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Abstract
This paper presents student proposals for redesigning the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Rosslyn waterfront in Arlington, Virginia as a case study in university and community partnerships. The George Washington Memorial Parkway, a registered historic landscape, currently lines the entire riverfront in Arlington, Virginia, and precludes much pedestrian access to the river, especially in Rosslyn, the most densely developed area adjacent to the waterfront. Landscape architecture and architecture students from Virginia Tech’s Washington Alexandria Architecture Center examined the Rosslyn waterfront and proposed changes to the parkway as a means of accelerating community discussion about potential public access to the water. Six student projects are presented that engage the parkway in various ways, raising questions about historical integrity of the parkway and community access to the waterfront. The paper discusses Arlington County planners’ initial steps to engage a larger conversation about the work and the issues the projects raise. It concludes with discussion about the value and opportunities of university and community collaboration.
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Introduction

Arlington, Virginia has a problem that many communities would be happy to have: its entire Potomac River waterfront is a scenic parkway, the George Washington Memorial Parkway. The problem is that for all its beauty and historical significance, it has become a congested regional commuter route that renders much of the waterfront inaccessible to most pedestrian uses. To be fair, a popular multi-use trail, the Mount Vernon Trail, runs along several miles of the shoreline and a primitive hiking trail clings to the wilder edge of the Potomac gorge just upstream from Washington DC, but there is little opportunity for picnicking or other recreational uses that simply require a place to hang out or play. This is perhaps most keenly felt near Rosslyn, the most densely developed part of Arlington, a business district of numerous high-rise buildings and a conjunction of highways and mass-transit routes. Rosslyn lies immediately across the Potomac River from Georgetown, one of Washington’s most popular and historic neighborhoods with its vibrant, redeveloped waterfront and urban promenade reminding Arlingtonians of the potential of an accessible waterfront. The challenge for Arlington is that the G.W. Parkway, as it’s locally known, runs immediately adjacent to the waterfront in Rosslyn, making access to the water nearly impossible right where the greatest density of people work and live in close proximity to the river.

The parkway is not the only obstacle between Rosslyn and the waterfront. Interstate 66 traverses the site, mostly below grade, and several other surface roads connect Rosslyn to Francis Scott Key Bridge crossing the Potomac to Georgetown. Although there is substantial open space, it is crisscrossed by so many roads that the remnant parcels of land are virtually cut off from each other and from pedestrian use. Thousands of people pass through this landscape daily in vehicles, or on bicycles, or as pedestrians crossing the bridge to get to the Rosslyn Metro stop, yet virtually no one has a place to linger, even though it is a spectacular waterfront location in the heart of the nation’s capital.

Redeveloping the landscape is further complicated by the numerous entities with vested interest in its condition. The National Park Service administers the G.W. Parkway; the Federal Highway Administration has oversight for I-66; and entities, like the Rosslyn Business Improvement District, the Arlington County Parks Department, as well as individual businesses, such as the adjoining Key Bridge Marriott, have a stake in the condition of the landscape and any potential changes to it. In short, these and many more constituencies, each with legitimate concern for what happens on the site, complicate matters as much as the existing roadways do. Proposals to change the status quo would no doubt stir up a lot of passion and concerns, creating additional challenges for Arlington’s urban planners and designers.

With these challenges in mind, Arlington urban designer Kris Krider teamed with Paul Kelsch and Jodi La Coe of the Virginia Tech landscape architecture and architecture programs, respectively, to see if Virginia Tech students could assist them in reimagining the Rosslyn waterfront. Krider explained it would be helpful to Arlington if the students explored the potentials of the site to show other designers, planners and community members what the site could become with some bold thinking about this urban landscape. This challenge became a great scenario for a design studio that explored the transformation of this landscape in order to open a community discussion about its potential for future public access and use.

