

Summary Meeting Notes
ALEXANDRIA WATERFRONT PLAN WORK GROUP
Wednesday, October 19, 2011
8:00 – 11:00 AM
City Council Work Room

MEMBERS

Christopher Ballard, At-Large Member. Principal at McWilliams/Ballard.

Bert Ely, At-Large Member. Head, Ely and Company; Board Member, Citizens for an Alternative Alexandria Waterfront Plan and Old Town Civic Association.

Mindy Lyle, At-Large Member. Vice President Client Development, Haley & Aldrich, Inc.; and President, Cameron Station Homeowners Association.

Nathan Macek, Waterfront Committee Chair and Representative, and Transportation Consultant.

David Olinger, Old Town Civic Association Representative. Realtor; and Senior Foreign Service Officer (Ret.) with a background in urban planning.

Elliot Rhodeside, At-Large Member. Principal, Rhodeside & Harwell, a firm offering urban planning and landscape design with a focus on revitalization and sustainability.

Councilman Paul Smedberg, Non-voting City Council Representative and Work Group Convener.

Lt. Gen. Bob Wood, (Ret.), At-Large Member. Alexandria resident and Business Owner.

FACILITATOR

Sherry Schiller, Ph.D., The Schiller Center

CITY STAFF

Faroll **Hamer**, Director, Planning and Zoning (P&Z); James **Banks**, City Attorney; Joanna **Anderson**, Assistant City Attorney; Karl **Moritz**, Deputy Director, P&Z; Barbara **Ross**, Deputy Director, P&Z; Tom **Canfield**, City Architect, P&Z; Al **Cox**, Historic Preservation Manager; P&Z; Nancy **Williams**, Principal Planner, P&Z; Ben **Aiken**, Urban Planner, P&Z; Emily **Baker**, City Engineer, Transportation and Environmental Services (T&ES); Jack **Browand** Department of Parks, Recreation and Cultural Affairs (RPCA); Jennifer **Harris**, Communications Officer, Communications; Sharon **Annear**, City Council Aide.

PUBLIC ATTENDEES – (list of those who signed in):

Gina **Baum**, Roderick D. **Belcher**, Christine **Bernstein**, Stephan **Brown**, Susan **Cohen**, **John Gosling (OTCA)**, Linda **Hafer**, Mitchell **Helbrecht**, Michael **Hobbs**, Andrew **Macdonald**, David **Miller** (Pillsbury-Winthrop), April **Noland** (AMGA), Kathryn **Papp**, Joanne **Platt**, Ann **Shack**, Carl **Smith**, Robert **Taylor**, Hugh **Van Horn**, Van **Van Fleet**, Margaret **Wood**, John **Whitestone**, Matthew **Whitestone**, Mike **Young (Old Towne Gemstones)**,

Media sign-in: Sharon **McLoone (Old Town Alexandria Patch)**.

I. Opening

A. Welcome - Smedberg convened the meeting at 8:05 AM, and Waterfront Plan Work Group (Work Group) members introduced themselves.

B. Meeting Overview

1. Continuation of the private realm discussion including:
 - a. Completion of staff presentation begun on October 12, 2011; and
 - b. Presentations from owners and/or developers of the three redevelopment sites:
 - (1) Carr Hospitality, LLC – 220 South Union Street (Duke Street, between S. Union Street and The Strand
 - (2) Lawrence N. Brandt, Inc. – 204 and 206 South Union Street, 2 and 10 Prince Street
 - (3) Robinson Terminal Warehouse Corporation – Robinson Terminal North and South
 - c. Public Comment Period

II. Organizational Items

A. Approval of 10/12/2011 Meeting Notes – Smedberg suggested and the Work Group agreed to defer the October 12, 2011 meeting notes to the next meeting to give the Work Group more time to review them.

B. Comment Board Summary – It was noted that the Comment Board Summary with the most recent comments is included in the day's meeting packet.

C. Updated Meeting Schedule - Smedberg pointed the Work Group to the Updated Meeting Schedule in the day's meeting packet reflecting additional meetings on October 26 at 8 AM in City Hall, November 2 at 8 AM in City Hall, November 9 at 8 AM in City Hall, November 16 at 8 AM in City Hall, and, if needed, November 30 at 8 AM. Smedberg indicated that he received a request to move the meeting of November 16 from morning to evening at 5:30 PM and the Work Group agreed. Rhodeside indicated that he would be out of town that day and Lyle indicated that she would be a little late. There is no meeting scheduled for the week of Thanksgiving.

