

Waterfront Plan Work Group *Report*



December 20, 2011

Waterfront Plan Work Group

Christopher Ballard

Bert Ely

Melinda Lyle

Elliot Rhodeside

Nathan Macek

David Olinger

Lt. General (Retired) Bob Wood

Councilman Paul Smedberg

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	1
Foreword	4
Introduction.....	6
Executive Summary	7
Creation of the Work Group and Organization	7
Work Group Charge.....	7
Work Group Membership	7
Organizational Priorities	8
Execution of the Work Plan	8
Report Organization	9
Work Group Findings.....	10
Public Realm – General.....	10
Foot of King Street.....	11
Parks and Public Spaces.....	11
Marina, Piers and Shoreline	12
Art and History	13
Flood Mitigation	14
Parking.....	14
Traffic and Circulation	15
Private Realm.....	16
Implementation and Funding	19
Environmental Issues.....	22
Conclusion	24
Public Realm - General	25
Summary of Work Group Public Realm - General Findings.....	25
Work Group Plan Statements on the Public Realm - General.....	26
Review of Plan Recommendations for the Public Realm - General	27
Foot of King Street.....	33
Summary of Work Group Foot of King Street Findings	33
Work Group Plan Statements on the Foot of King Street	34
Alexandria Waterfront Plan Work Group Report	1

Review of Plan Recommendations for the Foot of King Street.....	35
Parks and Public Spaces.....	41
Summary of Work Group Parks and Public Spaces Findings	41
Work Group Plan Statements on Parks and Public Spaces	42
Review of Plan Recommendations for Parks and Public Spaces	43
Marina, Piers and Shoreline	53
Summary of Work Group Marina, Piers and Shoreline Findings.....	53
Work Group Plan Statements on Marina, Piers and Shoreline	55
Review of Plan Recommendations for Marina, Piers and Shoreline.....	56
Art and History	66
Summary of Work Group Art and History Findings.....	66
Work Group Plan Statements on Art and History	67
Review of Plan Recommendations for Art and History.....	68
Flood Mitigation	76
Summary of Work Group Flood Mitigation Findings.....	76
Work Group Plan Statements on Flood Mitigation.....	76
Review of Plan Recommendations for Flood Mitigation.....	77
Parking.....	79
Summary of Work Group Parking Findings	79
Work Group Plan Statements on Parking.....	80
Review of Plan Recommendations for Parking	81
Traffic and Circulation	85
Summary of Work Group Traffic and Circulation Findings.....	85
Work Group Plan Statements on Traffic and Circulation	87
Review of Plan Recommendations for Traffic and Circulation.....	88
Private Realm.....	98
Summary of Work Group Private Realm Findings.....	98
Work Group Plan Statements on the Private Realm	102
Review of Plan Recommendations for the Private Realm.....	104
Review of Policy for Restaurant/Hotel/Commercial Uses.....	111
Review of Development Guidelines for Robinson Terminal North.....	116
Review of Development Guidelines for Robinson Terminal South	122

Review of Development Guidelines for the Cummings-Turner Block.....	127
Implementation and Funding	131
Summary of Work Group Implementation and Funding Findings	131
Work Group Plan Statements on Implementation and Funding.....	134
Review of Plan Recommendations for Implementation and Funding	135
Environmental Issues.....	139
Summary of Work Group Environmental Issues Findings.....	139
WPWG Plan Statements on Environmental Issues.....	139
Plan Recommendations for Environmental Issues.....	140

Appendices

- Appendix A Waterfront Plan Work Group Schedule and City Council Resolution Chartering Work Group
- Appendix B Draft Waterfront Small Area Plan Goals and Objectives
- Appendix C Work Group Plan Statements and Summary of Plan Recommendation Alignment
- Appendix D Staff Memoranda to Waterfront Plan Work Group

Foreword

This report represents the work of the Alexandria Waterfront Plan Work Group. It is neither a consensus report nor an approval of the draft Waterfront Small Area Plan. It is also not an alternate plan. In its review of the assumptions and assertions within the Waterfront Small Area Plan, we, the Waterfront Plan Work Group, provided a critical check on behalf of City Council on the key assumptions and plan assertions underpinning the draft Waterfront Small Area Plan. The findings and recommendations within this report reflect a thorough review of the draft Waterfront Small Area Plan in order to identify areas of consensus, agreement and disagreement, shortcomings, and methods to narrow differences and balance competing goals amongst the various interests. Where gaps were identified, we suggested remedies. This report intends to better inform public debate, City Council deliberations, and ultimately, decisions crucial to adoption and implementation of the Waterfront Small Area Plan in this historic area of Alexandria.

This report is not a product of City staff or consultants, but instead reflects the voice of private citizens concerned about the welfare and future of one of Alexandria's vital resources, its waterfront. Diverse viewpoints added to the strength of this review. The report contains detailed findings that resulted from written comment, public discussion, and Waterfront Plan Work Group deliberation surrounding common vision, contentious issues, and suggestions for improving the Waterfront Small Area Plan. These findings are intended to characterize the various viewpoints and insights in a narrative format that reframes the discussion away from the polarizing debates that preceded the formation of the Waterfront Plan Work Group. The findings are careful to highlight the diverse viewpoints represented by Waterfront Plan Work Group members. In addition, our individual comments on Waterfront Small Area Plan recommendations are recorded and identified by members.

We believe our work has been valuable and useful to the citizens. We have provided a constructive public review of a plan that needed this assessment because the intended and unintended outcomes of potential actions have significant ramifications on our National Historic Landmark waterfront. Not all sides can be satisfied, but the net results of our efforts are findings and recommendations with the potential, if adopted, to significantly improve the Waterfront Small Area Plan. Furthermore, we have offered many suggestions regarding implementation, which provide a fresh approach to achieving the City's vision for the public and private spaces that comprise our waterfront.

We welcome public review and debate of our findings. The reader is encouraged to go beyond the executive summary to better understand the sentiments and insights of a diverse and talented group of citizens who provided constructive input on a variety of plan areas. We urge the City Council to seriously consider the findings and deliberations contained in this report and ultimately take action. The Waterfront Plan Work Group stands ready to answer questions from the public and City Council in order to clarify or emphasize our findings.

The Waterfront Plan Work Group acknowledges the assistance and support of City Staff throughout this Plan review which was important for us to complete our charter and report to City Council.

