

## WATERFRONT PLAN WORK GROUP – PLAN STATEMENTS STATUS

UPDATE FOR MEETING OF NOVEMBER 9, 2011 (Rev)

### A. PLAN STATEMENTS – PARKING: REVIEWED SEPTEMBER 7, 2011

- **New surface parking lots will be prohibited along the water's edge in favor of parks, plazas, and public spaces.**

*Agreed: Rhodaside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.*

- **Existing surface parking lots will be discouraged. This statement is not intended to encourage the use of eminent domain.**

*Agreed: Rhodaside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.*

*Note: Mr. Ely agreed with the qualification that the ODBC parking lot should stay where it is and voiced concern about the neighborhood impact of eliminating the parking lot across from Chadwick's.*

- **Displaced parking should be accounted for in the Plan.**

*Agreed: Rhodaside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.*

- **Parking for new commercial buildings will be accommodated on site below grade. New parking should not be visible from public spaces.**

*Agreed: Rhodaside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, Ely.*

*Note: Mr. Ely agreed after P&Z confirmed that it would be the developer's responsibility to address situations where the water table makes constructing underground parking expensive.*

- **City will implement initiatives to encourage visitors to park in both public and privately-owned garages, including making it easier for visitors to find garages.**

*Agreed: Rhodaside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, Ely.*

- **City will take steps to manage parking garage capacity – through valet parking programs, technology, and by opening private garages – when monitoring shows that garage use is approaching capacity.**

*Agreed: Rhodaside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, Ely.*

**PLAN STATEMENTS – PARKING: REVIEWED SEPTEMBER 7, 2011  
(CONTINUED)**

- **Upon adoption of a plan, the City will use a Stakeholder Group to help implement the plan’s parking recommendations including evaluating increased residential parking protections.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, Ely.*

*Note: Mr. Ely agreed, with the qualification that the City should not rely only on resident-only parking restrictions.*

- **The City will make parking outside the core area more desirable and accessible through steps like pricing differentials, shuttle service, added signage, and technology applications.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, Ely.*

*Additional Comments: Members noted the importance of addressing handicap parking, perhaps via a set parking fee at all garages. Also, the Work Group will return to the parking analysis as needed, especially as it relates to the private realm and each of the four Plan Alternatives, recognizing that adding parks and public amenities would also have an impact on demand for parking.*

**B. PLAN STATEMENTS – TRAFFIC AND CONGESTION: REVIEWED  
SEPTEMBER 7, 2011**

- **A plan will improve options and the safety of people arriving at the waterfront by means other than the automobile, especially by trolley, by boat, by bike and on foot.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, Ely.*

*Abstained: Olinger.*

*Note: Mr. Ely agreed with a statement regarding the importance of stricter enforcement of traffic regulations for bicyclists.*

- **A plan will keep drivers away from the most congested streets and intersections (such as King and Union Streets) and from circling neighborhoods by directing them to “interceptor” parking locations (garages and valet stations).**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Ely, Macek, Lyle, Ballard.*

*Abstained: Olinger*

**PLAN STATEMENTS – TRAFFIC AND CONGESTION: REVIEWED  
SEPTEMBER 7, 2011 (CONTINUED)**

- **A plan will further address traffic congestion by exploring a variety of solutions – such as closing the unit block of King Street to vehicular traffic - that promote safety and activity.**

*Agreed: Rhodaside, Wood, Ely, Macek, Lyle, Ballard.  
Abstained: Olinger*

- **Conduct a study of traffic and circulation on Union Street, including how it functions for users of all modes of travel.**

*Agreed: Rhodaside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, Ely.*

- **Proposed amendment to Statement 4: Add Gibbons Street to Statement 4.**

*Failed on a 3-4 vote:  
Agreed: Rhodaside, Wood, Ely.  
Disagreed: Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard.*

*Additional Comments: – Those opposing adding Gibbon Street to this statement noted, among other issues, that Gibbon Street is more of a regional commuting issue than a waterfront issue; also, it is not the only additional street traffic that might be affected by a plan*

**C. PLAN STATEMENTS - FLOOD MITIGATION: REVIEWED SEPTEMBER 28, 2011**

- **A plan should include a proposal for flood mitigation.**

*Agreed: Rhodaside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely*

*Note: Mr. Olinger agreed, but noted – because flood mitigation would be needed without the Waterfront Plan - that he opposes using the cost of flood mitigation to justify the increase density within the Waterfront Plan area as a way of increasing funds that are generated by the Plan's elements to fund elements of the Waterfront Plan*

