

# Waterfront Park, Ankeny Plaza & Street Improvements Project Advisory Committee

## Meeting Summary

May 23, 2007, 4:00 – 6:00 pm  
Portland Development Commission  
222 NW Fifth Avenue, Portland

## Attendance

### PAC members present

John Beardsley	Beardsley Development
Harriet Cormack	Waterfront Park Master Plan Citizens Advisory Committee
Carol Edelman	Waterfront Park Master Plan Citizens Advisory Committee
Lou Elliot	Bill Naito Corp.
Richard Harris	Old Town Chinatown Visions Committee, OTCT Neighborhood Association
Gene Maier	Downtown Neighborhood Association (for absent Daniel Friedman)
Jerry Marshall	Portland Rescue Mission
Carly Riter	Portland Business Alliance
Louis Wachsmuth	Dan & Louis Oyster Bar
Terri Warpinski	University of Oregon

### PAC members absent

Chet Orloff	Portland Parks Board, Historic Resources
Henry Sakamoto	Oregon Nikkei Endowment

### Project team

Shelby Acteson	Portland Development Commission (PDC)
Kevin Brake	Portland Development Commission
Sandra Burtzos	Portland Parks and Recreation
Chelsea Cochran	Walker Macy (consultant landscape architect)
Peter Englander	Portland Development Commission
Barbara Hart	Envirolssues (consultant facilitator)
Joleen Jensen-Classen	Portland Development Commission
Doug Macy	Walker Macy (consultant landscape architect)
Ross Plambeck	Portland Development Commission
Mauricio Villarreal	Walker Macy (consultant landscape architect)
Bob Thompson	TVA Architects (consultant architect)
Nick Williams	TVA Architects (consultant architect)

### Audience members present

Jon Abrahamson	Captain Ankeny's Well
Anne Naito Campbell	Bill Naito Company
Kathy Cooke	Mercy Corps
Lisa Hamel	International Market
Margaret Hinshaw	Mercy Corps
Karl Lisle	Portland Bureau of Planning
Khan Nguyen	Client, Sisters of the Road
Jan Oliver	University of Oregon
Paul Verhoeven	Portland Saturday Market

## **Welcome and introductions**

Facilitator Barbara Hart welcomed everyone to the third meeting of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC). Members and audience members introduced themselves.

## **April 25 Meeting Summary**

Barbara asked for changes, additions, or edits to the April 25 PAC meeting summary. No changes were suggested and the meeting summary was approved by the PAC.

## **Presentation of Refined Concepts and Summary of Public Comments**

(Doug Macy, Walker Macy and Bob Thompson, TVA Architects)

Doug Macy and Bob Thompson briefly reviewed the three concepts “A,” “B,” and “C,” as they had been further refined since the April 24 PAC meeting for the May 9 open house event. They then presented the refinements made to the three design concepts based on PAC and community feedback.

### **Option A**

In its refined state, Option A continues to emphasize Waterfront Park and Ankeny Plaza as two separate but connected spaces with an enhanced walkway extending from Skidmore Fountain, through Ankeny Plaza, across Naito Parkway, and into the park. No modifications were made to the proposed street improvements along First Avenue, which include upgrades to the driving lane and sidewalk. Ankeny Street improvements also remain the same. However, based on the recommendations of the PAC, Option A would include closing the street to vehicular traffic to create a pedestrian-only walkway along Ankeny Street between Second and Third Avenues. Ankeny Street would include catenary lighting fixtures suspended over the roadway. The Skidmore Fountain MAX station under the Burnside Bridge would include a new façade for the vault on the west side that could provide space for retail stalls. A backlit perforated metal panel soffit feature spanning overhead between the two platforms would create a lower ceiling and illumination to improve the atmosphere under the bridge.

The Waterfront Park design described in the original Option A has not changed in any major way. Paving would extend across Naito Parkway connecting the plaza to the park. Where the paving enters the park, the same circular plaza area is proposed, with steps that surround the space and a water feature in the center. The steps surrounding the circular plaza would extend around the east side at the seawall, providing a four-foot rise to the upper walkway area at the seawall, as well as south to the lawn and north to the market platform. The walkway at the seawall would cantilever out slightly, providing people with a place to sit, as well as look at the Willamette River. As before, this option retains the three large oak trees in front of the pump station.