Introduction

Alexandria's waterfront is a public treasure - the lynchpin to the City's founding, its storied past, and its vibrant future. The City's relationship to the Potomac River spans centuries of remarkable history, from Native American settlements, through the earliest days of our nation, across years of conflict and peace, to today's evolving uses. Much of the City's identity, both past and present, is bound to the commerce, the transit, and the activities along this shoreline. Historic events, great American leaders, tragic episodes, and great celebration all passed through this public space.

Change along this waterfront has been no less constant than the varied pace and tempo of activity. No one date, or one period captures the sweep of history, visitors, and residents that transited these docks or trod these streets. What remains in the streets and structures of Alexandria's Old Town, its waterfront and the trace where river meets shore, are the echoes and evidence of our history. Preserving this history while adapting to the needs of the modern day is a challenge worthy of our very best efforts and continued vigilance.

With this in mind, in 2009 the City of Alexandria embarked on developing a Waterfront Small Area Plan for the first time in a generation. A draft of the Waterfront Small Area Plan was released in winter 2011 after two years of staff development, public comment, and City review. It proposed a vision for change, with key elements including an arts walk featuring public and performing arts, historical preservation and interpretation, flood mitigation, and enhanced parks and public spaces. The draft Waterfront Small Area Plan also proposed increased commercial utilization and additional density. There was disagreement in the community, however, over the scale and scope of change in this sensitive area of our City. Additionally, questions regarding funding, alternatives, traffic, parking, and environmental impacts needed clarification and resolution in plan details. In summer of 2011, when the draft Waterfront Small Area Plan was presented for consideration by the Alexandria City Council, the Council sought additional feedback from the community and chartered the Waterfront Plan Work Group to examine these issues and return with recommendations.

This report summarizes the findings and recommendations of the Waterfront Plan Work Group.

Executive Summary

Creation of the Work Group and Organization

Establishment of the Waterfront Plan Work Group (Work Group) and completion of its charge has been a four step process: (1) creation of the Work Group and identifying an approach for achieving its charge; (2) execution of the work plan; (3) generation of the Work Group's findings and report; and (4) delivery of the report to City Council.

Work Group Charge

The Work Group was established in late June 2011 by City Council resolution 2467 as an 8-member body including a non-voting member of the City Council to serve as convener, representatives of the Alexandria Waterfront Committee and Old Town Civic Association, and five at-large members with professional backgrounds in urban design, planning, and landscape and architecture. The resolution was clear that the Work Group was not to develop a new plan but, instead, assume the following charge, reporting back to the Council in fall 2011:

- identify elements of the Waterfront Small Area Plan (Plan) for which there is agreement;
- within each subject area of the Plan, identify and attempt to better define elements of the Plan where there remains disagreement;
- clarify positions, balance competing goals, and recommend alternative approaches to resolve differences;
- categorize outstanding issues to be addressed by action now or in Plan implementation; and
- deliver findings and recommendations that enable Council resolution on the Plan.

The Council resolution establishing the Work Group is included in Appendix A.

Work Group Membership

In July the Mayor appointed persons to the five at-large positions and the Waterfront Committee and Old Town Civic Association selected representatives. There was no elected chair of the Work Group. Members include:

- Councilman Paul Smedberg as convener
- Christopher Ballard, member at-large and Principal at McWilliams/Ballard
- Bert Ely, member at-large and Principal, Ely and Company
- Melinda Lyle, member at-large and Vice President, Client Development, Haley & Aldrich, Inc.
- Nathan Macek, Chair, Alexandria Waterfront Committee
- David Olinger, Board Member, Old Town Civic Association
- Elliot Rhodeside, member at-large and Principal, Rhodeside & Harwell
- Lt. Gen. (Retired) Bob Wood, member at-large and Principal, Star Strategies Group

Organizational Priorities

At its first meeting, the Work Group developed organizational priorities including:

- establishing a meeting calendar;
- establishing an approach to its charge, i.e., developing a work plan, with key topical areas to be covered at each meeting; and
- establishing a Plan vision.

Work sessions included 15 meetings: 12 morning meetings and three evening meetings held in Del Ray, the West End and City Hall.

The work plan centered around four key tasks:

- establish the Work Group plan statements to help evaluate the Plan;
- review existing Plan recommendations against the Work Group plan statements and develop additional recommendations as necessary;
- determine findings; and
- develop, review, and approve the report.

A copy of the schedule, identifying dates, times, locations and work plan related tasks for each meeting is included in Appendix A.

Execution of the Work Plan

To guide its work plan, the Work Group developed and approved a Plan vision statement that it augmented with the Plan's existing ten goals and objectives (included in Appendix B).

Vision Statement: *A vibrant waterfront that celebrates our historic and cultural legacy, expands and supports public uses, yet retains and preserves the special charm and ambiance of our community for future generations.*

Specifically, it is:

- authentic
- connected
- inclusive
- dynamic
- varied
- manageable
- sustainable
- compatible
- permeable
- creative

During several meetings, the Work Group developed plan statements to guide evaluation subject areas within the Plan requiring clarification and further resolution. These included:

- Public Realm – General
- Foot of King Street
- Parks and Public Space
- Marina and Piers
- Arts and History
- Flood Mitigation
- Parking
- Traffic and Circulation
- Private Realm
- Environment
- Implementation and Funding

The next step was to evaluate the Work Group plan statements against the Plan recommendations to identify where they aligned and resolve any existing gaps. Where a recommendation was found to be duplicative or unnecessary, the Work Group recommended eliminating it. Where a recommendation was found to be unclear, the Work Group recommended clarifying language. Where there was agreement that an issue or opportunity was not covered fully or at all, the Work Group recommended augmenting the existing recommendation or developed a new one.

Appendix C contains each Work Group plan statement by topic area, as well as a matrix summarizing this assessment for each existing and Work Group-proposed recommendation in the Plan.

Staff-written memoranda written in response to Work Group member discussion and questions are provided in Appendix D.

Report Organization

The results of the Work Group’s analysis as contained in this report are presented by subject area. In most cases, there is a general finding that captures the overall assessment reflective of Work Group discussion and written comments, followed by bulleted specific findings and suggested modifications to Plan recommendations and/or new recommendations. This is followed by the Work Group plan statement and specific review of each Plan recommendation. This review includes details on discussion of these recommendations offered during Work Group meetings, as well as an accounting of written comments submitted by Work Group members.

Throughout the subsequent chapters of this report, where a plan statement is quoted, it has been italicized. Strikethrough and underlined text reflects recommended deletions and additions to Plan recommendations by the Work Group.