**PLAN STATEMENTS - FLOOD MITIGATION: REVIEWED SEPTEMBER 28, 2011  
(CONTINUED)**

- **A study to improve drainage and minimize flooding in the low-lying portions of King, Union and The Strand should take into consideration: drainage impacts on existing buildings, storm sewers, vehicle and pedestrian access issues, visual and historic character.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.*

*Notes:*

- *Mr. Ely agreed, with the reservation that he is concerned about the feasibility and impact of raising street elevation levels, about the need for more data about the proposed actions, and concern that elements of the Waterfront Plan may be based upon the assumed success of proposed flood mitigation actions that may eventually be proven unfeasible by engineering studies not yet done.*
  - *Mr. Rhodeside agreed, noting he believes flood mitigation should be integral to the Plan's public and private realm elements, but disagreed with the idea of raising street levels, and identified this issue as needing an engineering study to provide more details.*
  - *Mr. Olinger noted he was aware of a paper done by two architects (his neighbors) examining the issue of development in a flood plain and recommended that this issue be returned to during private realm briefings.*
  - *Mr. Ballard urged that Work Group discussions address public concerns about the viability of development within a flood plain and the impacts on visitors and visitor spending when nuisance flooding cuts off access to the waterfront.*
- **The visual impact of flood mitigation should be minimized through incorporation of elements such as seating walls, berms and other features into the landscaping.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.*

**D. PLAN STATEMENTS – PUBLIC REALM-GENERAL: REVIEWED SEPTEMBER 28, 2011**

*Note: a roll-call vote was not held for the following four general statements. Agreement is noted in the approved notes for the September 28, 2011 meeting.*

- **A design for the waterfront public realm should be of very high quality (world class).**
- **Implementation should respect and balance the rights of property owners with public benefits.**
- **The view of the waterfront from the river should be inviting and express the character of Alexandria.**
- **There should be citywide public participation in the design of major and minor park elements.**

**E. PLAN STATEMENTS – PUBLIC REALM-FOOT OF KING STREET/PIER: REVIEWED SEPTEMBER 28, 2011**

- **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.**

*Agreed: Rhodaside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard.*

*Disagreed: Ely.*

- **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.**

*Agreed: Rhodaside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard.*

*Disagreed: Ely*

**F. PLAN STATEMENTS – PUBLIC REALM–PARKS AND PUBLIC SPACES:  
REVIEWED SEPTEMBER 28, 2011**

- **A plan should improve the quality, design and programming of existing parks and public spaces.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.*

- **There should be continuous public access to the shoreline from Daingerfield Island to Jones Point Park.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard.*

*Disagreed: Wood, Ely.*

*Note: Olinger saw it as a vision and as an objective recognizing that continuous access along the shoreline may vary. Ely disagreed with regard to the word “shoreline.” Wood noted that he agreed with the vision and objective of continuous public access.*

- **There should be a meaningful increase in parks and public spaces along the waterfront.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely*

- **Parks and public spaces should support activities for a wide range of users including families and children.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.*

**PLAN STATEMENTS – PUBLIC REALM–PARKS AND PUBLIC SPACES:  
REVIEWED SEPTEMBER 28, 2011 (CONTINUED)**

- **There should be both active and passive uses in the public spaces along the waterfront.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.*

- **Parks and public spaces should be respectful of Alexandria’s history.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.*

- **The City should consider its parks and open spaces as an integrated system. It needs to have a holistic design vision.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.*

- **There must be active, integrated management of the public spaces, both maintenance and programming.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.*

**G. PLAN STATEMENTS – PUBLIC REALM–MAINTENANCE: REVIEWED  
SEPTEMBER 28, 2011**

- **The waterfront should have a high level of maintenance, including the enhanced ability to minimize water-borne debris.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.*

*Note: It was noted that, for example, RPCA staff had the previous spring taken the cost effective action to prevent debris from accumulating in the marina area by installing a \$400 bubbler between the Torpedo Factory and the ODBC that has successfully kept debris from that part of the shoreline.*

- **Facilities for park maintenance and operations should be located in proximity to the waterfront and sensitively designed.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely*

- **Pursue public-private alliances that maintain and promote top quality public spaces.**

*Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.*

## **H. PLAN STATEMENTS - PUBLIC REALM - MARINA, PIERS AND SHORELINE PLAN STATEMENTS: REVIEWED OCTOBER 12, 2011**

- **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.**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

*Note: Ely said he agrees in general but has serious concerns about the specifics and wants to consider in greater depth issues such as the types of activities appropriate for the waterfront when the Work Group returns to the topic at a later meeting.*

- **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).**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

*Note: Wood would like to discuss—at a later time—possibilities for using the current City Marina as an option B for the Plan’s proposed new marina at Robinson Terminal South.*

- **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).**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

*Note: Ely supported the idea of separating commercial boats from pleasure boats, but has serious doubts about the feasibility of a marina at Robinson Terminal South.*

- **Environmental issues should be addressed in the design and engineering of shoreline improvements.**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

- **Where possible, rip-rap should be replaced with a more natural shoreline treatment.**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

*Note: Members distinguished between an ‘environmentally friendly’ and a ‘natural shoreline’ and questioned whether in some instances a natural shoreline would accommodate rising tide levels over time.*

**PLAN STATEMENTS - PUBLIC REALM - MARINA, PIERS AND SHORELINE  
PLAN STATEMENTS: REVIEWED OCTOBER 12, 2011(CONTINUED)**

- **In principle, a plan should incorporate the concepts embodied in the Waterfront Committee's Marina Vision Statement and Briefing Paper.**

*Agreed: Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

*Disagreed: Ely*

- **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.**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

- **The plan should include locations for launching non-trailered watercraft, such as canoes and kayaks.**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

- ***Proposed statement that was not agreed to - Pier: New public piers should not impinge on legally existing private piers.***

*Agreed: Ely, Wood.*

*Disagreed: Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside.*

*Note: Those opposing this statement indicated either they do not have sufficient information to consider it, or, because it may apply to the Old Dominion Boat Club and, therefore, it is not appropriate to include it as a Work Group plan statement.*

**I. PLAN STATEMENTS: ART AND HISTORY FOR THE PUBLIC REALM:  
REVIEWED OCTOBER 12, 2011**

- **In principle, the plan should incorporate the concepts set forth in the document “Alexandria Waterfront History Plan: Alexandria, A Living History.”**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

- **Alexandria history should be incorporated in the design process of the public spaces and private redevelopment.**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

- **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.**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

- **In principle, the plan should incorporate the concepts set forth in the “Alexandria Waterfront Public Art Proposal” and include the public art plan recommendations.**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

- **A plan should adopt the Art Walk concept and public art should be a distinguishing feature of the public realm.**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

- **The plan should support multiple, flexible venues for performing arts, activities and programming along the waterfront.**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

- **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).**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodeside, Wood.*

*Note: It was noted that this is the first statement that specifically references cultural anchors and educational institutions, with the latter including organizations such as the Art League.*

**PLAN STATEMENTS: ART AND HISTORY FOR THE PUBLIC REALM:  
REVIEWED OCTOBER 12, 2011 (CONTINUED)**

- **Artists and historians should be included in the design and implementation processes of public spaces.**

*Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodaside, Wood.*

- **A plan should address a range of sources for the funding of art and history elements.**

*Agreed: Ely, Macek, Rhodaside, Wood.*

*Disagreed: Lyle*

*Abstained: Olinger*

*Notes:*

- *Macek agreed with the caveat that this statement should be in the funding section.*
- *Lyle disagreed because she thought the statement should be in the funding section.*
- *Olinger abstained because he thought the statement should be in the funding section.*

**J. PLAN STATEMENTS – REDEVELOPMENT SITES: REVIEWED OCTOBER 26, 2011**

- **There should be some additional mixed use development on Alexandria’s waterfront.**

*Agreed:*

*Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard.*

*Agreed (11.2.2011 in writing):*

*Rhodaside.*

*Disagree:*

*Ely.*

*Notes:*

- *Ely felt “additional” conveys an open-ended amount and wanted “should be” changed to “could be”.*
- *Lyle will not support a limit on development as alternative wording proposed might have suggested.*
- *Macek noted that “mixed use” refers to “aggregate uses along the waterfront” not to mixed use on every parcel.*

- **A plan should not decrease existing development rights of private property.**

*Notes:*

- *The consensus of the Work Group is that this statement is not necessary.*
- *Therefore, no formal vote was taken.*

**PLAN STATEMENTS – REDEVELOPMENT SITES: REVIEWED OCTOBER 26, 2011 (CONTINUED)**

- **Current guidelines for redevelopment (existing small area plans, zoning ordinance, etc.) are not sufficient to ensure that the public’s goals for architecture and site design, land use, historic preservation, public art, public spaces, and other public benefits are met.**

*Agreed:* Wood, Macek, Lyle, Ely, Ballard.  
*Agreed (11.2.2011 in writing):* Rhodeside.  
*Abstained:* Olinger.

