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Phasing and Funding Options

Overview of Community Meeting
Presentation Objectives

- Update community on Waterfront implementation
- Seek community views on priorities
- Input for development of FY 2016 – FY 2025 Capital Improvement Program and for subsequent Council action
Waterfront Small Area Plan (2012)

• Small area plans represent general visions
• Early concepts for public space development
• Flood mitigation need acknowledged, but no detailed plan
• Cost estimated at $50 million
Waterfront Landscape and Flood Mitigation Design (2014)

- Community and stakeholder input
- Long term wishes, desires, and ideals
- World class level Olin design, unconstrained
- More fully integrated flood mitigation
Waterfront Plan Implementation (2015 and Beyond)

- Translate Olin and flood mitigation designs into a fundable implementation plan
- Determine what gets built when by phasing
- Develop phasing and funding plan for capital budget (CIP)
- Will compete with other capital needs in a short and medium term constrained fiscal environment
## Implementation Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility &amp; infrastructure construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront Priorities construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Design**: Various stages, with significant activity in Year 4, 5, and 6.
- **Permitting**: Significant activity in Year 4.
- **Utility & infrastructure construction**: Significant activity from Year 4 to 9, with major completion in Year 10.
- **Waterfront Priorities construction**: Significant activity from Year 7 to 10, with major completion in Year 10.
Major cost categories of Waterfront public improvements

Total estimated cost = $120 million

CORE-PRIMARY AREA
$61.2 million
- Utilities and Strand Street = $4.9 m
- Promenade and Flood Mit. = $33.1 m
- Fitzgerald Square = $14.0 m
- Point Lumley Park = $2.9 m
- Waterfront Park = $4.8 m
- Thompson’s Alley = $1.6 m

CORE-SECONDARY AREA
$31.6 million
- Street end gardens = $3.8 m
- Civic building = $7.7 m
- King Street pier = $6.2 m
- Torpedo Factory = $5.6 m
- Marina = $8.4 m

NON-CORE AREA
$27.2 million
- Harborside and RTS = $2.2 m
- Founders Park = $3.7 m
- Oronoco Bay Park and RTN = $17.9 m
- Rivergate Park = $3.4 m
Financing Options and Implementation

- Bond Funded
- Bond and Cash Funded
- Cash Funded

Number of Years

Funding Type

TBD

1
Project Revenues

- Tax increment from new development
- Developer contributions for Waterfront Plan
- Potential fees for services
- Private donations and fundraising
- Grant funds
Phasing and Funding Options

Summary of Feedback
Keypad Polling

• Keypad polling
  ▪ Series of 17 questions
  ▪ Approximately 70 participants

• Polling question categories
  ▪ Demographics
  ▪ General priorities
  ▪ Specific priorities
Keypad Polling

Demographics
Polling Participants

- 75% Alexandria residents
- 56% Old Town residents
- 35% Represent business
- 69% Attended previous Waterfront meetings
Polling Participants

- 94% age 35+
- 17% with children in the household
Keypad Polling

General Priorities
General Design Priorities

Highest priorities:
• Expansion and enhancement of parks (30%)
• Continuous riverfront promenade (25%)
• Flood mitigation (23%)
General Design Priorities

Second highest priorities:
• Enhancement of parks (33%)
• Continuous riverfront promenade (28%)
• Activity at foot of King St. (16%)
Type of Public Space

Most important type of space:

- Large open areas (40%)
- Space for events (26%)
Keypad Polling

Specific Priorities
Start Construction

- Inside core: 57%
- Outside core: 23%
- Both: 13%
- No preference: 7%
Core Area Components

Highest specific priorities:

• Continuous riverfront walkway (30%)  
• Flood mitigation (25%)  
• Point Lumley and Waterfront Parks (16%)
Core Area Components

Also high priorities:

- Continuous riverfront walkway (22%)
- Flood mitigation (22%)
- Point Lumley and Waterfront Parks (12%)
Conclusions

- Start construction inside the core area
- Provide flood mitigation
- Provide continuous riverfront walkway
- Expand and enhance parks
- Over 70% of respondents – 2 or more core area projects in 10 year CIP
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Phasing Options
Phasing Options

• Based on engineering project sequencing prioritized by community feedback

• Three phasing priority options:
  A. Flood mitigation and promenade
  B. Fitzgerald Square
  C. Core area parks
Phasing Options – Option A

Flood Mitigation and Promenade Priority
Option A
Flood Mitigation & Promenade Priority

Phase 1
Bulkhead Promenade Pump Stations

Estimated Cost
$33.07 M
Option A
Flood Mitigation & Promenade Priority
Option A
Flood Mitigation & Promenade Priority
Flood Mitigation and Promenade Priority

• Advantages:
  ▪ Early protection from nuisance flooding
  ▪ Highly desired continuous riverfront walkway
  ▪ Protection of future investments

• Disadvantages:
  ▪ Enhancements to public parks deferred
  ▪ No new programmable space
  ▪ No new or enhanced large or active space
  ▪ Proximity to new development
  ▪ Delays synergy with private investments in public amenities
Phasing Options – Option B

Fitzgerald Square Priority
Option B
Fitzgerald Square Priority
Option B
Fitzgerald Square Priority
Option B
Fitzgerald Square Priority
Fitzgerald Square Priority

• Advantages:
  - New programmable and active public space
  - Early focus on marquee element of plan
  - New seasonal draw to support existing and new businesses

• Disadvantages:
  - Limited protection from nuisance flooding
  - Delays synergy with private investment in public amenities
  - Impacts to pleasure boat marina
Phasing Options – Option C

Core Area Parks Priority
Option C
Core Area Parks Priority
Option C
Core Area Parks Priority
Option C
Core Area Parks Priority

Phase 3
King Street Unit Block
Fitzgerald Square

DUKE ST  PRINCE ST  KING ST  CAMERON ST  QUEEN ST

Core Area

Carr Hotel
ODPO

Robinson Terminal South

Estimated Cost
$0  $10  $20  $30  $40  $50  $60
$17.18 M  $16.13 M  $18.28 M

N
Core Area Parks Priority

• Advantages:
  ▪ New and enhanced large open space
  ▪ Creates synergy with private investment in public amenities
  ▪ New space for events and fee revenue

• Disadvantages:
  ▪ Improvements are at risk from nuisance flooding
  ▪ Delays flood mitigation
  ▪ Improvements in less centralized spaces
Priorities for Phasing and Funding

Next Steps
Next Steps

• December 16, 2014 – Waterfront Commission

• January 6, 2015 – Planning Commission

• January 15, 2015 – Park and Recreation Commission

• January 27, 2015 - City Council Legislative Meeting
Key Questions

• Phasing options:
  A. Flood mitigation & promenade priority
  B. Fitzgerald Square priority
  C. Core area parks priority

• Which option do you prefer?
• Which elements do you want to see in 10 years?