A member questioned whether the Work Group would be done with its work by November 30, while another member indicated the Work Group should be done by that time if it moves quickly. Wood advised that in following up on Smedberg's earlier request, he and Macek will develop a table of contents/outline for the Work Group's Report, working this weekend to do so.

D. Status Report Discussion - Smedberg reiterated that the City Council would like something from the Work Group in the fall and the Work Group should try to accommodate that as best it can. He further stated that he has been providing them with brief updates on the progress of the Work Group during the

Orals portion of City Council meetings, with the more detailed Status Report to occur at the November 9, 2011 City Council meeting. He indicated the Status Report will reference the discussions completed to-date on the private and public statements and how that work will help form the foundation for the final Report.

III. Road Map – Private Realm

A. Proposed Zoning, Design Guidelines, and Community Benefits - presentation by Karl Moritz, Deputy Director, P&Z (Continuation of October 12 meeting presentation):

Moritz indicated he is utilizing slides and the Waterfront Model for his presentation, acknowledging that the model has been expanded to now include all the redevelopment sites. He also indicated that the model, as currently before the Work Group, reflects existing conditions for both the core and the Founders Park/Robinson Terminal North portions of the waterfront planning area. He stated that as he reviews options for the redevelopment sites, Canfield will replace the existing conditions with proposals identified under the Plan. It was clarified that the scale of the model is 1 inch equals 30 feet.

The presentation began with a recap of the FAR discussion from the last meeting:

- The zoning table slide shows only one redevelopment site with an increase to 3.0 FAR. Robinson Terminal North will increase to 1.7 FAR and Robinson Terminal South to 2.3 FAR.
- While FAR is important, it is equally important to have quality design compatible with Old Town's character.
- Examples of FAR at various ranges were shown, including Harborside (1.2 FAR), Abingdon Row (1.2 FAR), the Prescott (1.2 FAR), the Lorien (2.5 FAR), Chatham Square (2.3 FAR), and the Saul Center (2.5 FAR). In accommodating FAR, the Plan's development guidelines encourage use of open space, more porous buildings with alley ways, varying roof lines, and more accessibility to the public. The block where the Plan calls for a 3.0 FAR is where there is a 3.0 FAR building already--the 3-story Wattles Corn Mill, built in 1843. In that block, a series of small buildings with spaces separating them conveys a smaller feel than a 3.0 FAR. The Strand building from the water was also shown, indicating that it would feel smaller if there were two alley ways through it.
- The Plan calls for an increase in density in response to what Alexandrians asked for during many of the initial meetings of the planning process: (1) amenities such as more and better public spaces, a higher level of maintenance, public art, history, and more; and (2) more control over future development through site design, architecture, street scape, etc.

- To get all of those things, the tradeoff is more density. Some of those things are available from a developer without more density, but not all.
- To get a better understanding of what might work with some increased density, the 1982 settlement agreement densities were utilized, recognizing that they were caps, and acknowledging that the National Park Service and even people like Ellen Pickering in 1982 said this is something that would work.
- A variety of tests were done to that level of density to see if they would still work in 2011 by undertaking very detailed site designs with a variety of scenarios including parking layouts, hotel rooms with maximized views and residential units.
- Ways the Plan can achieve more amenities and control:
 - The 14 Development Guidelines in the Plan;
 - The Hotel and Restaurant Policy which describes issues which need to be addressed during the SUP process (finalized with assistance from the Old Town Civic Association); and
 - Heights under the Plan will not change except for one location – the west side of Robinson Terminal North will change from 55 feet to 66 feet – recognizing that the Height District but not the Zoning for this area already calls for 66 feet.

B. A review of the four basic waterfront development alternatives that P&Z presented to City Council in May 2011:

- Current Zoning with no Special Use Permit (SUP);
- Current zoning with SUP;
- The Planning Commission Recommendation; and
- The Parks and Museums Alternative.

