

**Waterfront Plan Work Group Meeting  
Wednesday, November 30, 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.

**CITY**

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; Jack **Browand**, Deputy Director, Recreation, Parks and Cultural Affairs (RPCA); Cheryl **Lawrence**, Special Events Supervisor, RPCA; William **Skraback**, Deputy Director, T&ES; Sandra **Marks**, Chief, Planning, T&ES; Jennifer **Harris**, Communications Officer, Communications; Sharon **Annear**, Aide to Councilwoman Alicia Hughes.

**PUBLIC ATTENDEES** (list of those who signed in)

Engin **Artemel**, Gina **Baum**, Katy **Cannady**, John **Gosling** (OTCA), Al **Kalvaitis** (CAAWP), Marguerite **Lang**, Andrew **Macdonald** (CAAWP), Janice **Magnuson**, Kathryn **Papp**, Carl **Smith**, Hugh **Van Horn**, Van **Van Fleet**, Margaret **Wood**,

**MEDIA:** (signed in)

Sharon **McLoone** (Old Town Alexandria Patch)

Michael **Pope** (Alexandria Gazette)

- I. **Welcome and Introduction of Members** – Schiller welcomed everyone and the Work Group members introduced themselves. Schiller indicated Smedberg would be joining the Work Group later in the meeting due to an unexpected delay.

## II. Organizational Items

- A. November 9<sup>th</sup> Meeting Notes** – A motion by Olinger, and seconded by Lyle, to approve the November 9<sup>th</sup> meeting notes was agreed to by voice vote. It was explained that the November 9<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> meeting notes, before the Work Group today, do not include discussion related to the recommendations portion of those meetings. That information is to be included in the draft Report. The Work Group agreed they would like to have the notes in their entirety with the recommendations discussion included and requested that the November 9<sup>th</sup> and November 16<sup>th</sup> notes be resubmitted in their entirety for consideration at the December 8<sup>th</sup> meeting. Staff indicated the November 9<sup>th</sup> and November 16<sup>th</sup> meeting notes, in their entirety, would be forwarded later in the day to the Work Group and posted to the website.
- B. Comment Board Summary** - It was noted that the Comment Board Summary covering the period of November 17 – 28<sup>th</sup> is in the day's meeting packet.
- C. Meeting Schedule** - The Work Group agreed to defer discussion regarding the updated schedule until the end of the meeting with the idea that the Work Group would wait to see how much could be accomplished today and what would remain to be accomplished within the deadline.
- D. Follow-up from Previous Meetings** - Moritz went through a handout covering responses to the members' outstanding questions pertaining to the following items:
- (1) The legal status of the Waterfront Small Area Plan (SAP) and the proposed zoning text amendment;
  - (2) The format of the Work Group Report, with a question as to whether the SAP will be revised before the Work Group votes;
  - (3) Existing underground parking levels in various local hotels; and
  - (4) Information from the Historic Preservation staff's analysis of existing buildings on the waterfront that could not be built under current requirements or under the SAP proposed guidelines. The document covers that information and also significant information regarding elements of each building.
- E. Work Group Comments** – Comments from the Work Group to the provided information are noted below along with additional responses by staff highlighted in italics:
- Ely:** Indicated the Monaco has two levels, not one, and he requested the information be updated. He further requested that data regarding the number of parking levels in the Lorien and Hampton Inn also be added to the information. *Staff indicated it will follow-up with the updated and additional information.*
- Wood:** Indicated a request to understand the zoning. Stated the response to question #1 walks through the text amendment, the Plan, and the Plan as a legal planning document. But, the last sentence essentially says it will not be necessary for the Work Group to review the text amendment unless hotels were approved by the

Group. As an advisory group he indicated the Work Group does not approve measures; it just agrees on them; therefore, it would not approve hotels. He indicated that somehow the Plan that we are reviewing has the force of law . . . if something, right? *What the sentence says is if you consider, as part of your work, whether the Plan should have hotels and density increases, etc., you don't have to also look at the text amendment and go over those same issues again. That is all the last sentence says. Every critical issue that is in the zoning text amendment is covered in your discussion of the SAP. A SAP in Virginia does not have the legal status that zoning does.*

**Wood:** Do the guidelines and goals in the Plan have the force of law because they cause a change in the W-1 zoning? *Yes, by virtue of the sentence which refers to them.*

**Wood:** The way it has been described, the Plan does not have the force of law *but for* the reference back to the development goals and guidelines in the Plan (paragraph d) which then allows the Plan to be part of law. *Right.*

**Ely:** The proposed text change refers to a Waterfront SAP but it does not put a date on it. So, if the text amendment is adopted and becomes part of the zoning ordinance and another Waterfront SAP is adopted in a couple of years and it has different provisions, say the redevelopment of Canal Center as an random example, it seems to me that paragraph 5-504(d) of the text would still be applicable to the Waterfront SAP that may be adopted by the City Council next year and also to any future SAP. *The answer is yes if in adopting the subsequent SAP there is language saying we are amending the Alexandria Waterfront SAP. If they give it a different name or adopt it as a stand alone measure, not as a substitute, then it would be different.*

**Ely:** I think what the City Council might do, and I believe what we are being asked to endorse, is to make a permanent change in the zoning ordinance. Then separately and apart from the ordinance – at some time in the future -- there could be a new Waterfront SAP that, in effect, would key off paragraph 5-504(d). *We do this often with other small area plans in the City that are referenced in the zoning ordinance and then they are updated but the reference remains valid. And you would do what you would want the effect to be in the new plan you are adopting.*

**Ely:** Language like 5-504(d) titled FAR troubles me. It reads as follows: “Development sites in the waterfront plan/SUP. For property that is part of a redevelopment site identified in the waterfront small area plan, with a special use permit, the maximum floor area ratio may be increased, provided the development meets and is consistent with the Development Goals and Guidelines in the Waterfront plan for the property.” This concerns me as it reads like a blank check.