The market podium in Option A is the smallest in area of the three options. Two fixed cantilever canopies, each 30 ft. wide, would provide a total 60 foot width by 180 feet length of cover for people as they move between the booths and through the market. The project team is investigating options for a retractable cover for non-market days or when the weather is fair. The covers may incorporate translucent vinyl materials that would allow more natural light into the area. The booth count for this option is 209 total, with 75 booths at Ankeny Plaza and 134 booths in Waterfront Park.

**Option B**

Option B's design has been refined and enhanced. Within this option, Ankeny Street would maintain vehicular traffic, but include a widened pedestrian walkway on the south side of the street. Ankeny Street would be fitted with street light standards. The First Avenue street improvements remain the same as proposed in the earlier version of this scheme, including an asphalt pavement rather than cobblestones in the drive lane, as well as sidewalk improvements of pavers or stone.

On First Avenue, the platform sites would be flanked by two towers that extend above the elevation of the Burnside Bridge at the existing stairways that lead to the MAX station. These towers would be visible from the bridge and the surrounding area; banners hung from these towers could help to identify the Saturday Market site.

The southern edge of the walkway across Naito Parkway and the lower plaza in the park would approach the Willamette River at a slight angle, following the Ankeny Plaza southern edge alignment, while the northern walkway edge would follow the Ankeny Street alignment. Steps rise four feet to the market platform to the north, to lawn at the south, and to the seawall to the east. A water feature would rest at the center of this plaza. As this section of the river is turning at the approach to the park, a wedge-shaped cantilevered dock access is utilized to match that angle.

The market podium would be widened to accommodate more booths. The podium design incorporates a reflecting pool that can be activated when the platform is not in use. A fixed canopy, 160 feet long and 60 ft. wide, would provide cover for booths and customers. In the uncovered area, trees could be planted to provide additional booth protection. The esplanade would be moved directly adjacent to the pump station façade. This option would require the removal of the three large oak trees adjacent to the pump station to accommodate the widened platform. The booth count for this option is 257 total, with 72 booths at Ankeny Plaza and 185 booths in Waterfront Park.

**Option C**

Option C's design includes the same modifications as were proposed previously. Street improvements on First Avenue include concrete sidewalks, asphalt paving, and cobblestones left where they currently exist. Ankeny Street would retain its on-street parking and one-way vehicular traffic, but would be upgraded to pavers or stone in the drive lane with concrete sidewalks.

Under the Burnside Bridge, the use of curved facades would eliminate the current pocket area behind the platforms and could be used for storage and restrooms or retail activation. The switchback stairway would be replaced by a more spacious and safer elongated stairway.

Option C continues to use a strong pedestrian walkway to the waterfront, 40 feet wide matching the width of the existing Naito crossing, with a pocket area to the south of the market podium containing a water feature. The podium would be pulled slightly to the north compared to the other design options and the esplanade would be pulled slightly to the east to allow for a wider market podium. The three large oaks next to the pump station would be removed under this scenario. The booth count for this option is 244 total, with 74 booths at Ankeny Plaza and 170 booths in Waterfront Park.

The project team suggested that the market structure in Waterfront Park needs to be a meaningful piece of architecture. Option C provides for a covered structure of opposing wedge forms. Each is 30 feet wide and 170 feet long. Saturday Market booths would pair up underneath these structures between the columns. The project team is looking at options for fritted glass sides, a thin metal louver system, and/or a very simple removable fabric that could be used within the structure to provide transparency.

### **Summary of Public Comments**

Sandra Burtzos provided an overview of the public comments received to date. Three events serve as the primary source of these public comments: Saturday Market “Stop and Talk” events held once in April and again in May, as well as the first open house event held on May 9. Sandra noted that there are many other written comments, as well as comment cards and surveys from the open houses that are available for review, upon request. The following comment themes were observed:

