics. Each collection method has distinct limitations that were addressed through one of the other methods. Additionally, based on the notes of Németh (2012) in his work on publicness, these multiple data sources were selected to address the limitations he found while transitioning Lessig's (2001) framework from the digital world to the material world.

Given the varying perceptions of skateboarding's relationship to authority, it was necessary for a peer reviewer to be employed to address areas of potential personal bias. These include possibilities of overemphasizing the perceived conflict between skateboarding and its communities, as these conflicts are not always present and in some cases, can be propagated by the action sports community. The cultural products, often mediated literature (blogs, web sites, magazines), of these sporting cultures can offer a view that serves to shape and reshape the image of skateboarding for the continuation of the anti-establishment culture (Beal & Wilson, 2004). The peer reviewer was a colleague in sociohistorical studies within Kinesiology, who is completing their doctoral work. Their scholarly areas of interest include the examination of spaces by "non-mainstream" bodies (particularly disability studies and queer studies) through intentional human movement highly engaged with spatial awareness (i.e. dance). The peer reviewer and I met weekly to discuss my analyses, including the use of frameworks. Additionally, they reviewed my final document to identify and eliminate potential biases related to areas of authority and skateboarding, along with areas of skateboarding and other action sports.

CHAPTER IV

DATA ANALYSES

In this chapter, I present the overall analyses of the Seattle Citywide Skatepark Plan (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007) and the Portland Skatepark System Plan (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008). The analyses included the critical reading of the plans, associated policies and ordinances, mediated literature (i.e. magazines and newspapers) related to the plans and subsequent skatepark builds, images of four skateparks referenced in the plans, and the collective memories of communities where the four skateparks are located. I present the themes constructed from the analyses outlining how each city developed, deployed, and consumed plans and policies for physical activity and public space. These themes directly address the central questions of this project related to the regulation of human movement: how the cities developed plans and policies (conceived), how the cities deployed the plans and policies (perceived), how the cities consumed plans and policies (lived), and what this means for other sports who occupy these spaces.

Overall Analyses

As noted in Chapter Three, the analysis included both axial and open coding. The axial codes included seven items: the Lefebvrian Triad (conceived, perceived, lived)

(Lefebvre, 1991) and the four characteristics of spatial selection noted by Woolley and Johns (2001) (accessibility, compatibility, sociability, trickability). The open coding process identified 33 additional codes (see Table 4) that could be categorized into eight code groups: activity, administration, community of action sports, community at large, degenerate/deviant behavior, legality, money, and surveillance. In the axial coding, Wooley and Johns' (2001) characteristics provided textual connections to skateboarding and how skateboarders consume space. These characteristics were heavily represented in code groups of activity, community of action sports, and legality.

Based on this analysis, several themes emerged within each question and the related component of the Lefebvrian Triad. First, within *conceived*, themes of reputations and representations, mission and goals, siting¹² and funding, and expendable skatespaces heavily shaped and directed the documents and their authors responses to the community at large. Second, within *perceived*, the development of hierarchies of surveillance and orders of displacement emerged. Lastly, within *lived*, a focus on administration and continuous use were identified.

¹² Both municipalities refer to “siting” or “the siting process,” which refers to the process of determining and selecting a location for new skateparks. In both documents this included multi-phase process that surveyed the cityscape and narrowed location possibilities.

Table 5

Key Themes

Conceived	Perceived	Lived
Reputations and Representations Missions and Goals Siting and Funding Expendable Skatespaces	Hierarchy of Surveillance An Order of Displacement	Administration and Continuous Use

In the analyses, it became apparent that the authors of both plans relied on three assumptions to shape and frame the plans. These three assumptions served to dictate the development and deployment of both documents. First, the authors assumed that skateboarding is growing as a youth sport, and in some literature, faster than other youth sports (demonstrated in the introductions of both documents). Second, they assumed that skateboarding and related sports are generally perceived negatively by the community, as either instigating crime in or inviting crime to the area (demonstrated in the language shaping the community survey and meeting processes). Lastly, the authors assumed that action sports, particularly skateboarding, “are not going away” (Skatepark Advisory Task Force, 2007, p. 5), and need to be addressed (demonstrated in the justification sections presented in both documents).

These assumptions, though used to direct the documents, are also challenged throughout each city plan, by the data collected by each city on skateboarding and skateboarders, by known industry data, and scholarly literature. Assumption one is challenged by industry reports on youth sport involvement (though skateboarding is growing in popularity, the speed of that growth is location dependent). Assumption two is

dispelled in the two city plans through the presentation of city collected data in both plans. These data echoed the work of Wooley and Johns (2001). The third assumption runs counter to the work of Campo (2013), Chui (2009), and Wooley and Johns (2001), as each present a skateboarding culture unbounded by “official” sanctioning of spaces.

However, these three assumptions served as directive components for each plan. In some cases, these assumptions created limitations to how each municipality conceptualized their respective “system” plan. For example, both plans argued that by giving skateboarders “legal” spaces to skate, then skateboarding will not occur elsewhere in the city. This causal assumption serves to limit the potential of both plans to develop municipal-supported skatescapes. In other cases, the assumptions served as guideposts to address longstanding challenges skatepark siting and development have faced in these communities, particularly, the cities addressed “not in my backyard¹³” philosophies. Both communities have a long history of starts and stops in skatepark development, along with wavering commitments to skateboarding and related sports. In both cities, this inconsistency led skateboarders within the community to develop their own skateparks “illegally” in appropriated spaces throughout the city, (i.e. Burnside and Marginal Way). These parks would later be claimed by their respective city plans, but still serve as direct challenges to the three assumptions that shape the municipal plans.

¹³ “Not in my backyard” is defined as residences supporting the “idea” of skateparks as long as the skatepark is not constructed in their community (Fiore, Heinicke, Ragel, & Weigel, 2005).

Lefebvrian Triad: A Critical Lens

As noted in Chapter Two and Three, the Lefebvrian Triad (Pierce & Morgan, 2015) (conceived, perceived, lived) served as the overarching critical lens for this project. The significance in understanding how the spaces are produced by and composed of the Lefebvrian Triad (Soja, 1980) allowed for the defining of and analyses of the sociospatial networks and rights within space as presented in each plan. The Triad was further defined by the work of Németh (2012) to account for the role of public space within the municipal sociospatial relationship with skateboarding. Each component of the Triad was reconceived with the intersections of other social science frameworks (the Sociological Imagination and edgework), as well as the conceptions of skateboarding and human movement. This re-conception served to expand, contract, and reimagine the rights to “the city” in a landscape of intentional human movement.

Lefebvrian: Conceived, the development of city plans. For these analyses, the boundaries of *conceived*¹⁴ were shaped with the intention of exploring how cities develop city plans and subsequent skateparks, as viewed through understandings of how bodies move centrally through municipal space. The boundaries of *conceived* centered on how each city developed their plan and the process of determining skatepark sites (or “siting”). For this component of the Triad, the municipal plans, associated municipal

¹⁴ As described in Chapter Two, the components of the Lefebvrian Triad in some spaces create analytical overlap (Németh, 2012). This is part of the dialectic as each component shapes and is shaped by the others. This requires the researcher to select artificial boundaries between each of the components, something noted by Jessop et al (2008) and Németh (2012).

ordinances, and city maps were analyzed. This process identified the code groups of administration, activity, degenerate/deviant behavior, legality, money, and surveillance. Thereby the process produced the themes of reputations and representations, missions and goals, siting and funding, and expendable skatespaces.

Reputations and representations. Both plans focus on how skateboarders and skateboarding are seen by the public at large. This also includes some, but limited, discussion of how other related sports (particularly BMX and inline skating) are classified alongside skateboarding. The “understood” and “accepted” reputations of skateboarding and related sports within the community, though not always accurate, directed how each city approached the development process, such as when to engage the community and when to engage the skateboarders. This was also evident in the justification each city presented on the need for public skateparks and documented skatepark plans. The plans started from the perspective that the community “loathed” skateboarding, and the plans presented cause and effect scenarios to counter this perception. Simultaneously, each city used these cause and effect scenarios to justify a need to build containing spaces for skateboarders (not skateboarding). In both documents, the authoring task force assumed that the greater community perceived skateboarders to be negative:

Seattle: There are a lot of perceptions about skateparks and skateboarders. Some can be tied to the wear and tear the sport can take on the built environment. Some of it is based on stereotypes... The Task Force sought to learn about and educate others about skate boarding as a sport and skaters as a park user group (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007, p. 2)

Portland: A frequent challenge to the construction of new skateparks is the stereotypes about skaters. People have negative images about skaters because of the damage they cause to public and private property, which is often because there are no legal skateable places. There are also negative impressions of skaters and BMX riders themselves. People often think that providing a place for them will attract crime and drugs (Portland Parks and Recreation Program, 2008, p. 16).

Both documents attempted to dispel “myths” regarding reputation and aimed to address the community’s perceived concerns in the siting and design process. The skateboarders’ abilities to actively police themselves and the spaces they occupy (“eyes on the park”), to engage with each other, and to bring the greater community together were used to offset notions and beliefs that skateboarders, and by extension skateparks, do more harm than good to communities where skateboarding occurs. Both plans argued that building public skateparks make communities where the parks are located safer.

The documents present the average skateboarder as young, particularly too young to drive, and therefore not a “danger” to the community. The argument is presented by both cities that community members likely fear an increase in crime, noise, trash, parking, and graffiti. The authors make the causal assumption that these acts are indicators of larger criminal offenses. By presenting the average skateboarder as young, there is an attempt to dispel ideas of “criminals” or “criminals in the making” in traditional understandings. The skateboarder is presented as a young, fresh community mind, who – with adequate surveillance – can be molded into the ideal “citizen” with the addition of a community skatepark. Additionally, each city emphasized skatepark designs that maximized opportunities for observation and surveillance – by parents, police, and other skaters.

Good visibility has several advantages. It provides ‘natural’ surveillance that deters those who may come with the intent of causing problems, it allows for quicker response to emergency situations and it helps legitimate users feel safe. High visibility is also beneficial because skating is popular as a spectator sport. (Portland Parks and Recreation Program, 2008, p. 11)

Seattle’s Citywide Skatepark Plan assures the reader that those wishing to do harm in the community want to remain unseen, therefore a visible skatepark deters such behavior (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007).

More importantly, both plans assert that community concerns can be designed for through a *designing for nuisance* strategy. This includes materials selected to eliminate the noise of skateboards at the park. Each city plan assured the reader that skatepark noise is no louder than passing cars. Portland had the City’s Noise Control Officer measure sound at existing skateparks, basketball courts, and baseball fields to determine that the noise level in each space is comparable and not audible above other ambient noise (passing cars, planes, etc.) (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008). As for graffiti, both communities asserted that the skateboarders themselves are not the culprits, as skaters have a feeling of “ownership” over the space and would not want to risk losing the space because of graffiti. However, the development of community policies for when graffiti does occur were recommended and encouraged. Portland also offered the option of providing a “job box” as is provided at an existing Portland skatepark (Pier Park), where tools, paint, and other items can be stored for skatepark users to address graffiti themselves (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008). The emphasis is on local skateboarders’ desire to keep “their” park. The argument becomes that if the skateboarders allow others

(particularly “transient” users) to vandalize the parks or commit crime near the parks, they do so under the threat of having the skatepark removed.

The concerns of crime, noise, and vandalism framed the process of developing each plan. Both cities held multiple community meetings (Portland had 35, Seattle had six) where a designer could address the community’s voiced concerns and then community members could have more intimate small group conversations about specific skatepark topics. Seattle hosted a skateboarding open house at the Ballard Bowl in North Seattle so that community members could witness the noise level. Portland hosted a regional skatepark summit (which representatives from Seattle attended) for communities who were building or had built skateparks to explore all of the “understood” challenges and possible ways to address said challenges.

Missions and goals. Both cities outlined skateboarding and the development of skateparks as components of their respective city master plans, Parks and Recreation missions, and as a response to community ordinances or resolutions. Seattle was specifically motivated by changes and challenges in the community (Marginal Way) and the release of a new resolution from the City in 2006. The resolution stated that “[t]he City of Seattle recognizes skateboarding as a healthy and popular recreation activity that is currently underserved by the City’s parks infrastructure” (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007, p. 49). This resolution also called for the creation of a taskforce to develop the Citywide Plan.

In 2005, the City of Portland (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008) recognized that the development of a single skatepark, as part of a 2002 levy, was insufficient for

community demand. Ordinance Number 179462 was passed in August, 2005 that accepted recommendations to develop a siting committee and the further development of future parks. Additionally, Ordinance Number 175211 was already in effect for the City that made it legal for BMX riders, in-line skaters, and skateboarders to use most streets in the downtown area, similar to “mainstream” cyclists (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008).

The creation of a citywide public-facing document regarding skateboarding and the promotion of skateboarding was considered a goal of both cities’ parks and recreation programs. Specifically, Portland argued that the creation of a plan supported the Department of Parks and Recreation’s goal of “developing and maintaining excellent facilities and places for public recreation, building community through play” (Portland Parks and Recreation, 2008, p. 1). The City of Seattle was guided by their Department of Parks and Recreation program to address skateboarding “as a healthy and popular recreational activity and a legitimate use to be accommodated in the parks system” (City of Seattle, 2003, p. 1).

However, not formally stated as a main goal in either plan, but equally present as a goal, was the aim to create spaces for “legal” skateboarding with the intent of eliminating skateboarding in “illegal” spaces. In both documents, the authors asserted that skateboarding is occurring illegally because there are no “legal” spaces for skateboarding to exist. For example, the Seattle Citywide Skatepark Plan (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007) states that “[d]ue to the lack of public places within Seattle to legally skate, many skateboarders practice their sport on public and private property,

often competing with other activities” (p. 1). In the Portland Skatepark System Plan (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008) this is stated as “[d]ue to the lack of public facilities within Portland, many action sports enthusiasts resorted to practicing their sport on other public and private property. This activity has resulted in property damage, citations and arrest” (p. 4). In both cases, the assumption is made that skateboarding is happening in these spaces because other spaces are not available and immediately limits possible skateboarding space opportunities. Neither document acknowledges that some skateboarders prefer to skate in non-purposefully built skatespaces, just as some skateboarders prefer to skate in skateparks.

Moreover, the terms “legal” or “legally” are mentioned 21 times between the two documents in relation to the plans “establish[ing] a network of legal, public skateparks of various sizes” (Portland Parks and Recreation, 2008, p. 1). The terms are mentioned roughly the same number of times as the words “appropriate,” “allow/ed,” “neighbors,” “injuries,” and “kids.” Though the documents do not explicitly say that eliminating skateboarding from other areas is a goal, they do explicitly say that the creation of “safe” and “legal” spaces are the intended outcomes. “The ultimate goal of the system plan is to provide access to a legal, public sanctioned skateboarding facility within a one-mile radius of every Portlander” (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008, p. 2).

Siting skateparks and paying for them. A significant portion of each city plan is dedicated to the process of siting skatepark spaces and the funding of skateparks. In both cases, the siting process is framed by the second assumption mentioned earlier in the chapter – that community perceptions of skateboarders and skateboarding are adherently

negative. This assumption is then followed by the other remaining assumptions – skateboarding is a growing part of the youth sport landscape.

The siting criteria in both cases are extensive with a strong consideration for environmental impacts. “Since skatepark development will often replace green spaces with concrete, it will be important to mitigate the environmental impact with various sustainable design and construction principles” (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008, p. 32). In Seattle’s plan, an emphasis on “gray-to-gray” space development was given priority, where concrete or similar material covered spaces would be converted to skateparks. This addressed the argument that skateparks reduce or eliminate existing green spaces throughout the city. Moreover, Portland emphasized the potential of sustainably-minded skateparks to serve as models of the City’s “environmental commitment” and showcase the sustainable potential of city infrastructure. “These goals will also allow skateparks to function as environmental demonstration projects and provide education opportunities for groups that are typically hard to reach...” (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008, p. 34).

Additionally, siting in both cities depended heavily on visibility and access. The parks, as noted above, had to be developed with high levels of observability as the top priority. This included spaces that allowed for spectators, as well as authority access. This was coupled with accessibility – again noting that the average skateboarder in both cities would be too young to drive. The parks would need to be accessible by public transit, both for the skateboarders and to address parking concerns. However, this too addresses visibility, particularly as public transit spaces in the United States are heavily monitored

and surveilled post 9/11. For many of Seattle's Link Light Rail stops, this includes an armed police presence (L. Pipe, field notes, June 2016).

Additionally, the siting criteria focused on maximizing current parks and recreation spaces. In the case of Seattle, this focused heavily on spaces where restroom and concession facilities existed or could be developed. Seattle's Citywide Skatepark Plan (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007) focused on the potential fund generating opportunities a large regional facility could produce. As the largest facility in the plan (accommodating up to 300 users at a single time) the regional facility would be used to attract competitions and sponsors to the area. The facility would include space for retail and concession stands. To date, this facility has not been built. Portland's Skatepark System Plan (Portland Parks and Recreation, 2008) approached their regional facility as a possible way to showcase "Portland's talent" to national audiences, also emphasizing "sponsorship" potential for the city.