- **If there is increased density on redevelopment sites, it should be balanced by increased amenities and benefits and additional zoning controls.**

*Agreed:* Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ely, Ballard.  
*Agreed (11.2.2011 in writing):* Rhodeside.

- **Uses on redevelopment sites that face public space should accommodate and be compatible with active, publicly accessible public space.**

*Agreed:* Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ely, Ballard.  
*Agreed (11.2.2011 in writing):* Rhodeside.

*Discussion:*

*It was made clear that The Strand Building where it faces Waterfront Park would be inconsistent with this principle. Hamer suggested that this statement might also open up the possibility of the ground floor of The Strand Building being reconfigured.*

- **Boutique hotels (hotels limited to 150 rooms) should be added to the list of land uses permitted in the W-1 zone with a special use permit.**

*Agreed:* Macek, Lyle, Ballard.  
*Agreed (11.2.2011 in writing):* Rhodeside.  
*Disagreed:* Wood, Ely.  
*Abstained:* Olinger.

The Work Group agreed to discuss this issue in further detail at a future meeting.

*Discussion:*

- *Olinger considered specifying a 150-room size inappropriate and suggested that perhaps 75 rooms would be more consistent with the waterfront’s scale, saying that the 150-room figure was an arbitrary illustrative number offered by the Planning Commission.*
- *Smedberg said “boutique” is a phrase open to too much interpretation, noting that some people see “The W” as boutique hotel. Smedberg sees it as “smaller scale”.*
- *Wood supported mixed use along the waterfront but not specifying hotels as among the approved mixed uses and noted that the Turner letter submitted to the City said*

**PLAN STATEMENTS – REDEVELOPMENT SITES: REVIEWED OCTOBER 26, 2011 (CONTINUED)**

- *using the 150-room size for boutique hotels put them in a difficult commercial situation.*
- *Macek: Hotels need to be mentioned specifically because this is the only use not allowed in current zoning law.*
- **The heights on redevelopment sites should PERMIT the existing height district limits.**

The Work Group agreed that this issue will be returned to for a fuller discussion.

*Agreed:* Ballard, Lyle, Macek.  
*Agreed (11.2.2011 in writing):* Rhodeside.  
*Disagreed:* Olinger, Ely.  
*Abstained:* Wood.

***Discussion:***

- *Wood was concerned that a 66-foot height would create a “canyon” effect.*
- *Olinger opposed a 66-foot height limit and advocated that the view from the street be given more weight than the view of a building from the river.*

**PLAN STATEMENTS – REDEVELOPMENT SITES: REVIEWED NOVEMBER 2, 2011 (CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 26, 2011)**

- **Architecture and site design could be contemporary design inspired by historic precedent while maintaining compatibility with nearby neighborhoods. Contemporary design that meets these standards is acceptable.**

*Agreed:* Wood, Rhodeside, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ely, Ballard.

*Note:* Staff explained that “contemporary design”, a phrase taken from the Alexandria Archaeology Commission’s “Waterfront History Plan”, is designed to recall Alexandria’s history but not to replicate historic structures. Staff also indicated that this statement is consistent with BAR guidelines.

***Discussion:***

- *Rhodeside: It should be noted that while the intent is not to impose architecture that is faux looking, contemporary design is an acceptable treatment along the waterfront.*
- **New development must make significant contributions to on-site and off-site public amenities, including parks, streetscapes, other public spaces, and art and history elements of the plan.**

*Agreed:* Wood, Rhodeside, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ely, Ballard.

**Discussion:**

- Ely: Asked how the word *significant* is defined and staff responded by stating that it is not possible to say exactly what new development will contribute now but it is a clear expectation that it will not be something small.
- Wood: Change the word *should* to *must*.
- Olinger: Noted increased density has not been fully discussed.