**Macek:** Is this any different than what is being used for other areas of the City? *No; we frequently refer to guidelines in the plan. All the CDDs are based on that. For*

*CDDs only, there is no height or density in the zoning ordinance; you have to go to the SAP and look at the CDD guidelines to determine what the answer is.*

**Ely:** Why is this language not already in the W-1 zone? Why are we putting this language in now? *Because we do not have design guidelines now in any plan that applies to the waterfront.*

**Wood:** It is important for me to get across that our decision and the Work Group's agreement with the SAP does in fact provide grounds for legally binding zoning by the reference made back to that point in the Plan.

**Ely:** This issue should be on the table as it is a very substantive matter.

**Schiller:** Please champion this question, Ely, so by the time we get to the Report, you will feel that the question has been adequately addressed.

**Ely:** Agreed.

### III. Recommendations

Schiller asked Moritz to provide background on how today's discussion on the Public Realm has been organized.

#### A. Discussion – Process for Considering Proposed Recommendations

- **Overview - Moritz:** Moritz indicated that at the request of Councilman Paul Smedberg, staff has identified recommendations under the Public Realm that were highlighted by three or more members for discussion. Those recommendations, and related issues, were then organized in a format where they can be discussed together. That approach has generated five issue areas under the Public Realm for discussion today with the first focusing on the Foot of King. As an example, he explained that for *the Foot of King Street*, the Plan has four recommendations – 3.63, 3.68, 3.69 and 3.75. In order that issues raised about these Plan recommendations can be discussed together, staff has clustered together all four of these Plan recommendations, members' written comments on them, and highlights from related previous discussions. Staff has also proposed wording for a consolidated Plan recommendation or recommendations that reflects the Work Group's earlier combined sentiments.
- **Overview – Schiller:** Schiller indicated that Councilman Smedberg's goal in taking this approach is to eliminate some of the steps so the Work Group can focus on those issues which members of the group believe are most important for consideration in the Report. Everyone's comments are preserved and aligned with a given issue and if anyone has proposed a related new recommendation, it has been included at the bottom. She indicated, again, that this approach has resulted in five issues for discussion today under the Public Realm. Schiller stated that for the foot of King Street, staff has taken members' recommendations and comments and has drafted a proposed change. The result consists of the elimination of 3.63 and 3.68; the elimination of part of 3.69 along with some new language that is underlined; 3.75 would also be eliminated; and there is a related proposed new recommendation that is being introduced by one of the members.

## B. Discussion - Foot of King Street

Moritz indicated he would use the handout provided to members to walk them through the process which is organized as follows:

- Discussion of related Plan Statements regarding the Foot of King Street
- Discussion of Staff and/or Member Proposals for the Foot of King Street
- Discussion of Previous Comments made by the Work Group
- November 30<sup>th</sup> Discussion on the Above
- November 30<sup>th</sup> Consensus of the Work Group

### (1) Discussion - Work Group Plan Statements on the Foot of King Street

- Where King Street meets the river, there should be a **significant public space** that acts as a gateway to the City from the river and offers a variety of activities for residents and visitors.
- A plan should include a new pier extending from near the foot of King Street for uses such as water taxis, permanent or visiting ships of character, and for people to walk along. The view of the Potomac River from King Street should be preserved.

### (2) Discussion - Staff Proposals: Foot of King Street

#### Issue 1: Recommendations related to the “significant public space” at the foot of King Street.

There are four recommendations for the foot of King Street that can be revised based upon the Work Group’s discussion and plan statements. Two points emerged from the Work Group’s discussion:

- that the plan should recommend a “significant public space” where King Street meets the river, and
- that if the ODBC parking lot is to be used for public space, it should be a mutually-agreeable result of negotiations between the City and ODBC.

**Revisions:** To address these points, staff suggests eliminating three of the recommendations and replacing them with a single recommendation (underlined text) based upon the WPWG’s plan statements. (**Black bold strikeout/underlined text** represents staff’s proposed changes; **red text** reflects later revisions by the Work Group during the 11.30.2011 Work Group discussion)

~~3.63 Create an exceptional public plaza/promenade from Union Street to the riverbank, replacing the unit block of King Street and King Street Park.~~ [Staff note: this recommendation is no longer needed, given other recommendations, including 3.69 below]

**3.68 3.69 Consider Pursue eliminating the ODBC parking lot along The Strand through negotiation with the ODBC.**

~~3.69~~ **3.68** ~~Create a new public park/plaza where the ODBC parking lot currently exists, with a public promenade along the water's edge from King Street to Waterfront Park. Consider naming the park/plaza after John Fitzgerald, one of the pivotal figures in Alexandria's maritime history. King Street, between Union Street and Where King Street meets the river, there should be a significant public space on King Street between Union Street and the river that acts as the gateway to the City from the river and offers a variety of activities for residents and visitors functions as the focal point of pedestrian-related waterfront activities for residents and visitors. The preferred approach for acquisition or use of the ODBC parking lot for public space is through negotiation with ODBC.~~

~~3.75~~ ~~Negotiate parking lot land transfer or acquisition with ODBC.~~

**Additional Recommendation:** related to the “significant public space” at the foot of King Street. Macek suggests a new recommendation for how interim use of ODBC parking lot should be reconfigured.

**NEW** ~~Any interim~~ At a minimum, improvements to this site reached through negotiation with the ODBC should include public access along the waterfront and preserve public access at King Street Park. Existing chain-link fencing should be removed or, if replaced, constructed of materials consistent with the architectural fabric of Old Town. Art and historic interpretation should be incorporated into the reconfigured site.