In both documents, the need to find funding for the skateparks was also key. Both cities had voter-passed levies that helped fund a park, but funding needed to be secured for any future parks beyond the levy. Seattle set up small grants that communities could apply for as partial funding, however, communities were encouraged to fundraise or contact national grant providers (such as the Tony Hawk Foundation). Additionally, Seattle provided links to resources for approaching local businesses for donations (Seattle skateparks.org, n.d.). These included tips on everything from what attire to wear, whom to bring, and what attitude to use. The website included talking points – such as

reminding local businesses that building a skatepark would mean fewer skateboarders skating in front of their businesses.

Expendable skatespaces. Each city had a skatepark built by community skateboarders in found space or loose space prior to their respective skatepark plan development. These parks were built to address a feeling of frustration from skateboarders in both communities who perceived each city as neglecting skateboarding access to the city. The building of Burnside Skatepark happened in the early 1990s, followed by the building of other similar “claimed-space” parks throughout the U.S. (such as Shantytown, NYC, mentioned in Chapter Two). In 2004, Seattle’s Marginal Way Skatepark was built. Both parks were built by skateboarders and are maintained by skateboarders in spaces that were abandoned or neglected by the city. Neither Portland or Seattle provide any funding or maintenance support of the spaces or skateparks, beyond trash removal from municipal trashcans. However, both cities included the skateparks in their respective city skatepark plans.

Skateboarding in Portland. Skateboarding in Portland, Oregon has been progressive by national (U.S.) standards. Portland was the first city in the United States to legalize skateboarding in specific downtown locations, particularly on sidewalks (Fiore, Heinicke, Ragel, & Weigel, 2005). According to *The Wall Street Journal* (Dougherty, 2009), Portland is the “skateboarding capital of the world” (para. 1). However, this progressive skateboarding culture was not always present and is not always apparent. In Portland, advocates of skateboarding have been petitioning and working with the municipality since the mid-1970s to create supportive skateboarding legislation and

facilities. After several starts and stops by the municipality, the skateboarding community of Portland began developing spaces on their own. In the late 1980s, the creation of the first U.S. “SkateChurch¹⁵” was developed in the city (Fiore et al., 2005). By the early 1990s, there still had not been any major traction with the municipality on the development of public skateparks. This is when the Burnside Skatepark was developed - as a response by the local skateboarding community (Burnside Project, 2004; Fiore et al., 2005). The Burnside Skatepark sits just under the Burnside Bridge on Southeast Second Avenue, between Martin Luther King, Jr Boulevard and Interstate Five (I-5). The Burnside neighborhood, often called Skid Row¹⁶ or Old Towne, is a community known for both its eclectic cultural diversity and perceptions of a high crime rate. However, the park is credited with “cleaning up” the neighborhood and now the park faces possible displacement through politics and gentrification.

The imprints of the Burnside Skatepark are not only present on the Portland Skatepark System Plan, but can be seen throughout the United States and beyond. This is due to two things: the rise of guerrilla skateparks across the United States, and the professional work of Burnside Skatepark’s original architects. “The same skaters who built Burnside illegally are building skateparks, legally and for money, as far as Austria and Italy” (Fiore et al, 2005, p. 32) as many went on to create local skatepark design

¹⁵ The Central Bible Church opened the “Skate Church” as a *Plus Skate* program, using the language of Coakley’s *Plus Sport* (2011) concepts for youth development, the focus of Skate Church is skateboarding with evangelical properties. “If you skate there you also hear the ‘gospel’” (Fiore et al., 2005, p. 30).

¹⁶ The term Skid Row comes from the name Skid Road where logs from mills would be skid across and into the river (Ryan & Beach, 1979)

firms (for example, “Dreamland, Gri[n]dline, Airspeed and Place to Ride” (Fiore et al, 2005, p. 32)). This includes Mark Hubbard, who would go on to found Grindline Skateparks in West Seattle that designed and built the Delridge Skatepark in Seattle (RecTech Seattle, 2010).

Skateboarding in Seattle. Much like Portland, Seattle had several starts and stops in their skatepark development (Carr, 2010; Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007). The city had one official skatepark, SeaSk8, that was located in the central part of the city (Kilwag, 2009). Additionally, the skateboarding community answered with the construction of the Ballard Bowl, a DIY skatepark in the Ballard park area of North Seattle. When the City of Seattle began a redevelopment plan for Ballard park, the Bowl was marked for removal. At the same time, SeaSk8 was marked for removal as part of a land sale to the Bill and Melinda Gates’ Foundation for their world headquarters (Carr, 2010). Though the closure of SeaSk8 and the Ballard Bowl would lead to larger conversations regarding skatepark networks in the city, and to the creation of the Skatepark Advisory Taskforce and the Citywide Skatepark Plan (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007), skateboarders were still frustrated. The frustration came with a belief that the municipality was opting to demolish skateparks and build new ones rather than using the same funding to expand current parks (Levin, 2006).

“The city [kept doing] this thing where they were tearing down skateparks and rebuilding them,” said [Shawn] Bishop [one of the original Marginal Way builders]... “So rather than spending the resources on adding more skateable features and square footage to existing Seattle skateparks or building new parks, they were just wasting their energy building parks that they had just torn out.” (Levin, 2006)

The response was a second guerilla skatepark under Route 99 in the South of Downtown (SoDo) district of the city. This park, Marginal Way (Levin, 2006), has become as famous as its Portland predecessor, Burnside. Like Burnside, Marginal Way was built in an underpass space being underutilized in the city. As noted previously, skateboarding (Carr, 2010; Woolley & Johns, 2001) often occupies ambiguous spaces within the urban environment – spaces often absent of use value by much of the community. However, much like Burnside, Marginal Way faces a shifting landscape through politics and gentrification.

Connections to the greater city plans. The common themes for both cities and their respective skateparks are invisibility and continuous threats of displacement. Each city has relegated maintenance and social codes of conduct for the guerilla parks to the skateboarding community for control, while city-built parks are seen as temporary space-holders until other opportunities arise. This creates an opportunity to for the city to ignore the skateboarders, while simultaneously claiming them for city gains – in particular, addressing each municipality’s goals and missions mentioned previously. At the same time, the skateparks sit in spaces under constant threat of displacement. This displacement comes from gentrification of the communities where the parks reside and through the political landscape that surrounds them (Booker & Kargo, 2016; Sillman,

2014; Virgin, 2010). The reality is one of an expendable permanence – made of concrete and sweat, these parks are still fragile, moveable, and destructible. Though the guerilla skateparks were built in spaces that each city, and many residents, would have deemed as ambiguously useless and marked by “high crime,” they now sit in spaces that are considered lucrative by the city (downtown with commercial potential).

Lefebvrian: Perceived, the deployment of control. The boundaries of *perceived* centered on how each city constructed rules, laws, and mechanisms to control or contain bodies in municipal spaces, particularly perceived “challenges” in the skateparks. As outlined earlier, each city noted the potential for crime, noise generation, parking, trash, and graffiti, and “the wrong sort of people” as key challenges when siting and developing skateparks. “[S]ome neighbors of candidate sites expressed concern that the skateparks would bring crime to the park, such as drugs, fights, and even gang activity” (Fiore et al., 2005, p. 11). Additionally, both plans referenced the potential challenges of what Fiore et al. (2005) called the “not in my backyard” syndrome (NIMBY). For the component of perceived, the municipal plans, associated municipal ordinances, mediated literature, and photos were analyzed. These analyses generated the code groups of community at large, degenerate/deviant behavior, legality, and surveillance. The key themes of a hierarchy of surveillance and an order of displacement being identified. Surveillance becomes an easy appeasement for each municipality. This allows them to address community concerns without focusing on the need to change community perceptions of the skateboarding or the skateboarder.

Hierarchy of surveillance. Throughout each of the documents, the key concern is perceptions of crime and the attraction of criminals to areas with skateparks. The largest response to address this concern has been surveillance. This response comes in a three-tier approach to surveillance: authority/grownups, spectators, and skaters themselves.

Authority and grownups. In both plans and in the supporting literature, continuous reference to the siting skateparks “correctly,” by putting them in observable spaces, was key to preventing crime. “Park and Police agencies [in other cities with skateparks] stated that location and visibility are the most important aspects of siting a successful skatepark” (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007, p. 12). In conversations with communities that had existing skateparks, both Seattle and Portland found that cities reported having increased crime and challenges when the skateparks were built in secluded areas. This was also addressed by Fiore et al. (2005) in *The Urban Grind*, noting that while siting skateparks away from busy areas allowed skaters to avoid conflicts with commercial and residential spaces, it also caused a severe exclusion effect.

When skateparks are highly visible, integrated into larger active parks, or next to active roads, minimal or no crime or drug usage was reported. Skateparks that are hidden away from public view and not integrated into a larger park can have more problems. (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007, p. 12)

However, observation of the spaces was not relegated to sight-lines for parents and authority figures. The City of Portland also considered the installation of cameras that could be streamed to the web. “Site installed cameras that stream directly to the web could provide users a forewarning of how busy a facility is ... [and is] an opportunity to

monitor the facilities from afar” (Portland Parks & Recreation Program, 2008, p. 31).

This would allow the spaces to be under continuous surveillance by police, parents, and others in the community. In Fiore et al.’s (2005) interviews with park and police officials of cities throughout the region, they found suggestions that increased police patrols around the skatepark as soon as the park opens were considered a deterrent to crime.

“Although few cities did this, staff reported that it would have prevented problems from developing and would have eased the transition of accommodating a new and heavily used facility” (Fiore et al., 2005, p. 10).

Spectators. The term “spectator/s” appears seven times between the two city plans and is equal to the number of times the term “supervision/supervised/supervise” appears.

Skateparks provide legitimate, safe, legal places to practice. If they are designed as part of a larger park they will attract a variety of spectators. The mingling of user groups can encourage positive interactions between different users of public space. (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007, p. 9)

Both cities encourage space for spectators at the skatepark, stating that skateboarding is a high spectator sport. “High visibility is also beneficial because skating is popular as a spectator sport” (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008, p. 11). Specifically, space needed to be available so that others could be present in the skatepark, not just users of the park or their guardians. “Therefore new skateparks need to provide space for spectators as well. This includes not only parents but others who come specifically to be part of the scene” (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008, p. 14).

Skateboarders. The third level of surveillance outlined by each plan involved the skateboarders themselves. “At Pier Park in North Portland, neighbors reported that the skatepark actually served to improve the parks[‘] problems by bringing in more users and more ‘eyes on the park’” (Fiore et al., 2005, p. 11). Multiple references were made by both cities regarding the value of older skateboarders policing the community. Older skateboarders would serve as role models for younger skateboarders and set the standards for skatepark etiquette that would keep the park working safely and legally.

“[O]lder skaters who have worked so hard to get safe, legal places to skate are often good stewards of skateparks and can serve as a good role [model] for younger skaters” (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007, p. 36). The argument that skateboarders have advocated and worked hard to have skateparks built therefore they will “protect it,” does not stop with older skaters policing younger skaters. This was applied to graffiti and potential vandalism to the parks. It was noted in both reports that skateboarders are likely not the individuals “tagging” or damaging spaces because they fought so hard to have the parks created. Additionally, this translated into skateboarders holding “transient” users accountable for the damage they impose, as to not risk losing the park in the future. The second component of this is the design of the park itself. “Poor quality design and/or construction will lead to neglect by skaters. Under-used skateparks, like other public spaces, are more likely to attract problems” (Fiore et al., 2005, p. 16).

A sustainable design pulls together elements that can grow with the community and is accessible and desirable for users at all proficiency levels (L. Pipe, field notes, June 2016). Additionally, as noted by Portland’s plan (Portland Parks & Recreation,

2008), hiring an experienced skatepark designer and builder are key. For example, the Pier Park skatepark in northern Portland was originally designed and built as a community service project between several organizations and the National Guard. The National Guard completed the construction of the skatepark as practice for working with concrete. Unfortunately, the park had design and construction problems (due to the inexperience with skatepark design and construction of all involved). This made the skatepark unattractive to more advanced skaters and BMX riders. Beginner skaters and riders have been able to use the park, but it was not sufficient for sustaining growth with the community.

A lesson learned from the original Pier Park skatepark is that simply being able to work with, and form, concrete does not mean one can build a quality skatepark... successful design... is a combination of skill and craftsmanship. (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008, p. 14)

Orders of displacement. There is an assumed idea that skateboarders and related sports (specifically freestyle BMX and inline skating) are equal users of city spaces or are equally displaced. However, the documents present a more nuanced understanding. These groups are not equally seated amongst each other – a hierarchy of sorts exists. Seattle and Portland were faced with this as they developed their plans. Skateboarders in both communities argued that BMX bikes should not be allowed in the parks. In both cases, the argument was made that the bikes could cause more damage to the parks and take up more space than skateboards. This argument appeared in both plans, as well as mediated literature in both communities.

The use of skateparks by freestyle BMX bikes is a sensitive issue with some very strong feelings on this issue on both sides. For BMX riders, the issue has to do with unfettered access to public facilities. For skateboarders, the issues have to do with being displaced by the bikes, the potential for injury, and excessive wear and tear on the skatepark caused by the metal stunt pegs on some BMX bikes. (Portland Parks & Recreation Program, 2008, p. 34)

Each city opted for different approaches, with Seattle banning bikes and inline skating from their skateparks and Portland arguing for equitable access. The City of Portland took a very strong stance against banning bikes from these spaces and was deliberate in the inclusion of BMX in the language of the document. “Promoting skateboarding, BMX freestyle bike riding and in-line skating as legitimate recreational activities within our community” (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008, p. 9).

However, as noted by Dougherty (2009), the relationship in Portland between skateboarding and BMX is still tricky and contentious. The collective memories between these communities, as it is in many cities, is strained due to scarce resources and spaces. As skateboarders have established their part in the greater Portland community, including a key advocate and skater serving as the chief of staff for the Mayor in 2009, BMX has been pushed out of the conversation. “[BMXers] were aligned with skaters in fighting for skateparks but feel skate advocates shut them out of the parks as the skateboarders gained power” (Dougherty, 2009, para. 4). Despite this, it has not stopped BMX riders from using the skateparks in either city. Fiore et al. (2005) interviewed staff at local skateparks in the Pacific Northwest and found that prohibiting BMX riders from using the parks did not stop them from using the parks, and suggested that cities find ways to include them to prevent potential conflicts between the two groups. This dynamic creates a hierarchy

within the action sports community. As more action or “risk” sports became popular, little is being considered by either city regarding how making some of these sports “legal” further entrenches other sports in competitive relationships for spaces within “the city.”

Lefebvrian: Lived, the consumption of space. The boundaries of *lived* centered on how each city enacted their respective skatepark plan and how the parks were utilized by the communities and bodies moving throughout each city. For the lived component, mediated literature, photos, collective memories of communities, popular histories, and maps were analyzed. These analyses generated the code groups of administration, community of action sports, and community at large, with the key theme of administration and continuous use being identified.

Administration and continuous use. As noted by Fiore et al. (2005) in *The Urban Grind*, maintenance and the day-to-day care of the parks are just as important as the design of the parks. Poorly designed and poorly maintained parks can lead to the parks being seen as not appealing to users, which in turn leads to them being underused, and thus, to Fiore et al., 2006) can lead to problems such as crime and other activities. “Anticipating maintenance needs is just as important as planning for proper design. ...skatepark advocates should develop strategies to deal with common nuisances like litter and vandalism before problems arise” (Fiore et al., 2006, p. 16). Both plans presented policies for managing graffiti and trash. Beyond the surveillance and “job box” listed previously, both plans recommend quick documentation and removal as to not

invite further vandalism, an application of the Broken Windows Theory (Kelling & Wilson, 1982).

Maintenance also included daily operations of and ongoing administration of the skateparks and the skatepark plans. Each city outlined the development of a Skatepark Advisory Committee that would continue to deploy and expand the skatepark plans. Additionally, Portland Parks and Recreation (2008) recommended that a single staff member be hired to oversee the day-to-day operations of the parks and coordinate with the Advisory Committee. This is a significant commitment on the part of the municipality toward long-term skatepark development. The position would entail monitoring the parks regularly, managing community outreach, completing assessment and follow up activities, overseeing the siting and development of new skateparks, and developing on going “programming” for users.

In the work of Skatepark Leadership Advisory Team (SPLAT) (Portland) and the Skatepark Advisory Taskforce (Seattle), it was determined that skateparks are high use facilities. “Reports from maintenance and operations staff about developed skateparks indicates these facilities are getting constant use, typically more than other recreation facilities in the same parks” (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008, p. 19). During the Skatepark Advisory Taskforce’s (2007) interviews with police and parks and recreation staff in communities with skateparks throughout the region, parks and recreation directors noted that skateparks are among the most used public parks and are worth the cost. Additionally, during these interviews, several communities confirmed that the public fears regarding the skateparks and criminal activity were unfounded.