This paper is a presentation of that design studio as a case study for how students can engage in creative scholarship as a catalyst for public discussion. Because of the impact of roads on the site, especially the G.W. Parkway, the paper focuses on schemes that propose alterations to the parkway, redesigning it to provide better public access to the waterfront while remaining sensitive to the existing context. After presenting the background of the project, including the existing conditions of the site and relevant history and design of the parkway, we will discuss the structure of the studio and present six projects that illustrate a range of responses to the parkway. Krider and his urban design team have already begun using the work to accelerate public discussion about the site, and we will present these first steps to show the kind of impact that the student work is having. Finally, we will reflect a bit about the merits of undertaking such an endeavor.
Existing Conditions

Rosslyn is a dense collection of high-rise office buildings sitting atop a bluff at a major bend in the Potomac River with fairly steep slopes descending toward the river on the north and east sides. (Figure 1) Major roads run parallel to the slopes except those leading to Francis Scott Key Bridge, which crosses the Potomac to access Georgetown. With limited land between it and the edge of the river, the G.W. Parkway runs along the edge of the Potomac River on dual roadways separated by a narrow grassy median. I-66 traverses the site adjacent to the business district of Rosslyn, dipping below grade to allow surface streets to cross at grade. Gateway Park, an underutilized, multi-level urban plaza, sits atop the highway and is connected to adjacent buildings with overhead walkways. The park is competently designed but the walls and stairs that elevate pedestrians above the adjoining streets hinder any visual connection to the waterfront. Several surface streets connect Rosslyn to Key Bridge, and collectively all these roads make a complicated network of slip lanes, city streets, parkway, and interstate highway. As a result, the land sloping northward down toward the river is fragmented into disconnected parcels, varying in size and content. Near the bridge and along the parkway they tend to have planted, maintained vegetation; whereas, in other places, they have remnants of woodland areas with invasive vines, all on rather steep slopes. The combination of heavy traffic, unmanaged vegetation and steep topography offers little appeal or opportunity for use other than on designated sidewalks and the Mount Vernon Trail, which begins at Key Bridge and heads almost twenty miles downriver to Mount Vernon.

History and Precedent

The confluence of roadways is a direct result of Rosslyn’s geography and history as a junction of transportation routes. For centuries, the bend in the Potomac River between Georgetown and Rosslyn has been an important crossing. That bend marks the threshold between free-flowing, fresh water and tidal, brackish water, an ideal place to settle where potable water meets navigable water. (1) Because of the favorability of this location, Georgetown was among the earliest settlements along the river, and ferries connected it to Virginia as early as 1737. By the early 1800s a causeway connected neighboring Mason’s...
Island to the Virginia shore at Rosslyn, and it became a stepping stone in the ferry crossing. Since then numerous crossings have been constructed, each of them touching down in the same vicinity. The Alexandria Canal Company’s Aqueduct Bridge spanned the river in 1843 allowing canal boats to connect with the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal; and, just prior to the Civil War, the first railroad line reached Rosslyn, presumably to transport goods to and from the canal. This was a vulnerable crossing during the Civil War, and Union troops occupied William and Carolyn Ross’s adjacent farmland to protect the bridge. In 1888, a new superstructure was built on the bridge, allowing pedestrians and carriages to cross, too. (3)

Figure 2 Aerial view showing Aqueduct Bridge and Key Bridge, c. 1930

During the twentieth century, this nexus of canal, rail and roads transformed into modern infrastructure. In 1912, the Washington and Old Dominion electric railroad replaced the earlier train line, leading the way to the suburbanization of Arlington County. The Aqueduct Bridge was removed in 1933, after its replacement with the Francis Scott Key Bridge, which carried trolleys from Georgetown to Rosslyn, allowing passengers to transfer to the Washington and Old Dominion line. (Figure 2) (3) Since its completion in 1923, Key Bridge has been expanded numerous times, its first addition in 1939 an extra
supporting arch on the Rosslyn side to allow the new G.W. Parkway to pass underneath it. With later additions it now carries six lanes of traffic plus pedestrians and cyclists on adjoining sidewalks cantilevered off the main deck. (4)

Modern Rosslyn began to develop in the 1960s, including plans for an interstate highway. Before the highway was completed, however, a new metro line opened in 1975, crossing under the river and connecting Rosslyn directly to downtown Washington. When I-66 opened two years later, there were three important crossings between Rosslyn and Washington all crossing the Potomac within a short distance of one another. Currently, a second Metro tunnel and a gondola crossing are being considered, potentially adding even more transportation infrastructure to a landscape already largely defined by it. (3)