- **Robinson Terminal North – Current Zoning, No SUP**
 - 1.0 FAR
 - 30 Ft Height Limit
 - 3-Story Garage Townhomes
 - Pathway, Shoreline Improvements not required
 - Future of Pier uncertain
 - Not subject to BAR – not in the Historic District
- **Robinson Terminal North – Current Zoning with SUP**
 - 2.0 FAR
 - 30, 45, and 55 Ft Height Limits
 - Mixed Use with Retail or 3-5 Story Garage Townhomes
 - Higher level of Public Investment: Pathway, Shoreline, Streetscape
 - Future of Pier uncertain
 - Not subject to BAR – not in Historic District
- **Robinson Terminal North - Planning Commission Recommendation**
 - Pier – With investment to double the amount of Public Space
 - 150 (or less) room Hotel east of Union Street (inspired by Alexandria architecture)
 - West side: 131 Housing Units west of Union Street shown
 - Parking On- site, Below Grade

- Extensive Investment in Public Space: Connecting Parks, Pathway, Streetscape, Shoreline, History and Public Art
- **Robinson Terminal North - Parks and Museum Alternative**
 - Passive Park on the east side of Union Street
 - Performing Arts Center on the west side at .75 FAR under current zoning 32,000 sf (higher with SUP)
 - Piers to be Stabilized
- **Robinson Terminal South – Current Zoning, No SUP**
 - 1.0 FAR
 - 30 Ft Height Limit
 - 3-Story Garage Townhouses or Mixed use with Retail
 - Access to Shoreline Pathway
 - Pathway, Shoreline Improvements not Required
 - Future of Pier uncertain
 - Subject to BAR Review
- **Robinson Terminal South – Current Zoning with SUP**
 - Up to 2.0 FAR, 50 Ft Height
 - Townhomes or Mixed use “Wrap” (Above Ground Parking Garage wrapped with Residential or Non-residential uses)
 - 175 Units, 87,000 SF Office (including Restaurant)
 - Higher level of Public Investment: Pathway, Shoreline, and Streetscape
 - Future of Pier uncertain
 - Subject to BAR Review
- **Robinson Terminal South - Planning Commission Recommendation**
 - 150 (or less) Room Hotel facing Water or Park
 - 180 Housing Units facing Union and Wolfe Streets
 - Ground Floor Retail facing Park and Duke Streets
 - Parking On-site, Below Grade
 - Porous Design: extend The Strand and create Alley Way
 - Extensive Investment in Public Spaces: Connecting Parks, Streetscape, etc.
- **Robinson Terminal South - Parks and Museum Alternative**
 - Retain 2-story 2 Duke Street and the Marine Supply Building
 - Passive Park
- **Cummings/Turner Block: – Current Zoning, No SUP**
 - 1.25 FAR
 - 30 Ft Height Limit
 - 3-Story Mixed use
 - Historic Structures – Adaptively Re-used
 - No Contribution to Point Lumley Park
 - Subject to BAR Review
- **Cummings/Turner Block – Current Zoning, With SUP**
 - Up to 2.0 FAR, 50 Ft Height Limit

- Village on The Strand Concept (Former Proposal)
- Residential over Retail/Restaurant
- Structured Parking
- Historic Structures – Adaptively Re-used
- SUP Process – Higher Level of Investment in Design/Streetscape
- Subject to BAR Review

Cummings/Turner Block – Planning Commission Recommendation

- Hotel on one or two Parcels
- Parking On-site, Below Grade
- Restoration of Historic Buildings
- Adaptive Reuse
- Contributions to the completion of Point Lumley Park
- Reopen Alley, Streetscape Improvements
- **Cummings Turner Block – Parks and Museums**
 - May Concept: Public Investment with a New Building and Historic Buildings
 - Art League, Seaport Museum, Archaeological Museum and Maritime Museum

C. Flood Plain Elevations (100 Year Flood Plain is Elevation 10)

- 2.5 Elevation – Foot of King Street
- 5.0 Elevation – Waterfront Park
- 8.0 Elevation – Cummings/Turner
- Above 100 Year Flood Plain – Slightly south of Robinson Terminal South

D. Discussion: Clarifications and Questions/Answers (staff responses are in italics)

- A flood protection strategy for the open space component would be at elevation 6, not at the 100 year flood elevation (10). You could add a series of steps or terraces to get to 10.
- Mean high tide is 2.2; mean low tide is -.9.
- Habitable space requires an additional foot so you go from an elevation of 10 to 11.
- Is it correct that what the model shows is just suggestive and property owners/developers could propose something different? *Yes, but what is shown in the model conforms to the controls discussed.*