Portland's Skatepark System Plan (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008) created a larger document that included more specific information on how the parks would be maintained and operated after completion. Two key observations were discovered in the process of developing "operational standards." First, despite the work and research completed by the Portland Parks and Recreation staff during the development of the plan, the Portland Parks and Recreation Department believed there was a significant amount to still learn. "Like other recreation facilities, the best management approach will come through trial and error or by modifying an approach. Since no two neighborhoods or skateparks will be the same, flexibility is important" (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008, p. 29). The second observation regarded rules related to helmet and safety pad requirements in Portland skateparks. The use of helmets and safety gear are encouraged but not required. The plan cites the *Journal of Injury Infection & Critical Care* as reporting that most traumatic injuries in skateboarding come from collisions with motor vehicles. Skateboarders who choose not to skate in public skateparks because of helmet and safety gear requirements are then skateboarding in areas trafficked by more motor vehicles. Therefore, the Portland Parks and Recreation department felt that the risk was too high that skateboarders might opt out of using the parks due to the safety rules, and in turn be at higher risk of motor vehicle collision (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008).

In supporting interviews with the media, both Portland and Seattle have outwardly discussed the creation of skate routes and skate trails. In his *The Wall Street Journal* article, Dougherty (2009) sites Portland's development of a downtown "skate route," linking multiple public skateboarding spots together into a network, as to why Portland

was named the skateboarding capital of the world. Seattle's Skatepark Advisory Committee members were interviewed by the magazine *Next City* (Owens, 2014) and discussed the use of "Integrated Skateable Terrain¹⁷" (skatedots and skatespots) to encourage skaters to travel between skateparks and throughout the city. "[W]ith thoughtful placement, they help to build a connected park system where skaters can practice tricks in one neighborhood, then head on their board to another, finding skateable features along the way" (Owens, 2014).

¹⁷ Developed by Matt Johnston (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007), member of the Seattle Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, integrated skateable terrain focuses on building skateable objects throughout public space. In most cases, only the skatespace user is aware of the objects skateable existence.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION: SKATEBOARDING AND THE SKATEBOARDER

In this chapter, I present the overall analyses of the Seattle Citywide Skatepark Plan (Skatepark Advisory Taskforce, 2007) and the Portland Skatepark System Plan (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008). The analyses included the critical reading of the plans; associated municipal policies and ordinances, related national and local mediated literature (i.e. magazines and newspapers), images of the four skateparks referenced in the plans, and the popular histories and collective memories of communities where the four skateparks are located. I present the themes constructed from the analyses, outlining how each city developed, deployed, and consumed public spaces for physically active communities. These themes directly address the central questions of this project related to the regulation of human movement: how the cities developed plans (conceived), how the cities deployed the plans and policies (perceived), how the cities consumed plans and policies (lived), and what this means for other sports who occupy these spaces.

The analyses introduce five major assertions. First, the terms legal and illegal, as assigned to human movement in public space, are undefined and applied universally by the municipality. Second, the municipal approaches to skateboarding struggle to contain the skateboarder while promoting skateboarding within the city as a “legitimate” activity.

Third, the municipal skatepark attempts to scale the Skating Commons as a means of containing and promoting skateboarding in public space. Fourth, the plans seek to have skaters serve as “citizen police,” observing others and themselves within sanctioned movement through “the city.” Lastly, the skateboarding communities in these spaces struggle with a complacent resistance to the precedents of legality set in these plans. These themes directly translate into how cities manage physical movement through “the city” in the name of the “common good.” How these assertions are applied and assumed in community “lived” experiences have the potential to impact how individuals understand, value, and engage in physical activity and movement through their communities.

Returning to the Problem Statement and Research Questions

As noted in Chapter One, this project sought to examine how municipalities regulate human movement in “the city” by utilizing municipal skateboarding policies as a case study. Many U.S. cities are renegotiating the relationships between community health with physical activity and public spaces. This renegotiation occurs as skateboarding claims new heights of commercial popularity in the U.S. and abroad. Thus, some communities, in this case Seattle, Washington and Portland, Oregon, are responding to this popularity by developing public skateparks. Through the critical analyses of the two city plans, this project sought to respond to the following questions:

- 1) How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding developed in the “City?” (Physical/Conceived)

- 2) How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding deployed in the “City?” (Code/Perceived)
- 3) How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding consumed in the “City?” (Content/Lived)
- 4) How are municipal policies and plans regarding skateboarding encompassing of other action sports in the “City?”

Themes. In response to these questions, seven themes emerged and were presented in Chapter Four. The themes of reputations and representations, mission and goals, siting and funding, and expendable skatespaces heavily shaped and directed the conception of the documents and responses to the community. The themes of hierarchical surveillance and orders of displacement emerged in the deployment of each plan. Lastly, themes focused on administration and continuous use were consumed by the city. From these themes, I constructed five assertions. These assertions present a glimpse of how communities understand the municipal role in the promotion and regulation of physical activity and human movement.

Responding to the questions. The assertions below straddle the boundaries of each research question. Much like the Lefebvrian Triad, these assertions cannot operate as discrete responses to the research questions individually, but operate as a response to the questions as a whole. The four research questions, however, do provide information on how the cities conceived, perceived, and lived their respective plans. The conception is one of sanctioning, the perception is one of minimizing, and the lived is one of confusion.

At the surface, the cities approached the development (conceived) of the plans from an understanding of public *sanctioning* of skateboarding spaces. Returning to Portland's stated goal "The ultimate goal of the system plan is to provide access to a legal, public sanctioned skateboarding facility" (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008, p. 2). The development of each plan hinges in an air of legal blurriness as the municipality operates with a fear-centric stance that any activity operating within "the city" in an unsanctioned fashion does so with high elements of danger to the common good. Specifically, perceptions by community members that "skateboarding" increases crime are leveraged to shape how each city approached plan development both in an attempt to mitigate fear and an attempt to mitigate a visible skateboarding presence in "the city." Efforts were made in the design of each plan, and corresponding municipally-built park, to promote surveillance but minimize "presence." Noise, trash, and parking, which are all part of any public space, were considered key issues in a skatepark siting process in need of minimization to prevent the parks from attracting crime.

However, negligibly present in each document was the conversation of health. The idea that skateboarding could promote physically active communities exist in the background but is never mentioned outright. The benefits are either assumed or overshadowed by a looming need for the "legalization" of designed spaces. City compartmentalization takes precedence over individual rights to the city in each cities' approach to their respective plan. Specifically, the need to assign space and correct "misuse" of space in an attempt to create order. The documents make it appear as though Kelling and Wilson (1982) have prevailed in their conception of broken windows, despite

continuous scholarship to prove otherwise (Fulda, 2010). A fear-based rationale takes hold of the municipal development – an almost “what if skateboarders are criminals” takes a place of prominence. However, at the same time, this logic is challenged by skateboarding and by existing skatespaces (like Marginal Way and Burnside) in “the city.” Each city sits almost halted by conflicting accounts of skateboarding in the city. Skateboarding is both good and bad in the municipal organization of space, promoting community and economy, while challenging and resisting “sanctioned” movements. This creates a push-pull dynamic between the “ideal” development of a skatepark plan and the “actual” development of a skatepark plan.

This struggle then roots how the plans are deployed by each municipality. The municipalities approached the deployment (perceived) of the plans by aiming to *minimize* the presence of skateparks in public spaces. On one hand, policies and ordinances are argued and deployed for specific portions of the community – in Seattle, only skateboarding, and in Portland, skateboarding and other action sports. On the other hand, the municipality is confused about how to deploy these new spaces while minimizing their presence. How to handle the public relation problem that is the “skateboarder” becomes a key policy approach. Both cities are struggling with the conflicting idea that skateboarding should be present but not known, almost as if the old montage – “a child should be seen, but not heard” – governs the municipality’s approach. This “visible” but “invisible” approach challenges a now confused skateboarding community. Modern skateboarding no longer exists in hidden spaces, where the skateboarder could claim the space they desire. Once a skatepark becomes available, confusion ensues over desire-

driven space appropriation and “respectable citizenship.” A tug of legitimacy pushes the “popular” narrative that skateboarding wielded as a badge of appeal to an afterthought that may not be endangered, but is certainly displaced as the majority. The plans are then deployed as if this struggle between promotion and minimization is absent. The struggle to build a space while minimizing its user is latent in both cases.

The municipality is now tasked with the “safety” of the common good and an acknowledgment of skateboarding as a part of the common good. This creates a disjunction between who the city “is” and how the city “wants” to be seen. The city, not the municipality, is left with a consumption (lived) of confusion that is navigated by the skateboarder but paralyzing for the municipality. By acknowledging “skateboarding” the city is left in confusion on what to do with the skateboarder. Both skateboarding and skateboarder appear as separate components of this developed and deployed system. The skateboarder, now in negotiation with the city and the municipality, must emerge to redefine the consumed myth of “skateboarding.”

Lastly, these approaches at each stage of the development, deployment, and consumption of the skatepark plans stifle other action sports from emerging as public space users. The hierarchy between action sports, regarding the rights to appropriate space, creates orders of displacement that are emphasized by the newly deployed plans. The other action sports that have lingered in “the city,” negotiating scarce spatial resources with skateboarding, now are left to navigate the new relationship between skateboarding and the municipality. This is more than a simple argument over which sport does more damage to a space (skateboarding or BMX) or which sport has more

interest (skateboarding or inline skating). These challenges become a central argument over which movements can be sanctioned by the municipality, thus creating a power dynamic. This power dynamic itself is blurred. While skateboarding may have the attention of the municipality, the other sports do not “require” the sanctioning that skateboarding is now expected to uphold. Therefore, the sports that were operating in a contentious harmony with one another now operate with a shifting and fluid power structure with neither knowing how the other fits into the newly deployed system of skateparks.

Constructing Assertions

The assertions derived from these analyses offer a preliminary glimpse into how municipalities, in particular two municipalities, examined the role and place of skateboarding within the space of “the city.” In each assertion, the challenge faced by the municipality is one of definition. First, the defining of legal and illegal spaces is absent and assumed, constructed in the abstract language of sanctioning. Second, the defining of the skateboarder separate from the act of skateboarding takes place. The assumed understanding is that these two can be separated from one another, allowing “the city” to benefit from the act of skateboarding while mitigating the skateboarder. Third, the defining of a modern Skating Commons is attempted and blurred. The municipality attempts to secure the “Commons” through ordered bureaucracy but neglects to fully grasp the role and defining features of the Commons as part of “the city.” What derives from these defining efforts is the desire for the skateboarder, now separated from the act of skateboarding and the Skating Commons, to become the enforcer of the newly

“governed” skatescape. This requires a new negotiation and defining of relationships for skateboarding and other action sports with each other, the municipality and the city.

Assertion 1: Municipalities define bodies as “legal” and “illegal” within public space. The city as a public playground is absent from these documents. In an attempt to establish legal skateboarding boundaries, each city has allowed for all human movement to fall under confining categories of “legal” and “illegal.” However, the municipality in each case has neglected to broach the definitions or the fluidity of the terms and actions of legal and illegal. The words are assumed to be universal and accurate, and the cities assume their interpretation of the terms to also be accepted and accurately understood. Little is done to expand the conception and connection of “sanctioned” space to “legal” space. This connection is believed to be causal and justified by the municipality as confining boundaries of municipal and public spaces.

By not broaching a discussion of these terms, the planners eliminated any opportunity to address broader concerns with rights to the city. There is no room for the documents or the authors to identify or discuss how the municipality could be creating artificial boundaries to publicness, or in this case, limiting community access to physical activity. The question, “who decides what is legal and illegal?” becomes key when developing public skating spaces. The conception and assumption that skateboarding, and by extension freestyle BMX and inline-skating, occurs in “illegal” spaces, many of which are public, because “legal” spaces are not made available to them is not only limited, it is simplistic. The reality is much more complex and, like action sports, does not sit in an easily conceived binary.

The process of determining and marking a space as “illegal” for certain activities and not for others is never addressed. It is simply assumed that the interpretations of legal/illegal in these plans are only contained and assigned to skateboarding. However, as public spaces are determined and marked as “illegal” for certain activities and not for others, the municipality begins to shape and reshape how movement through the city is seen, defined, and experienced. Back to the work of Németh (2006; 2012) and Woolley and Johns (2001), the spaces deemed “illegal” for use by skateboarders are often plazas, sidewalks, and downtown spaces. These are public spaces designed for and by the municipality for communal use through the city. However, as noted by Loukaitou-Sideris and Ehrenfeucht (2012), though sidewalks are “owned” by the municipality, the abutting businesses are responsible for managing these islands of concrete. Moreover, this translates to a similar philosophy for many public plazas – the abutting structures take on the responsibility of management. If skateboarding, like homelessness, is seen as a disruption of economic spaces, as noted by Kelling and Wilson (1982) and Carr (2010), then these activities are treated as “illegal” activities even if technically they are occurring in public spaces.

Therefore, determining the publicness and legality of an activity, such as skateboarding, is not a simple matter with clear demarcations between right and wrong and is inherently tied to the spaces where these activities occur. This fluidity translates directly into how public skateboarding policies, ordinances, and master plans are shaped. The assumption that these activities are a) happening “illegally” and b) can be redirected to “legal” spaces, neglects the larger conversation of what makes public spaces “illegal”

in “the city.” Moreover, there is no conversation regarding how some bodies are more legal or less legal in public spaces or why these distinctions occur. In both city plans, the broader and more timely concern of why the municipality desires to contain, organize, or “sanction” movement throughout the city is never directly addressed or considered. However, as with legal arguments, a precedence is being set in both plans that allows the municipality to direct, and in some cases “outlaw,” movement in the city beyond skateboarding.

Considering who has rights to existing public space becomes a deeper and more evident question if the municipality seeks a transparent definition for the terms “legal” and “illegal.” Without a transparent definition, the municipality is inviting some “citizens” and disinviting other “individuals” by defining some bodies as illegally occupying a “public” space – or are themselves illegal. In turn, the defining of people, not space, is occurring in these plans. People are being defined as illegal by being present in public spaces and these public spaces are then used to determine or even dictate the legality of individuals in “the city.”

As noted in Chapter One, the definition of citizen continues to narrow nationally in the U.S. By defining public space in a legal/illegal dichotomy, the municipality is able to criminalize some individuals/bodies (in a legal/illegal dichotomy) for being present in the city. This shifts the argument from “illegal” public skateboarding space to the larger argument of who is considered a “legal citizen” with the rights to move freely through the city and public spaces. All of this is further complicated by the municipal tug-of-war with the state over legal and illegal, documented and undocumented bodies, and the

opportunity and obligation to determine the status of those bodies. Specifically, the precedent set by this naming of skateboarding bodies in a legal/illegal dichotomy is the resulting argument that allows the municipality to extend this naming to all bodies – more precisely, bodies the municipality can name as threatening, often Brown, Black, teenage, and/or homeless bodies. By camping this naming and regulating of skateboarding bodies as legal/illegal, the municipality is able to more easily do the same to other bodies because skateboarding bodies in the areas of Seattle and Portland are predominately white and male. This demographic identification allows the municipality to name the body illegal not the activity, creating an ongoing justification for naming all bodies who could be considered threatening to the common good.

As American (U.S.) society moves into the future, the ability of the municipality and the state, not communities, to determine the status of bodies within public space as legal or illegal has the potential to use the physical public landscape to target “undesirable” bodies (however that may or may not be defined). Moreover, this ability to target and remove bodies serves to embolden behaviors of exclusion, with exclusion running counter to both municipalities’ justifications for authorizing the skatepark plan development. This begs the question of how municipalities and the state are able to define a “public” space as legal or illegal, and why those definitions of space change when specific bodies occupy that public space.

As skateboarding evolves into a more mainstream activity – with skate camps and large events – then the conceptions of “illegal” public spaces will also change. These are “public” spaces designed and considered “accessible” for communal use, but

simultaneously defined and designed as “illegal” for public use by specific groups. Building “legal” spaces on the assumption that current skateboarding usage of space is “illegal” returns the city to an assumed causality, just as with “Broken Windows” (Kelling & Wilson, 1982). As noted by Fulda (2010) “[h]and someone a neighbourhood with broken windows, litter and dirtied lavatories and he will make it an even less liveable place, more likely than not, but he will not start committing murder and mayhem” (p. 2). The idea that tolerating small “quality of life” (Fulda, 2010) infractions leads to a graduated level of criminality is not accurate. Building city policy from this logic is not only faulty, it is costly. As cities consider building skatespaces for these communities, it is important to widen the definitions of “illegal” and “legal” spaces and how those terms are assigned to spaces. The municipality has a need to return to conceptions of publicness, if it is going to make the city accessible to diverse bodies and movements.

Moreover, by examining the topography of the city, public spaces that are now deemed “illegal” for certain movements, like skateboarding, could become “legal” when the municipality considers conceptions of publicness. This could eliminate a key hurdle to the development and deployment of skatepark plans – funding. Opening city spaces for wider use maximizes existing resources and addresses a key point of frustration for skatepark advocates – instead of expanding the availability of skatespaces, cities are wasting resources building and redirecting skateboarding to “new” spaces (Levin, 2006).

Assertion 2: Cities separate the “skateboarder” and the act of skateboarding.