**(3) Discussion – Work Group Comments previously submitted on the above four recommendations:**

**Comments on 3.63**

1. See comments on 3.62. (Wood)
2. There are no practical alternatives to the present size and location of the ODBC parking lot. Also, the lot should not be downsized. (Ely)
3. This may not be part of the plan based on the ODBC property being removed. (Lyle)
4. Discuss in lieu of alternate plan for the parking lot. (Ballard)

**Comments on 3.68**

1. We need to look at an alternate plan that beautifies the parking and re-plans the area. (Ballard)
2. Modify to call for "re-envisioning" rather than "elimination" of ODBC parking area. Couple with a parallel recommendation to Council that the Work Group supports using negotiation as the preferred negotiation strategy. (Macek)
3. Add the word “preferably” after The Strand; the parcel is too important to tie the City’s hands. (Olinger)

4. Inadequate recommendation in light of the protracted negotiations facing the city as it attempts to reverse a federal court ruling. It is fine to pursue negotiations with ODBC. But, this recommendation should also state that the city should pursue a feasible alternative to accomplish its goals at the foot of King Street. (Wood)
5. This idea is an absolute non-starter. Drop it! (Ely)
6. This should no longer be discussed; the plan should move forward without ODBC. (Lyle)

**Comments on 3.69**

1. This idea is an absolute non-starter. Drop it! (Ely)
2. This should no longer be discussed; the plan should move forward without ODBC. (Lyle)
3. See above. (Ballard)
4. No; Our plan statements call for a significant public space at this location, not Fitzgerald Square (see E1, Public Realm - Foot of King). Fitzgerald Square as presented and detailed in the WFP depends on judicial reversal of federal court settlement with the Boat Club and reference to this entity misleads the public and their accurate understanding of the WFP. Further, it masks the very real work still to be done to present a feasible alternative to Fitzgerald Square in the plan. (Wood)

**Comments on 3.75**

1. See above. [3.68] (Ballard)
2. See 3.68 comment. (Wood)
3. There are no practical alternatives to the present size and location of the ODBC parking lot. Also, the lot should not be downsized. (Ely)
4. Same as above. [3.68] (Lyle)

**(4) Discussion - November 30<sup>th</sup> Discussion: Foot of King Street**

3.63: Staff proposal to eliminate  
 3.68: Staff proposal to eliminate  
 3.69: Staff proposal to revise as follows  
 3.75: Staff proposal to eliminate  
 New Recommendation: Nate Macek above

**3.69 Revised Language:** “Where King Street meets the water, there should be a significant public space that acts as a gateway to the City from the river and offers a variety of activities for residents and visitors. The preferred approach for acquisition or use of the ODBC parking lot is through negotiation with ODBC.”

- **Ballard:** Is this where we would discuss looking at the bottom of King and Union Streets. If the parking lot is off the table perhaps some of the uses that were being considered for Fitzgerald Square could be moved to King and Union Street where there could be a pedestrian plaza area. We

talked about modifying the trolley turnaround to make the area more pedestrian oriented. *Yes.*

- **Wood:** Is this the central place, and only instance, where we would discuss the variety of issues at the foot of King Street, namely, the trolley parking, tour bus access, and the proposed one-meter elevation in the roadway. *We have spent time on those items during your discussion on parking and traffic. In addition, in starting the Public Realm last week, you also talked about some of those items.*
- **Wood:** This process allows us to go through the recommendations but there will be other issues, and recommendations that we may want to suggest and review as a Work Group and add in the Report.
- **Macek:** Suggested that prior to next week's meeting, members should submit in writing any additional recommendations they would like considered.
- **Work Group:** The Work Group agreed with the Macek suggestion.
- **Ely:** Suggested it would be helpful for the Work Group to see a clean-copy version of the final set of the revised recommendations as approved (absent strikethroughs).
- **Work Group:** The Work Group agreed that the clean copy would be done as part of the draft Report.
- **Schiller:** A fair amount of time has been spent on the Public Realm so it will be important for the Work Group to get through these five issue areas to enable it to move to the Private Realm. The goal is to discuss this issue as a whole by hearing where there is Work Group agreement or disagreement with the elimination of the language that is crossed out, the addition of the new language for 3.69, and the new recommendation that has been proposed.
- **Wood:** In looking at the last sentence which includes the preferred approach language, the question becomes what is the alternative approach? Not aware of an effective alternative except for negotiation with the landlord. Preferred -- without an alternative -- is as equally problematic as using the word "eliminate."
- **Ely:** The inference is that there may be other potential alternatives one of which may be eminent domain and some feel eminent domain should not be used for any private property acquisition along the waterfront.
- **Olinger:** Questions the idea of a preferred approach. Stated for the record he does not rule out anything, including the possibility of eminent domain if the City determines that it is legally able to do that. With regard to the last sentence, it doesn't belong there. It is implementation rather than a planning consideration. The foot of King Street is the pivotal point – the focal point – of the whole Plan but circumstances haven't been resolved. Agrees with the statement but where is the plan?
- **Rhodeside:** Suggest striking "offers a variety of" and replace it with ***"functions as a focal point for pedestrian related waterfront activities for residents and visitors."*** Olinger is correct; it is important to emphasize that the foot of King Street is the focal point of the waterfront area. It is



one of the key open spaces in the City; it needs to be pedestrian-oriented and it needs to be compatible in its programming for its setting on the waterfront.

- **Work Group:** Agreed on the above change.
- **Olinger:** That is correct. However, it still leaves a basic plan problem in that if this is the focal point of the Plan, it is important to identify how you are addressing it and that is not evident.
- **Rhodeside:** Whether one agrees with the design or not, the programmatic uses in the model are pedestrian oriented and the model offers an open vista for the area.
- **Ballard:** Clarification is needed of the area that we are talking about.
- **Work Group:** Members agreed the language could be clarified to state *There should be a significant public space on King Street between Union Street and the River.*
- **Ballard:** Olinger is right; if we don't achieve Fitzgerald Square then this area will need to be re-programmed.
- **Hamer:** Keep in mind there are two options on the table. One is to endorse the parking lot that is there now and the other is to endorse a public space.
- **Macek:** That is what the new suggested recommendation is aiming at. There is a vision for Fitzgerald Square but what happens if that is not achieved and what occurs in the meantime. The Work Group may think it is too prescriptive but it focuses more on the parking lot area itself rather than the area between The Strand and Union Street. The unit block of King Street is where interim uses could be addressed.
- **Wood:** The unit block of King Street is the area where King Street Park is located.
- **Hamer:** If you are not including the parking lot as a part of the significant space then you are endorsing having the parking lot remain there as a permanent use.
- **Wood:** The idea is to continue to negotiate so that the option of using the full parking lot remains open. 3.68 would do that and in the meantime you work on an interim solution.
- **Rhodeside:** "Consider" in 3.68 is not a strong enough word.
- **Work Group:** There was agreement to replace the word "Consider" with "*Pursue*" in 3.68 and to restore that recommendation.
- **Ballard:** If the parking lot never happens; if it is not achievable, then we should not define it as a failure.
- **Lyle:** Reminded the Work Group of the Georgetown example: it took decades before the then-existing parking lot could finally be converted to a lovely public park.
- **Rhodeside:** We have failed if we don't make a strong statement of how we treat this whole area.
- **Ely:** The parking lot – and boat launch area -- is not going away anytime soon so there is a need to be realistic and to focus on a plan "B" using the unit block of King Street and the existing King Street Park.