Throughout the report, there is frequent reference to the following terms. To aid the reader, we provide a definition of these key terms here:

- **Consensus** – Reflects the Work Group’s unanimous agreement on a given subject matter considered as part of its deliberations.
- **General Agreement** – Reflects agreement by a majority of Work Group members on a given subject matter considered as part of the Work Group’s deliberations.

- **Finding** – An outcome achieved by the Work Group through consensus or general agreement on a given subject matter considered as part of its deliberations.
- **Plan Statements** – Principles adopted by the Work Group to guide its evaluation of Plan Recommendations.
- **Plan Recommendations** – Recommendations contained within the Draft Waterfront Plan designed to promote goals and objectives outlined for the waterfront.

Work Group Findings

The key findings of the Work Group by subject area are as follows:

Public Realm – General

The Work Group supports recommendations to achieve a minimum width of waterfront public space of 50 feet or more and supports compliance, to the greatest degree possible, with the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and Alexandria’s Eco-City Charter. The Work Group takes the position that the waterfront should have a holistic design vision that unites the City’s waterfront public spaces with a design plan that is authentic and unique to Alexandria, which stems from Old Town’s historic character and 18th century street grid. Features throughout the waterfront area should be welcoming to residents, visitors, and their families, and accessible to people with limited mobility and other physical impairments. The Work Group made a number of clarifying amendments to Plan recommendations and suggested removing recommendations that address issues that are outside the Plan area.

- The Work Group strongly discourages the use of eminent domain to accomplish the recommendations of the Plan. Nothing in the Work Group report should offer rationale for eminent domain action. The Work Group recommends negotiation with private property owners as the preferred land acquisition strategy. This is consistent with a desire to protect private property rights at all development sites along the entire waterfront.
- The Work Group expressed consensus that the Alexandria waterfront should have a “world-class” design. This term implies a specific design plan and characteristics of design that have not yet been fully determined during the planning phase. The Plan as it exists now is conceptual and provides a design framework defined more by characteristics and recommended examples as opposed to a unifying vision that achieves requisite “world-class” design. The development of a design plan, one of the early-stage implementation actions, can remedy this shortcoming. Such development should seriously consider methods and incentives that invite and incorporate the very best design perspectives from as broad an array of participants as possible.
- Much attention has been paid to how the waterfront appears to visitors arriving by land. It is equally important to examine the waterfront’s face to river—its beauty, its variety, its

attraction. A growing number of visitors will approach Alexandria from the water, including water taxis, pleasure craft, and other vessels. The waterfront can also provide an appealing face for the City to air travelers and motorists on the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. Therefore, care should be taken in design plans to project the waterfront's identity from all perspectives.

Foot of King Street

The Work Group supports a significant public space at the foot of King Street that acts as a gateway and functions as a focal point for pedestrian-related activities. This public space should function as a hub to orient visitors and connect King Street, Old Town, and the history of the waterfront with today's maritime activities including the water taxi, commercial boats, historic vessels, and private pleasure boats. Ongoing negotiations with the Old Dominion Boat Club (ODBC) regarding property issues should encourage innovative planning and implementation in this key area of the waterfront. To facilitate this vision, the Work Group recommends pursuing the elimination of the existing parking lot and determination of viable parking alternatives through negotiations with the ODBC—and not through eminent domain actions. Regardless of these negotiations, the City should proceed with developing this public space, incorporating the unit block of King Street and King Street Park. An important element of this recommendation is the closure of the unit block of King Street to traffic. This public space should be top quality and must be designed to complement any eventual property agreements in this area. The Work Group supports a new commercial pier in the vicinity of King Street with facilities to support water taxis, a historic ship, and public access to the waterfront.

Parks and Public Spaces

Alexandria's waterfront parks and public spaces have the potential to be an asset for our City, the region, and the nation. The Work Group believes the parks and public spaces of the waterfront should be considered an integrated system and should have a holistic design vision that is respectful of our history and achieves a high standard of style, architecture, and artistry. Our historic waterfront has a story that needs to be told and experienced with facilities, activities, and services that support both passive and active uses. Improved maintenance is an absolute must; at present, resources are insufficient to maintain a waterfront of which we can all be proud. Management and maintenance of parks and public spaces must be improved. This unique public space is both a tidal wetland and a restricted protective area linked to the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Environmental requirements, the goals of the City's Eco-Charter, and flood mitigation measures must be accomplished without limiting public access and enjoyment. New park space along The Strand, from Waterfront Park to Wolfe Street, must be constructed, celebrated, and enjoyed early in implementation as a major addition to a newly vibrant waterfront and a clear signal to the community of the importance of public amenities.

- Management and maintenance of waterfront parks and public spaces must be a priority of the City, particularly as the City implements the Plan. Maintenance practices should change immediately to signal to the public that focus and attention will be paid to the impending and significant public investment to Alexandria's waterfront. There should be ready access to

equipment but having park operations and support facilities proximate to the waterfront should not sacrifice valuable property.

- In order to stage a variety of activities in the vibrant waterfront public spaces, support infrastructure must be enhanced. Such things as power to support audio, video, lighting, and vendor requirements or seating, stages, and platform supports should be incorporated into any park improvements.
- Planning and programming of activities in the parks and public spaces is an important responsibility that requires a more creative approach if the City intends to foster a waterfront that remains fresh and vibrant. City staff should renew its approach to support programming along an integrated waterfront. It should solicit public input and develop an annual program of creative and innovative activities and events sponsored by the City, non-profits, citizens, and other organizations. Staff should review its current procedures and make necessary changes to ensure it has the ability to coordinate the increased activities envisioned on the waterfront (e.g., pre-event organization, insurance, advertisement, site support, execution, and clean-up).

Marina, Piers and Shoreline

The Work Group supports the intent of the Plan to create a more natural, inviting, and environmentally sound shoreline. There should be equal attention paid to activities along the waterfront as well as from water to land. There should be a comprehensive approach to boating. City marina facilities should be improved to support existing and expanded commercial vessel operations north of King Street, including tour boats, dinner cruises, and excursions. To retain integrity with Alexandria's maritime heritage, the Work Group recommends that the ability to dock large vessels be retained. To minimize dredging expenses, consider docking large shallow-draft vessels at Robinson Terminal North while maintaining the option of docking deep-draft vessels at Robinson Terminal South. The pleasure boat marina should be a modern and well-maintained and located so as to avoid conflicts with commercial vessels. The marina should be a self-sufficient enterprise and accommodate both lease slip holders and day trippers. Finally, while a public boat launch for trailered vessels should not be located in Old Town, launch sites for canoes, kayaks, and other self-propelled watercraft are encouraged near Rivergate Park and Windmill Hill Park, in addition to the new launch in Jones Point Park.