#### *PSM Vendor & Visitor Comments from two Saturday Stop & Talk events at PSM*

- Storage—same amount as PSM currently has, on-site or in very nearby location, secure
- Restrooms —same number PSM currently has, in WFP or very nearby, 20,000 visitors a weekend, PSM can't go back to porta-potties
- Booths—same quantity as now, some prefer all 10 x 10 size min, tie-downs,
- Market covering—more important for customers than vendors, transparent, same amount as PSM has now, some vendors don't want to be under cover, some want more cover than current designs propose
- Protection from elements (wind & rain) —solid windbreaks on north side of market
- Market surface—smooth & even paving, good drainage, level, easy access for vendor load/unload, some food and other vendors want to continue to vend from trailers onsite
- Naito Crossing—signal timing, paving to lead people to destinations, connectivity important; have amenities in WFP and Ankeny Plaza to draw visitors back and forth (restrooms, credit card machine, info booth), remove arches in Plaza for better visibility
- Utilities—telephone lines, phone access for credit card machines, electrical min 500 watts per space/several electrical outlets per space, some prefer natural gas, potable water, dirty water disposal, grease disposal
- Garbage & recycling — need to accommodate current compactor and garbage very nearby
- Misc. Amenities — lots of public art, benches/seating beyond food area, grass, trees, ATMs, phones, small kitchen area
- PSM Attributes — Keep feel same as PSM now-not the Pearl, lots of color, visible from I-5, clean & safe, uniqueness, tourist attraction, destination, makes Portland unique, hand crafts, micro-businesses
- Streets — like curbless, historic lights, hanging pots
- Lease rates — Keep it affordable
- PSM Location — keep same as it is now - synergy with MAX, other markets, Skidmore Fountain Bldg, and WFP, why are needs of new entities coming to neighborhood more important than a spot for PSM?

#### *Public and PSM Vendor Comments from May 9, 2007 Open House*

- Of the 26 completed surveys, 7 were PSM vendors/musicians, 18 were not PSM vendors, 1 did not answer.

- Uses of the area — bike on esplanade (10); walk or jog on esplanade (19); visit/work PSM (22); Hang out (7); visit Japanese-American Memorial (5); watch events at performance stage (5)
- Majority liked all the elements in common of the three schemes.
- Water features B & C were more favored over A (13 & 14: 9)
- Esplanade moved closer to pump station was favored 15:7 over keeping esplanade is current location, but 6 comments mentioned they would not like to see the three large oak trees removed
- Ankeny Plaza Columns — majority (14 scheme B: 6 scheme A: 6 scheme C) favored keeping both sets in current locations
- Metal Sculpture Wall — majority (10:4) favored relocating it within WFP
- Street Crossing — Majority (16:2) favored scheme B
- MAX Station — Majority (11 :3) favored scheme C under bridge vault space bumping out into the sidewalk area
- Retail, more finished look under bridge, lighting — majority favored (12:5 and 18:2)
- Pedestrian access through parking lot under bridge — Majority favored sidewalks on north and south side of lot (11 both sides: 5 south side only: 3 no access)
- Barrier between parking lot and MAX station – Majority favored bollards (8) and transparent wall (6) with breaks over a solid wall (2) or no barrier (2).
- Restrooms at MAX station — Slight majority (12:9) liked the idea.
- Stair access from top of bridge to MAX station — Majority (14:6) thought the connection is important to the station and the market. Schemes B (6) & C (6) were thought to address it better than A (1)

Richard Harris asked if there were any specific comments about the Ankeny Street improvements. Sandra responded that there were qualitative comments about the improved feel of the area and about closing the area for exclusive use by pedestrians, but not any specific comments about the street improvements.

Lou Elliot asked if all three design options included bathrooms. Doug Macy replied that each of the options will include public restrooms, with varying costs based on capacity. The project team will be looking at the size and location of the restrooms in greater detail.

Paul Verhoeven asked if each of the market cover systems were amenable to gutters for management of stormwater. He also commented that, if possible, he would like to see the option of connecting the structures to get more contiguous cover. Bob Thompson replied that each of the canopies would have a gutter system and that the project team would look into the option of providing more contiguous cover. With the canopies, there is the challenge of how to provide cover and have as few moving parts as possible. There is a lot of weight involved in these structures, a potential sail factor with wind necessitating large foundations, etc. There are examples of these types of movable cover systems for swimming pools and athletic facilities. The project team is looking into how the function of these outdoor structures that can be operated by the push of a button.

Terri Warpinski asked about the mechanics of a movable fabric cover. Would such a structure be pulled until it was flat? If not, would there be potential for water to puddle on the roof? Bob Thompson explained that the fabric portion of the cover structure would move along a series of cables, with a layer above and one below. As the fabric moves against the cables into cover

position, it would lay on the lower cables, creating a slight arc. As a result, stormwater would sheet-off into the gutter system.