- **Macek:** The relevant questions that should be addressed include: if the parking lot goes away what do we do? And, if the parking lot stays, what do we do?
- **Rhodeside:** It is important to work toward a resolution with the ODBC of a vision and not to waffle. There are many interim alternatives but it is important to be visionary and if you have an alternative you give up the big vision.
- **Ballard:** The word interim seems as if we haven't gotten there.
- **Macek:** You can take the word "Interim" out of the new recommendation and replace it with "*at a minimum.*"
- **Work Group:** Agreed with the change.

**(5) Discussion - Work Group Consensus: Foot of King Street**

- **Schiller:** This is what I think you are saying and I suggest reordering it as follows (**Black bold strikeout/underlined text** represents staff's proposed changes; **red text** reflects later revisions by the Work Group during the 11.30.2011 Work Group discussion)
- **Vote #1:** 3 (Lyle, Olinger, Rhodeside) voted to include only the first recommendation; 3 (Ballard, Macek, Wood) voted for all three recommendations and 1 (Ely) voted against them all.
- **Vote #2:** General consensus, except Ely, to include the first recommendation and to move the other two to implementation.

**#1 Recommendation:**

**There should be a significant public space on King Street between Union Street and the river that acts as the gateway to the City from the river and offers a variety of activities for residents and visitors functions as the focal point of pedestrian-related waterfront activities for residents and visitors. The preferred approach for acquisition or use of the ODBC parking lot for public space is through negotiation with ODBC.**

**#2 Recommendation:**

~~Pursue~~ Consider eliminating the ODBC parking lot along The Strand through negotiations with ODBC.

**#3 Recommendation:**

**At a minimum, Any interim improvements to this site reached through negotiation with the ODBC should include public access along the waterfront and preserve public access at King Street Park. Existing chain-link fencing should be removed or, if replaced, constructed of materials consistent with the architectural fabric of Old Town. Art and historic interpretation should be incorporated into the reconfigured site.**

- **Olinger:** For plan purposes I am ok with the first recommendation but I suggest taking out the second and third recommendations. They are not necessary; they are implementation. The others are the “how” and not the “what.”
- **Macek:** I think it is important to express that negotiation is the preferred approach and to make some statements about how the City goes about implementing it.
- **Ballard:** It is important to start with a vision. 3.69 should be the lead recommendation.
- **Rhodeside:** The parking lot’s location makes it intrinsic to other statements relating to flood mitigation, the river’s water level rise, and other open spaces in that area. If one is looking to employ flood-proofing measures in the design of this area, one needs to look at a broader area and not separate this open space area from the broader areas on either side north or south. It needs to be designed as part of a larger open space. Each part of the waterfront needs to relate to the overall design.
- **Wood:** The foot of King Street has to be flood resistant.
- **Ely:** What does the phrase in the new recommendation *include public access along the waterfront* mean?
- **Macek:** My intent in writing it is that some of the alternatives for that site involve some type of pedestrian access on the waterside of that site.
- **Ely:** This has come up in the negotiations between the ODBC and the City. There has been talk of some kind of walkway that would connect on the waterfront side of King Street Park and Waterfront Park. Even within the ODBC, I have been strongly opposed to that recommendation. It would result in an isolated walkway that would not be in view of any street or building and therefore would create a public safety issue. It is much more appropriate to have people walking along The Strand. There are other places along the waterfront where you can’t walk right at the water’s edge.
- **Rhodeside:** The Plan should not include any interim solutions. The ultimate solution – the vision – is what we should be designing. With the parking lot eliminated, there will be more people in the area and public access and safety will be enhanced.
- **Ely:** So where would the parking go?
- **Rhodeside:** That is part of implementation.

(6) **Vote: November 30<sup>th</sup> Discussion - Foot of King Street**

- **Vote #1:** 3 (Lyle, Olinger, Rhodeside) voted to include only the first recommendation; 3 (Ballard, Macek, Wood) voted for all three recommendations and 1 (Ely) voted against them all.
- **Vote #2:** General consensus, except Ely, to include the first recommendation and to move the other two to implementation.
- **Ely:** I am not going to agree with any of the three statements.

**C. Issue 2: New Pier and Historic Ships in the vicinity of the foot of King Street**

Moritz indicated he would use the handout provided to members to walk them through the process which is organized as follows:

- Discussion of Recommendations and Staff and/or Member Proposals for the New Pier and Historic Ships
- Discussion of Previous Comments made by the Work Group
- November 30<sup>th</sup> Discussion/Consensus on the Above

**(1) Discussion - Recommendations and Staff and/or Member Proposals for the New Pier and Historic Ships**

Moritz indicated there are three recommendations related to the proposed new pier in the vicinity of the foot of King Street. The recommendation can be revised to reflect the Work Group's thoughts on Fitzgerald Square as well as specific comments on each point. Staff proposes several edits to address Work Group concerns (**Black bold strikeout/underlined text** represents staff's proposed changes; **red text** reflects later revisions by the Work Group during the 11.30.2011 Work Group discussion.):

- Recognizing that the location of the pier will need to accommodate the current status of the ODBC parking lot as well as interim or ultimate agreements with ODBC;
- Recognizing that some potential locations for the pier would result in the historic ship not being visible from King Street; and
- Deleting recommendation 3.80 as unnecessary since the negotiations with ODBC are referenced in other recommendations.