- Alexandria is a maritime City and must retain its heritage. The City must make key decisions about future marina facilities: their location, improved infrastructure and amenities, supporting services, and the mix of public and private operations. The end goal is a marina that is economically viable and better serves the boating public and lures maritime visitors to Alexandria, yet is compatible with its neighbors and is compatible with the historic fabric of Old Town. The separation of commercial and pleasure boat activity is a vital first step in future planning for existing and expanded waterfront activities.

- Boating is an activity that is integral to the waterfront and boating needs should be addressed in a holistic and comprehensive way. Future engineering and design should address how to accommodate these needs in the right locations.

Art and History

Art and history must be fundamental to the design and development of the Alexandria waterfront. The Plan calls for an Art Walk and artistic finishes along the entire waterfront. The depiction of Alexandria’s living history will be equally emphasized. The art and history recommendations found in the **Alexandria Waterfront Public Art Proposal** and the **Alexandria Waterfront History Plan** form a strong basis for actions. A similar plan for arts and history programming should be developed and could be equally useful. The central role envisioned for art and history across the entire waterfront is not matched by a sufficient or assured funding strategy in the Plan. The cost of maintenance and staging of art and history elements should be better specified within the Plan. The function and illustrative design of “cultural anchor(s)” needs to be further described to guide implementation and desirable growth—the discussion of cultural anchors in the History Plan is a good model.

- A cultural hub must provide more than historical wayfinding. It should tell the story of Alexandria’s seaport history in a way that is not conveyed by existing City museums. Consider coupling a seaport historical center of reasonable size with appropriate commercial activity such as a café, gallery, small auditorium, or museum shop to help sustain the facility. Along The Strand, a cultural hub could be located at the The Beachcomber’s Restaurant site or share a structure with the civic center and park maintenance facility proposed for this area. Another potential location for a cultural hub is West’s Point.
- The Work Group endorses several additional art and history Plan recommendations as follows:
 - *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.*
 - *As the Plan is implemented, the City should take proactive measures to attract new cultural institutions on the Alexandria waterfront that complement its history and existing cultural institutions.*
 - *Funding by the Plan for art and history should reflect the importance of these elements to the overall Plan.*
 - *West’s Point represents the origins of Alexandria and was the site of much of the City’s early seaport history. Therefore, this historic wharf should emphasize significant activities that occurred here, such as tobacco shipment, the transit of military forces, Fishtown, railroads, and the gasworks. This may be accomplished through multiple*

approaches, including: interpretive artwork, text, and signage; sculpture; historically inspired building design; rail linkage; and landscaping. West's Point could also be a good location for a maritime museum and the docking of an historic ship.

Flood Mitigation

The Work Group agrees that the next phase of the flood mitigation project should be a more detailed design and engineering study of the proposed strategies to determine a feasible and cost-effective way forward. A benefit cost assessment would be crucial at this stage. The Work Group is concerned about the proposal to elevate the unit block of King Street and the nearby Strand and suggests that the next phase of study address those concerns. The significant public space and pedestrian focus at the foot of King Street will be a significant investment for the City that warrants a sound flood mitigation plan.

- It is important to reduce the impact of flooding. The impact of frequent nuisance flooding (up to 6.0 feet above sea level) may be reduced through mitigation measures. Flood mitigation should be implemented in a way that is compatible with the historic character of Old Town and demonstrates real return on public investment. We believe the concept to elevate the foot of King Street has serious design and engineering issues. We recommend that detailed engineering studies be completed to refine flood mitigation concepts to achieve a more feasible and cost effective alternative in this area. We note that these improvements will not prevent the effects of more severe flooding that will still occur, but encourage mitigation of routine nuisance flooding if cost effective.
- The Work Group suggests including the following new Plan recommendation: *The next phase of the design and engineering of the comprehensive strategy to mitigate flooding should take into consideration: drainage impacts on existing buildings, storm sewers, vehicle and pedestrian access issues, and visual and historic character. Consider impacts of nuisance flooding along the entire waterfront within this comprehensive strategy.*

Parking

The Work Group emphasizes the importance of immediate implementation of the parking recommendations of the Plan, including guidelines for new commercial development, increased waterfront activity, and provisions protecting residential parking. The Work Group modified language to clarify that all new parking is to be on site below grade. This is acknowledged to be a difficult design requirement, but is vital to protecting public access and the beauty of the waterfront. Relief from this requirement as the waterfront develops should not be permitted. Work Group members suggest adding a recommendation to use pricing to incentivize use of parking spaces away from the waterfront and to encourage use of garages. The Work Group also strengthened language related to valet parking and to the time periods when garage parking is available to the general public.

- The City should begin immediate implementation of the parking recommendations contained in the Plan's Transportation, Circulation, and Parking chapter and the **Old Town Area Parking**

Study. We believe that parking is a problem in the vicinity of the waterfront today, with limited potential increase for growth in capacity. Within the Plan, parking at redevelopment sites will be accommodated on site below grade, and surface parking lots are discouraged. Due to the cost and challenge of this approach, any increase in parking will be small. Any parking beyond what is required at development sites will be constrained and provide very few additional spaces to the public. In addition, some existing surface parking will be displaced, and the City should account for this in implementation of the Plan. Therefore, the parking management concepts outlined in this chapter—which include wayfinding, valet parking, shuttle services, and pricing—must begin to be tested and should be proven to ensure effective measures are present to guide implementation of the Plan. Another possible approach is to limit development, and thereby attendant parking demands. Implementation should include a rigorous assessment plan with specific performance metrics to ensure goals and objectives are being achieved.

- Other possible approaches include:
 - limiting development, and thereby reducing attendant parking demands; and
 - using City funds to construct additional public parking in the waterfront area in conjunction with commercial redevelopment.