Terri also inquired as to how the cover structure of design Option C would avoid creating a greenhouse effect. Also, she commented that the vertical sections of glass did not seem to perform any function and was worried that the structure seemed too “monumental.” With respect to heat-trapping, Bob Thompson replied that the ends of the structure are open, so air moves through the area. In addition, the project team is considering some retractable fabric tops for the structure that would further increase air flow. Relative to the structure’s size, Bob replied that the highest point is only 30 feet tall, so the scale is not overwhelming. Doug Macy responded to concerns about the vertical sections of the structure, saying that the glass material being considered has a pattern to it that cuts light penetration (and therefore heat), and can be up-lit at night for dramatic effect.

Jan Oliver of the University of Oregon commented that it will be important to vet the public safety considerations for the area under the bridge. There are a number of individuals in the area who focus on public safety and could help to ensure that the designed spaces meet these needs. Doug Macy replied that all schemes address public safety and that Option C does so better than the other options.

### **Preliminary Cost Estimates & Project Budget**

The project team distributed a spreadsheet that summarized the preliminary cost estimates for each of the three design concepts. The PAC considered the costs associated with key elements found in each concept. Sandra Burtzos explained that the objective of this discussion is to gather feedback on what PAC members consider to be the most important features so that the project team can prioritize refinements to the design options.

Kevin Brake explained that there is currently \$8.8 million total available for this project, \$8.5M of which is urban renewal funding. This funding amount was determined prior to the completion of the Ankeny Burnside Development Framework (ABDF) and prior to ABDF’s cost estimates, in order to incorporate into the FY06-07 PDC budget. The ABDF Stakeholder Advisory Group recommended a more comprehensive set of public realm improvements than originally anticipated during the budget process.

- \$8.5M urban renewal funds from PDC, broken down as follows::
  - \$4.5M for Portland Saturday Market and Waterfront Park improvements
  - \$1M earmarked for other improvements in Waterfront Park
  - \$500K for Ankeny Plaza improvements
  - \$500K for fire station wall improvements
  - \$2M for streetscape and public safety improvements
- \$300K from other sources

With the benefit of the additional information from the ABDF planning cost estimates, it was determined the full set of improvements recommended by the ABDF Stakeholder Advisory Group would not be possible within the budget that had been allocated. At that point, the total project cost was estimated to be in the \$14-15M range. Based on a preliminary prioritization of the public improvement areas by staff, it was determined it was likely that the \$8.8M would go towards the following project areas (in this order), and that the other areas would need to fall into a future phase:

- Waterfront Park
- MAX station & Under Bridge

- Ankeny Plaza

The preliminary cost estimate presented today shows the estimated direct construction cost, and soft cost, for a total project cost for each of the three design options. These project totals reflect all of the design elements for each of the options and include significant contingencies and assumptions about the quality of materials to be used, as well as all the soft costs required to accomplish the project. The cost estimates are expected to be reduced as the design options are refined into a single hybrid concept and more is known about actual materials and construction methods. A preliminary total project cost for each of the options is as follows: Option A, \$17.8M; Option B, \$18.8M; Option C, \$19.7M. At the time the project goes out to bid, it is anticipated that the estimating contingency will be reduced from the current 20% to approximately 10% of direct project cost.

### **John Klum, Portland Fire and Rescue**

John Klum of Portland Fire and Rescue provided an update on the redesign of Fire Station No. 1 and the Fire Museum. John explained that the project will focus primarily on seismic upgrades, accessibility to the second floor of the museum, and improvements for administrative support and on-site housing. The work will retain the existing footprint of the station and museum.

He explained that Portland Fire and Rescue supports efforts to develop seven-day-a-week activity in Ankeny Plaza and welcomes the additional support, maintenance, and security that would accompany such development. John reported that there are no major conflicts anticipated between the planned station remodel and the improvements to Ankeny Plaza and Waterfront Park based on their review of the proposed designs. However, while the Commissioner's office supports public bathrooms in Ankeny Plaza, there are concerns about locating these restrooms on the north side of the fire station. Portland Fire and Rescue will not support a design that could limit the flexibility of future fire operations in the building.