**3.77** ~~Create a new commercial pier off Fitzgerald Square in the vicinity of the foot of King Street to accommodate water taxis and historical vessels.~~ **[Implementation: Pier designs shown in this Plan are illustrative; the ultimate engineering and design will be determined during the implementation phase and may be of a different length, width or location from that shown in the Plan. Pier location and design should be compatible with interim or ultimate agreements with ODBC.]**

**3.78** ~~Attract a tall ship or other ship of character preferably to be berthed at the new pier (with ability to provide other berthing opportunities along the waterfront for other ships). and visible from King Street. (Bert disagrees)~~

### **3.80 ~~Negotiate dock and boat ramp agreements with ODBC.~~**

#### **(2) Discussion – Work Group Previous Comments on above Recommendations**

##### **Comments on 3.77**

1. Also supports Plan Statement E2. (Macek)
2. This recommendation reflects a key weakness of the proposed waterfront plan -- a lack of specificity as to where key water-related activities will be located, notably the docking and service facilities for the commercial boats serving Old Town. Further, Fitzgerald Square is a non-starter. (Ely)
3. Pier should be relocated (Lyle)
4. Consider line of sight to the river in locating berthing facilities for boats. (Rhodeside)
5. See above. (Ballard)
6. No; Conflicts with language in H3 Plan Statement in Marina statements. (Wood)
7. This assumes Fitzgerald Square exists; is this a long term recommendation Relocating water taxis would necessitate supporting infrastructure. Why shouldn't water taxis be placed with other commercial water uses? (Olinger)

##### **Comments on 3.78**

1. Also supports Plan Statement E2. (Macek)
2. A tall ship or a "ship of character" (whatever that means) should be located adjacent to and be an element of a maritime/riverine-related museum. Such a ship should not be stuck in a no-man's land, as proposed here. (Ely)
3. This is implementation and not planning. (Lyle)
4. See comment for 3.77. (Rhodeside)

##### **Comments on 3.80**

1. Also supports Plan Statement E2. (Macek)
2. What does this statement mean? (Ely)
3. Move forward without ODBC. (Lyle)
4. What does this mean? (Olinger)

(3) **Discussion - November 30<sup>th</sup> Discussion/Consensus on New Pier, Historic Ships**

- **Wood:** How many ships of character are anticipated and where would they be located?
- **Rhodeside/Lyle:** The discussion should not be focused on implementation matters.
- **Wood:** This Group should talk about the number and location because those factors will come with impacts that are important to understand.
- **Macek:** There presently is not a historic ship at the waterfront, but if one is acquired it should be at the foot of the City's historic street, King Street.
- **Rhodeside:** What is important is that there is a program in the Plan for a historic ship. What Macek is saying is important. Also, the goal should be to attract a historic ship to the waterfront area and to look at the waterfront as a whole when considering where to locate it.
- **Ely:** A ship should be up at West's Point, rather than the foot of King Street; it should be tied into a maritime museum. Suggested to delete 3.78. Not even sure water taxis should be located at the foot of King Street. Maybe pleasure boat visitors should tie up there instead.
- **Rhodeside:** The foot of King Street should be considered but there are likely other locations that are appropriate as well for ships of character. Additionally, there should be a statement related to engineering and design because those studies will influence the location.
- **Schiller:** Let's review the language for each of the recommendations as proposed, starting with 3.77.
- **Ballard:** Is this the appropriate place to indicate a desire to locate personal watercraft in the more central area such as the foot of King?
- **Rhodeside:** The Plan's recommendation for personal watercraft is only a few blocks away.
- **Ely:** In 3.77, can we say historic and other vessels?
- **Macek:** It is important to have the water taxis where people can easily see and access them.
- **Wood:** Is there a statement that can speak to transient tie-ups? Such as a recommendation that puts the transient boater back in the picture.
- **Macek:** There is a location for transient tie-ups now along The Strand and conceivably the overnight vessels would be in the private marina.
- **Moritz:** There is some language which might speak to what Wood is saying on page 7.
- **Ballard:** What about kayaks?
- **Moritz:** There are two kayak launches in the Plan and one at Windmill Hill Park and one at Jones Point Park.
- **Ely:** How will the commercial boats operate efficiently if their docks are in different places, such as the cruise boats being separated from the water taxis?
- **Charlotte Hall:** In a way, it does make sense to have services all together but then again the Potomac River Boat Company and the Dandy have told staff that if they are located all together it will cause too much congestion.

- **Ely:** Thank you, Charlotte, that makes sense to me now from a business point of view.
- **Olinger:** Everything after the first sentence in 3.77 is really implementation.
- **Lyle:** It makes sense to move it to implementation.

**(4) Discussion - Work Group Consensus on New Pier and Historic Ships**

- **Work Group:** Based on the Work Group’s comments, the staff edits were revised as noted with there being general consensus in support of the revisions, except for 3.78 to which *Ely* voted no.

**D. Issue 3 – Parks and Public Spaces**

**Discussion – Parks and Public Spaces**

Moritz indicated he would use the handout provided to members to walk them through the process which is organized as follows:

- Discussion of elated Plan Statements regarding Parks and Public Spaces
- Discussion of Staff and/or Member Proposals for Parks and Public Spaces
- Discussion of Previous Comments made by the Work Group
- November 30<sup>th</sup> Discussion/Consensus on the Above

**(1) Discussion – Work Group Plan Statements for Parks and Public Spaces**

- A plan should improve the quality, design and programming of existing parks and public spaces.
- There should be continuous public access to the shoreline from Daingerfield Island to Jones Point Park.
- There should be a meaningful increase in parks and public spaces along the waterfront.
- Parks and public spaces should support activities for a wide range of users including families and children.
- There should be both active and passive uses in the public spaces along the waterfront.
- Parks and public spaces should be respectful of Alexandria’s history.
- *The City should consider its parks and open spaces as an integrated system. It needs to have a holistic design vision.*
- There must be active, integrated management of the public spaces, both maintenance and programming.