Traffic and Circulation

A vibrant waterfront, by its very nature, will generate increased activity. Additional activity is highly desirable, but the attendant traffic impacts must be managed with clear foresight to prevent harmful impacts to the unique historic character and livability of Old Town. Because of its constrained capacity, the street network near the waterfront can only accept a small amount of additional traffic. Therefore, the Work Group recommends that the City conduct a study of traffic and circulation along the Union Street corridor and adjacent Old Town streets, including how it functions for users of all modes of travel, prior to the approval of redevelopment in the Plan area. This study should offer recommendations and insights to help manage any projected increase in traffic congestion at the river along Union Street and within the proximate street grid. The Work Group also made amendments to the traffic and circulation recommendations so that they conform to positions taken by the Work Group in other areas – for example, revising references to Fitzgerald Square and the foot of King Street. The Work Group supports proactive measures to reduce or eliminate conflicts between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, e.g., routing, enforcement, and engineering. The Work Group also supports exploration of additional short-distance transit options to improve access to and movement along the waterfront. The effect of these transit options should be to enhance, not hurt, businesses along the routes.

- Union Street traffic impacts must be understood. The Work Group strongly recommends that the City complete a transportation management study along the Union Street corridor and adjacent Old Town streets. The Work Group envisions that Union Street will be a pedestrian-friendly corridor with additional street-level retail south of King Street and near Robinson Terminal North. The Work Group anticipates new pedestrian activities within a pedestrian zone

at the end of King Street, which is already a congested intersection. At the same time, additional development in the vicinity of the waterfront will create new demands on the transportation network, including increased vehicular traffic; commercial deliveries; bicycles; taxis, motor coaches, and shuttle buses; and parking. With these new demands and anticipated requirements and a finite capacity of the existing traffic grid, and the City needs to use innovative methods to manage and control this finite capacity, including through the Special Use Permit (SUP) process, to help mitigate the impacts on the community. A Union Street transportation management study will provide the data and planning guidance necessary to alleviate transportation impacts, and should be completed prior to approval of any new development on the waterfront. Some in the Work Group feel that this is so critical that Plan adoption should not proceed before this study is completed.

Private Realm

Work Group members broadly acknowledged that mixed-use, commercial development was likely and desirable and environmental concerns must be addressed. There is consensus among Work Group members that given the high value of waterfront land, by-right development is unlikely and undesirable. By amending the Development Goals and Guidelines for each development site (Robinson Terminal North, Robinson Terminal South, and the Cummings-Turner Block) the Work Group seeks to make Plan language more flexible and less prescriptive, to encourage mixed-use commercial activities, to favor active and welcoming ground-floor uses such as retail and cultural use, and to control residential use and design to ensure its compatibility with the anticipated activity and increased public access desired along the waterfront. In addition, specific recommendations are offered regarding the Policy for Restaurant/Hotel/Commercial Uses to mitigate negative impacts of development. There was extensive discussion regarding the scale, size, and nature of development. Environmental expectations are emphasized.

- There is clear agreement on the need to balance development with high quality open space while preserving the historic nature of Old Town. Private contributions supporting public uses, waterfront infrastructure, and quality public spaces (including arts, history, and recreational elements) are important expectations of developers. Environmental amenities, particularly added green space as a priority amenity, should be prominent features of development sites, above and beyond the minimum required. In all cases, ground-floor uses should primarily serve the public and complement activities envisioned for public spaces. Cultural uses (museums, galleries, classrooms, performance venues, etc.) should be specifically encouraged to anchor development, support activity, and facilitate a variety of attractions. Programming these uses, along with promoting well-designed commercial activities, can help disperse visitors and density up and down the waterfront to ease congestion. Residential development should be significantly controlled so as not to inhibit public access and enjoyment of activities in adjacent public space. Townhomes, in particular, seemed inconsistent with this objective. For any development proposal, it is important to assess, account for, and, if necessary, mitigate the different externalities (e.g., traffic and circulation, parking, noise, odors, etc.) associated with added density at each development site.

- There is fundamental disagreement over the scale, size, and nature of development as it impacts the historic fabric of Old Town and the appropriate representation of the historic waterfront. This issue is not development versus no development, but instead involves the difference in density between settlement agreements with Robison Terminal Warehouse Corporation and the 1992 Alexandria Master Plan that serves as the basis for the W-1 zoning. A secondary issue involves the number and size of hotels as a permitted use. There are two primary sentiments expressed regarding this disagreement.

On one side, the additional density and uses proposed in the Plan—including hotels—are found to be modest and necessary to promote an enlivened and commercially viable waterfront that facilitates private investment in the public spaces envisioned by the Plan. Private and public realm Plan recommendations, as modified by the Work Group, are thought to be sufficient to address the attendant external impacts of development. The proposed number of hotels and hotel rooms is supported as long as the Development Goals and Guidelines are stringently applied. Adopting the uses proposed in changes to W-1 zoning and allowing the density specified in the settlement agreements provides a greater degree of certainty to the planning process as it potentially mitigates the likelihood of litigation by property owners. These proposed changes also provide revenues to fund implementation of the plan in a timely fashion.

Alternatively, the other side feels that the zoning specified by the 1992 Master Plan remains appropriate and legally defensible, based on City staff explanations. The City's calculations show that this Plan can be funded over an acceptable timeframe without hotels and with no change in W-1 zoning. Density and developmental rights, coupled with the Work Group's recommended amendments to Plan Developmental Goals and Guidelines, are entirely adequate to achieve the amenities necessary for a vibrant waterfront and there is no need to change the W-1 zoning. Substantial development can and will take place under existing zoning and further increases will only add to the strains placed on the already fragile surrounding neighborhood. Hotels are not entirely ruled out, in this opposing view, as an allowable mixed use development if W-1 zoning was changed to allow this specific use without an accompanying increase in density. But, the number of proposed hotels (3) and their impact and on traffic congestion and the historical fabric of Old Town in this area makes the hotel alternative extremely undesirable or outright unacceptable. The economic viability and appropriateness of hotels, particularly the proposed limit of 450 rooms, is challenged due to misgivings expressed in developer input and serious physical shortcomings of the sites (e.g. distance from Metro, additional traffic congestion and parking impacts). Given the critical nature of revenues from hotel developments to support the finances of this plan, over-emphasis of this one commercial solution—when compared to other commercial uses—could create a long-term fiscal shortfall in revenues needed to help implement the Plan if the number of hotels and rooms was not market viable.

- A central issue regarding the private realm is a proposed change in W-1 zoning. Such a change would amend the 1992 City of Alexandria Master Plan and as such must be carefully considered

since it could potentially establish precedence for similar changes or cause unintended consequences in other parts of the City. The specific changes proposed concern the addition of hotels, deletion of a small number of uses, specific references to Development Goals and Guidelines proposed for the Plan, and a change in permitted heights for consistency across City plans. Likely development, whether under existing or amended W-1 zoning, would in almost all instances seek a SUP from the City. This is an important control on any development, particularly to ensure public amenities are secured and appropriate guidelines are applied for design, construction, and operation of developments. It should be noted that hotels could potentially be allowed without an increase in density through simple amendment of the special uses permitted in the W-1 zone.

