

EENA Armory visioning 12-1-07

Laura Shealy called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. at the University of Idaho Urban Research and Design Center, Old Boise. Armory Sub-committee members present were Laura Shealy, Charles Gill, Dave Krick, Erik Kingston, Andrea Merrill, Steve Trout, Gordon Trounsen, Deanna Smith, Diane Ronayne (secretary)

Laura: The City plans to auction this property to highest bidder a year from now and hopes to get \$2.5 million for it. We're moving backward in time from that auction date to use this visioning process to help the neighborhood to serve as a guide and advisor to the city. EENA is looking forward to a collaborative experience with UI and Boise City.

Sherry McKibben: UI students are off for vacation on Dec. 14.

Four questions for visioning:

1. Do you consider the Armory an asset? For the community, city-wide or neighborhood?
2. Should the armory building be saved in whole or in part?
3. What uses would you like to see on the site?
4. What would actually work on the site? What's viable there?

Students and others present: [Sherry please add to/correct this list]

Students are Phil O'Connor, Jason Simmons, Rebeka, Miriam, Erin, Tristan, Sarah.

Others: Charles Hummel, Kathy Barrett, Dave Krick and Susan Medlin (representing the Treasure Valley Food coalition), Terry Schorzman (National Preservation Trust), Dan Everhart (Preservation Idaho), Jean Calveny (lives two doors down from fire station on Reserve), Brent Pitts (a neighborhood resident who also serves on the ANSER board), Norm Weinstein (former neighborhood resident and architecture writer), Tom Scholfield and Colin Hudson (St. Luke's, which has a continuing interest in the site), Jim Anders and Bud Federly (neighbors on Reserve), Glen ? (Erstad Architects), Brian Garrett (former neighbor), Jennifer Pirtle (city developer relations planner); Sherry McKibben (UI URDC). Later: Tamara Cameron.

Sarah Seabridge, UI student, reviewed history of site from her research on the Internet, Id Historical Museum and Boise Public Library. Beginning in 1953, proposals were made for a community center, an ice rink, an indoor sports for soccer in 1997 (all fell through); in 2000, New Heritage Theatre leased site for 75 years and raised \$1 million and did some tenant improvement to building but this deal eventually fell through.

Charles Hummel, retired architect whose father designed the building and was commanding officer 160th Engineers National Guard, reviewed prior history. As a child, he hung out there and learned to ride horses there. How the city acquired the property is a big mystery. "We all presume it's owned by the city but we'd be shocked if it turned out to be owned by Uncle Sam." His father's memorabilia, which he donated to the Idaho State Historical Society, includes minutes of Idaho National Guard Assn., of which he was president. INGA was a volunteer group that began in the early 1930s to persuade the state to build armories. Before that time they were in shacks all over the state. They raised money and when the WPA came along, WPA workers completed the armory. Unfortunately, the State Historical Society can't find that information

now. “That diary and Minutes would probably say how the property was purchased in the first place.”

Art Albanese knows a lot about the building. He gave thousands of dollars worth of freebee time to New Heritage Theatre, doing plans for their remodel. He learned the structure is pretty sound; concrete exterior, interior wood framing, with concrete floor in basement.

First part of building began in 1931 with the stables (Troup E of 116th Calvary was in that part). It was one story with a hay loft. The rest of the building (with the WPA plaque) was built later, but Hummel designed it in 1931 and he was big on “Art Decoid.” The front of the office section was built first, then the second floor wings added after WWII (Charles designed them). Drill Hall: Troup E used the whole corral, all the way to Ave. H; the 116th Engineers and the band, and a company of 140th Field Artillery used the hall. The Adjutant General’s office was there after WWII; the local units of the National Guard moved from the armory to Gowen Field at that time. The south side was garages for trucks and was built later. So there may be as many as four different construction dates on the building, and the structural connections between them may be tenuous. Parts of the building could be taken off, depending on how much integrity of historical structure is important. The office section couldn’t have been built earlier than 1936 or 1937.

The National Historic Register (NHR) has the entire building listed on it. However, the armory doesn’t have a Boise City historic designation because it’s not in an historic district.

Colin Hudson: Art says structure is in great condition and should stand for many years.

Erik Kingston: The complete NHR application is on website, along with basic historic elevation drawings. The Hummel Architects office has the original drawings, and Art Albanese has copies.