**(2) Discussion - Previous Work Group Previous Comments and Staff and/or Members Proposals: Parks and Public Spaces**

Several Work Group members suggested that a recommendation be added to address plan statement F7: *"The City should consider its parks and open spaces as an integrated system. It needs to have a holistic design vision."* The Work Group also discussed the importance of applying a *holistic, integrated approach to maintenance and programming*. A new recommendation on this subject would logically be located among the other “waterfront-wide” recommendations on page 37 of the Plan.

**New:** The parks and public spaces of the Waterfront should be considered an integrated system and should have a holistic design vision. [maybe also implementation: “Similarly, Waterfront public spaces should be actively managed – both maintenance and programming – as an integrated system.” [add also an implementation statement to urge city manager to reorganize or create a management structure with responsibility for the waterfront].

**(3) Discussion - Work Group Comments related to Parks and Public Spaces**

- Need to have recommendation that addresses the Plan Statement F7: "The City should consider its parks and open spaces as an integrated system. It needs to have a holistic design vision." (Macek)
- The City should consider its parks and open spaces as an integrated system. It needs to have a holistic design vision. (Wood)
- There must be active, integrated management of the public spaces, both maintenance and programming. (Wood)

**(4) Discussion - November 30<sup>th</sup> Discussion/Consensus on Parks and Public Spaces**

- **Wood:** Are we saying that this is not piecemeal management?
- **Moritz:** Suggested that there be an implementation statement that the City Manager reorganize staffing as needed to facilitate management.
- **Schiller:** The first sentence has to be as strong and clear as possible regarding having a great open space in this area.
- **Ballard:** What should not happen is that a whole new bureaucracy is created.
- **Olinger:** When we get to implementation, how management occurs will need to be discussed in more than 2 or 3 sentences. It is a very important part of the Plan.
- **Ballard:** There has been talk about phasing related to flood mitigation but it would be great if there could be something in the Plan that talks about enhancing Waterfront Park under Phase I.
- **Wood:** Nothing has been said about linking Waterfront Park to King Street’s public space.
- **Work Group:** There was general consensus on the statement, while identifying parts of it for implementation as noted above. Members also agreed on the importance of upgrading Waterfront Park as an urgent priority in Phase 1 of implementing the Plan.



#### **E. Issue 4 – Marina, Piers and Shoreline and Public Boat Ramp**

Moritz indicated he would use the handout provided to members to walk them through the process which is organized as follows:

- Discussion of elated Plan Statements regarding Marina, Piers, Shoreline and Public Boat Ramp
- Discussion of Staff and/or Member Proposals regarding Marina, Piers, Shoreline and Public Boat Ramp
- Discussion of Previous Comments made by the Work Group
- November 30<sup>th</sup> Discussion/Consensus on the Above

#### **(1) Discussion – Work Group Plan Statements regarding Marina, Piers and Shoreline and Public Boat Ramp**

- A plan should include options for expanding docking locations for commercial boats (water taxis and tour boats) as well as permanent or visiting ships of character.
- A plan should include the option of a new pleasure boat marina in the Waterfront Plan area. Consideration should be given to a variety of options for operation (public, public-private, private or other).
- Conceptually, pleasure and commercial boat activities should be separated. Commercial boat activities should generally be north of King Street (primarily the Torpedo Factory/Chart House area).
- Environmental issues should be addressed in the design and engineering of shoreline improvements.
- Where possible, rip-rap should be replaced with a more natural shoreline treatment.
- In principle, a plan should incorporate the concepts embodied in the Waterfront Committee's Marina Vision Statement and Briefing Paper.
- A public boat ramp for trailered vessels is incompatible with the center of Old Town; trailered boat ramp activity should be accommodated elsewhere in the Waterfront study area or nearby.
- The plan should include locations for launching non-trailered watercraft, such as canoes and kayaks.

#### **(2) Discussion – Recommendations and Staff and/or Members Proposals**

Schiller explained the following edits to the recommendations were made to better conform to the Work Group's plan statements (**Black bold** ~~strikeout/underlined text~~ represents staff's proposed changes; **red text** reflects later revisions by the Work Group during the 11.30.2011 Work Group discussion.):

- 3.82** ~~Create a new pleasure boat marina at Robinson Terminal South. Consider private construction and operation, possibly in conjunction with a redeveloped Robinson Terminal South redevelopment.~~ **If there is a The Alexandria City (pleasure boat) Marina, it Any pleasure boat marina should be a**

modern, well-maintained facility for docking boats that meets the technical specifications and market demands of recreational boaters. Re-locate the pleasure boat marina to avoid conflicts with commercial operations. The preferred location is Robinson Terminal South. The Marina should be a self-sufficient enterprise, with user fees covering the cost of operations, maintenance, and capital improvements that primarily benefit boaters. Consider private construction and operation.

- 4.26 Commercial and pleasure boat activity should be segregated as much as possible to enhance each operation. ~~Commercial boating should be combined together in the vicinity of King Street; pleasure boat marina should be moved to the south~~ Commercial boat activities should generally be north of King Street (primarily the Torpedo Factory/Chart House area).
- 4.27 Water taxi stops should be added ~~at considered for the King Street pier considered pursued for the new pier in the vicinity of the foot of King Street~~ in order to reinforce Fitzgerald Square that area as the “hub” of the waterfront and make the commercial boat operations, especially the water taxi, more visually and physically accessible to the public. Additional stops may be considered.
- 4.31 ~~The Plan recommends that a new pleasure boat marina be located offshore of Robinson Terminal South. Tie-ups should be available in front of Waterfront Park and The Strand for~~ Appropriate accommodation should be made for daytrippers visiting by boat. possibly in the vicinity of Waterfront Park and The Strand.