This struggle with determining spaces and movement as legal and illegal is connected to

the assumptions outlined in Chapter Four that shape the municipal plans. Assumption one, as demonstrated in the introduction of both documents, is that skateboarding is growing as a youth sport faster than other youth sports. Assumption two, as demonstrated in the language used by both reports to survey and connect with the community, that skateboarding and related sports are perceived negatively by the community, as either instigating crime in or inviting crime to the area. Specifically, assumptions one and two, that are used to shape the development of each plan, serve as contradictions to how the plans were then deployed. These assumptions only serve as a springboard for a much larger latent challenge - whether the city is attempting to contain skateboarding or the skateboarder.

In both city skatepark plans and throughout the mediated literature, the reputation of skateboarding is extrapolated from the assumed “reputation” of the skateboarder. The documents outline skateboarding in individual terms with case examples that are skateboarder specific, not skateboarding encompassing. This translates into policies and plans that attempt to minimize the impact of the “skateboarder” on the municipal space, while promoting “skateboarding” as a “legitimate” activity in “the city.”

It is the imagined “skateboarder” that is the target of the Broken Windows’ (Kelling & Wilson, 1982) interpretation of skateboarding for “the city.” The perception of the “skateboarder” is still culturally tied to the images of skateboarding’s preferred and promoted origin story, Dogtown. The “imagined” skateboarder is a punk kid up to no good, spreading trash, spray painting neighborhoods, and worst of all, promoting juvenile criminality as a lifestyle. However, it is this struggle between the mythical identities of

the “skateboarder” and the economic promise of “skateboarding” that shape the municipal response. For example, the descriptions both cities use to outline the purpose of the regional skateparks is rooted in municipal financial opportunity. The regional skatepark is the largest skatepark proposed in each plan, holding up to 300 simultaneous users. The regional parks would feature retail space along with the facilities to host “national” and “international” actions sports competitions and sponsors. Additionally, both cities encouraged communities to seek outside funding grants, from organizations such as the Tony Hawk Foundation and the Sheckler Foundation, to support the building of public skateparks. At the same time, both plans sought to create observational spaces in order to keep the “imagined” skateboarder from emerging in the community. A great deal of information was presented by both plans to argue for skateparks to be in the public eye line of authority figures (police, parents, etc.) to control for these “imagined” bodies.

Both cities attempt to exploit the popularity of skateboarding while attempting to minimize the behavior of the imagined skateboarder. This exploitation however is bounded by the extrapolation of skateboarding from the imagined “reputation” of the skateboarder. This creates a cyclical interpretation of who skateboards and what that means for public skateboarding space. Moreover, the two cannot be separated, any more than space and place; without the skateboarder skateboarding, skateboarding does not exist.

Assertion 3: The cities attempt to scale the modern skatespot operating as a Skating Commons. When considering this tension between skateboarding and the

skateboarder for the city, a larger and more pressing challenge emerges. How can the city build, replicate, and scale skateboarding opportunities in public spaces without scaling the imagined “skateboarder.” The concept of the Commons emerges as a key component in each municipal plan, with the skatepark systems attempting to replicate and scale a “new” Skating Commons.

The Skating Commons. The modern skatepark is a dynamic, fluid description that includes the organic skatespot, the guerrilla skatepark, and the municipal-purposeful skatespace. This creates a spectrum of skatescapes that are occupied by diverse users with unique needs and engagements with public and private spaces. However, skateboarding and related sports are presented in flat-singular descriptors by municipal documents, either legal or illegal, good or bad. These representations have consequences on the space conceiving process engaged by both municipalities. The consequences of this process included the filtering of substantive historical narratives and hierarchies that have served to enrich early skatescapes.

Starting with the popular origin stories of skateboarding, Dogtown, the American (U.S.) skatespot has operated as a roving Commons. The Commons, as defined by Németh (2012), operates with shared users having unabridged control of common resources or spaces. Elinor Ostrom and Nives Dolšak (2003) specifically describe the Commons of the new millennium in terms of decision-making – no individual can make allocation or use of shared resources. And Derek Wall (2014) takes the Commons back to its origins in collective ownership. However, the modern Skating Commons combines all of these. As skateboarders claim non-purposefully built spaces, like Dogtown did with

backyard pools and sidewalks, they are disrupting understood boundaries and structures of ownership enacted by the municipality and returning the space temporarily to a collectively owned, organized, and lived space.

The Commons becomes central to how skateboarders engage with the space they occupy and with each other – a shared level of usage, creativity, and governance is formed in these temporary spaces. The spaces claimed by skateboarders are organic in nature and development, the skatespot users select, nurture, and mature the space as they go. When skateboarders claim space for long-term use, such as with Burnside and Marginal Way Skateparks, the space is developed, organized, and maintained as a Commons with user governance and design. This is precisely how skateboarding has managed to navigate decades of changing cityscapes – evolving organically (Carr, 2010).

The analysis brought to light the role of the American (U.S.) skatespot as a Commons, disrupting and dispersing rights to public/private ownership. This disruption serves as a challenge to the municipal ruse that public space is public. The American (U.S.) skatespot operates as a roving disruption, acknowledging the city's and the municipality's needs to contain and organize behavior, while simultaneously ignoring that containment. The municipal ruse that is public space as public, in reality, comes with limitations when the public space is first developed by the municipality. The municipality creates public space with a defined and assigned purpose and correspondingly assigned movement. For example, the average public plaza is developed for activities such as coffee or chess in the park, and modern greenways are developed for walking and running through the city. In these spaces, boundaries are created to demarcate activities

and organize bodies moving through the public space. The boundaries are meant to make the public space an assigned or sanctioned space in the name of the “common good.”

The Skating Commons then disrupts a narrative of ownership and public assignment. The skateboarders operate in a skate-only hierarchy that determines the rules of the space the skateboarders now occupy and renders the boundaries created by the municipality as arbitrary and temporarily discarded. A new collective is operationalized and the space is “liberated” for skateboarding. This only disrupts ownership but does not dissolve ownership, as a new ownership – a skate ownership – is forged and a new fluid ownership emerges. Moreover, these spaces were created from a perceived need by the users to self-contain and separate from the municipal-structure that had “ejected” them from other public spaces. This allows the skatespot, and by extension the guerrilla skatepark (such as Burnside and Marginal Way), to develop in organic and shared ways that the municipality cannot replicate.

Scaling the Commons. An attempt by the municipality to assert control over the Commons that is forming starts with components that are tangled in contradicting uses. First, an attempt to replicate parts of the Skating Commons is made through the development of the municipal skatepark. Then an attempt to dissolve the Skating Commons is executed to remove “illegal” skateboarding from other spaces. The municipality attempts to replicate the Commons and at the same time exploit the Commons for its ability to shape and control the skatescape. Specifically, the municipality is asking the skatepark user to govern the municipal skatepark, not by user-set guidelines as in the Skating Commons, but by the ordered governance desired by the

municipality. Thus, the municipality faces the challenge of scaling the Commons from an organically user-developed space to a structured-municipal space.

As noted by David Harvey (2012), the scaling of the Commons has been difficult if not impossible. Solutions and organization that operate at the small-organic levels “do not and cannot carryover” (Harvey, 2012, p. 69) as the Commons is scaled upward. This means that the municipality, in its attempt to replicate the Skating Commons, faces a difficult task of artificially manufacturing the commons. This is compounded by the flat-singular descriptors of skatepark users offered in both municipal plans. If the descriptor of the skatepark user is limited to municipal conceptions of legality and order, then the Commons cannot come to fruition. The Commons would operate in direct competition with the municipality, and therefore cannot withstand the weight of the municipal structuring force. Once the municipality attempts to scale skatespots to locations in an organized and selective fashion, the Commons dissolves. No longer are the spaces capable of self-governance, development, or evolution. The Commons that made skatescapes successful for the user in the past is absorbed by the municipality, shifting focus from the lived occupants to the order-maintenance of the municipality. This is done in the name of safety for all, both user and non-user, and in the name of creating “legal” opportunities for the Commons to form. However, the new Skating Commons is now plagued by the system of bureaucracy that it originally sought separation from.

Assertion 4: Cities ask skateboarders to police themselves. What comes from this new municipal replication is not quite as either the skateboarder or the municipality had hoped. Both sought to maintain parts of the original skatespaces that are no longer

viable in the new replicated structure. For example, both Portland and Seattle present arguments that the skaters and park users can police the skateparks. They argue that in skatespace, older skateboarders mentor younger skateboarders and keep the space safe. This is a significant outcome of non-municipal skatespaces – the skaters using the space can establish “known” rules and hierarchies that include ejecting others from the skatespace. However, in the replicated municipal skatepark this role is simultaneously encouraged and thwarted. There is a heavy reliance on the park-users to adopt a “see something, say something” mentality. This is a mentality that is rampant in many spaces post-9/11 in the United States. This policy is different than the organic skate hierarchy of the skater-claimed spaces. The municipal skatepark, a replicated Commons, moves the user from active decision maker to an observer and reporter of bodies. This approach has the potential to encourage a climate of distrust and violence in these skatescapes. Particularly, the plans reference the likelihood of transient users vandalizing the parks and regular users policing this behavior. As noted in the Portland System Plan (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008), “because a traditional response to vandalism is to close the skateparks, which eliminates their usability altogether. Users clearly do not want this, since many of them advocated for years to get the facilities” (p. 30).

What this climate of distrust encourages, under the threat of removing the “permanent” concrete park, is the policing of bodies new or unfamiliar to the park. The climate is acted out in how community members interact, react, and live within the space. This does not encourage new users, or even the cultivation of community users, and returns the “city” to the causality assumptions of Kelling and Wilson (1982) and the

Broken Windows Theory. It also encourages the park-users to become arm-chair watchdogs, creating yet another contradiction. The plans argue that creating skateparks has the potential to build community and bring a diverse community of users together. However, by encouraging the surveillance of unfamiliar bodies, under the threat of losing the space, the municipal city has created space for an opposite action.

Assertion 5: Skateboarding and the “skateboarder” have a complacent resistant relationship with the city. As skateboarding continues to engage with the municipality in terms of its role in the city, skateboarding and the skateboarder are positioned to examine their role in the defining of legality and citizenship. The popular, and preferred, histories of skateboarding revolve and evolve around a position of resistance. However, skateboarding has become equally complacent in the assumed definitions of these terms as much as it is resistant to the ideas of legality. By embracing the exclusion of some physical activities from skateparks (such as BMX and inline skating), skateboarding actively perpetuates the exclusionary aspects of the terms “legal” and “illegal.” At the same time, the diversity that is the skateboarder struggles with the roles of complacent citizen (that they are asked to play) and resisting anarchist (that they are assumed to play).

The struggle is manifested in the promotion of a popularized view of skateboarding as the resisting underdog, challenging the municipality and the boundaries of “the city.” Alternatively, skateboarding’s popularity has led to the creation of mainstream access – skate camps, mega events, and mall shops – creating a new level of visibility in “the city” through a language of commerce. This new commercial role (that

is not actually new) positions skateboarding as a sport that both joins and challenges the municipality. In terms of the two city plans, each municipality sought to incorporate commercialized skateboarding while minimizing the chance of “no rules,” “no coaches,” “non-sanctioned” skateboarding from appearing in spaces throughout the city. However, these two parts of skateboarding are inseparable. Skateboarding is commercially worthy because it is also “non-sanctioned” in perceptions. Skateboarding also embraces the ideals of this commercialized self, building larger events, bigger sales campaigns, and “professional” opportunities. The conceptions of risk present in the everyday investment that is skateboarding are at the heart of a post-modern capitalist America (U.S.).

Thus, skateboarding becomes a space of passive resistance and complacency in the construction of legalized bodies and organized spaces. In the words of Delridge Skateparks’ designer, “there will always be purists” (L. Pipe field notes, June 2016). These are skateboarders that seek to skate an unsanctioned urban landscape, keeping the sport “punk” and “resistant.” Each city plan is trapped by an inability to see, understand, or control this “purist.” To the municipality, this makes the skateboarder conceptually separate from skateboarding, for how can the municipality contain the purist and support skateboarding unless they are separate? Moreover, the inclusion of Marginal Way and Burnside Skateparks in their respective city plans creates contradictions for the municipality. The plans seek to “count” the purist and the guerilla skatepark, but distance them through the language of sanctioning and temporality. For each plan, the “purist” will stop skateboarding unsanctioned spaces once the sanctioned space becomes available, and the guerilla skatepark is only temporary until the municipality finds a more

lucrative use for the space. However, as noted by the histories of Seattle skateparks, the sanctioned skateparks are just as temporary as their unsanctioned counterparts. All of these spaces operate and exist at the pleasure of the municipality. However, what the municipality neglects in their attempt to organize skateboarding is the ability of skateboarding to reinvent itself continuously as noted by Carr (2010).

In his work, Carr (2010) theorizes that skateboarding has survived upheaval, financial downturns, and changing city landscapes because it is able to adaptively reinvent its core narratives and images. Much like the pop star Madonna, skateboarding is in a cycle of continuous self-reinvention. This makes skateboarding more commercialized than perceived, while making it more difficult for the municipality to contain the sport as a predictable entity – like other sports in the city. As the municipality attempts to figure out how to “tame” skateboarding, skateboarding (and skateboarders) evolve both spatially and culturally, morphing the city landscape.

At its preferred origin, skateboarding, like many sports, hoped to create a space of equity (Friedman et al., 2001). It was “arguably” accessible for any gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and so on. However, skateboarding has failed to live up to this hope, replicating the inequities of the American (U.S.) culture it mirrors but has the proclivity to resist. With the boom in the skatepark revolution (Howell, 2008), local skateboarding, and in some respects broader skateboarding culture, are challenged not to find acceptance but to be accepting. The popularity of skateboarding has expanded access, just as the city plans assert. However, the question becomes – “expanded access for whom?” At the same time, expanding access means a chance to reinvent another aspect of skateboarding,

with the aim of creating a more inclusive culture that then challenges the very inequity of popular American (U.S.) culture. This in turn has the potential to challenge the very definitions of legality that sanctioned the municipal skatepark. However, the larger question remains for skateboarding, and the skateboarder - how can they both exist in the municipal-governed skatescape and simultaneously challenge conceptions of bodies, movement in the city, and the understanding of the “common good.”

Turning Assertions into Recommendations: Community Skatepark Development

As cities begin to investigate the possibility of adding a public skatepark several strategies need to be considered and further developed. First, simply, the municipality should be asking “why does the city need a skatepark?” Stating that the sport is growing and more youth are participating in these sports is limiting the municipality’s ability to address the true concerns of youth engagement with physical activity and “the city” itself. If the conversation is about containing skateboarding and related sports to specific locations, the municipality should consider alternatives that allow for “containment” that embraces the known characteristics of skatespot development or selection, particularly the work of Chui (2009), Németh (2002), and Woolley and Johns (2001). The consideration of skate routes and skate trails has the potential of pulling together key behaviors – the need for diverse skatespaces and the need, by the municipality, to maintain order. If the conversation is about engaging youth with “the city,” then approaches that encourage youth to explore and traverse the city are needed, thus having a different intended outcome from “containment.”

Considering how skatespaces can be included in current public space – not just public parks – provides more opportunity for the city and for skatespace users. Seattle and Portland developed their city plans around the installation of “integrated skateable terrain” in areas throughout the city. After the development of the plans, this led to greater conversation about the joining of these spaces into a network through each city. The development of integrated skateable terrain allows the city to expand the footprint of skatespaces into existing public areas that were previously inaccessible to skateboarding. This approach could create fiscal savings by eliminating the need to construct other necessary adjacent facilities that would be required when building a municipal skatepark (e.g., water fountains, bathrooms, parking). It is worth noting that both plans were still strongly bounded by ideas of a “traditional” park facility (not just a traditional skatepark facility), thus limiting their ability to examine the skate networks they argued to include.

Second, cities should consider a multiple end-user approach. Creating skatespaces for only skateboarders sets a clear “us versus them” dichotomy between park users and the community. Municipalities rarely plan space with a single end-user. In cases where cities have done this, communities often continue to examine ways to expand use (which is costly to retrofit). Skatespaces should not only accommodate a growing skateboarding, freestyle BMX, and inline skating user-base, but these spaces should become ongoing community gathering spaces. This will address perceived conceptions of skateboarders as “bad kids doing bad things,” as community members begin engaging and understanding why skateboarding and related sports are significant to a new generation of community members. Additionally, a space with multiple end-users allows cities to secure more

funding to develop these spaces, and addresses key concerns of self-policing that currently occurs. As noted in Portland's Skatepark System Plan (Portland Parks & Recreation, 2008), multiple end-users will utilize these spaces, whether they are planned for or allowed in these skatescapes.

By bringing multiple end-users into the skatespace, municipalities are also opening early conversations between users for how the spaces should be developed and shaped. This addresses the opportunity for early interaction among users and has the potential of eliminating future conflicts. Additionally, by including all possible users in the early process of siting and designing a skatespace or identifying existing skatespaces, cities have an opportunity to cultivate civic engagement amongst younger community members. Youth will be able to see the municipal process while also understanding the value of their involvement in the civic process.