John said that Portland Fire and Rescue is open to the removal of the wall at the southwest corner of the property if it is seen as a detriment to the neighborhood. The fire station redesign project does not include funds to remove the wall. He explained that there have been several discussions with Lisa Hamel of the International Market about the possibility of hosting the market in the existing museum facility on a seven-day schedule, with expansion onto the plaza. Lisa confirmed that plans to relocate the market include the removal of the wall to allow use of the plaza space.

### **Design Concepts**

The PAC considered the design elements and provided the following comments:

- Gene Maier commented that he saw a primary difference in the cost of the market cover structure offered in the three options with Option C's structure being twice as expensive as the others. In addition, there is a difference in the number of booths afforded by each option.
- Doug Macy commented that there is the challenge with designs B and C is that they currently require the removal of the three large oak trees adjacent to the pump station. He observed that many do not want these trees removed, and that a hybrid design could include a creative approach that would keep the trees without sacrificing booths.
- Richard Harris commented that the vision for Portland Saturday Market and the need to provide for this destination has been established for a long time as a neighborhood

priority. If budget does not allow for these improvements, Ankeny Plaza and other non-market elements should be of lower priority.

- Harriet Cormack commented that one of the illustrations shows tents under the shade structures and inquired as to whether this indicates a double layer of cover. Doug Macy confirmed that vendors will have their tents under the cover. The priority for the design of the structure is to cover both the vendors and the customers at the market as well as to effectively move customers back and forth.
- Paul Verhoeven commented on Portland Saturday Market's interest in having enough space for 140 booths under contiguous cover. The only design that achieves this is Option C, but does not necessarily represent the Market's preferred option. If the two canopies in Option A were somehow knit together, they might be able to provide about the same amount of cover. However, it appears that Option B does afford enough cover. Paul also questioned the benefit of the wind break, considering the amount of space it consumes.
- Lisa Hamel commented that in addition to a cover for the market, the street improvements for crossing Naito Parkway should also be a priority.
- Paul Verhoeven asked about restrooms and what the alternatives exist if they cannot be placed against the fire station wall. Doug Macy replied that if the fire station wall location is not feasible, then the restrooms need to be sited in a location that is highly visible. The Bureau of Planning has discouraged the project team from placing restrooms along Naito in a location that blocks views of the proposed water feature from Ankeny Plaza and Naito Pkwy.

### **Development of the Preferred Design Concept**

Doug Macy presented a preliminary hybrid design concept. The project team has considered the feedback up to this point and borrowed from the strengths of each of the design options to form this preliminary hybrid design. Additional feedback from this meeting and other venues will also factor into this emerging preferred design concept. Doug noted that Option A has had the most favorable review, to-date. It permeates the park area with a prominent circular pocket, as well as retains the trees. The strength of Option B is its design at the MAX station. The structure in Option C provides the most cover and makes a stronger statement than the other options.

The hybrid design shows the pocket area in Waterfront Park moved back slightly to create more room for the market podium. The wall west of the pump station is removed and the promenade shifted and the three large oak trees are retained. As more room is made for the podium, the booth count in this hybrid option is likely to go up. Doug displayed another alternate "river market" concept that could host another 65 booths by building a deck out under the Burnside Bridge. Restrooms could go on the north side of the Burnside Bridge and provide a buffer to the Japanese American Historical Plaza. While not the best option from a proximity standpoint, the restrooms at this location would be exposed to Naito Parkway. If feasible, the restrooms could also go in the retail area under the bridge.

Tom Carrollo asked whether all the operational needs of Portland Saturday Market have been accounted for in the designs, including garbage, storage, water and wastewater, etc. Paul Verhoeven added that it appears there are some logistical items that have not yet been addressed within the designs and should be addressed upfront. The project team agreed that they need to continue work to gather specific feedback from Saturday Market representatives and vendors.

Richard Harris commented that siting public restrooms is a lot more complicated than originally anticipated. He encouraged the PAC and project team to refer to recent studies and reports that assess what makes public restrooms successful. One of these elements is having an attendant on-site to prevent the facilities from being vandalized or inappropriately used. In addition, the restrooms should be expandable so that during the market hours it has more capacity, but can be scaled down at other times to keep the space manageable and secure. The restroom site also needs to be as visible as possible. Jon Abrahamson added that the location of the restrooms should not be in the sightline of the walkway/crossing between Ankeny Plaza and Waterfront Park.