- What are the plans for revitalizing the Torpedo Factory/Food Court site and doesn't it become a fourth site for redevelopment – including the possibility of introducing programming that uses the existing outside gazebo? *The properties in the Food Court area (the Torpedo Factory [including the Torpedo Factory Office Building and Arcade], Food Court, Chart House and nearby public space) are under a long-term lease which was entered into in the early 1980s to help encourage redevelopment of the waterfront at that time. The lessee has been discussing the possibility of redesigning or tearing down and rebuilding the Food Court in order to attract new restaurants. The Waterfront Plan provides guidelines for the site and also addresses the public space around it. The City's concept includes a redesign of the outdoor realm at this site, offering improvements such as more outdoor dining, screening for back of house activities off Thompson Alley and between the Food Court and the Chart House, and widening the promenade to the east of the Chart House to steer people waterside. The gazebo represents the identified need for having programming at waterfront sites to help attract people.*
- Are the two claws in the earlier version of the marina permitted by the Corps of Engineers? *The Corps did not indicate they would not approve them, or that they were impossible. They indicated they would have to go through the approval process. However, we chose to modify the design in a manner that meets the objectives of the Plan while reducing the investment that would be required and addressing some of the concerns which people had.*
- What options would be available for Old Dominion Boat Club (ODBC) members to park if the Plan replaces their parking lot with public open space? *By cutting the ODBC and Chadwick's parking lots and reducing on-street parking, the Plan eliminates over 200 surface parking spaces. The Fitzgerald Square proposal expects a successful resolution will be reached with the Boat Club. If a successful resolution is not achieved, there are several alternatives some of which were discussed with the Planning Commission in May. There may be some interim solutions that may include some parking but the Planning Commission does not see a parking lot as part of the long term vision for the Plan at this location. The demand for parking spaces eliminated at surface lots would be met by the hundreds of existing parking garage spaces within three to four blocks in either direction of King Street.*
- Who owns King Street Park? *The City.*
- How do housing and hotels differ in the amount of traffic they generate? *It doubles for housing, with housing generating most traffic during rush hour, while hotels generate their traffic outside rush hours. Additionally, most hotel guests are likely to use public transportation.*
- Did you assume the 1982 or 1992 densities when you did the zoning table because wouldn't the 82 densities result in a change of only 60,000 square feet? *The 1982 settlement agreements would allow an increase of 100,000 square feet*

on the two Robinson Terminal sites. The Plan would increase development potential on the Cummings/Turner site by 60,000 square feet.

- *How can the two parcels not designated for development or open space in Robinson Terminal North be utilized? They can be used as a private plaza or as private open space, and they can have temporary structures on them.*
- *If Robinson Terminal North is not in a Historic District, how will the design guidelines be effective and will design be more integral to the SUP process? More dependence will be placed on the design guidelines in the Plan; they will be the guide, working in conjunction with the SUP.*
- *It would be helpful for staff to provide a list of exclusions under the FAR, particularly for hotels. The Director explained that that level of detail is not typically part of a small area plan; however, the exclusions are in the zoning ordinance, which is available online.*
- *Where are the height districts codified? In the Zoning Ordinance and the Height District Map. Staff will provide the Height District Map.*
- *Have costs been generated related to improving the piers and what would that mean to the adjacent developments assuming that the developers would have to pick up those costs, including maintenance and dredging? Yes; those costs have been generated.*
- *How feasible it is to think in terms of retail on either of the two terminals? The demand for retail is less than it would be closer to King Street.*
- *What is the definition of a “working waterfront”? A “working waterfront” is a concept developed in the Waterfront History Plan. It reflects those activities that occurred near The Strand such as shipbuilding and warehouse activities.*
- *Isn't it expensive to build garages underground with the garage floor below mean high tide? The expense is related to the FEMA requirements for flood proofing. Anything built below grade, in the flood plain, must be flood proofed.*
- *Staff is requested to reorganize the Zoning Chart to reflect development in four categories: (a) existing, (b) by right, (c) settlement agreement and (d) the Plan.*
- *Is the model representative of the maximum height and footprint? It is the maximum height. In terms of the footprint, there is some flexibility in how it is arranged but it should be substantially the same.*