In this context, Krieder’s desire to make the site more accessible for public use seems to be fighting the trajectory of history, but there is good precedent in the design of the G.W. Parkway itself for combining public use with a parkway. The parkway’s original segment, the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway, was the first federally-built parkway and commemorated George Washington’s 200th birthday by making a beautiful and dignified pilgrimage route to his home at Mount Vernon. It transformed railroad yards, swamps, woodland, and gravel quarries of the Virginia riverfront into a picturesque landscape for fifteen miles leading to Mount Vernon; and, for the first time, the river became accessible to the public with scenic pullouts, picnic areas and developed parkland along its length. (5) The project was so popular that, even before it was finished, Congress authorized a much bolder vision to expand it to include both sides of the river from Great Falls, fifteen miles upriver, to Mount Vernon, fifteen miles downriver. The larger parkway was renamed the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and the first extended section was built past Rosslyn in 1939.

The design of the original Mount Vernon Memorial Highway differs in important ways from the later segments of the George Washington Memorial Parkway, and this older design offers insight into the challenges facing Rosslyn today. (6) The southernmost section of the design is still largely intact from Alexandria to Mount Vernon, and it is easy to see how the design links the roadway to its adjoining communities. (7) Unlike most later parkways, including the northern segments of the G.W. Parkway, the Memorial Highway deliberately cultivated a sense of connection to its neighboring communities and the waterfront. Each segment has its own character, responding to the varying site conditions, and in several sections, new secondary roads were designed alongside the main roadway, so that new housing would be built facing the parkway across communal park space rather than turning away from it. A continuous walking path was proposed along the river side of the roadway with a matching bridle trail on the inland side, and these connected a set of picnic areas, marinas, overlooks, and bus shelters, the latter allowing residents to use the parkway to travel to and from Alexandria and Washington. The road itself utilized a single, forty-foot roadway to keep a relatively narrow footprint, and it was graded to follow the existing topography with most intersections occurring at grade. All of this gives the original segment of the parkway a more domestic and community focused character, and any nice weekend the landscape is literally saturated with people.

By contrast, the George Washington Memorial Parkway heading north from Rosslyn is a more modern design with dual roadways, extensive cut and fill, grade separated interchanges, limited access, and sweeping curves that flow through a continuous swath of open, grassy space bordered by dense forest. (8) It was literally the textbook example of modern roadway design, illustrated with a photograph taken from atop Key Bridge showing the two roadways diverging as they ascend the bluffs of the river and fit into the complex topography. (5) It is a strikingly beautiful design. However, for all the undeniable beauty of its sweeping curves and continuous flowing space, the more modern design of the G.W. Parkway did not seek to engage the communities along its length. There are occasional scenic overlooks and access points for a trail at the river’s edge, but otherwise there is little opportunity for non-drivers to experience this extraordinary landscape.

The parkway segment along the Rosslyn waterfront fits neither of these scenarios, in part because it was constructed as a strategic link between the original Memorial Highway and the future segments of the G.W. Parkway. It is shoe-horned between the steep bluff of Rosslyn on one side and the water’s edge on the other as it rounds the prominent bend of the Potomac River. Its design seems more constrained by
its site than the other segments, and this may be indicative of the fact that it’s the only segment of the
parkway which had not been studied as part of a National Park Service Cultural Landscape Inventory. Like
the other segments, it presumably is historically significant for reasons associated with the planning and
preservation of the Potomac River and for its association with George Washington, but its design is arguably
less significant than the other segments. (9) The challenge in creating more public access to the Rosslyn
waterfront was to reimagine the G.W. Parkway in ways that integrated people into the landscape with the
same kind of thoughtful design that characterized the earlier design. How do we reimagine this segment of
the parkway landscape being focused as much on public use as it does on scenic driving?