- Commercial development in the W1 zone falls entirely within the Resource Protection Area (RPA) of the Chesapeake River watershed. As such, the provisions of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and the City’s own zoning provisions implementing this Act are especially relevant. Increases in impervious surfaces, storm water runoff, and overall density pose challenges to the City in its compliance with ever more restrictive standards for pollution control and environmental remediation. As indicated in the Work Group suggested changes to the Developmental Goals and Guidelines, expectations of developers regarding environmental amenities (e.g. catchment and runoff control, green practices, buffer zones, etc.) must go beyond the minimums expected. The City must exercise leadership in its environmental stewardship over the City’s waterfront as well as strong management.
- Members discussed the Plan’s proposed Policy for Restaurant/Hotel/Commercial Uses:
 - The Work Group acknowledges a public desire for additional dining options along the waterfront. It is important that new waterfront restaurants be considered within the context of the high number of existing King Street and Old Town restaurants in this historic area. Although there was discussion of whether to limit the sum total of waterfront-area restaurants to a particular square footage to prevent oversaturation of restaurants and the related negative impact on the surrounding neighborhoods, there are no recommended changes to the proposed policy. However, the consensus of the Work Group is to avoid a food court or “restaurant row” atmosphere while potentially allowing new options.
 - Although there is no consensus on the need for hotels, the Work Group expresses general agreement in support of this policy. The Work Group recommends a modification to better reflect meeting room sizes appropriate for the size of the hotel without an arbitrary capacity limit of 50 persons. This modification is intended to be more flexible with this constraint, but the intent remains to be consistent with the Planning Commission’s desire to prevent convention-sized meeting space. In similar discussions about the number of hotel rooms, some members felt that the 150 room limit per hotel at three sites (450 rooms total) was equally arbitrary and suggested adjusting the limit downward to mitigate impacts from hotels. The hotel study supporting the Plan did not address the question of the minimum number of rooms

necessary for a hotel to be market viable in this area. There is no agreement to change the recommended number of no more than 3 hotels of 150 rooms each (450 rooms total), with no more than one hotel at each of the three development sites. Narrative text in the implementation section of the Plan needs to be made consistent with the three hotel limit by eliminating references to a second hotel on the Cummings-Turner block.

- The Development Goals and Guidelines for the Robinson Terminal North, Robinson Terminal South, and Cummings-Turner properties contained in the Plan are intended to be additive to the requirements specified in City planning documents. Current City planning documents contain insufficient guidelines to achieve the vision of the Plan. The Work Group's suggested modifications to the guidelines and recommendations of the Plan provide important amplifying language to ensure the public's goals for architecture and site design, land use, historic preservation, public art, public spaces, and other public benefits are met.

Implementation and Funding

The Work Group recommends that that implementation of the Plan begin soon after adoption and include development of a design plan, introduction of new activities, and completion of a signature project in public spaces in the core area. Implementation plans require further development and can benefit from management changes within City government augmented by public involvement through a body charged with Plan implementation and waterfront oversight. An early activity will to develop a design plan to ensure a high quality look and feel for waterfront public and private spaces.

Costs of waterfront public improvements should be considered a significant investment from which Alexandria can expect to generate City-wide returns. The Plan will entail significant public costs, and financial calculations that account for projected revenues and expenses over time must be further refined. The recovery of those costs is dependent on the timing and scale of waterfront development. With or without a change in zoning, projected costs of implementing this Plan can be recovered, though the recovery period would vary based on the nature of development. If the waterfront is to be considered an integrated space with a variety of venues and activities, the Work Group recommends that have its own budget identity within the City's Operating Budget and Capital Improvement Program. Opportunities exist to fund improvements, maintenance, and activities through public and private funding, and the City should strengthen current process and take new steps to secure such funding. Funding priorities as reflected in the draft Plan do not reflect in allocation of public funds the priority accorded to art and history.

- A variety of plans, engineering, and design studies are required to turn the concepts expressed in the Plan into a Plan ready for implementation. These include:
 - Assessment of Pilot Parking Program;
 - Union Street Transportation Management Plan;
 - Detailed Design Plan;
 - Flood Mitigation Engineering Study;

- Pedestrian Flow and Safety Study;
 - Marina Redevelopment Study, including engineering of piers and wharves;
 - Environmental Assessment within an overall waterfront design and engineering plan; and
 - A GenOn Small Area Plan.
- The assumed implementation period for the draft Plan is a 15- to 25-year period. In the near-term, it will be important for the City to demonstrate a commitment to implementing the Plan soon after adoption. The Work Group recommends that initial investments and activities be focused in key public spaces proposed by the Plan, including the foot of King Street, Waterfront Park, or new park space along The Strand. These are prominent locations near the heart of the City's waterfront and developments here can signal an exciting new phase for Alexandria's waterfront. However, it is crucial that this Plan be considered with a long-term perspective in mind. In addition, the phasing of implementation must be clarified through a work plan that clearly demarcates requirements and the timeline for execution to guide public expectations and keep the City on task.
 - Development, policy changes, budget allocations, management focus, and adopted practices must seek not only to implement but also to sustain the vision of this waterfront for generations. We urge the City to review its economic model for supporting activities along the waterfront. Some facilities, like the Torpedo Factory Art Center, are highly successful. Others, like the Food Pavilion, are not. This is where proactive steps must be taken to reinforce success and avoid failure.
 - The draft Plan presents illustrative concepts of how waterfront public spaces and private development could be constructed. It serves as a design framework, but not a design plan since pieces are not integrated to present a clear design identity characteristic along the entire waterfront. The development of a design plan should be addressed early in the implementation stage. This must involve public input and City support and could involve a professional design competition, request for proposals, or a similar approach to prompt the highest degree of expert involvement and innovation. The design plan must reflect high design standards to ensure that the waterfront ages gracefully and remains consistent with the historic setting of Old Town.
 - Management is critical. Current management of the waterfront is fractured across several City departments, with responsibility for varying aspects of its maintenance and operations. We recommend appointment of a senior director within City government to lead implementation of the Plan, determine priorities, and be held accountable for integrated management of the waterfront, coordination of the activities of City agencies, public entities, and commercial interests, and achievement of the Plan vision. The activities of this office need to be specifically resourced by the City. This senior director should be tasked with preparing and defending an integrated budget for waterfront needs. Other responsibilities may include: coordination of operation of the marina, programming, maintenance of parks and public space, security, facilities maintenance, budget and funds administration, and planning of future needs.