Charles Hummel: “NHR listing doesn’t guarantee preservation. But since it’s in government ownership, its demolition can’t be haphazard, and there’s a process (not easy) to delist it. However, Boise City designation is moot because the city hasn’t designated a historic district there. The city can’t take a freestanding building and designate it as historic.”

Dan Everhart: Boise City has mainly designated larger historical districts, but one historic property in Boise under single ownership is a farm on Cole Road. There’s a possibility that the city could designate it as a district with one building. There’s also a possibility of Landmark designation by the city, but that doesn’t have the same teeth. It just means there’s a 180-day waiting period required if demolition is proposed. NHR listing is honorific only; a building can be listed one day and demolished the next. It’s the local designation that allows for some sort of review. The city could demolish it under their ownership if they chose to do it.

Deanna Smith reviewed the East End Neighborhood Association concerns for the site. When EENA’s Historic District was designated some years ago, the original effort was to extend its boundaries to Reserve Street, but later that section was excluded because there’s quite a bit of non-qualifying property around the armory and there was some neighbor resistance to doing it.

Charles Hummel: “The significance of a historical designation with respect to this process is moot. It’s wonderful that this process has started now, because it will determine what happens to

the building and the site. The city could offer the building for sale with particular stipulations in response to this process, but historic designation is immaterial.”

Sherry McKibben: Reviewed the property boundaries on maps.

Deanna Smith: Relevant elements that have gone through the neighborhood vetting process during EENA’s Neighborhood Plan revision (still in process) are *pedestrian access, transportation issues and trails.*

Transportation challenges include too many cars on Reserve, going too fast. The neighborhood generates its own traffic problems. To alleviate trips, the neighborhood plan identifies five East End sites for possible commercial use. The armory wasn’t on that list but EENA recognizes it has the potential for mixed use (could be another “Hyde Park”).

Trails: Public/private money may be available for them A federal trail goes along the side of the fire station. (Fire station property will not be part of property put up for auction.) Along the canal is trail to McKinley Street heavily used by students going to East Junior High and by people going to the dog park and foothills from the neighborhood. EENA wants it designated as a pedestrian connectivity trail. Also, there are no full sidewalks along Avenue H, and EENA has identified that as a need plus a better crossing of Reserve at Ave H. Speed is an issue on Reserve so EENA wants ACHD to provide some street treatments to slow speed down there.

The Blueprint Boise process going on now is rewriting the Boise city Comprehensive Plan and all implementing codes. We’re one year into the three-year process. Tricia Neilson is the city planner in charge of that process. This armory project is ahead of that plan, but could serve to guide and advise the comp plan process and could possibly get adopted into that plan eventually, when the plan is ready for it.

Mass Transit: A bus route serves the Veteran’s Administration Home, so we will always have a bus service at this location because of that. The other bus route through the East End is along Warm springs Ave. The armory site could actually invigorate mass transit here if it were a viable community center of some kind. Transit needs people – a hub – to make it viable and functional. ACHD has no current plans for Reserve Street—the neighborhood would have to champion something and make it happen.

This visioning/armory process isn’t about convincing the city to keep this site in public ownership. It will go private. But we hope to help advise potential future private developers, including telling them what we might want to see happen with the transportation system.

Sherry McKibben: Sustainability is a strategic goal for the whole city. Site already has geothermal water and has had been heated geothermally.

Breakout Visioning groups: Group 1 (my group): Colin Hudson, Dan Englehart, Norm Weinstein, Laura Shealy, Diane Ronayne; students Rebekah and ?;

1. Is armory an asset to the city, neighborhood, etc?

Colin: It’s a city asset so belongs to all people, but it benefits this quadrant. Taking St. Luke’s as an example, if the city gave the property to St. Luke’s, Saint Alphonsus RMC wouldn’t like it. It is where it is and belongs to the community, and it needs to be a community piece of property. However, if a private enterprise develops it, it will have to be high density and high traffic or it

won't pencil out. For equity purposes, what segment of community is best served, and how will the community decide if their tax dollars are worth it? It's real property with a derelict building on it that's gorgeous and may be able to be salvaged.

Dan: The asset is in part the land and in large part the building that sits on the land. From a historic preservation point of view, it's the largest historic armory in the state in scale, size and history. There's no other pre-war asset of this size in Idaho. So it could be viewed as a statewide asset.