### Civic and Educational Partnership

In September 2015, the Arlington County Board adopted the Rosslyn Sector Plan, the first such update in
over two decades. As part of the implementation guidance, one key recommendation of the plan was to
explore opportunities to improve the waterfront and nearby Gateway Park and create a vision with economic
development, recreation, open space and multi-modal transportation benefits. Tasked by Steve Cover,
Director of the Department of Planning Housing and Development, the Urban Design and Research section
sought assistance from the Virginia Tech Washington Alexandria Architecture Center. Staff sought a
collaboration with landscape and architecture faculty, Paul Kelsch and Jodi La Coe, to develop a semester
long program for students to analyze the existing conditions and history of the site, explore a wide variety
of conceptual solutions and engage county leadership in a thought provoking dialogue. For Arlington
County, goals included supporting the implementation of the Rosslyn Sector Plan, achieving a body of
work to further the mission of the Center for Urban Design and Research and to educate the Arlington
leadership and community on the value and impact of high quality urban design, architecture and landscape
solutions. By utilizing an academic exercise, we were unencumbered of the need to develop an extensive
scope, consultant selection and civic engagement process which requires extensive resources and time. The
overarching goal was to unleash a series of ideas and design concepts for consideration by federal agencies
and stakeholders who have oversight and ownership of the Rosslyn waterfront.

### Structure of the Design Studio

Design studios at Virginia Tech’s Washington Alexandria Architecture Center have a distinct structure that
influenced the way we ran the studio. Whereas most design studios in architecture and landscape
architecture programs are comprised of students in a single discipline and at a common academic level, the
Washington Alexandria Architecture Center is a consortium of design schools from around the country and
around the world; and our studio reflected this diversity with a mix of landscape architecture and
architecture students, graduate and undergraduate students, and Virginia Tech students and students from
other universities. The scope of the project fell more comfortably within the realm of landscape architecture;
but we were confident that the architecture students would offer important insights into the overall
investigation of the site and the charge to improve access to the waterfront.

Many public landscapes do not have programmed activities so park visitors can use the land as they
desire, most buildings do have a specified use, and we thought it important to define three potential
programs to guide the students’ work. Each of the three programs included a way to access the site and
some activity to do while there. Each was intentionally vague such that the students would need to interpret
their selected program to fit the site and their design intentions. The three programs were:

- **“Bike, Bathe and Beyond,”** a place for bathing (showering, swimming, etc.) connected to
  bicycling (commuting, recreational riding, etc.)
- **“Food-Boat Wharf,”** a place where future food-boats could moor along the river’s edge and
  sell their products to Rosslyn workers and others looking for a waterside lunch.
- **“Urban Drive-In Theater,”** a place where people could arrive by foot, bike or car to view movies
  or other outdoor performances.
At their simplest level, the programs include common activities in public spaces – engagement with water, eating and people-watching – and common modes of travel – walking, bicycling and driving. Each student accommodated these activities in distinctive ways, but the activities themselves are really quite traditional.

In the outset, we established a tighter structure to the studio, and increasingly encouraged students to direct their own design inquiry. We assigned a series of exercises requiring the students to engage the site directly and then to place it in larger contexts. Based on these initial investigations, they hypothetically manipulated the topography by cutting and filling the earth in order to introduce some aspect of one of the programs onto the site. All of this was aimed at evoking ideas and helping the students establish directions for themselves. At this point, the students presented their work to Kris Krider and his colleagues from the urban design team, Brett Wallace and Justin Falango, who provided feedback and encouraged each of the students to be bold and imaginative in their designs. Collectively the urban design team was consistent in their encouragement of the range of ideas and did not try to steer the projects in a particular direction; and, by the midpoint of the semester, each student had determined a program for the site and a design strategy to pursue and develop in more detail in the second half. Given the complexity of the site, each student necessarily focused on a portion of it and with a particular emphasis. Each student, in effect, established his or her own project within the overall charge to reimagine the connection between Rosslyn and the waterfront.

Design Studio Stakeholder Engagement

With a design program in place for the project, the studio began with the students working in teams to draft site cross sections through the landscape and roadway network and to individually analyze environmental, historic, development and cultural impacts on the site area. They also researched historical documents related to the construction of the G.W. Parkway, evolution of the waterfront and base mapping files sourced by Arlington County.

Following site visits, students presented their initial analyses and preliminary design concepts in early February 2016. This served as an opportunity for Arlington County urban design staff to offer suggestions for further design exploration and share their vision to transform the waterfront from an inaccessible landscape of highways and remnant land parcels into an accessible, recreational destination while reintroducing a more environmentally sustainable landscape supporting habitat, native species and improving water quality.