- A request is made for a dialogue with staff about the urban design opportunities that could be considered to make the Plan better if more flexibility in terms of height and density relative both buildings and open space is given.
- A request is made of staff for additional specificity about the Plan's potential positive and negative impacts: Where do the impacts occur? When do the impacts occur? What is the quantified nature of the potential impacts? Who will likely be impacted? For example, what locations are most vulnerable to congestion and at what times? The Work Group's requested Union Street traffic study was offered as an example of the type of additional information desired.
- How do BAR Guidelines for Union Street affect the waterfront? *BAR 1993 Design Guidelines include an entire chapter for buildings along the waterfront relating to height, setbacks, facades, material, etc. The BAR standards are 30 feet along certain street frontages with a setback above that to achieve a maximum height of 50 feet with a SUP. Cox and Canfield believe the representations in the model conform with the BAR Guidelines.*
- An interest in whether tour buses which now park along North Union Street would need to relocate and, if so, where? *They might need to relocate.*
- Members indicated that the presentation had clarified a number of issues and agreed that the model should be available at future meetings for their reference.

E. Developer Presentations

Developer 1: Cummings/Turner Block

- **Hammad Shah (Carr Hospitality LLC) and Jonathan Raq, Esq.**
 - Reviewed the 120-room (approximate) boutique hotel that Carr proposes at 220 S. Union Street site (approximately half acre of land) at 5 stories within the 50 ft. height limit. It is considering use of the Hotel Indigo brand with one relatively small restaurant, two small ground-floor meeting rooms for guests' use (approximately 500 square feet), and no conference facilities. Believes the proposal can be developed within the Plan guidelines. The property is under contract.
 - Hotel Indigo brand has 40 hotels worldwide; develops unique boutique hotels reflecting communities in which they reside.
 - Would develop a hotel that is consistent with Alexandria's charm/history within a 21st century context.
 - Hotel Indigo has a focus on corporate guests during the week and leisure on the weekends.
 - The rate would be for an upper end boutique hotel.
 - If current zoning for the site is not changed, Carr Hospitality would consider residential development.
 - Traffic study shows the impact of traffic and parking using residential as opposed to a hotel would be double.

- The hotel would have a \$14 million economic impact for Alexandria and create 30 jobs.
- **Members Discussion – Carr Proposal**
 - A question as to whether the market would accommodate the 450 high-end boutique hotel rooms comparable to those offered by Hotel Indigo? *Carr looks at the time frame and span for development; over the next 15 years, the market is probably there. The same applies to residential, with the market expanding over time.*
 - What is the number of rooms required for a hotel to be profitable? *A profitable hotel which meets the standards of the lenders and the investors has to be between 100 – 150 rooms. The average room size of the Indigo Hotel is 120 rooms. The Morrison House does not operate as an independent entity and likely could not be built today as an independent facility.*
 - A request was made for staff to provide the Carr representatives a copy of a letter to City Council from the Whitestones [who are among the members of the Turner family who own parcels in the Cummings/Turner block] in order to get Carr's perspective.

Developer 2: Cummings/Turner Block

- **Bobby Brandt (Lawrence N. Brandt, Inc.)**
 - The Brandts are the contract owner for 204 and 206 S. Union Street and 2 and 10 Prince Street.
 - Plans to restore the warehouses (204 and 206 S. Union Street), including relocating the building openings (windows and doors) exactly where City staff thinks they historically had been located; a review by BAR is required.
 - Intends to bring 204 and 206 S. Union Street up to today's code with an elevator, improved plumbing, HVAC, fire suppression and other features.
 - Use of 204 and 206 S. Union Street will be commercial with retail on the ground floor. There are 9 commercial tenants now, with a change to one commercial tenant as of January 1, 2013. No condos.
 - The tenants of 10 Prince Street and 2 Prince Street will stay for the time being due to long term leases.
 - Under the current existing zoning you could not do much with 2 Prince Street (Big Wheel Bikes); but, Brandt indicated it was purchased with the intention of developing it.
 - It is conceivable that the floor area of 10 Prince Street could be increased with a FAR of 3.0 but not by much.
- **Member Discussion – Brandt Proposal**
 - An interest in whether the Waterfront Plan affects the Brandts' plan for 204 and 206 S. Union Street. *For 204 and 206 S. Union Street will close on February 1. The Plan would offer an opportunity to restore the third floor of the warehouses and reclaim previous square footage (less than 2000 square feet).*