Colin: The building is a liability, too. Who will spend \$6 million to improve it unless it's someone who wants to get a reasonable return on that investment? Or it will have to be something the community sees will be valuable to them.

Laura: If the building weren't on that property, how would we approach it differently? The location in proximity to the city is fabulous.

Dan: There are people who wouldn't be here [at this meeting] if it weren't for the building. The East End neighborhood always will be interested, but others are interested in the building as a resource.

Norm: We need a "porous" definition of "neighborhood:" the East End doesn't have walls around it.

The neighborhood and the wider community need to support whatever goes there.

Colin: New Heritage Theater was a good fit because it didn't interfere with ambulance traffic. St. Luke's spent \$330,000 on parking lot because during the day when we have huge public meetings at the hospital, if we parked all of them on our campus, patients had to fight for spaces. So for several years we shuttled people to meetings from that lot.

"Every idea St. Luke's puts forth is biased; we do have an agenda—we want to benefit the community at large. We put forth an idea to the city more than a year ago that fell through the cracks. [He explained the need for 26,000 square feet of storage space for used equipment the hospital is trying to find places to donate to.]

"We'd like a multiple use of this facility including day care (YMCA manages two daycare centers for St. Luke's employees that will be razed due to St. Luke's new building next year). They're 6,000 to 7,000 square feet. We want to build a 30,000-square-foot daycare center to serve hundreds of kids and need space where the kids can play. We also need office space for ancillary non-mission-critical staff who now occupy space that could be used for health care. These features help the broad community. We were prepared to put the money into it, did a study that penciled out unless we had to pay \$4 million to buy the land."

He was surprised to hear the city wants just \$2.5 million for it. "St. Luke's wants a lease like the theatre had. If we got it, we could also have police continue to use it for training. This storage would also be used by St. Al's, and a lot of their employees would use the child care facility." However, St. Luke's doesn't want to get in a bidding war so Colin said they won't go to an auction on it.

General consensus of the group: It is an asset to the neighborhood and the city.

Colin: St. Luke's would leave the entire building intact. It needs a new roof, and owner will have to do lots of work to make the inside sound.

Laura: It has to make sense on paper financially. The buyer would want to preserve enough of the building to appreciate it historically, perhaps just the façade—enough to be reminded of the original armory structure. Boise lacks much of historical significance in our architecture. Armory is one of the few interesting historical buildings left.

Diane: I would like to preserve the façade, some of the open space on the site. We need to watch out for the safety of Reserve and H streets and keep the building sizes in proportion to the rest of the surrounding buildings (no high-rises).

Dan: The exterior has the character-defining characteristics: we need to preserve at the least the front façade facing Reserve and the arena area sight-line (be able to see the dome from Avenue H. so can people understand why cavalry used horses inside it.) The last-built one-story wing could be sacrificed for the retention of the larger portion of the building. Interior spaces aren't of big concern to protect.

Colin: It costs substantially more to retain the historical integrity of the building and bring it up to code than to raze it.

Dan: Demolition costs will be substantial because it's concrete. Rehabbing the interior is feasible.

?: One entity could acquire the property and another could partner with them to build. A for-profit could get tax credits for efficient and effective reuse.

Norm: Regarding the traffic issue, Mike Greenberg, San Antonio, writes about green issues. He uses the 14-year-old on a bike test to determine what a neighborhood is: Where he wants to get to on and off a bike and be comfortable defines his neighborhood. The site developer should use designs that accommodate all forms of traffic: bikes and pedestrians as well as cars. Our vision should highlight the opportunities for multi-generational interaction in this area: Close proximity of the Boise Senior center, assisted living, Veteran's Home, etc. There are lots of isolated institutions within walking distance of each other and they need enhanced cross-talk.

Diane: Form follows function, and functions and design considerations should determine uses.

Laura: It has to be mixed use that has to benefit the neighbors (there's some public access) and provides another feature for the larger community such as workforce housing, storage for St. Luke's, etc. The city needs to get something out of this. We have an opportunity to be a model plan, showing how the community and a neighborhood can work with their city.

Dan: I can see multiple uses; charter school mixed with housing and retail—a school works in the current building set-up. Then could bring in other aspects of the community: after-school use,

weekend basketball leagues, etc. Other uses would be on the site, too, such as housing. School would have to sell part of the parcel for development to support itself.