Third, municipalities need to strongly consider the significance of free play in their community wellness plans. Physical activity and human movement are not regulated to spaces of labor production. Nor should these activities be regulated to lone conceptions of health. Neither city plan made activity, wellness, or health a primary focus. This eliminated all arguments or consideration for health or physical activity spaces. If cities are to create more health-focused communities, with a community of physically active individuals, free play needs to be promoted, and in some cases reintroduced through physical literacy (Aspen Institute, 2016). The value of skateboarding and related sports is the potential for and the penchant for play. These sports thrive on creative problem

solving and engaged communities of participants. Maximizing these traits allows for cities to reconsider the power and significance of free play.

Skatepark Implications for Action-Related Sports

As noted in Chapter One, skateboarding policies regulate more than just skateboarding. Particularly, sports like freestyle BMX are grouped within the enactment of skateboarding policies. This grouping will continue to expand as sports like scooter riding, parkour, and base jumping become more mainstream. Municipalities often have blanket policies outlawing the activity of base jumping, and in some cases parkour, under the guise of safety. This argument will continue to be challenged, as it has been with skateboarding and BMX, as safety technology progresses and conversations regarding rights to public space and choice of risk expand. The rights to the city cannot so simply be addressed by municipal ordinances and policies – especially when those rights pertain to individuals who, by definition, are acculturated to push and challenge boundaries.

However, a greater challenge faced both city plans and their supporting documents is that a hierarchy exists among these sports. Much like the opening chapter of Matthew in the Christian Bible, action sports have long lines of “begets.” Surfing begot skateboarding begot snowboarding and scootering¹⁸. Motocross begot bicycle motocross (BMX) begot freestyle bicycle motocross (with help from skateboarding) begot freestyle motocross. Never mind the additional begetting lines of inline skating, kite surfing,

¹⁸ Though it could be argued, much to the dismay of modern youth skateboarders, that surfing begot scootering begot skateboarding begot snowboarding. The first skateboards were often planks of wood with a second plank added upright for steering capability (Borden, 2001).

mountain climbing, parkour, and base jumping. These sports are interconnected, not only be their relationship to risk taking, but with their lifestyles and relationships with each other.

Dynamic relationships in action sports. The relationships between action sports (particularly skateboarding, freestyle BMX, and inline skating) are complicated but exacting in how these users engage each other in spaces. The city plans only lightly touch on the complexity of the relationship between skateboarding and BMX, tacking inline skating to the end much like an afterthought. As noted above, the footprint of action sports is expanding – also noted by both plans – therefore cities need to include these intra-action sport relationships in the conception and development of a city plan. Building a skatepark for a single end-user is costly and not sustainable. It is not cost effective and, as noted above, does not prevent other users from eventually using the space “illegally”. This, of course, shifts the burden of legality from one user to the next. In the case of Portland, BMX riders argued this also shifted the role of enforcement and left skateboarders enforcing the policy to keep bikes out of the “sanctioned” skatepark (Dougherty, 2009).

A stronger solution is to consider all of the end-users (and to consider future unknown users) in the development and construction of these spaces. How can bikes and in-line skating be co-users of these spaces? How can these sports be included in long-term planning of existing spaces? What mechanisms might need to be considered to make a fully inclusive space a possibility, particularly with adaptive action sports gaining space and momentum?

Project Scope and Potential for Future Research

The critical reading of the two city skatepark plans developed as many new questions as they provided answers. Questions around access, play, and organization are all still very relevant to this project. However, these same questions also highlight a number of limitations in the scope of this project that need to be addressed in future work. The first question that needs to be considered – how are these trends or perceptions of trends understood in other areas of the United States and the global community?

Table 6

City Comparison Data

	Seattle	Portland	Charlotte, NC	Raleigh, NC	Milwaukee, WI	United States
Population	684,451	632,309	827,097	451,066	600,155	323,127,513
% White, Non-Hispanic	66.3%	72.2%	45.1%	53.3%	37.0%	63.3%
High School Graduates age 25+	93.4%	91.3%	88.4%	90.5%	82.0%	86.7%
College Graduates age 25+	58.9%	45.5%	41.3%	48.2%	28.7%	29.8%

(Census.gov, 2015)

The areas of Portland and Seattle were selected because of their forward planning in city and spatial design. This forward planning is not always available to other communities because of size or location. However, Portland and Seattle, like much of the Pacific Northwest in the United States, is not demographically representative of the rest of the country. Both Portland and Seattle residents are reported to have higher rates of

educational attainment than the rest of the United States or cities of comparable sizes. Additionally, the cities are reported to be more predominately white than comparable cities (Census.gov, 2015) (see Table 6).

Examining how policies, ordinances, and plans regarding these sports are enacted in other areas of the country is essential to expanding the list of recommendations and the opportunities available to communities and participants. For example, a look at how communities such as New York City and Philadelphia, that adopted anti-skateboarding ordinances, have approached the building of skateparks could yield different or expanded recommendations. Future work should look to other communities across the U.S. (and beyond) with a critical reading of municipal literature.

Second, how can BMX bikes, skateboards, scooters, in-line skates, and other action sports co-exist and use spaces together? The relationship between the multiple sports engaged in these spaces needs to be better examined and understood. This project only provides a minimal examination of these complex and evolving relationships. For cities to develop inclusive skatespaces that are open to multiple end-users, questions regarding how these sports and participants engage and intersect need to be explored. Moreover, as these sports evolve and other sports arise (e.g., parkour, adaptive action sports) this work can help cities expand these skatescapes to meet the needs of a changing action sport community. Can these sports (and related sports) be done simultaneously, or must other structures be developed? How might cities examine the usage of these spaces to design more inclusive spaces in the future – is it policy or is it design?

Third, can the claimed spaces of the urban environment be reconsidered as “legal” skatespaces? The scope of this project could only infer how “legal” and “illegal” spaces were being defined by either municipality in the city plans. For analysis of legality to prove useful, and more encompassing, interviews with municipal personnel, local action sports participants, and even the authors of both plans should be conducted. Policy can outline conceptions of legality, but not realities of lived legality. Therefore, future work should include interviews with various stakeholders to better understand how spaces are being defined and deployed in terms of legality. This understanding can provide insight into how existing “illegal” skatespaces may be reconsidered and included as part of the skatetapestry of a community. This can also further explore how skateparks are being used to enact these definitions of legality on skateboarding and other communities. There needs to be opportunities for ongoing investigation and consideration for how non-purposefully built spaces are selected, managed, and categorized. What role can integrated skateable terrain have in enhancing or incorporating these claimed spaces into legal networks of skateable space? What can conceptions of these claimed spaces tell us about how bodies can exist in the city in a spectrum understanding of legality?

Lastly, and arguable the most important, how are guerrilla skateparks, such as Burnside and Marginal Way, operating as a Commons? The idea that the modern skatespot is a roving Commons that can disrupt the boundaries of ownership and assignment by the municipality comes back to the heart of skateboarding’s preferred origin story. “The city” is home to a number of mini-commons that include not only skatescapes, but also neighborhood and community centers, community parks, and ethnic

communities. These Commons serve to protect and govern the communities in which they exist, but are often claimed by the municipality. This claiming by the municipality then disrupts the disruption, and returns the space of the Organic Commons to the bureaucracy and order of the municipal city. However, the Commons blossoms elsewhere and the process starts again. The uniqueness of the Skating Commons is that this process of municipal claiming happens in an accelerated fashion, making the Skating Commons more fluid in its ability to roam the city as spaces close. Future examination of this roving Commons could provide insight for other communities that are being displaced within the city. How have parks like Burnside existed for decades despite the temporality and the illegality assigned to them? How have these guerrilla skateparks sustained a community of support across generations that have allowed them to continue to grow yet remain tied to a heritage and history? A number of questions surrounding the Commons exist and are observable in an accelerated fashion through the guerrilla skatepark.

What Becomes of Public Space and Physical Activity?

If human movement throughout the city needs to be organized, as Kelling and Wilson (1982) and others (Carr, 2010; Loukaitou-Sideris & Ehrenfeucht, 2012) assert, then how can this organization be directed to better support physical activity throughout the city environment. How are policies and structures able to be leveraged for greater freedom of movement through the community for all in the community, not just specific bodies that are deemed less criminal than others? This goes beyond skateboarding, BMX, and related sports. A number of bodies are planned against and pushed to the margins of movement throughout cities, and as cities seek to create healthy communities, all bodies

need to be included, not just considered. This requires naming and acknowledging that marginalized bodies exist and are not currently being supported by the municipality.

Additionally, municipalities and communities need to consider what inclusive activity spaces look like or need to look like. The municipality will need to fully define what is meant by the term “healthy community.” As a field, we need to better define what are inclusive and diverse healthy communities and how these communities can be developed for all community members. Additionally, our work needs to expand beyond the positivist forms of measuring health and human movement to a multi-faceted potential of cultivating and developing human movement for greater health through the arts and sciences of intentional human movement.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, A. (1997). Of time and space: The contemporary relevance of the Chicago School. *Social Forces*, 75(4), 1149-1182.
- AdSprouts.com (2016). Just Media Kits: TransWorld Skateboarding, TransWorld RIDEbmx, Thrasher. 24 Nov 2016. Retrieved from <http://justmediakits.com/mediakit/>
- Appadurai, A. (1990). Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. *Theory Culture Society*, 7, 295-310.
- Aspen Institute (The). (2015). Sport for all, play for life. *Project Play*. Retrieved from <http://youthreport.projectplay.us/>
- Aspen Institute (The). (2016). Physical literacy in the United States. *Project Play*. Retrieved from <http://youthreport.projectplay.us/>
- Atkinson, M., & Young, K. (2008). *Deviance and social control in sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Ayo, N. (2012). Understanding health promotion in a neoliberal climate and the making of health conscious citizens. *Critical Public Health*, 22(1).
- Bale, J. (1993). The spatial development of the modern stadium. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, 28(2+3), 121-133.

- Bale, J. (1996). Space, place and body culture: Yi-Fu Tuan and a geography of sport. *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, 78(3), 163-171.
- Beal, B., & Weidman, L. (2003). Chapter 20: Authenticity in the skateboarding world. In R. Rhinehart & S. Sydnor. (Eds.), *To the extreme: alternative sports, inside and out* (337-352). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Beal, B., & Wilson, C. (2004). Chapter 2: 'Chicks dig scars': commercialization and the transformations of skateboarders' identities. In B. Wheaton (Eds.), *Understanding lifestyle sport: consumption, identity and difference* (31-54). New York: Routledge.
- Bently, J. (2017). Delridge history. *Southwest Seattle Historical Society – Loghouse Museum*. Retrieved from <http://www.loghousemuesum.info/history/delridge-history>
- Bhatt, S. (2006, December 15). Hearing on proposed citywide skatepark plan lightly attended. *Seattle Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/hearing-on-proposed-citywide-skatepark-plan-lightly-attended/>
- Brown, B. (Director) (1971). *On any Sunday* [Motion Picture]. United States: Brown-Solar.
- Booker, C., & Kargo, C. (2016). Iconic Portland skate park on the front lines of gentrification. *PBS News Hour, December 24, 2016*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/iconic-portland-skate-park-front-lines-gentrification/>

- Borden, I. (2001). *Skateboarding, space and the city: Architecture and the body*. Oxford: Berg.
- Burnside Project (the). (2004). Retrieved from <http://burnsideproject.blogspot.com/2004/06/real-story-at-least-my-story.html>
- Carr, J. (2010). Legal Geographies – Skating around the edges of the law: Urban skateboarding and the role of law in determining young peoples’ place in the city. *Urban Geography*, 31(7), 988-1003.
- Campo, D. (2013). *The accidental playground: Brooklyn waterfront narratives of the undersigned and unplanned*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Census.gov. (2015). *United States Census Bureau*. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/table/PST045216/3712000,3755000,5363000,53,4159000,41>
- Chui, C. (2009). Contestation and Conformity: Street and park skateboarding in New York City public space. *Space and Culture*. 12(25).
- City of Portland. (n.d.). The Burnside street history. *Portland Bureau of Transportation*. Retrieved from <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/295412>
- City of Portland. (1996). *Outer southeast community plan – Powellhurst-Gilbert neighborhood*. Portland, OR: Bureau of Planning.
- City of Portland. (2009). East Portland historical overview and historic preservation study. Portland: Bureau of Planning and Sustainability.
- City of Seattle. (2013). *Skateboard Park Policy*. Seattle, WA: Department of Parks and Recreation.

- City of Seattle. (2013). *Duwamish M/IC: Policy and land use study*. Seattle, WA:
Department of Planning and Development
- City of Seattle. (2016). Duwamish industrial lands study. Seattle: Office of Planning and
Community Development.
- Coakley, J. (2011). Youth sports: What counts as positive development? *Journal of Sport
and Social Issues*, 35(3), 306-324.
- Cranz, G. (1980). Women in Urban Parks. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and
Society*, 5(3), 79-95.
- Creswell, J. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five
approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Davis, J. (2004). *Skateboarding is not a crime: 50 years of street culture*. Buffalo, NY:
Firefly Books
- Dahl, R. (2007). Despite objectors, skateboard park idea grows. *Project for Public Space
– Placemaking*. Retrieved from [http://www.pps.org/despite-objectors-skateboard-
park-idea-grows](http://www.pps.org/despite-objectors-skateboard-park-idea-grows)
- Daily Journal of Commerce (2010, August 30). Delridge skateboard park development.
Daily Journal of Commerce – Oregon. Retrieved from
<http://djcoregon.com/news/2010/08/30/delridge-skateboard-park-development/>
- The Delridge History Project. (n.d.). Delridge history. Retrieved from
<http://www.delridgehistory.org>

- Dougherty, C. (2009, Jul 31). Skateboarding capital of the world. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052970204119704574238073660408040>
- Eaton, M., & Swarr, J. (Directors) (2005). *Joe kid on a stingray: The history of BMX* [Motion Picture]. United States: Bang Pictures.
- Elias, N. (2000). *The civilizing process: Sociogenetic and pshycogenetic investigations*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Fat Tony. (2009). Jackass flips truck inside burnside skatepark. *TransWorld Ride:BMX*. Retrieved from <http://bmx.transworld.net/news/jackass-flips-truck-inside-burnside-skatepark/#VEe5UcxaZmj1278r.97>
- Fiore, E., Heinicke, S., Ragel, B., and Weigel, L. (2005). The Urban Grind: Skateparks – neighborhood perceptions and planning realities. *Master of Urban and Regional Planning Workshop Projects*. Paper 32. Retrieved from http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp_murp/32
- Foucault, M. (2014). The politics of health in the 18th century. (R.A. Lynch, Trans.). *Foucault Studies*, 18, pp. 113-127.
- Franck, K., & Stevens, Q. (2007). *Loose Space: Possibility and diversity in urban life*. New York: Routledge.
- Friedman, G. (Producer) Nemeth, S. (Producer), Ostroff, D. (Producer) & Peralta, S. (Director). (2001). *Dogtown and Z-boys: the birth of extreme* [Motion Picture]. United States: Sony Pictures Classic & Vans Off the Wall.

- Friedman, M. & van Ingen, C. (2011). Bodies in space: Spatializing physical cultural studies. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 28, 85-105.
- Fulda, J. (2010). The 'Broken Windows' Theory and The New York Experience Reconsidered. Institute of Economic Affairs.
- Fusco, C. (2007). 'Healthification' and the promises of urban space: A textile analysis of play, activity, youth (play-ing) in the city. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*. 42(1). 43-63.
- Galbraith, J. (2001). The skatepark: The Burnside project. *Rolling Stones*, 861.
- Gold, S. (2007). Chapter 6: Using photography in studies of immigrant communities: Reflecting across projects and populations In G. Staczak (Eds.) *Visual research methods: Image, society and representation*. (141-166). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Hamm, K. (2010). Burnside turns 20: Looking back and ahead with Che Childress, Bryce Kanights, Mark Scott and more. *ESPN.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.espn.com/action/skateboarding/news/story?id=5741014>
- Haney, A (2017). A secret skate park was built under I-85, just yards from the collapse. Tegna Media. Retrieved from <http://www.wfmynews2.com/news/nation/a-secret-skate-park-was-built-under-an-atlanta-interstate/429356405>.
- Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*. Brooklyn, NY: Verso.
- Henderson, K., Uhlir, G.A., & Greer, D. (1990). Women and physical recreation. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 61(1), 41-43.

- Henry, F (1964). Physical education. *Journal of Health, Physical Education, Recreation*. 35(7), 32-69.
- Hess, C., & Ostrom, E. (2007). *Understanding knowledge as a commons: From theory to practice*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Hoffman, S., & Harris, J. (2013). Chapter One: Introduction to Kinesiology. In S. Hoffman (Ed), *Introduction to Kinesiology and Physical Activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hoffman, M. & Lewman, M. (2002). *The ride of my life*. New York: Regan Books.
- Howe, J. (2003). Chapter 21: Drawing lines: a report from the extreme world (sic). In R. Rhinehart & S. Sydnor. (Eds.), *To the extreme: alternative sports, inside and out* (353-371). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Howell, O. (2008). Skatepark as a neoliberal playground: Urban governance, recreation space, and the cultivation of personal responsibility. *Space and Culture*, 11(4), 475-498.
- Irvine, S., & Taysom, S. (1998). Skateboarding: Disrupting the city. *Social Alternatives*, 17(4), 23-26.
- Jessop, B., Brenner, N., & Jones, M. (2008). Theorizing sociospatial relations. *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 26, 389-401.
- JSeattle (2010, October 20). Why we can't have nice things: Summit/John skatedot brings complaints, park changes. *Capitol Hill Seattle*.