For the benefit of stakeholders and the students, a rotating project critique was held in late February with guests including the National Park Service and National Capital Planning Commission, senior county staff from planning, economic development, parks, and transportation, adjoining property owners, members of the Ballston Business Improvement District, planning commissioners and members of the design community. Each student made brief presentations and every 20 minutes, teams of reviewers would move from one project to the next, giving each student 4-5 opportunities over three hours to express their ideas, orient the reviewers and gather feedback from a variety of perspectives.

In early April, the urban design staff offered a mid-term review of each student’s primary concept with a goal of getting more resolution from their investigations and to focus on the stronger ideas for a final concept design. This was followed by a final open house in May, when previously invited guests returned for a more informal drop-in presentations and one-on-one conversations to allow students to describe their major design gestures.

To bring closure to the studio effort and introduce the project to the broader public, the urban design staff invited Kelsch and La Coe to Arlington County’s monthly Design Lunch to describe the results and view a public gallery display of all of the student’s presentation drawings in early June. County staff has also created a web site, which features the student work. (10) The studio results have been shared with
consultants studying the feasibility of a gondola traversing the study area and connecting Georgetown to the Rosslyn Metro station. Follow up steps include a presentation to federal agencies and property owners considering redevelopment in the study area.

Proposals
The projects varied widely, and we present six that represent a range of approaches to the redesign of the G.W. Parkway. Four are landscape architecture projects and investigate the possibility of moving the parkway onto a causeway in the river; cutting it into the slope farther from the edge; elevating it; and leaving it as is, but working around it. Two architecture projects investigate the possibilities of using architecture to bridge over the parkway or to tunnel under it. The six projects are presented here as a gallery of their work.

A new causeway, Ian Hunter.
Ian Hunter transformed the waterfront by proposing a new causeway for the parkway that encloses a lagoon and allows for more intimate contact with the water. (Figure 3) There is historical precedent for such a bold move in the original design for the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway which utilized causeways to span the mouths of four streams, making lagoons of each. In Hunter’s proposal, a small stream runs down a narrow ravine and then flows into the lagoon, where a protected beach would allow children to wade safely in the water and kayakers to launch boats and explore the river. The causeway itself extends across shallow water, rising onto piers where the water is deeper, and aligns through the second arch of Key Bridge. New exit ramps connect the roadway to the traffic on the upper level, and the site of the existing roadway is regraded for a variety of park uses along the new, protected waterfront. Berms along the new roadway and solid guardrails would screen the noise of the cars, so they would be visible but not audibly intrusive.
Figure 4 Paige Courtney’s proposed natural swimming pool is fed with filtered storm water.

A natural swimming pool, Paige Courtney.
Paige Courtney proposed relocating the parkway farther inland, cutting it into the slope with a large retaining wall so she could use the former roadbed for innovative storm water management and a natural swimming pool along the waterfront. (Figure 4) She channeled a small tributary flowing down the hillside and into a filtering wetland along the former westbound lane of the parkway. She sized wetlands to collect and filter storm water sufficiently enough for safe swimming in two successive pools, one for lap swimming and one for family swimming. A small waterfall plunges from the upper pool into the lower one where children can play in it as it cascades into the shallower basin. The former eastbound lane of the parkway provides vehicular access and parking for the new facility.

A theatrical landscape, Lauren Habenicht Arledge.
Lauren Habenicht Arledge studied the theatricality of the existing parkway, especially its sequence of dramatic views of the Potomac River and the monuments of Washington DC, and she proposed an equally theatrical landscape. By elevating a stretch of the parkway, she set up a dramatic view from the new highpoint of the road and transformed the adjoining landscape into a series of terraces with cascading pools stepping down to the river’s edge. (Figure 5) The various terraces provide opportunities for active and passive recreation, including a soccer field, basketball court, and areas for picnicking and just hanging out in small groups. She conceived of the smaller terraces as box seats from which the sports activities, the Georgetown waterfront, and even the passing cars could all be viewed and appreciated. The roadway is elevated high enough to allow spacious and comfortable access to the waterfront where water taxis, food boats, and other boats could moor and provide service to the office workers up the slope in Rosslyn.
A wilder roadway experience, Carlin Tacey.