Colin described a proposal by a California townhouse developer to build 88 units. Because it would take the space required for open space for the 33,000-square-foot daycare that St. Luke's wanted, they didn't partner with this developer.

What does NOT belong:

Diane: Any kind of alcohol sales in any kind of venue (retail, with or without food sales). Hyde Park neighbors have suffered greatly, now that it's mostly liquor-oriented dining.

Possibilities: Workforce housing; a farmer's market selling retail organic local foods (producers would lease or purchase spaces).

Development needs to continue to have connectivity with the neighborhood and be used by its residents—could have a meeting space for neighborhood meetings.

Norm: Should encourage multi-generational use and bring in local residents. Identify what constrains the site: the flume; height can't be too tall (more than 3 stories high); traffic on Reserve (speed and volume).

Adult education center; vocational training; intergenerational training between elders and youngsters; arts and theater aspect to school (Montessori?).

Make it an adaptable space so it can be used for a variety of purposes over the years. Interpretive center for foothills? Transit node for bikers/hikers/buses/walkers (baby strollers, dog walkers). Meeting spaces are needed within the neighborhood.

REPORTS FROM GROUPS

Group 1 (Laura presented): 1. Property is both a neighborhood and community asset but the neighbors will use it the most and would have to sustain it to some degree.

2. Save at least the façade and dome that identifies it as an armory because it's the only prewar armory in Idaho and has historical significance.

3. Mixed use is good: an anchor such as a school (charter school), possible retail and housing; day care; St. Luke's has looked at it as a storage site
Support multi-generational interaction (senior center, assisted care, Vets Home nearby); theater/arts are good because traffic is off peak hours; meeting spaces for neighborhood and community; adult education

4. What belongs? Don't want any alcohol-associated business; need to have height restrictions (not more than 3 stories tall); it's an important public transit node spot; bikes/trails/joggers/hikers should be accommodated.

GROUP 2

(Tom from St. Luke's) presented)

1. Adaptable reuse, community value, historic value.
2. Rear portion could go but preserve structure.

3. ANSER, YMCA, St. Luke's, affordable housing; mixed use: year-round farmer's market, chef's market. Potential hub for community, gateway to foothills therefore bike shop rental, bookstore, coffee shop, live/work lofts, archive like Merle Welles State Historical Society archive near Old Pen.
Need gateway from Warm Springs to integrate the armory site (via wide sidewalks?) with rest of East End.
4. No big box stores, chain stores. Any retail should feel like a neighborhood store. No Starbucks but a smaller, neighborhood feel. What belongs there: Neighborhood- and pedestrian-friendly, neighborhood-scale development. Should support sustainability. Apartments next door should guide the building heights. Street-level commercial with houses, like brownstones in a big city. Bookstore is a potential use. Don't duplicate Boise Little Theater and Ft. Boise Community Center uses.

GROUP 4

(Jean Calveny reported)

1. It is a community asset; it could be a neighborhood asset OR it could degrade the neighborhood.
2. South side could go but in general would like to preserve the whole building. Could open south wall to let light in and create a plaza.
3. Uses like hardware/lumber store (maybe that was a joke?); mixed use is nice: farmer's market; minimal light retail (i.e. locally owned coffee and bike shops), offices on second floor, artist live/work space; workforce living space. Enliven the street edge as well as the building. Small school okay. Shared community artist studio space (local artists and craftspeople have long expressed a need for shared studio and creative space).
4. What belongs/doesn't belong: Anything generating high traffic volumes coming and going that pushes out the pedestrian or discourages walking does NOT belong. We want it to benefit the neighborhood, so not anything noisy or that creates light pollution. Be sensitive to hours of operation and preserve views (especially from foothills residences north of Shaw Mountain Road). Prefer owner-occupied housing other than rental, with mixed-incomes able to live there; however, if Laurel Park Apartments converts to condos, might consider rentals in the armory site.