- Kelling, G., & Wilson, J. (1982, Mar). Broken windows: The police and neighborhood safety. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/archive/1982/03/broken-windows/304465/>
- Kilwag (Ed). (2006). Marginal Way battles vandalism – Pier Park slipping too. *Skate and Annoy*. Retrieved from <http://skateandannoy.com/blog/2006/10/marginal-way-battles-vandalism-pier-park-slipping-too/>
- Kilwag (Ed). (2008). Marginal Way from the eyes of a tourist. *Skate and Annoy*. Retrieved from <http://skateandannoy.com/blog/2008/08/marginal-way-from-the-eyes-of-a-tourist/>
- Kilwag (Ed). (2009). Seattle’s SeaSk8 has history, and a blog. *Skate and Annoy*. Retrieved from <http://skateandannoy.com/blog/2009/08/Seattles-seask8-has-history-and-a-blog>
- Kretchmar, S. (2008). The utility of silos and bunkers in the evolution of Kinesiology. *Quest*, 60, 3-12.
- Lefebvre, H. (1976). *Reflections on Politics and Space*. (M. Enders, Trans.). *Antipode*, 8, 30-37.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Lefebvre, H. (1996). *Writings on cities*. (E. Kofman & E. Lebas, Ed, Trans.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Lefebvre, H. (2003). *La Revolution urbaine (The Urban Revolution), 1970*. (R. Bononno, Trans.). Minneapolis, MN: The University of Minnesota Press. (Original work

published 1970 Gallimard).

Lessig, L. (2001). *The future of ideas: The fate of the Commons in a connected world*.

New York: Random House.

Levin, H. (2006, Mar 6). Skate start: Once illegal, a new skatepark takes shape on

Marginal Way. *The Stranger*. Retrieved from

<http://www.thestranger.com/seattle/Content?oid=30934>

Loukaitou-Sideris, A., & Ehrenfeucht, R. (2012). *Sidewalks: Conflict and negotiation*

over public space (urban and industrial environments). Cambridge, MA: The

MIT Press.

Lutters, W., & Auckermann, M. (1996). An Introduction of the Chicago School of

Sociology. *Interval Research Proprietary*. Retrieved from

http://userpages.umbc.edu/~lutters/pubs/1996_SWLNote96-

[1_Lutters,Ackerman.pdf](#)

Lyng, S. (2005). *Edgework: The sociology of risk-taking*. New York: Routledge.

Mead, G. H. (1936). *The problem of society how we become selves*. In M. H. Moore

(Ed.), *Movements of thought in the nineteenth century* (pp. 360-385). Chicago, IL:

University of Chicago Press.

Meiklejohn, A. (1932). *The experimental college*. Reprint: 2000, Madison, WI:

University of Wisconsin Press.

Merriman, B. (2015). Three conceptions of spatial locality in Chicago School of

Sociology (and their significance today). *The American Sociologist*, 46 (2), 269-

287.

- Mills, C.W. (1959). *The sociological imagination*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mirra, D. (2003). *Mirra images: The story of my life*. New York: Regan Books.
- Mosely, T. (2013, October). Skateboarding for girls: Initiating girls into Seattle's skateboarding culture. *Seattle Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.seattlemag.com/article/skateboarding-girls>
- Mullin, J. (2006, September 30). City hopes to expand skateboard options. *Seattle Times*, State and Regional News.
- Muñoz, J. (2013). "Gimme gimme this... gimme gimme that." Annihilation and innovation in the Punk Rock Commons. *Social Text*. 116(31), 95-110.
- Németh, J. (2006). Conflict, exclusion, relocation: Skateboarding and public space, *Journal of Urban Design*, 11(3), 297-318.
- Németh, J. (2012). Controlling the Commons: How public is public space? *Urban Affairs Review*, 48(6), 811-835.
- Noal, P. (2013). History of Lents: An historical portrayal of a Portland community – Lents. *Marking the Land: Interactive mapping from urban dialogues*. Retrieved from http://www.udialogues.org/Ushahidi_Web-2.6.1/Ushahidi_Web-2.6.1/index.php/reports/view/131
- O'Connor, K. (2008, July 22). Delridge Playfield skatepark public meeting. *US Fed News Service, Including US State News*.
- O'Connor, K. (2009, June 2). Parks holds third and final public meeting for Delridge Playfield Skatepark. *US Fed News Service, Including US State News*.

- O'Connor, K. (2009, January 6). Parks hold second public meeting for Delridge Playfield Skatepark. *US Fed News Service, Including US State News*.
- Olmstead, F. L. (1971). *Public parks and the enlargement of towns*. In S. B. Sutton (Ed.), *Civilizing American cities: A selection of Frederick Law Olmstead's writings on city landscapes* (pp. 52-100). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Ostrom, E., & Dolšák, D. (2003). *The Commons in the new millennium: Challenges and adaption*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Owens, C. (2014, Oct 1). "Skateboarding urbanism" could change park planning. *Nest City*. Retrieved from <https://nextcity.org/daily/entry/skateboard-urbanism-draft>
- Park, R. (1952). *Human communities: The city and human ecology*. New York: Free Press.
- Park, R. (1981). Chapter 4: The emergence of the academic discipline of physical education. In G. Brooks (Ed), *Perspectives on the academic discipline of physical education: A tribute to G. Lawrence Rarick*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Park, R., Burgess, E., & McKenzie, R. (1925). *The city: Suggestions for investigation of human behavior in the urban environment*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Parry, R. (1982). Defining the municipal entity. *Management Accounting*, 64(3), 50-55.
- Patton, M. (2015). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods: Integrating theory into practice* (4th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publishing.
- Pauwels, L. (2012). Chapter 1: An integrated conceptual framework for visual social research. In E. Margolis & L. Pauwels (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Visual Research Methods*. London: SAGE Publications.

- Peralta, S. (Director). (1989). *Ban This: Bones Brigade Six*. [DVD]. United States: Powell Corp.
- Pierce, J., & Martin, D. (2015). Placing Lefebvre. *Antipode*, 47(5), 1279-1299.
- Pollard, J. (2013). History of PowellHurst/Gilbert. *Marking of the land: An interactive mapping from urban dialogues*. Retrieved from http://www.udialogues.org/Ushahidi_Web-2.6.1/Ushahidi_Web-2.6.1/index.php/reports/view/74
- Portland Parks & Recreation Program. (2008). *Skatepark System Plan*. Retrieved from <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/parks/article/202401>.
- Raley, D. (2010). *Tideflats to Tomorrow: The history of Seattle's SoDo*. Seattle, WA: Fairgreens Publishing, LLC.
- RecTech Youth Media. (2010). *Emerald Concrete*. [Motion Picture] Retrieved from <https://vimeo.com/45107699>
- Reeve, T.G. (2007). Kinesiology: Defining the academic core of our discipline: Introduction. *Quest*, 69,1-4.
- Richardson, L. (2000). New writing practices in qualitative research. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 17(1), 5-20.
- Rinehart, R., & Sydnor, S. (Eds.). (2003). *To the extreme: alternative sports, inside and out*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Robinson, P. (2011, June 25). Grindline Skateparks is dedicated to a timeless dream [Slideshow]. *West Seattle Herald*.

- Robinson, P. (2011, September 8). Delridge Skatepark will open Sept. 17 with pro skaters, prizes, and music [Slideshow]. *West Seattle Herald*.
- Robinson, P. (2011, September 17). Delridge Skatepark sees huge crowd and happy skateboarders on opening day [Slideshow]. *West Seattle Herald*.
- Robinson, P. (2013, August 18). Delridge Day was a neighborhood celebration [Slideshow]. *West Seattle Herald*.
- Robinson, P. (2014, August 9). A scaled down Delridge Day focuses on fun and feedback [Slideshow]. *West Seattle Herald*.
- Rose, G. (2007). *Visual methodologies: An introduction to the interpretation of visual materials* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.
- Rundquist, R (2007). Chapter 4: Street skateboarding and the government stamp of approval. In A. Greenberg (Eds.) *Youth subcultures: exploring underground America* (171-189) New York: Pearson Longman.
- Ryan, K., & Beach, M. (1979). *Burnside: A community- A photographic history of Portland's skid row*. Portland: Coast to Coast Books.
- Seattleskateparks.org. (n.d.). *Advocacy Guide*. Retrieved from <http://seattleskateparks.org/advocacy-guide/>
- Shields, R. (1999). *Lefebvre, love and struggle: Spatial dialectics*. London: Routledge.
- Sillman, M. (2014, Mar 10). Development planning for Sodo, Seattle's 'gritty backbone.' *KUOW: The Record*. Retrieved from <http://kuow.org/post/development-planning-sodo-seattles-gritty-backbone>

- Skateoregon.com. (2017). Burnside Skatepark Portland Oregon. Retrieved from
<http://www.skateoregon.com/Burnside/Burnside.html>
- Skatepark.org. (2010). Marginal Way DIY skatepark. Retrieved from
<https://www.skatepark.org/park-development/diy/2010/12/marginal-way-diy-skatepark/>
- Skatepark Advisory Task Force. (2007). Seattle Citywide Skatepark Plan. Retrieved from: <http://www.seattle.gov/parks/skateparks/CitywideSkateparkPlan.pdf>
- Snyder, C. (2015). *The secret history of the ollie, volume 1: The 1970s*. Cambridge, MA: Black Salt Press.
- Soja, E. (1980). The socio-spatial dialectic. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 70(2), 207-225.
- Soja, E. (2010). *Seeking Spatial Justice*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Stanczak, G. (2007). *Visual research methods: Image, society and representation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- States News Service (2011, September 8). Grand opening celebration for Delridge Skatepark. Biography in context. *States News Service*.
- Striler, A. (2010). *X play nation of action sports game changers*. San Diego, CA: Striler Publishing.
- Swake, J. (2016). Portland skateparks. *Museum of the City*. Retrieved from
<http://www.museumofthecity.org/project/portland-skateparks/>

- Swanson, R., & Massengale, J. (1997). *Exercise and sport sciences of 20th century America*. The History of Exercise and Sport Science. Champagne, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Taylor, M. & Khan, U. (2011). Skate-park builds, teenaphobia and the adolescent need for hang-out spaces: The social utility and functionality of urban skate parks. *Journal of Urban Design*, 16(4), 489-510.
- Thornton, D. L. (2013). *Common criminals: The anthology of stoke*. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.
- Thorpe, H. (2009). Understanding 'alternative' sport experiences: A contextual approach for sport psychology. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Science*, 7(3), 359-379.
- Tuan, Y. (1977). *Space and place: The perspective of experience*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- UDialogues.org (2013). History of Lents. *Marking the land: Interactive mapping from urban dialogues*. Retrieved from http://www.udialogues.org/Ushahidi_Web-2.6.1/index/php/reports/view/131
- UDialogues.org. (2013). History of Powellhurst-Gilbert. *Marking the land: Interactive mapping from urban dialogues*. Retrieved from http://www.udialogues.org/Ushahidi_Web-2.6.1/index/php/reports/view/74
- van Ingen, C. (2003). Geographies of gender, sexuality and race: Reframing the focus on space in sport sociology. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*. 38(2), 201-216.

- Vahey, J. (n.d). History of Powellhurst-Gilbert, East Portland Neighborhood Office.
PGPride.org. Retrieved from <http://pgpride.org/history-of-pgna>
- Vahey, J. (n.d). History of Powellhurst-Gilbert, East Portland Neighborhood Office. *East Portland Neighborhood Office*. Retrieved from
<http://eastportlandactionplan.org/history-of-pgna>
- Virgin, B. (2010, Oct). The old industrial heart. *Seattle Business Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://seattlebusinessmag.com/article/old-industrial-heart>
- Wall, D. (2014). *History for a sustainable future: The Commons in history: Culture, conflict, and ecology*. Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Wheaton, B. (2014). *The consumption and representation of lifestyle sports*. New York: Routledge.
- Woolley, H., & Johns, R. (2001). Skateboarding: The city as a playground. *Journal of Urban Design*, 6(2), 211-230.
- Worpole, K. (2007). The health of the people is the highest law. In *Open space: People space* (C. Thompson & P. Travlou, eds.). New York: Taylor and Francis, Inc.
- Zarka, R. (2011). *A chronicle of skateboarding (1779-2009)*. Paris: Editions B42.

APPENDIX A

COMPLETE LIST OF MEDIATED LITERATURE

1. Bently, J. (2017). Delridge history. *Southwest Seattle Historical Society – Loghouse Museum*. Retrieved from <http://www.loghousemuseum.info/history/delridge-history>
2. Bhatt, S. (2006, December 15). Hearing on proposed citywide skatepark plan lightly attended. *Seattle Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.seattletimes.com/seattle-news/hearing-on-proposed-citywide-skatepark-plan-lightly-attended/>
3. Booker, C., & Kargo, C. (2016). Iconic Portland skate park on the front lines of gentrification [Transcript]. *PBS NEWSHOUR*. Retrieved from <http://www.pbs.org/newshour/bb/iconic-portland-skate-park-front-lines-gentrification/>
4. City of Portland. (n.d.). The Burnside street history. *Portland Bureau of Transportation*. Retrieved from <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/295412>
5. City of Portland. (1996). *Outer southeast community plan – Powellhurst-Gilbert neighborhood*. Portland, OR: Bureau of Planning.
6. City of Portland. (2009). East Portland historical overview and historic preservation study. Portland: Bureau of Planning and Sustainability.

7. City of Seattle. (2013). *Duwamish M/IC: Policy and land use study*. Seattle, WA: Department of Planning and Development
8. City of Seattle. (2016). Duwamish industrial lands study. Seattle: Office of Planning and Community Development.
9. Dahl, R. (2007). Despite objectors, skateboard park idea grows. *Project for Public Space – Placemaking*. Retrieved from <http://www.pps.org/despite-objectors-skateboard-park-idea-grows>
10. Daily Journal of Commerce. (2010, August 30). Delridge skateboard park development. *Daily Journal of Commerce – Oregon*. Retrieved from <http://djcoregon.com/news/2010/08/30/delridge-skateboard-park-development/>
11. Delridge History Project (The). (n.d.). Delridge history. Retrieved from <http://www.delridgehistory.org>
12. Dougherty, C. (2009). Skateboarding capital of the world. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from <http://www.wsj.com/articles/SB10001424052970204119704574238073660408040>
13. Fat Tony. (2009). Jackass flips truck inside burnside skatepark. *TransWorld Ride:BMX*. Retrieved from <http://bmx.transworld.net/news/jackass-flips-truck-inside-burnside-skatepark/#VEe5UcxaZmj1278r.97>
14. Fiore, E., Heinicke, S., Ragel, B., and Weigel, L. (2005). The Urban Grind: Skateparks – neighborhood perceptions and planning realities. *Master of Urban*

- and Regional Planning Workshop Projects*. Paper 32. Retrieved from http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp_murp/32
15. Galbraith, J. (2001). The skatepark: The Burnside project. *Rolling Stones*, 861.
 16. Hamm, K. (2010). Burnside skatepark turns 20. *ESPN.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.espn.com/action/skateboarding/news/story?id=5741014>
 17. JSeattle (2010, October 20). Why we can't have nice things: Summit/John skatedot brings complaints, park changes. *Capitol Hill Seattle*.
 18. Kilwag (Ed). (2006). Marginal Way battles vandalism – Pier Park slipping too. *Skate and Annoy*. Retrieved from <http://skateandannoy.com/blog/2006/10/marginal-way-battles-vandalism-pier-park-slipping-too/>
 19. Kilwag. (Ed) (2008). Marginal Way from the eyes of a tourist. *Skate and Annoy*. Retrieved from <http://skateandannoy.com/blog/2008/08/marginal-way-from-the-eyes-of-a-tourist/>
 20. Levin, H. (2006). Skate start: Once illegal, new skatepark takes shape on Marginal Way. *The Stranger*, March. Retrieved from <http://www.thestranger.com/seattle/Content?old=30934>
 21. Mosely, T. (2013, October). Skateboarding for girls: Initiating girls into Seattle's skateboarding culture. *Seattle Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.seattlemag.com/article/skateboarding-girls>
 22. Mullin, J. (2006, September 30). City hopes to expand skateboard options. *Seattle Times*, State and Regional News.