**PLAN STATEMENTS – REDEVELOPMENT SITES: REVIEWED NOVEMBER 2, 2011 (CONTINUED FROM OCTOBER 26, 2011)**

- **Parking for new buildings will be accommodated on-site below-grade.**

Agreed: Wood, Rhodeside, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ely, Ballard.

**Discussion:**

- Ely: Believes a plan is being developed on a premise that is economically infeasible. Expressed concern whether below-grade parking is financially viable and, if not, whether at some point in the future the City may be requested by a developer to grant an exception to the requirement for below-grade parking.
  - Lyle: Offered to arrange for an engineer from her company, experienced in below-grade parking, to answer Ely's questions. Indicated that Cameron Station includes levels that are below grade and in some cases at the water table.
  - Macek: Developers came in and did not raise issues with underground parking.
  - Wood: Underground parking was only discussed in the context of one project when the developers were here.
  - Rhodeside: The statement should include both new and renovated buildings.
  - Ballard: Expressed concern about adding renovated buildings.
- **(New statement) Parking for new commercial buildings will be accommodated on site below grade. New parking should not be visible from public spaces.**

Agreed: Wood, Rhodeside, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ely, Ballard.

**Discussion:**

- Several issues were highlighted for future discussion:
  - The Planning staff was requested to come back with more information in response to the following concern: Work Group members are concerned that renovation of existing properties -- because they are currently underutilized -- may generate more parking demand once renovated. This concern was particularly stressed given the buildings are grandfathered under the Zoning Ordinance.
  - A member inquired as to whether below-grade parking for new buildings precludes a museum or a public-use building from being built because of the expense of below-grade parking. This was addressed by incorporating the word *commercial* in the statement.

**K. PLAN STATEMENTS – IMPLEMENTATION AND FUNDING: REVIEWED ON NOVEMBER 2, 2011**

- ~~The general timeframe for implementing a plan should be 20-25 years. [deleted]~~

*Discussion:*

- After discussion, it was generally agreed by the Work Group that this statement is not needed since the timeline is already included in the Plan.
- Ely: Noted that the GenOn site fits within this timeframe.

- **Flood mitigation and parking are two of the highest priority initiatives for City action – *Deferred.***

*Discussion:*

- After discussion, it was generally agreed to defer discussion relating to priorities to a later time.
- It was noted, however, that parking and flood mitigation had been the most often-mentioned concerns expressed by the public; that the statement identifies these matters as “City” priorities; and that when it is time to discuss this again, perhaps parking should be supplemented by pedestrian congestion within the context of “City priorities”.

- ~~**Implementation of a plan should not place an undue financial burden on the City.**~~

*Note: This statement was deleted due to duplication.*

- **The revenues from increased economic activity should pay for as great a portion of the costs of the plan as feasible in an effort not to place an undue financial burden on the City.**

Agreed: Wood, Rhodside, Lyle, Macek, Ely, Ballard.

Abstained: Olinger

*Discussion:*

- Ely: Stated he believes that when discussing revenues to cover Plan elements (amenities), revenues which are generated City-wide should be considered, and not just those generated by commercial activities east of Lee Street.
- Macek: Added “*financial*” before the word “*burden.*”

*Notes:*

- Olinger said he abstained because he felt (a) the wording implied that Plan costs should be covered by funds generated east of Lee Street and because (b) public costs of the Plan’s public elements have been “inflated” by including as Plan elements previously announced City budget items - such as flood mitigation and Windmill Hill Park bulkhead repairs which should be considered as City capital improvements.

**PLAN STATEMENTS – IMPLEMENTATION AND FUNDING: REVIEWED ON NOVEMBER 2, 2011 (CONTINUED)**

- **The City should pursue federal, state, and other governmental/non-governmental grants and funding programs to support the construction, maintenance and operation of the waterfront.**

Agreed: Wood, Rhodaside, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ely, Ballard.

- **Individuals, groups and cultural institutions should play a strong role in implementing the all aspects of a plan.**  
~~Advisory participation in the design, planning, and implementation of public projects [such as flood mitigation and new parks and guiding implementation programs, such as parking,] and~~  
~~b. Raising funds or otherwise supporting the retention, expansion and establishment of museums, cultural and education institutes, and related elements (such as historic ships) in the waterfront area.~~

Agreed: Wood, Rhodaside, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ely, Ballard.

***Discussion:***

- The Work Group generally agreed to consider at a later meeting adding specific statements regarding the Plan's implementation since the Plan does not now include implementation recommendations.