GROUP 6

(Charles Hummel presented)

1. Consensus: it's a neighborhood asset, and neighborhood uses will be predominant; the building is also a cultural asset for the city. If a developer sees an asset as tearing down a building and maximizing the use of land, we don't favor that.
2. Save entire building ideally, but parts not functionally viable could be sacrificed (stable or garage in back). The 1937 fabric should be saved.
3. Uses: What works! We like all uses already listed, especially small-scale neighborhood uses and a daycare function. There's no adequate day care in entire neighborhood, so it could serve both flatland and upland East End. Uses that enhance the neighborhood good. No large-scale commercial uses.
4. Commercial viability: No large-scale at this site (no streets can handle heavy traffic and we don't want it to be an attractant). Three ways to make it work: City could put it up for sale with no conditions; city (if possible within restrictions of existing law re disposal of

city assets) could put it up for sale with conditions; city could not sell it at all but instead be the developer itself, because most uses our group wants to see there aren't commercially viable. We don't see a compelling need for the city to get rid of this property even within the one-year time frame, but that provides a compelling reason to consider this now. City could treat it like its park properties and develop the kind of public uses that aren't commercially viable. Should the city or developer be allowed to split off the H-street side? No, it shouldn't be subdivided, although that depends on the plan. City should not offer separate parcels. Long-term lease to a private developer would fit into the third alternative.

Jennifer Pirtle: City wants to get it into the hands of someone who can do something with the property. City doesn't have money to do anything with it now. City only has three options legally: Trade for property of like value, enter a long-term lease or sell it. The one-year timeline isn't set in stone but it's out there.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

Susan Medlin: "The armory was built as a protective structure and has an inherent quality to go that way, whether it's facing threats to our food supply or other threats coming at us. We can't just buy into the fact that the current financing/use paradigms are the only ones out there. We need to really get out of the box. Maybe seek public financing: A community that can protect the trails in the Foothills could come up with an idea to protect something like this."

Laura: City budget needs for library expansion are informing this discussion.

Erik: Proposals he has received online and in conversation with other folks for uses: an entrepreneurial business incubator asset for the whole community; a "[sustainability](#) center" with emphasis on sustainable design, food production, technology, etc. Some of the ideas could present opportunities for robust economic development for the larger community.

Dave Krick: Right now, we're in a paradigm that the property will be sold to a for-profit, but we could look at it as an effort with a more social purpose: more useful in the long run to the community could be a sustainable center, a thoughtful way to do green workforce housing. It has geothermal and there are opportunities for people to participate in the overall productivity of the site so the people living there or nearby could be partners in the business activity of it.

Gordon: The size of the property is a big asset. Subdividing the firehouse section off the parcel is premature; it should stay with the property and be leased back to the city.

Erik: Fire personnel have said the station uses some of the areas behind the station for practice drills and vehicle storage.

Gordon: Options: This property could be sold commercially, or a foundation or the city could take it on for farmer's market or other ideas that couldn't make it as retail alone. A foundation that does historical preservation could subsidize these businesses with lower rents. Or the city could take it on as a park entity for enlightened uses. If it's sold and the building is retained somewhat, the only business that would go there is high-end residential. As a resident who

overlooks it, I wouldn't mind that, but Aldape Cove homes [just north of Shaw Mountain Road] have a view now so we need to consider their needs. If it's sold outright, I don't see a mixed use happening, other than maybe a little coffee shop. A foundation would keep a neighborhood thing going. Or we could do a foothills initiative for the armory, to pull the whole city in.

Erik: Earlier projects proposed for the site may have failed because they lacked adequate development capacity, resources or neighborhood support to push the project to its conclusion. The Advisory Committee can gather information (including some informal market survey work through our public process) to create a report we can hand to the city and potential developers. It would describe what people would most likely support in terms of new construction that won't overwhelm the site and development that protects the old building.

Assuming a sophisticated developer with creative vision is interested in an adaptive reuse of the armory structure, we might even be able to give them a list of potential tenants ready to make lease payments. This up-front work may be valuable to developers who want to create a legacy project, streamline the approval process and are interested in meeting local market demands. We're trying to propose practical ideas of how to use the property in a way the neighborhood would support and that will represent a return on any investment.

NEXT STEPS

Diane: Identify all potential stakeholders so we can notify them of subsequent meetings and opportunities for input. Students could research height limits.

Steve Trout: What would the pro forma look like? It would require configurational work be done first.