23. O'Connor, K. (2008, July 22). Delridge Playfield skatepark public meeting. *US Fed News Service, Including US State News; Washington, D.C.*
24. O'Connor, K. (2009, June 2). Parks holds third and final public meeting for Delridge Playfield Skatepark. *US Fed News Service, Including US State News; Washington, D.C.*
25. O'Connor, K. (2009, January 6). Parks hold second public meeting for Delridge Playfield Skatepark. *US Fed News Service, Including US State News; Washington, D.C.*
26. Owens, C. (2014). "Skateboard urbanism" could change park planning. *Next City*. Retrieved from <https://nextcity.org/daily/entry/skateboard-urbanism-draft>
27. Robinson, P. (2011, June 25). Grindline Skateparks is dedicated to a timeless dream [Slideshow]. *West Seattle Herald*.
28. Robinson, P. (2011, September 8). Delridge Skatepark will open Sept. 17 with pro skaters, prizes, and music [Slideshow]. *West Seattle Herald*.
29. Robinson, P. (2011, September 17). Delridge Skatepark sees huge crowd and happy skateboarders on opening day [Slideshow]. *West Seattle Herald*.
30. Robinson, P. (2013, August 18). Delridge Day was a neighborhood celebration [Slideshow]. *West Seattle Herald*.
31. Robinson, P. (2014, August 9). A scaled down Delridge Day focuses on fun and feedback [Slideshow]. *West Seattle Herald*.
32. Seattleskateparks.org. (n.d.). *Advocacy Guide*. Retrieved from <http://seattleskateparks.org/advocacy-guide/>

33. Sillman, M. (2014). Development planning for Sodo, Seattle's 'gritty backbone' [Transcript]. *KUOQ.org* (94.9). Retrieved from <http://kuow.org/post/development-planning-sodo-seattles-gritty-backbone>
34. Skateoregon.com. (n.d.). Burnside. Retrieved from <http://www.skateoregon.com/Burnside/Burnside.html>
35. Skatepark.org. (2010). Marginal Way DIY skatepark. Retrieved from <https://www.skatepark.org/park-development/diy/2010/12/marginal-way-diy-skatepark/>
36. States News Service. (2011, September 8). Grand opening celebration for Delridge Skatepark. Biography in context. *States News Service*.
37. Swake, J. (2016). Portland skateparks [Exhibit]. *Museum of the City*. Retrieved from <http://www.museumofthecity.org/project/portland-skateparks>
38. UDialogues.org. (2013). History of Lents. *Marking the land: Interactive mapping from urban dialogues*. Retrieved from http://www.udialogues.org/Ushahidi_Web-2.6.1/index/php/reports/view/131
39. UDialogues.org. (2013). History of Powellhurst-Gilbert. *Marking the land: Interactive mapping from urban dialogues*. Retrieved from http://www.udialogues.org/Ushahidi_Web-2.6.1/index/php/reports/view/74
40. Vahey, J. (n.d). History of Powellhurst-Gilbert, East Portland Neighborhood Office. *PGPride.org*. Retrieved from <http://pgpride.org/history-of-pgna>

41. Vahey, J. (n.d). History of Powellhurst-Gilbert, East Portland Neighborhood Office. *East Portland Neighborhood Office*. Retrieved from <http://eastportlandactionplan.org/history-of-pgna>
42. Virgin, B. (2010). The Old Industrial Heart. *Seattle Business Magazine*, October. <http://seattlebusinessmag.com/article/old-industrial-heart>

APPENDIX B

SAMPLE CODED DOCUMENT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In February 2006, the Seattle City Council adopted a resolution recognizing skateboarding as a healthy and popular recreation and resolved to establish a network of skateparks of various sizes throughout the City. Seattle Parks and Recreation worked with an appointed Skatepark Advisory Task Force and a consultant to develop this Citywide Skatepark Plan.

As a means to recognize the needs of skateboarders while addressing the concerns of neighbors, Parks hosted six public meetings and an open house during June and October of 2006 to hear ideas and opinions from residents about skateboarding and skateparks. This process engaged the community to assist the Task Force in assessing the need/demand for skateparks and to identify the best potential areas to locate them. Wide support for the planning process was expressed at the public meetings, with more than 400 community members attending.

Task Force members visited existing and planned skatepark sites in Seattle and the surrounding area to see how skateparks are sited, designed and functioning. The consultant spoke with Parks and Recreation and Police department representatives in other cities to understand the day-to-day impacts a skatepark may have on a community. The team also researched who skateboarders are and outlined some of the positive benefits skateboarding can have on a community.

Based on research and visits to skateparks, the Task Force developed a tiered system of sizes and types of skateparks that are most appropriate for the City of Seattle. Four different types of facilities/skateable terrain constitute Seattle's proposed system; Skatedots, Skatespots, District parks, and a Regional facility.

After conducting national research, the Task Force developed siting criteria and a framework of assumptions for choosing the most appropriate sites for skate facilities in Seattle's dense, urban environment. There are baseline criteria applicable to all sites and additional criteria for the District and Regional sites. The criteria reflect the different roles of each tier in the system.

During the month of June, citizens and public agencies nominated 130 sites for potential skateparks. A Task Force member and the consultant visited all 130 sites during July and August and then calculated a score for each site based on Task Force weighted criteria. The top 30 sites were discussed with the community and Parks. The Task Force recommends 26 sites for inclusion in the citywide plan. There are:

- 8 Skatedots
- 9 Skatespots
- 4 Districts
- 1 Regional
- 4 Potential Future Sites

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

Executive Summary

Planning level costs for tiers in the system range from \$6.00 to \$45.00 per square foot. No funding is currently allocated for these facilities, so community-funding resources are identified. Additionally, the Task Force recommends that six sites receive priority funding by the City:

- Judkins Park/ Charles M. Stokes Overlook - Skatespot
- Roxhill Park- Skatespot
- Dahl - Skatespot
- Jefferson Master Plan Facility - District
- Delridge Playfield - Skatespot
- Brighton Playfield - Skatespot

Throughout the course of the planning process, the Task Force also developed several ideas for Seattle to begin incorporating skateboarding on a broad level throughout the City. These recommendations are as follows:

- **Fill geographic gaps in the recommended system**
 - Integrate skateparks in future park development
 - Integrate Skatedots into future waterfront planning
 - Allow use of wading pools for skateboarding during non-summer use
- **Set action items for Seattle Parks and Recreation and the Skatepark Advisory Committee**
 - Consider industrial site options that do not meet the site criteria identified in this plan
 - Work with Community Center Staff to allow skateboarding on surrounding hardscapes
 - Build partnerships with the Seattle Police Department, private developers and city departments to incorporate skateable design features and paths throughout the city
- **Skatepark design recommendations:**
 - Accommodate different skill levels
 - Hire reputable skatepark firms to design and build new facilities
 - Cover some facilities

This Citywide Skatepark Plan identifies a network of safe, legal places throughout the city, for people of all ages, races and genders to enjoy. It also offers recommendations that can begin to change the way people think about and experience skateboarding in the City of Seattle.

Parks briefed the Board of Park Commissioners on the plan on June 22, 2006 and October 24, 2006. They also held a Public Hearing on the draft plan on December 14, 2006. The Board unanimously recommended adopting the plan to Parks Superintendent on January 11, 2007.

Preface



Why a Plan Now?

More than 10.5 million people skateboard nationwide, making it one of the fastest growing sports in North America. Skateboarding appeals to a wide range of people of all ages and backgrounds and requires specific facilities to appropriately accommodate the sport.

Due to a lack of public places within Seattle to legally skate, many skateboarders practice their sport on public and private property, often competing with other activities. As a means to address this issue, Seattle Parks and Recreation (Parks) adopted a Skateboard Park Policy in 2003, recognizing skateboarding as a healthy, popular recreational activity and a legitimate use to integrate into the parks system.

Several skateparks were sited in the City after the adoption of this policy and one was constructed. However, siting skate facilities proved to be a somewhat controversial process. Therefore, at the urging of skateboard advocates, in February 2006, City Council unanimously approved legislation to develop a comprehensive citywide skatepark plan. (See side bar and Appendix for the full Resolution).

An appointed Skatepark Advisory Task Force (Task Force), comprised of representatives from all areas of the city who have diverse backgrounds, professional expertise and bring both skater and non-skater perspectives to the planning process, worked with Parks and a consultant team during the course of ten months on Seattle's Citywide Skatepark Plan. The Task Force desired a holistic planning process resulting, not only in a network of skate

The Resolution called for Seattle Parks and Recreation, a consultant, and a newly formed Skatepark Advisory Task Force to; "engage the community in a citywide planning process to develop a network of safe and accessible skateparks of various sizes" throughout the City of Seattle.

Preface

Seattle Skatepark Advisory Task Force Members

George Blomberg, Chair – Environmental Planner with the Port of Seattle, and Chair, Seattle Planning Commission

Joe Bell – Director of Street Use and Urban Forestry Division, Seattle Department of Transportation

John Carr – PhD candidate at the University of Washington, Chair, Skatepark Advisory Committee

Susanne Friedman – Project Manager, Seattle Parks and Recreation

Jelani Jackson – Active in the Seattle Young People’s Project, Powerful Voices, and The Sound Board

Matt Johnston – Producer at PopCap Games, member of the Skatepark Advisory Committee

Jeanne Krikawa – Urban Planner and Architect, former Seattle Planning Commissioner and member of Seattle’s Landmarks Board

Christine Larsen – Chair, Friends of Dahl Playfield, involved in Neighborhood Matching Fund projects

Joyce Moty – Involved with Parks projects; sits on the Pro Parks Levy Oversight Committee

Scott Shinn – Computer Programmer, Chair, Parents for Skateparks

Nin Troung – Landscape Architect, Art Director of Manik Skateboards

facilities, but also in a plan shaped by and reflective of the community as a whole.

The Seattle Citywide Skatepark Plan considers a broad range of perspectives and determines the need for skateparks, inventories existing and proposed facilities, identifies skatepark typologies (hierarchy of facilities), creates siting criteria unique to Seattle’s dense urban environment, and specifies where and how many public skateparks can best serve Seattle over the next 20 years.

There are a lot of perceptions about skateparks and skateboarders. Some can be tied to the wear and tear the sport can take on the built environment. Some of it is based on stereotypes. Therefore, equally as important as the developing the citywide system, the Task Force sought to learn about and educate others about skateboarding as a sport and skaters as a park user group.

The Task Force learned that when sited appropriately with community involvement, skateparks can be successful public spaces that add to the vitality of cities and help to build healthy neighborhoods. The Citywide Skatepark Plan seeks to add skateboarding vibrancy to the City of Seattle.

Seattle Citywide Skatepark Plan, critical reading 1 (Jan 2017)

Overview: 3 of the 11 member taskforce are readily identifiable as skateboarders or community of skateboarding

Skate as spectacle.

“I do not have children and I don’t skate. However, I want to offer my support for all skateparks in Seattle. I live nearby (Ballard Commons) and I enjoy the culture and spectacle of the Ballard Bowl. I see people of all ages, genders and backgrounds skating harmoniously together. As a teacher I think this is kind of gathering space is crucial for the future of communities. This is a positive use of taxes. Viva skateparks!” (2)

“I do not have children and I...
OP: comm - about the
OP: spectator
I see...
OP: diversity

“What a wonderful park in Ballard. What a GREAT place to be! The skaters are great. The sport will never go away, might as well give them a legal place to do it! The fountains are refreshing. The families seem so happy. I’m a mom of three in my 50s. What a smart way of using land. Makes people of Seattle feel lucky” (5).

“What a wonderful p...
OP: legal
Lef: perceived

Executive Summary

“As a means to recognize the needs of skateboarders while addressing the concerns of neighbors, Parks hosted six public meetings and an open house during June and October 2006 to hear ideas and opinions from residents about skateboarding and skateparks”(iii).

“As a means to r...
OP: process

“skate facilities in Seattle’s dense, urban environment” (iii)

“...
OP: environment

- 130 potential skatepark sites
- 30 sites were discussed with the community
- 26 sites recommended for inclusion
 - 8 skatedots, 9 skatespots, 4 districts, 1 regional, 4 potential future sites
- six sites to receive priority funding

130 potential skatepark
OP: process

<p>-Judkins Park/Charles M. Stokes Overlook – Skatespot</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Roxhill Park – Skatespots -Dahl – Skatespot -Jefferson Master Plan Facility – District -Delridge Playfield – Skatespot -Brighton Playfield – Skatespot 	<p>sites -30 sites were discu...</p>
<p>“...developed several ideas for Seattle to begin incorporating skateboarding on a broad level throughout the City. These recommendations are as follows:</p>	<p>“...develo... OP: process</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fill geographic gaps in the recommended system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Integrate skateparks in future park development - Integrate Skatedots into future waterfront planning - Allow use of wading pools for skateboarding during non-summer use 	<p>Fill geographic gaps in the re... OP: goals</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set action items for Seattle Parks and Recreation and the Skatepark Advisory Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Consider industrial site options that do not meet the site criteria identified in this plan - Work with Community Center Staff to allow skateboarding on surrounding hardscapes - Build partnerships with the Seattle Police Department, private developers and city departments to incorporate skateable design features and paths throughout the city 	<p>Set action items for Seattle Parks and Recreat... Lef: conceived</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Skatepark design recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Accommodate different skill levels - Hire reputable skatepark firms to [design] and build new facilities - Cover some facilities” (iv) 	<p>Skatepark design rec... Lef: conceived</p>
	<p>“Th OP: diversity</p>

“The Citywide Skatepark Plan identifies a network of safe, legal places throughout the city, for people of all ages, races and genders to enjoy” (iv)

e Citywid...
 OP: safety
 OP: legal
 OP: goals

Preface: Why a Plan Now?

“The Resolution called for Seattle Parks and Recreation, a consultant, and a newly formed Skatepark Advisory Taskforce to[:] ‘engage the community in a citywide planning process to develop a network of safe and accessible skateparks of various sizes’ throughout the City of Seattle” (1)

“The Resolution calle...
 WJ: trickability
 WJ: accessibility
 OP: safety
 OP: comm - about the
 Lef: conceived

- An increase in the number of “kids” skateboarding nationally
- “Skateboarding appeal to a wide range of people of all ages and backgrounds and requires specific facilities to appropriately accommodate the sport” (1).
- “Due to the lack of public places within Seattle to legally skate, many skateboarders practice their sport on public and private property, often competing with other activities” (1).
- The 2003 Skateboard Park policy “recognized skateboarding as a healthy, popular recreational activity and a legitimate use to integrate into the parks system” (1).
- Several skateparks were sited to be built due to the 2003 plan, however, “siting skate facilities proved to be a somewhat controversial process” (1).
- 10 month process – the skatepark advisory task force was intended to have diverse backgrounds, both skate and non-skate, varied professional experience. In hopes to reflect the community as a whole.
- Main goals of the plan:”” (2)
 - o Consider a broad range of perspectives and determine the need for skateparks

An In...
 OP: skateboarders

“Skateboardi...
 OP: skateboarders

“Due to the L...
 OP: legal
 OP: property

The 2003 Sk...
 OP: health
 OP: physical activity

Several skat...
 Lef: perceived
 Lef: conceived
 OP: reputation

10 month proces...
 OP: diversity
 OP: process

Main goals of th...
 OP: goals

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inventory existing and proposed facilities ○ Identify skatepark typologies (hierarchy of facilities) ○ Create siting criteria unique to Seattle's dense urban environment ○ Specify where and how many public skateparks can best serve Seattle over the next 20 years 	<p>e plan:" (2) ○ Consider a broad ra...</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "There are a lot of perceptions about skatepark and skateboarders. Some can be tied to the wear and tear the sport can take on the built environment. Some of it is based on stereotypes... The Task Force sought to learn about and educate others about skate boarding as a sport and skaters as a park user group" (2). 	<p>"There are a lot of perce...</p> <p>OP: reputation OP: environment</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The Task Force learned that when sited appropriately with community involvement, skateparks can be successful public spaces that add to the vitality of cities and help to build healthy neighborhoods" (2). 	<p>"The Task Force...</p> <p>OP: health Lef: conceived OP: comm - about the</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "The Citywide Skatepark Plan seeks to add skateboarding vibrancy to the City of Seattle" (2). 	<p>"The...</p> <p>OP: goals</p>
<p>Seattle Skatepark Advisory Task Force Members: 3 Skaters 5 P&R 2 Community Power Players 1 Youth</p>	<p>Seattle Skatepar...</p> <p>OP: process</p>

Chapter 1: Public Process

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Seattle Parks and Recreation works with all citizens to be good stewards of the environment, and to provide safe and welcoming opportunities to play, learn, contemplate and build community" (3) 	<p>"Seattle Parks an...</p> <p>OP: environment OP: comm - about the OP: safety</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parks held six public meetings, one open house, a project web site, community and media outreach, and briefings with city leaders. 	<p>Parks hel...</p> <p>OP: process</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Public meetings: 	<p>Put</p> <p>OP: process</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o outline the process o educated the community (“educate people about the sport of skateboarding, skateboarders as a park user group, and the impacts a skatepark might have on a neighborhood” (3)) o develop dialogue about the process o generate feedback on ideas o “solicit site nominations” o discuss nominations after 	<p>Public meetings: outline the process o edu...</p>
<p>evaluations</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Format: presentation by consultant, question and answer, information stations (encouraging small group and one-on-one, recorded ideas 	<p>Format: OP: process</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Outreach: libraries, community centers, neighborhood centers, interest groups, 50,000 citizens (near considered site via mail) received fliers. Multi-lingual signs were posted at key locations, and in parks, school district and doT properties; visits to 13 neighborhood councils 	<p>Outreach: libraries, c... OP: process</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - “More than 800 community members participated in this planning process by providing insight, comments, site [recommendations], and ideas at public meetings, via e-mails, phone calls, letters and comment forms” (4) 	<p>“More than 800 ... OP: process</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reported results of the meetings: (5) 	<p>Reported results of the meetings: (5) o OP: process</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Expressed need for skateparks “kids need active things to do, and they need safe spaces to go to” 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o “skateparks were seen as a means to building community” 	<p>“skat... OP: comm - about</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o “some doubt expressed about the need for skateparks 	<p>“som... OP: reputation</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o “strong desire for skatepark facilities in West Seattle... South Seattle” 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o “majority of concerns centered around design issues or the conception that skateboarding brings unsavory behavior to the area. (These were mainly from email 	<p>“majority of con Expressed nee OP: reputation OP: crime</p>