NEW: Additional WPWG Recommendation on Marina, Piers and Shoreline – Having a public boat ramp for trailered vessels is incompatible with Old Town. Nate Macek suggests the following new recommendation to address the WPWG’s plan statement:

“A public boat ramp for trailered vessels is incompatible with the center of Old Town; trailered boat ramp activity should be accommodated elsewhere in the Waterfront study area or nearby.”

### (3) Discussion - Work Group’s Previous Comments on the above Recommendations

#### Comments on 3.82

1. This marina idea is a non-starter because (1) the Army Corp of Engineers is highly unlikely to approve it and (2) it will not be feasible to provide sufficient parking for the proposed marina because below-grade parking is not feasible in the waterfront area. (Ely)

2. Need to make this recommendation consistent with Waterfront Committee recommendations. Consider, “The Alexandria City Marina should be a modern, well-maintained facility for docking boats that meets the technical specifications and market demands of recreational boaters. Re-locate the pleasure boat marina to avoid conflicts with commercial operations. The preferred location is Robinson Terminal South. The Marina should be a self-sufficient enterprise, with user fees covering the cost of operations, maintenance, and capital improvements that primarily benefit boaters. Consider private construction and operation.” Note that this recommendation is reiterated in 4.31 and that points raised in re-written recommendation are addressed in 4.32. (Macek)
3. No; Yes to more marinas, but...Traffic, amenities, roadways, compatibility of public uses in concert with dock operations here are all left undefined and unstudied. Size of the marina is less than suggested as economically viable by Waterfront Commission. Docks, as depicted, extend 330 feet into the navigable channel. No sense from Army Corps of Engineers if plan is feasible or acceptable. No mention made of plans or intentions to restore the viability of City Marina, even as we suggest a much larger marina is likely in the interest of some future developer. Public space expansion on RTS pier conflicts with expected private Marina operation. We continue to ignore the obvious alternative. Since we are suggested a "potential site" for a marina, it's appropriate to address the GenOn site as another "potential" site. Such a suggestion is easily added in the last paragraph on pg 82, ie....the waterfront ...could include a significant new public amenity, like a marina. (Wood)
4. Are we convinced that a marina at RTS is possible? 4.26 should say “moved elsewhere” rather than “to the south”. What is Plan “B” for private boats? (Olinger)

#### **Comments on 4.26**

1. Are we convinced that a marina at RTS is possible? 4.26 should say “moved elsewhere” rather than “to the south”. What is Plan “B” for private boats? (Olinger)
2. State that pleasure marina “should be moved elsewhere” instead of “to the south.” Also supports Plan Statement H6. (Macek)
3. No; no mention of restoring the viability of the city marina. Additional pleasure boat marina space should be sought on the river. (Wood)
4. Segregating commercial boats from pleasure boats is highly desirable but a marina off the south Robinson Terminal is a non-starter. (Ely)

#### **Comments on 4.27**

1. Needs further discussion in lieu of potential ODBC changes. (Ballard)
2. This assumes Fitzgerald Square exists; is this a long term recommendation? Relocating water taxis would necessitate supporting infrastructure. Why shouldn't water taxis be placed with other commercial water uses? (Olinger)
3. No; This "hub" is dependent on an agreement with ODBC and reversal of a federal court decision regarding the property disputes with the city. The

commercial "port" is suggested to be north of King Street, and particularly in the area of the Torpedo Factory, see H3. (Wood)

4. Neither Neither Fitzgerald Square nor a pier at the bottom of King Street is going to be built. Also, the present waterfront plan lacks clarity as to where the commercial boats are going to be docked. This recommendation needs to be completely rethought. (Ely)
5. May need to be moved away from ODBC (Lyle)

#### **Comments on 4.31**

1. Are we convinced that a marina at RTS is possible? 4.26 should say "moved elsewhere" rather than "to the south". What is Plan "B" for private boats? The first part of 4.31 is repetitive. (Olinger)
2. Delete "should be located offshore of Robinson Terminal South" and instead state that it "should be separated from the commercial users. This recommendation should be consistent with 3.82. (Macek)
3. No, see comments above (Wood).
4. This marina idea is a non-starter because (1) the Army Corp of Engineers is highly unlikely to approve it and (2) it will not be feasible to provide sufficient parking for the proposed marina because below-grade parking is not feasible in the waterfront area. While the idea of tying up day-trippers resembles the tie-up facilities at Washington Harbor in Georgetown, one must ask if there are sufficient differences between the two docking facilities as to render the idea of day-tripper docking in Waterfront Park impractical, especially from a security perspective. (Ely)

#### **(4) Discussion – November 30<sup>th</sup> by Work Group Discussion/Consensus**

- **Macek:** Explained the logic in separating the commercial and pleasure boat locations.
- **Ely:** What do you do with existing docks if they are no longer used for pleasure boats? If the Robinson Terminal South is not a good place for a marina, then where do you locate a pleasure boat marina?
- **Hamer:** The leased pleasure boat slips are subsidized by the City. An engineering study will help determine if there will be an Alexandria City marina and where it would be.
- **Ely:** Putting that qualifier in the recommendation would be helpful.
- **Rhodeside:** A statement is needed that speaks to accommodating boating activities in an integration fashion while not tying the City's hands in terms of implementation.
- **Olinger:** Begin with "*Any pleasure boat marina*" instead of Alexandria's marina.
- **Work Group:** Work Group agreed with the change.
- **Macek:** In explaining his new recommendation, Macek said that this was a plan statement that did not have a corresponding recommendation so he made it a recommendation.
- **Ely/Lyle:** Delete in 4.31 *possibly in the vicinity of Waterfront Park and The Strand.*

- **Wood:** Add *additional accommodation should be made* in 4.31
- **Wood:** Add *Additional stops may be considered* to 4.27
- **Work Group:** There was agreement with all the changes, including the new statement, with the idea that the Work Group will want to revisit this issue area.
- **Vote:** Agreed: Ballard, Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood

**F. Issue 5 - Art and History**

**(1) Discussion – Work Group Plan Statements on Art and History**

- In principle, the plan should incorporate the concepts set forth in the document “Alexandria Waterfront History Plan: Alexandria, A Living History.”
- Alexandria history should be incorporated in the design process of the public spaces and private redevelopment.
- All historic buildings in the plan area should be preserved and adaptively reused. Redevelopment programs should allow public access to and promote active use of the ground floor.
- In principle, the plan should incorporate the concepts set forth in the “Alexandria Waterfront Public Art Proposal” and include the public art plan recommendations.
- A plan should adopt the Art Walk concept and public art should be a distinguishing feature of the public realm.
- The plan should support multiple, flexible venues for performing arts, activities and programming along the waterfront.
- A plan should support the retention, expansion and/or establishment of museums, cultural and educational institutions, and related elements (such as historic ships and the history/cultural anchors).
- Artists and historians should be included in the design and implementation processes of public spaces.
- A plan should address a range of sources for the funding of art and history elements.

**(2) Recommended New Statements**

Schiller indicated that Work Group members Nate Macek and Bob Wood have two suggestions for new recommendations relating to art and history in the public realm. Staff suggests that WPWG accept both of them.

New **First and foremost, the City should take proactive measures to retain, enhance, and strongly promote existing cultural institutions on the Alexandria Waterfront as the Plan is implemented, including the Seaport Foundation, The Art League, the Alexandria Archaeology Museum, the Torpedo Factory Art Center, and others.” (Macek)**

**The City should take proactive measures to attract new cultural institutions on the Alexandria Waterfront as the Plan is implemented**

**that complement its history and existing cultural institutions...”  
(Rhodeside)**

**New Funding by the plan for Art and History should reflect the importance of these elements to the overall plan.” (Wood)**

**(3) November 30<sup>th</sup> Comments on Art and History**

- **Rhodeside:** It is important to make a make a statement to address make the waterfront as a place for existing and *new cultural institutions*.
- **Wood:** Also language is needed emphasize the importance to *enhance, and strongly promote existing cultural institutions* retaining existing cultural institutions.

**(4) November 30<sup>th</sup> Consensus on Art and History**

- **Work Group:** There was general consensus on the recommendations with the above revisions.
- Members suggested the concept “cultural hub”, introduced in the Waterfront Plan’s Art Plan proposal for creating three cultural hubs along the waterfront, be defined more clearly.
- Members suggested the Work Group Report will emphasize the fact that members give high priority to the City’s preserving a place for existing waterfront cultural organization at waterfront locations.

**IV. Schedule**

Smedberg indicated that to get through the remaining items of discussion, namely the Private Realm and the Environment, an additional meeting can be added to the December calendar, leaving the Group with two more meetings. The December 8<sup>th</sup> meeting can address the Private Realm, including (a) Hotels, (b) Heights, and (c) Increased Density, although two of those three have already been discussed, leaving increased density. Therefore, the additional meeting on December 14<sup>th</sup> would be dedicated to reviewing the Report.

Hamer indicated that she too is suggesting that the December 8<sup>th</sup> meeting be utilized to finish up the Private Realm, and to discuss Implementation and Funding, the Environment, and the CAAWP Report Analysis, leaving December 14<sup>th</sup> to discuss the Report. That would allow the Work Group to meet the January 10<sup>th</sup> Work Session and the January 21<sup>st</sup> Public Hearing date. If every issue can not be fully discussed than members’ comments on any outstanding issues can be highlighted in the Report.

Wood suggested some concern that there is more to discuss under the Private Realm than increased density.

Olinger indicated concern that the Work Group have sufficient time to read the draft Report before it is published and the Work Group needs time to discuss any comments it may have.

It was suggested that Macek and Wood could generate a draft for the Work Group on December 12<sup>th</sup> and the Work Group can share their comments at the December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting, with the idea of publishing it the week of December 21<sup>st</sup>.

To cover more of the Private Realm issues at the next meeting, December 8th, Work Group members agreed to expand the meeting time to 7:30 am to 12 noon.

Smedberg indicated he would summarize the schedule and get it out to the Work Group.

## V. **Public Comment**

Van **Van Fleet** expressed the following:

- GenOn site should be included in the Waterfront Plan.
- The Director of T&ES should attend the Work Group meetings.
- Parks should have been asked what it thinks of the integrated parks system since they attend these meetings.
- The marina at Robinson Terminal South will not happen for a number of reasons. The current City marina subsidizes the personal slips at around \$18,000 a year.

Katy **Cannady** expressed the following:

- Attended all the waterfront meetings since the beginning of the process.
- Early on, the City indicated the new density is needed to pay for amenities, namely Fitzgerald Square.
- Doesn't believe Fitzgerald Square will happen in her lifetime.
- The Plan needs more open space.

Kathryn **Papp** expressed the following:

- William Reilly the former EPA Director will send the Mayor a letter in support of more open space at the waterfront.
- Will reach out to environmental colleagues in the private and public sectors for help to achieve more open space.
- Will prepare a request to EPC from CAAWP for an environmental review.

Andrew **Macdonald** expressed the following:

- There was a good dialogue at the Waterfront Committee yesterday.
- Important to emphasize the public realm at the waterfront.
- CAAWP is interested in change that will result in more open space at the waterfront.
- Would like the City to buy Robinson Terminal North.
- The waterfront is part of a national historic district and it needs a reduction in the Private Realm and an increase in the Public Realm.

**Margaret Wood**

- Asked if the City has written to the Washington Post regarding acquisition of land? *Staff responded that the City has not sent the Washington Post a letter asking for part or all of their property.*

**VI. Next Meetings**

- Thursday, December 8, 2011, 7:30 AM to 12:00 Noon
- Wednesday, December 14, 2011, 7:30 AM to 12:00 Noon

DRAFT