Dave Krick: General consensus supports mixed use. So students could research some scenarios. One scenario might be 1/3 of the area to new development, 1/3 to open space/grounds, 1/3 to old building. How would that work? Maybe workforce housing on second floors, first floors have commercial uses. Speak to the potential of the site. Look at uses taking advantage of geothermal and solar, and that could share some features (rooftop gardens that add to the value of it); look at armory building as open air market of some type: green business incubation, craft or produce sales, capacity for use of that space. Identify what could be done, what uses and how much square footage is available for each.

Colin: Mixed use would need a nonprofit anchor to it but what proportion should be nonprofit? What nodal activities?

Laura: We need to present this to the city in a way that does the most for them. As we collect creative ideas on our website over the next few months, Jennifer will be working on potential deed restrictions, etc., as she talks with developers interested in it. We can come up with a handful of persuasive arguments even if they don't translate into dollar value: geothermal, sustainable business, promoting art, etc. Then we can have influence on potential developers who will want to make the neighborhood and city happy, so the developer will look good because

they're promoting x, y, z for the city. The more homework and due diligence we do, and the more creative ideas we have, will be more than any developer will do.

Students could research do a school, small business, daycare center, open space gardens. Showpiece for green development,.

Norm: Students could make persuasive arguments into a story line: "The Story of the East End," the story of Boise.

Deanna: We need

a. visual scenarios (models) of dense residential (height, sight-lining from Aldape Cove, etc.) with mixed uses and the armory developed. See which uses could be combined.

b. a scenario of land-oriented uses tied in with residential

c. lists of site strengths and constraints – compile them at a follow-up meeting that includes the development community.

Diane, Erik: Students could analyze effects of various scenarios on air quality, transportation infrastructure, recruitment/retention of critical downtown workforce, and other long-term costs the city would either bear or avoid due depending on the type of development.

Erik: We have an opportunity to learn from both development professionals and city officials about their respective realities, so we can explore common ground among neighborhood residents and those stakeholders.

Steve Trout: We all know some developers. We should ask them to sit down with us and critique our suggestions.

Charles Hummel: \$2.5 million was appraisal of Jan. 06. Why is it worth more without the building?

Andrea Merrill: I work in real estate. The location is what's valuable, not the building. It's close to the neighborhood, Foothills, downtown, businesses/employment, St. Luke's, etc., so that appraisal is realistic. There isn't any other land in Boise available in a neighborhood like this. The East End is already 95 percent developed. It's the only Boise neighborhood bordered by Foothills, downtown and the Boise River. So it's unique and valuable, and whatever we have developed there is all we'll ever have. We need to make the most of this opportunity.

Charles Hummel: "If the city doesn't sell it with some constraints, the city will act like any other private person who feels compelled to maximize the value of their property. I believe the city, as a corporate entity of citizens, doesn't have to be compelled by this kind of motivation. The city's highest and best use, in fact, is something other than maximizing the sale value. Even though another library, for instance, is a worthy end."

Erik: We hope to include the Executive Summary of the 2006 appraisal on our website. Among other things, the appraisal outlines how the historic designation could allow a developer access to historic tax credits to decrease their tax liability or sell on the market for a percentage of the dollar value (at 50 cents to 90 cents on the dollar) to provide development capital for the

developer. It's not a guarantee, though. Some developers have used it well, others haven't benefited. It could be an incentive for some developers, and requires preserving a large portion of the building's historic façade.

Laura: The City's annual budget says a portion of library funding will come from this sale. The City IS very much like a business. Our best hope is as a community to really voice our opinion, get involved, point developers toward this project.

Susan Medlin: I want to see research on creative community financing projects, especially when the project is green or super green.

Erik: Asked people to forward links to such websites to him for www.reservestreetarmory.com.

Gordon: We need to voice the restrictions we want placed on the property if it goes to auction, and also look at the potential for running a levy (set up a nonprofit to manage and fund it).

Erik and Deanna met in November with **Tim Breuer** to investigate the [Land Trust of the Treasure Valley](#) owning the land. While the LTTV represents an existing trust structure for land acquisition (and possesses the capacity to facilitate such a process), it is unknown whether a deal could be put together to acquire the Armory property. At the very least, it would require dedicated funding and an interest from the LTTV board. A land trust model is one option, but may not be necessary.

TO DO

- Research public/private partnerships, land trust and get it on the website.
- Students work on scenarios.
- Set up a developer-oriented meeting.
- Set up a meeting in January to present students' work. This will give students more time and give us time to involve more people.

Laura adjourned the meeting at noon.