Paul Verhoeven requested the cost figure associated with removing the above-grade utility vault that is under the Burnside Bridge in the park. Mauricio Villarreal of Walker Macy replied that the project team does not yet have a specific number for that, but will be able to relay that information to the PAC in the future. Lou Elliot asked for more information on the feasibility of the "river market" idea that would renovate the bridge to create a lower level space over the Willamette River. Doug Macy replied that the project team is just beginning to look at this information and at this point not sure if there are issues related to fire emergency exit, the need for elevator, etc. Again, this information will be available to the PAC in the near future. Harriet Cormack commented that there may be restrictions that would limit this type of non river-dependent uses in a greenway that would prevent the construction of the "river market" concept.

Harriet also shared her understanding that the vision for the park, based on the Waterfront Park Master Plan, was to have minimalist park structures. Carol Edelman agreed that the structure presented in Option C is not congruent with the goals of the master plan. She suggested that the structures in Option A or Option B were preferred, depending on which could provide better coverage of market booths and customers.

Jon Abrahamson asked what contingency plans are in-place should the project not be completed in time for the market opening by March 1, 2008. Kevin Brake responded that the project team is embarking on an interim site location strategy. Paul Verhoeven added that in consideration of their contingency options, there are two basic approaches: a site that the market can use for a full year, or a site that will host the market for just part of the year. The duration of stay at a temporary site will depend on how quickly the project is completed. At a certain point it may make sense for the market to stay at the temporary site throughout the rest of the season due to the conditions of agreements, customer familiarity, etc.

Carol Edelman commented that between the two major project elements, the cover structure and plaza, that Option A is the most successful. She likes the idea that the park design would provide a venue for other activities, as well as shade.

Paul Verhoeven commented that he supports the preliminary hybrid concept elements of moving the esplanade near the pump station and retaining the large oak trees.

Jan Oliver emphasized the importance of prioritizing Saturday Market needs, but also was of the opinion that the space under the Burnside Bridge was a priority. If these priorities are mutually exclusive, she would recommend a focus on Saturday Market, with a secondary focus on the park and bridge spaces. Richard Harris added that safety under the bridge has been an issue for a long time and should be addressed. Kevin Brake responded that Portland Saturday Market, Ankeny Plaza, and under the Burnside Bridge are all identified as key elements to be addressed by this project.

Anne Naito Campbell commented that she does not understand why a restroom could not be sited under the bridge, as it would be a great amenity. In terms of development at the MAX station, Anne suggested tying into Portland Office of Transportation or TriMet funding. She also suggested that classical music played under the bridge could be a way to deter loitering.

Kevin Brake announced that a public safety coordination group is currently developing a set of criteria that the agencies and bureaus can use to enhance public safety elements of the project. Representatives from this group may attend and present at the next PAC meeting. Eventually, this group will take on the same management role as the group that provides ongoing maintenance and public safety management at Pioneer Courthouse Square.

### **Wrap up and next steps**

The PAC discussed the next steps for the project. Sandra Burtzos explained that project team will be considering the information and feedback offered at this meeting as they further develop the design concepts. The final public open house will take place on June 13. Between now and then, the project team will be preparing for this event and working on the refined hybrid schematic design, as well as cost estimates. The next PAC meeting is scheduled for July 11. Sandra asked the group whether it made more sense to advance this schedule so the next PAC meeting occurs closer to the open house. This would allow the project team to move forward more quickly and make recommendations on what could be built with the available budget. The group discussed holding the next PAC meeting on June 20, from 4-6:30pm. This tentative meeting schedule will be confirmed with the group in the near future.

Lou Elliot commented that project stakeholders each have their own priorities for the project and suggested that the project team should work with each individually to determine similarities and differences. Sandra Burtzos replied that balancing needs and interests is one of the challenges present on all projects. The project team will think about this suggestion and consider how best to best approach the situation.

The PAC discussed the need to gather more input from neighborhood and business associations. The next meeting of Visions is on June 13<sup>th</sup>; June 5 is the next Old Town Chinatown Neighborhood Association meeting. The project team will attempt to brief these groups on project developments. Project postcards have been mailed to the broader neighborhood to encourage participation and share information. PAC members are encouraged to spread the word about the project and upcoming events, as well as to brief their respective organizations on the project. Details are available on the website.

### **Next meeting**

June 20, 2007, 4:00 – 6:00 pm