- correspondence and not from public meetings.)”
 - “Concern that skatepark development would result in loss of open space.”
- Insert page 4:
 - **“Ballard Open House:** The open house at the Ballard Commons Park in June [2006] included a number of skateboard organizations and a Tuck Knee Tournament skateboarding demonstration. Citizens were invited to attend the open house to experience an active park environment that includes a skatepark, water feature, and open space. Attendees experienced how a park can successfully serve the needs of different user groups and heard the level of noise generated by a skate bowl.”

d for skateparks “ ...	OP: environment
“Concern...	
“Ballard Open House: The open house at the B...	OP: noise Lef: lived OP: comm - about the

Chapter 2: Skaters, Skateboarding & Skateparks

- Task Force visited 13 other municipalities with skateparks to examine their placement, process and feedback.
- Task Force used the same equation that Portland did to determine number of skateboarders – national data on # of skateboarders nationally compared to national census data of 2004 – 3.58% of document US population skateboards. Then compared to the Seattle 2004 Census, came to the conclusion that roughly 20,500 skateboarders lived in Seattle (again – documented citizens).
- An American Sports Data “Super Study” found that 28,000 skateboarders lived in Seattle
- “According to the State’s Interagency Committee on Outdoor Recreation in Washington, skateboarding is the fifth most frequently participated in outdoor activity only behind various forms of walking, jogging, and gardening” (7)
- like with basketball, tennis, soccer – “Park’s goal is to distribute its facilities equitably throughout the

Task For ...	OP: process Lef: conceived
Task Force used the same eq...	Lef: conceived OP: process
An A...	OP: process
“According to th...	OP: recreation OP: process
like wit	WJ: accessibility

city" (7).	1...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Skateboarder Profile: (8) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Average age of skater in Seattle (14) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Park's finds that young compared to other sports o "A large number of the skateboarding population is not old enough to drive to a legal and safe place to practice... important to provide opportunities within walking distance or a short bus ride." o "According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, Kids devote 6.5 hours a day to engaging in media (television, the internet, video games, etc.) as compared to 1.5 hours a day spent in physical activity." o "Limited activities are available to this age group that are not organized and expensive." o "Since there are limited legal places to skate and social stigmas toward skateboarders, a lot of younger skaters quit the sport before they reach adulthood." 	Skateboarder Profile: (8) o Average age of skater in Seattle (14) - Park's finds that Y... OP: skateboarders
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parks does not make facility decisions based on demographics - due to population shifts. 	Park... OP: process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Skateboarding promotes physical fitness, self-esteem and discipline. It also provides an opportunity for people to interact in an unstructured activity while learning new skills" (9). 	"Skateboardi... OP: physical activity
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Skateparks provide legitimate, safe, legal places to practice. If they are designed as part of a larger park they will attract a variety of spectators. The mingling of user groups can encourage positive interactions between different users of public space" (9). 	"Skateparks provide l... OP: safety OP: legal Lef: lived OP: comm - about the
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Concerns: funding, noise generation, crime 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - During visit to 13 municipalities - Task Force determined "that skateparks integrated into larger parks with high visibility and access had the broadest appeal" (11). 	During visit t... OP: observe

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Task Force was “surprised to learn that Seattle ranked in the lowest tier for ratio of skateparks to population based on 2000 Census data” (11). 	<p>Task For...</p> <p>OP: process</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - From the 13 municipalities: “when skateparks are highly visible, integrated into larger active parks, or next to active roads, minimal or no crime or drug usage was reported. Skateparks that are hidden away from public view and not integrated into a larger park can have more problems” (12). 	<p>From the 13 municipa...</p> <p>OP: observe</p> <p>OP: crime</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o “There is a perception that skateboarders are criminals because of the way they look, but Parks and Recreation has not received complaints about increases in crime or drug use at our [two] parks.” Laurie Flem, Kent Parks and Recreation 	<p>“There is a perceptio...</p> <p>OP: crime</p> <p>Lef: perceived</p> <p>OP: reputation</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o “Areas that experience criminal activity could be helped by building a skate facility because bad people don’t want to be near kids and their parents.” Paul Peterson, Kent Police Department 	<p>“Areas that exper...</p> <p>OP: crime</p> <p>Lef: lived</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o “There were a lot of the usual fears in the neighborhood about the skatepark, but those fears have not been realized and there are very few complaints about the skatepark. The skatepark is an unequivocal success.” Scott Thomas, Burien Parks and Recreation 	<p>“There were a lot of the u...”</p> <p>Lef: perceived</p> <p>OP: crime</p> <p>OP: reputation</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o “The Community and the police department expected a lot of problems when the park opened, but haven’t seen many. There is a basketball court right next to the park and I expected conflict between the two user groups, but it hasn’t occurred.” Cindy Parks, Renton Police Department. 	<p>“The Community and the...”</p> <p>Lef: perceived</p> <p>OP: reputation</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o “The skatepark is heavily used and I like to see public money invested in things that get used.” Bob Crannell, Mill Creek Chief of Police 	<p>“The skatepa...”</p> <p>OP: \$ funding</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - concerns over trash generation and graffiti were addressed “Graffiti at skateparks does occur and 	<p>concern</p> <p>OP: trash</p> <p>OP: graffiti</p>

the faster graffiti is removed, the less frequently it reoccurs.” “Graffiti Removal Plan” (13).	s ov...	
- “Only those skateparks sited very close to homes had reports of noise complaints, which are primarily due to music and yelling, not noise generated by skateboards” (13).	“Only those...	OP: noise
- A representative from the Gig Harbor Police Department shared “ You’ve got to give them something to do or they’ll get into trouble” (13).	A repres...	OP: crime
- Like other sports “all sports are played ‘at your own risk’” (13).	Like...	OP: liability
- “Noise studies indicated that skateboards produce intermittent noise: noise that occurs occasionally from the ‘popping’ tails and ‘grinding’ of aluminum trucks...” (13).	“Noise studi...	OP: noise
- “sounds emitted from skateparks are diminished completely by other noises such as traffic passing by and planes flying over” (13).	“sounds...	OP: noise
- Insert “Injuries/100 Participants” (13) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Hockey ranked highest 2.7, Skateboarding the lowest .7 o “Skateboarders skating for less than a week account for 1/3 of all injuries” o “Irregular riding surfaces account for over half the skateboarding injuries due to falls” o “In 2002, the Journal of Trauma concluded in their report that, “Skateboarding is a relatively safe sport.” 	Insert “Injuries/100 Participants” (13) o...	OP: injuries

Chapter 3: The Citywide System

- The Task Force recommended four skatepark types – dots, spots, district, regional	The...	Lef: conceived OP: process
- Dots are integrated skateable terrain. Small – scattered throughout the city and parks	Dots are integrated skateab	Lef: conceived
- Spots 1,500 -10,000 sq ft spaces – accommodating around 13 skaters, single difficulty level, “neighborhood parks”		
- District Skateparks – larger (two –four tennis courts, 30 users, varying levels) 10,000-30,000 sq		

- ft,
Regional parks (“crown jewel”), larger still. Can accommodate up to 300 users – all skill levels, “The facility should be large enough to host regional competitions and possibly produce revenue, not just through, the venue itself, but also through goods and service purchases by visitors” (17).

ie terrain. Small – scattered th...
Regional parks (“crown je...
OP: \$ making of

Chapter 4: Site Criteria and Framework

- Developed a Framework of Assumptions – and was developed with the criteria to be applied as a pre-cursor. Edits were made to address concerns over loss of open space and address private property concerns.
- “The Task Force used public input, national siting criteria, Portland’s criteria, and Seattle’s original Skateboard Park Policy” (20).
- Insert (19): Frame Work of Assumptions””
 - o “Emphasis will be given to the selection of sites that are ‘gray-to-gray,’ i.e. asphalt or other paving materials exist and can be converted to skateparks.
 - o “**Sites will NOT:**
 - § Be sited in designated environmentally critical areas, natural areas, or greenbelts
 - § Interrupt planning projects underway or infringe upon recently completed projects, i.e. Pro Parks Levy and Neighborhood Matching Fund Projects
 - § Be sited on private property
 - § Replace or remove existing active uses (e.g. Ball fields, play areas)”
 - o “**Sites WILL:**
 - § Have adequate area available for appropriate size facility
 - § Be distributed equitably throughout the city”

Developed a Fra... OP: process

“The Tas... OP: process

“Emphasis wi... OP: environment
Lef: conceived

“Sites will NOT: § Be sited in designated envi... Lef: conceived
OP: environment

“Sites WILL: §... Lef: conceived
WJ: accessibility

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Skate Spots – <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o compatible with existing uses, consider adjacent uses and landscaping; o limit off-site impacts (noise and lighting), o allow “passive observation by parents, emergency services, police and the public”, o close proximity to public transit – foot bike vehicle access o developable – minimal construction impediments o “Allow for the creation of a safe and secure environment: providing for separation from vehicular traffic, vehicular and pedestrian access, and ease of routine maintenance” (20). o “highly visible areas with moderate to high pedestrian traffic, in an existing or new multi-purpose park, or in close proximity to other public facilities” (20) o integrateable with larger park space o space for community viewing o well being of skateboarders “including noise and air quality” (20) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lef: conceived Skate Spots – o limit... OP: noise allow “pa... OP: observe close... WJ: accessibility devel... OP: maintenance “Allow for the cre... OP: safety “highly visibl... OP: observe s... OP: observe well... OP: environment olimit... OP: noise
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - District Skateparks – all the above, <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o adequate separation from other facilities, close to water fountains/restrooms, o offer space for other “action-oriented sports”, o possibility of lighting, o expansion potential, o parking 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lef: conceived District Skateparks – all the ab...
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Regional parks, all the above and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o have the possibility to have concessions and hold large events. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lef: conceived OP: \$ making of Re...

Chapter 5: Site Recommendations

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 130 sites were nominated by the community - 70 were eliminated in the Framework of Assumptions phase - Full site analysis was conducted – considering both what facility the site was nominated for and alternative facilities based on established criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o During site visits the above criteria was evaluated on a scale of 1-10 - Criteria scores were then weighted and developed into a cumulative score for each site - 30 sites were discussed with the community at large – with the Task Force eliminating four sites - Two future reservoir sites (to be capped over by Seattle Public Utilities) and potential park-and-ride lot under negotiations with Metro Transit - neither had funding designated - Board of Parks Commissioners made additional recommendations – post, Task Force: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Citizen emphasized “ an expressed need for skateparks and an understanding that kids need active things to do and safe places to go. Skateparks were seen as a means to build community” (26) o Parks and Rec should “Collaborate with the Seattle Center to find a replacement site for SeaSkate, and continue to pursue other opportunities as may arise” (26) o West Seattle Stadium location was not to be considered (as it was reserved for a golf course driving range) o Genesee Park could be considered for district site, pending community feedback o The Myrtle Reservoir and High Point Play field could be considered for skate facilities with the understanding that only one site would occur between the two. 	<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">130 sites were nominated by the community -</p> <p>OP: process</p>
	<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">70 were eliminated in the Framework of Assumptions phase...</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Citizen emphasisz...</p> <p>OP: safety</p>
<p>Chapter 6: Costs, Funding Resources & Priorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Grindline – local – worked with Task Force to develop estimates – in 2006 dollars 	<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Grindlin</p> <p>OP: \$ funding</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Skatespot \$6 sq ft up to \$16000 ○ Skatedot \$40 sq ft up to \$640000 ○ District \$40 sq ft up to \$2 million 	e - local - worked with...	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Regional \$45 sq ft \$2 million and up 		
- Grindline estimates included mobilization, temporary erosion sediment control, compaction, excavation, formwork, concrete work and finishing	Grindline estimat...	Lef: conceived OP: \$ funding
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Did not include: landscaping, irrigation, benches 		
- Annual maintenance was suggested at \$24,000 for a district park	Annu...	OP: maintenance OP: \$ funding
- Fund Raising Resources were provided – communities could apply for two grants from the city – “Neighborhood Matching Funds” (\$15,000 or \$100,000) (includes design, planning, construction)	Fund Raising...	OP: comm - about the OP: \$ funding
- Communities were encouraged to look at the Tony Hawk Foundation	Com...	OP: \$ funding OP: comm - of the
- Seattle Parks and Recreation has a Skate Park Advisory Committee (SPAC) that has a “recipe book” for building – includes fundraising	Seattle P...	OP: \$ funding
- Skaters for Public Skateparks was noted as a free reference.	Skat...	OP: \$ funding
- Several sites were listed in priority order – Judkins Park, Roxhill Park, Dahl (skatespot), Jefferson Master Plan (district), Delridge Playfield, Brighton Play field.	Several sites were listed in priority or...	WJ: accessibility OP: process
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Brighton was noted in conjunction with a Pro Parks Levy project (near a middle school) and noted “ Physics could be studied and illustrated (and fun!) by incorporating skateable terrain into the science park.” (31) 		
- A skatespot pot was recommended – to allow for skatespot requests to be funded throughout the city – maximum \$16,000 grants at a total of \$160,000	A skatespot...	OP: \$ funding

Chapter 7: Recommendations

- Recommendations for “creating an intentionally skateable Seattle” (33)
 - o Integrate skateparks into future land purchases and development
 - o Integrate skatespots into future waterfront planning
 - o Allow use of wading pools for skating in non-summer months
 - o Consider industrial sites
 - o Work with community centers to allow skateboarding when appropriate on hardscapes
 - o “Work with the Seattle Police Department to make skateboarding legal throughout the city in designated places”
 - o relationships with private developers to educate them on skateboarding and Skatedot ideas.

Recommendations for “creating an intentionally skateable Seattle” (33) of...	OP: process
	Integ... OP: \$ funding
	Work wft... OP: property OP: comm - about OP: policy
	“Work wi... OP: policy OP: legal OP: property
	relations... Lef: perceived OP: reputation

APPENDIX B: Citywide Skatepark Plan Resolution
Resolution 30843

**APPENDIX D: “Skateable City” by Matt Johnston –
Drafted August 2005**

Integrated Skateable Terrain

“Supports the transient nature of the skating activity... Expanding the “park” into the city-at-large is an overdue idea and more conducive to growth and sustainability. Features can be upgraded and added with comparably low amounts of effort and expense” (59)

“Acknowledges that skating is everywhere. Skateboarding is not a crime and should be encouraged in appropriate public spaces through landscaping features that can be used by skaters. In contrast, the landscape of areas where skating is inappropriate should be designed to deter it. Because the law has not required park

“Acknow/ledg...	Lef: perceived
	OP: crime
Bec	OP: legal

planners to consider the impacts of their landscaping and development practices on skating, or the future skaters on proposed parks or buildings, the sport of skateboarding itself grew and flourished in a concrete environment where stairs, banks, ledges, loading docks, etc on both public and private property were the de facto skatedots of choice. This initiative gives park designers an opportunity to direct the skating activity that's already happening into loosely defined areas that are clearly superior for skating" (60)

...because the law has not requ...

Lef: conceived

OP: property

“Integrates skating with other disciplines. If neighborhood-level skate advocates are able to work with other community leaders who advise the Parks Department about new park features, they have an opportunity to educate all parties on the positive aspects of incorporating and integrating skating into the urban landscape. This would help the public understand skating, might actually might help get more skateparks built, and would help the skate community connect with the people responsible for sculpting our cityscape. The skating community would have an opportunity to learn from these other disciplines as well, opening up new avenues and ideas” (60)

“Focuses effort. ... Skateboard supports should not have to canvas the community with petitions in order to have a place to enjoy their sport. Integrated skate features look just like other park features, and in some cases would be even more aesthetically pleasing. Park users and citizens would not perceive the skate features as “issue worthy” as they would be unassuming and well integrated into the surrounding environment” (60)

“Broadens the skatepark design/build industry.” Encouraging the innovation of skateable terrain in a variety of settings. “Again, this is all tied into the idea of removing some of the insulation around skatepark design and construction. Integrating skateable terrain into existing and new parks would be a great “ramp up” for a

Parks Dept. staff who is tasked with understanding and creating facilities for skaters. It could be a great way to integrate skating as an acceptable park activity, making it as commonplace as kids playing on a swing set or two people playing chess” (60)

the idea of a skate trail

UW might offer a spring/summer skatepark design course

APPENDIX C

CODE BREAK DOWN