Carlin Tacey was inspired by existing moments of contrast at the site between wild vegetation and the constructed landscape. For her the parkway was not an obstacle but an opportunity for greater experience of those contrasts, so she proposed meadows and wilder woodland in the medians of the parkway, and developed a sequence of spaces and paths that would lead people to the waterfront through an alternating series of wild and constructed places. (Figure 6) For example, she attached a pedestrian bridge directly to the existing on-ramp of the parkway, so that pedestrians would experience the intensity of the roadway from a unique vantage immediately after emerging from the enriched woodland. Her goal was to accentuate
the experience of both places, leading to a sense of sublime awe in anticipation of arriving at the shoreline, itself framed between the Potomac River and the lower level of the parkway.

Figure 7 Will Scott’s proposed bathing facility sits underneath the elevated parkway.

Showering under the parkway, Will Scott.
Will Scott shifted the parkway inland where it would sit higher up the slope, allowing him to construct a bathing facility for bicycle commuters underneath the parkway. Cyclists would be able to ride to Rosslyn on the Mount Vernon Trail, store their bikes, shower, and make their way through an ascending set of courtyards and new buildings to reach the commercial heart of Rosslyn. The large piers of the elevated parkway would give the showers and locker facilities an industrial scale in notable contrast to the human scale of the bathers. A set of four conical stair towers allow pedestrians to cross over other roadways and then descend to ground level making a sequence of above ground, at-grade, and below ground spaces connecting the commercial district to the river.

A pop-up commercial bridge over the parkway, Runyu Ma.
Runyu Ma proposed a pair of long pedestrian bridges over the parkway to make a continuous walking loop from the Rosslyn commercial district to the river and back. The larger bridge is a structural frame designed for pop-up retail spaces, and it terraces down the slope in large steps with service cores at each of the level changes. The axis of the bridge extends into the river as a jetty, where it would collect sediments and form a natural beach on the upriver side. Water taxis and food boats would be able to dock on the downriver side to service the business community of Rosslyn. The second, smaller bridge has a gentle slope and a spiral access ramp so it can accommodate bicycles from the Mount Vernon Trail in addition to pedestrians. Storm water is also filtered on it and carried across the parkway in a small channel culminating in a waterfall at the edge of the river.
Figure 8  Runyu Ma’s pedestrian bridges bring workers over the parkway to the river.
Conclusion

These six proposals for redesigning the G.W. Parkway would each need tremendous development if they were to be implemented; and each, no doubt, would meet resistance from the very constituencies that have much at stake in the current design of the parkway. But implementation and practical solutions are not the point of this work. As stated earlier, these projects are intended to accelerate conversations about the relationships between the roadway, the water and the community.

On one level, they would seem to raise questions about acceptable change with regard to the historic roadway. Each proposes significant changes to the roadway, but many of them have precedence in the design of the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway or its extension into the George Washington Memorial Parkway. Ian Hunter’s causeway is reminiscent of the four causeways built for the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway, and Paige Courtney’s large retaining wall mimics those found on the final segment of the parkway, now called the Clara Barton Parkway. Various bridges have been added over the parkway, so bridging proposals also have precedence. True, none of these conditions occurred in this section of the parkway, which raises questions about the historical integrity of this actual design versus the original intention of the Memorial Highway to integrate community into the parkway landscape. By proposing a bold redesign of the parkway, but with precedents in other parts of the parkway, these designs open that discussion.

On another level, they give evidence of the kind of input students can have in a project. Landscape architecture programs regularly get requests from communities or organizations seeking design help, often along the line of, “Wouldn’t our project be great for your students?” Typically, the projects are indeed good projects, and the communities merit assistance. The problem is that design studios are better suited to explore a problem than resolve it. In most studios, students work individually on projects or in small groups; and, therefore, it is easier to produce fifteen or twenty schemes than it is to have one implementable scheme for a community. When Kris Krider suggested that students investigate the Rosslyn waterfront and propose schemes that would catalyze discussion about accessing the river, he tapped into the collective ability and strength of a design studio. In this case, the students’ lack of professional constraints was specifically valued and encouraged over the course of the semester; and, in turn, they were inspired to know their insights were going to matter. They felt they had something to offer as well as something to learn.

Overall then, the value of the students’ projects is precisely that they are not pragmatic responses. Rather, they constitute a body of creative scholarship, a collective investigation of site conditions, historical context and imagined futures. It is this combination of analysis and speculation that is their real value, and their work exemplifies the potential of such collaborative work between universities and communities or public organizations.
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