- Public oversight is critical. The City should designate a public body to act in concert with the duties and responsibilities of the senior director charged by the City to manage the waterfront. This body would provide the public input critical to achieving successful implementation of the plan in accordance with the public interest and within the City’s capabilities and resources. This could be a new body, but care must be taken to avoid unnecessary duplication of existing function with existing bodies like the Waterfront Committee. One option is to re-charter the existing Waterfront Committee as a Waterfront Commission and review and revise its membership and function. Another option is to establish a separate Waterfront Plan Implementation Task Force charged with overseeing implementation of the Plan, which would eventually transfer its responsibilities to a Waterfront Commission when implementation is substantially completed. Consideration should be given to ensuring a voice for residents proximate to waterfront development and civic improvements.
- The Plan contains cost estimates to implement its various features. Additional engineering studies and assessments executed as part of implementation will further refine these numbers. Similarly, the revenue streams from the variety of potential waterfront activities are estimated based on representative uses. With or without changes in zoning, adequate revenues are projected to meet projected costs, although the time period for amortizing costs is longer without rezoning. Regardless of alternatives, Plan phasing, and the mix of uses (and the attendant revenues generated), it is essential that the significant costs of improvements are addressed, but do not create an undue financial burden on the City. If properly implemented, investment in the City’s waterfront can significantly increase City revenues from a variety of sources (lodging, meals, and retail sales taxes). This investment benefits all of Alexandria. From this perspective, City funding of waterfront improvements should be highly prioritized and compete well within the City’s Capital Improvement Program.
- Although art and history are critical elements of the draft Plan, specific dedicated public funding anticipated within the Plan is relatively small. The draft Plan projects private funding for the vast majority of history and arts amenities. For such important features within the waterfront vision, funding streams must be more certain. Dedicated funding for these waterfront amenities from public and private sources needs City emphasis and support throughout implementation. One likely source is developer contributions, which will play a significant role in funding public amenities at and adjacent to development sites. In addition, creation of non-profit entities dedicated to supporting the waterfront and its activities should be encouraged and, within legal limits, enabled by the City. Good examples like the Founders Park Community Association and cooperative arrangements similar to this can also complement the City role. A third potential funding source is grant funding from federal, state, and non-profit organizations. Capturing grant funds will likely require dedicated effort by both City staff and volunteers, with Council approval. Grant activities should be managed by the senior director within City government charged with Plan coordination and execution.

- The Work Group suggests the following new Plan recommendation: The ~~application of net additional City revenues generated by redevelopment of the waterfront should generally be dedicated~~ applied to waterfront-area amenities, including parks, programming, and other public uses. The City should prepare an annual waterfront capital and operations budget, and the annual funding should be sufficient for timely implementation of the Plan and annual expenditures should generally be no less than the net annual revenues generated from redevelopment. The City should estimate and track new revenues generated by increased activities along the waterfront (e.g., hotel and restaurant taxes, property taxes, etc.) and these estimates can help the City explain and rationalize the investment cost made along the waterfront. In adopting this Plan recommendation, the Work Group notes that formally dedicated or partitioned funding may not provide the flexibility Council requires to manage the City. Further, funding may not be sufficient within this notional “lockbox” to fund the Plan and achieve the investments necessary to achieve a vibrant waterfront. The Work Group notes that better geographic identification of capital expenditures not only along the waterfront, but also in other sections of the City would better inform the public and help facilitate comparative analysis of investments by the City.

Environmental Issues

Environmental issues are especially important to the Plan specifically because most of the waterfront lies in the RPA and the Resource Management Area of the Chesapeake Bay. The City intends to be a leader in environmental stewardship and has developed and embraced an Eco-City Charter. It promotes environmental considerations through its zoning requirements, policies, and public proclamations. The waterfront is a key area to demonstrate achievement of the highest environmental standards. Promoting the health of the river and protecting the health of citizens through action in this area is a vital act of leadership and an important requirement. The Work Group recommends that environmental impacts be addressed as part of Plan implementation.

- There was discussion over whether an integrated environmental assessment should be completed for the Plan as a whole, or whether individual assessments as development occurred would suffice. The Work Group notes the difficulty of completing a comprehensive assessment of the Plan given the conceptual nature of proposed developments, but it remains important to look forward and identify environmental requirements and potential impacts as implementation of the Plan proceeds. The Work Group recommends that the City address environmental issues for the waterfront as a whole as an explicit element of the waterfront-wide design and engineering plan. In addition, the City should consider the environmental impacts of any City improvement or private redevelopment on the waterfront to address the goals and objectives of the Eco-City charter and capture every opportunity to meet or exceed these requirements.
- Green space is a natural defense against flooding and helps to naturally cleanse storm water runoff into the Potomac River. This is best accomplished through increased parkland, natural shorelines, and limits on impervious surfaces. The Work Group supports the Plan

recommendations and Development Goals and Guidelines that accomplish these objectives. Portions of the Robinson Terminal properties represent potential open space opportunities and remediation sites along the river, especially those areas with contaminated soil.

Conclusion

The discussions of the Work Group yielded a diverse set of viewpoints and insights that are summarized as findings in the report. These findings apply regardless of the alternatives identified in the Plan. The alternatives presented in the Plan differed, in particular, on degree of density, open space, commercial activities, and public uses. Each alternative had different impacts on the City's zoning. It remains for City Council to understand where agreement generally exists, the range of alternatives defined by Plan variables, the evaluation criteria to be used, and then decide how best to proceed. Summarized below are the areas of general agreement (though not necessarily consensus), key Plan variables (AKA, areas of disagreement), and evaluation criteria for both the public and private realms of the Plan area.