- **Owner 3: Robinson Terminal Warehouse Corporation (Washington Post)**
 - **Robert Taylor, Robinson Terminal Warehouse Corp (Washington Post); Duncan Blair, Esq., David Miller, Esq.**
 - Advised that unlike the developers who had described their plans for their Cummings/Turner block properties, the Washington Post Company is an owner, not a developer, and has no current plans to develop the Robinson Terminal properties.
 - Advised that the legal history provided to the Work Group at its meeting the previous week by the Deputy City Attorney accurately conveyed the history of the company's legal interactions with the City regarding Robinson Terminal development and density rights.
 - The Washington Post Company's interest is that when at some point in the future when the Robinson Terminal properties are eventually sold there will be "tools in the tool box to assure quality redevelopment" and believes that the 1982 Settlement Agreement heights and densities provide that without an SUP.
 - Advised that the company feels it can work within the Waterfront Plan even though it removes some of the owner's flexibility regarding development options.
 - Advised that when the company explored a possible sale in 2004 it learned that potential buyers were confused by what the City zoning requirements governing the site would be in light of the conflicting 1982 Agreement and 1992 zoning changes.

Member Discussion – Robinson Terminals

- Does Robinson Terminal own the piers and is Robinson Terminal used by the Coast Guard? *Robinson Terminal owns the piers and the Coast Guard uses the facility for "R&R" (rest and relaxation) visits.*
- What is the water depth and how far are the terminals from the channel? *The depth at the north terminal is 18-19 feet, and that terminal is 80 feet away from the channel; the depth at the south terminal is 17 feet and it is closer to the channel.*
- An question as to how members should reconcile the company's current support for the Plan's passage, especially its preference for hotels, with its April 5, 2011 letter to the Planning Commission saying it had serious concerns about the Plan's emphasis on hotels, referencing consultant views questioning the Plan's hotel analysis. *The current market would probably not support 450 boutique hotel rooms built at once but the Plan area could likely do so over the timeframe of the Plan.*
- A question as to whether the City's proposal for a placing a marina at the Robinson South Terminal is feasible. *The company does not have information to make that judgment.*

- Does the 1982 Settlement Agreement permit hotels? *That would need to be a change in the Settlement Agreement or an interpretation.*
 - Has Robinson Terminal looked at environmental considerations such as what remediation might be needed, particularly at Robinson Terminal North? And also are there concerns with archaeology impacts in terms of parking excavation? *Our basic due diligence does not bear out any environmental problem and archaeological assessments would be part of the cost of doing business.*
 - Did the Robinson Terminal owners think the City's 1992 zoning ordinance applied to them? *The owners believed the 3-way treaty (Settlement Agreement) was abrogated and that is what the lawsuit was about.*
 - A request that the Work Group add archeological concerns to the issues to be included in its report.
- **Plan Statements** – Deferred to next week.

IV. Public Comment Period

Van VAN FLEET – Highlighted concerns about flooding and recommended consulting Baltimore's environmental district planning staff to see if the Plan is feasible. Also suggested that the City Manager's Office put pressure on the lessee of the Food Court and indicated Union Street congestion continues to be a problem.

Margaret WOOD – Invited the Work Group to the Citizens for an Alternative Alexandria Waterfront Plan's (CAAWP) October 30 event at which time it will release its Plan.

Andrew MACDONALD: Indicated concerns about the number of issues that he says should have been on the table a long time ago and were never made part of the process. Believes development is the goal of the Plan and suggests the City is missing the opportunity to go in a different direction. Also stated that Citizens for an Alternative Alexandria Waterfront Plan (CAAWP) will release its own report on October 30.

Kathryn PAPP - Supports public- private collaboration, offering the examples of the City having pursued land swaps that resulted in two parks, Oronoco Bay and Founders Parks, on sites owned by corporations. Noted that even though King Street's urban renewal had led to some unattractive now-vacant commercial spaces the small merchants have stayed and have been the backbone of the community; questioned whether hotels would initiate sprawl and density over time such as the density at National Harbor.

Michael HOBBS - Supported members' request that the presentation use "existing uses" as the reference baseline; offered the City's BRAC experience of having a letter -- August 2008 letter -- assuring there was no need to worry about transportation impacts because no problems were anticipated on the horizon.

VI. Meeting Summary – Shortage of time for this section of the agenda.

VII. Next Meetings

- Wednesday, October 26, 2011, 8:00 – 11:00 AM, City Council Work Room
- Wednesday, November 2, 2011, 8:00 – 11:00 AM, City Council Work Room
- Wednesday, November 9, 2011, 8:00 – 11:00 AM, City Council Work Room
- Wednesday, November 9, 2011, 7:00 PM, City Council Meeting

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 AM.

DRAFT