	Public Realm	Private Realm
Areas of General Agreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High quality parks and public spaces • Maintaining seaport heritage • Promoting and funding art and history • Retaining/attracting new cultural institutions • Prominence of public space at foot of King St. • Improved, economically viable marina • Managing nuisance flooding • Ensuring public oversight and involvement • Integrated management of the waterfront • Enhanced programming and activities • Quality of design • Need for early, prominent public investment in waterfront core area • Adequate funding for improvements • Discrete budgeting for waterfront • Exceed environmental standards • Areas for additional study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Assessment of pilot parking program ○ Union St. transportation management plan ○ Detailed design plan ○ Flood mitigation engineering study ○ Pedestrian flow and safety study ○ Marina redevelopment study, including engineering of piers and wharves ○ Environmental assessment within overall waterfront design and engineering plan ○ GenOn Small Area Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Balanced, mixed-use development • Quality of design • High environmental standards • Protecting private landowner rights, including avoidance of eminent domain • SUP anticipated for all development • Allowing 66' height west of Union St. at RTN • Mitigating impacts of hotels and restaurants • Ensuring public oversight and involvement • Contributions for public amenities • Exceed environmental standards
Variables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Degree of pedestrian focus • Degree of public and private funding • Quantity and quality of public amenities, including public space, art and history, etc. • Allocation of waterfront and non-waterfront area revenue to fund civic improvements 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mix of usage (% hotel; % retail, etc.) • Quality of development • Allowable density • Private funding of public amenities
Evaluation Criteria	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public benefits • Public costs • Public acceptance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • External impacts • Market viability • Developer contributions for public amenities • Net tax revenue

Public Realm - General

The Work Group supports recommendations to achieve a minimum width of waterfront public space of 50 feet or more and supports compliance, to the greatest degree possible, with the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and Alexandria’s Eco-City Charter. The Work Group takes the position that the waterfront should have a holistic design vision that unites the City’s waterfront public spaces with a design plan that is authentic and unique to Alexandria, which stems from Old Town’s historic character and 18th century street grid. Features throughout the waterfront area should be welcoming to residents, visitors, and their families, and accessible to people with limited mobility and other physical impairments. The Work Group made a number of clarifying amendments to Plan recommendations and suggested removing recommendations that address issues that are outside the Plan area.

Summary of Work Group Public Realm - General Findings

- The Work Group strongly discourages the use of eminent domain to accomplish the recommendations of the Plan. Nothing in the Work Group report should offer rationale for eminent domain action. The Work Group recommends negotiation with private property owners as the preferred land acquisition strategy. This is consistent with a desire to protect private property rights at all development sites along the entire waterfront.
- The Work Group expressed consensus that the Alexandria waterfront should have a “world-class” design. This term implies a specific design plan and characteristics of design that have not yet been fully determined during the planning phase. The Plan as it exists now is conceptual and provides a design framework defined more by characteristics and recommended examples as opposed to a unifying vision that achieves requisite “world-class” design. The development of a design plan, one of the early-stage implementation actions, can remedy this shortcoming. Such development should seriously consider methods and incentives that invite and incorporate the very best design perspectives from as broad an array of participants as possible.
- Much attention has been paid to how the waterfront appears to visitors arriving by land. It is equally important to examine the waterfront’s face to river—its beauty, its variety, its attraction. A growing number of visitors will approach Alexandria from the water, including water taxis, pleasure craft, and other vessels. The waterfront can also provide an appealing face for the City to air travelers and motorists on the Woodrow Wilson Bridge. Therefore, care should be taken in design plans to project the waterfront’s identity from all perspectives.
- The Work Group recommended modifications to the public realm Plan recommendations as follows:
 - 3.1: Create a continuous waterfront public space of at least 50 feet and preferably 100 feet or more to comply to the greatest degree possible with Chesapeake Bay

Preservation Act guidelines and to better achieve the goals of the Eco-City Charter. There shall be a continuous waterfront walkway with a minimum width of 25 feet or wider, where appropriate.

- ~~3.3: Incorporate paving materials that are native to the Potomac River as well as ballast stones symbolically transplanted from ports from throughout the world. Emphasize the use of local paving and plant materials that may have historical precedent.~~
- ~~3.57: Replace railings and other dock “furniture” to be consistent with overall design guidelines for the waterfront. Use the combined people/dog “Molly” drinking fountain on Torpedo Plaza as a model for drinking fountains elsewhere on the waterfront. Create overall design guidelines to ensure consistency for elements such as paving, lighting, street furniture, etc.~~
- ~~3.101: Work with the National Park Service and the Virginia Department of Transportation during the implementation of the Jones Point Park Plan to help them address neighborhood issues as they arise.~~
- ~~3.102: Over the long term, pursue improvements to the Mount Vernon Trail between Jones Point Park and Hunting Creek.~~
- ~~3.104: Pursue opportunities to provide pedestrian access between Potomac Yard and the Mount Vernon Trail along the George Washington Memorial Parkway.~~

Work Group Plan Statements on the Public Realm - General

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.

Review of Plan Recommendations for the Public Realm - General

RECOMMENDATION 3.1

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Create a continuous waterfront public space of at least 50 feet and to the greatest degree possible comply with Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act guidelines with a walkway of a minimum width of 25 feet.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.1: General agreement with the above modifications related to width of the pathway and the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act.

Work Group Comments on 3.1: Modify to specify a preferred width for public space of 50 feet or more (inclusive of the walkway width) (Macek). A continuous walkway should only traverse publicly owned property that has been acquired through voluntary transactions with private property owners. Eminent domain should not be used anywhere along the waterfront (Ely). Agree with preferred width of 50 feet or more. Uncomfortable ‘tying the city’s hands with regards to eminent domain.’ (Olinger). Change to 50 feet (Lyle). Would like to clarify the requirements of the federal settlement agreements for properties on the waterfront. Not sure it's 25 feet. Urges the Work Group to remain as consistent as possible with the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act requirements; would support a ‘buffer zone of 100 feet.’ (Wood).

RECOMMENDATION 3.3

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~*Incorporate paving materials that are native to the Potomac River as well as ballast stones symbolically transplanted from ports from throughout the world.*~~ *Emphasize the use of local paving and plant materials that may have historical precedent.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.3: Consensus to substitute Rhodeside’s wording as noted above.

Work Group Comments on 3.3: These recommendations strike me as details that are best left for implementation. Some recommendations in other sections are equally fine-grained (3.22: removal/repurposing the volleyball court, for example.) (Olinger). The ballast-stone idea seems like a costly accouterment that is of minor historical import relative to preserving old buildings and maintaining the historic character of Old Town and its street grid (Ely). This is implementation and not planning (Lyle). Emphasize the use of local paving and plant materials that may have historical precedent (Rhodeside).

RECOMMENDATION 3.5

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Incorporate in-pavement lighting where appropriate.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.5: General agreement in support and to modify as above incorporating the words “where appropriate” as suggested by Rhodeside.

Work Group Comments on 3.5: Is such lighting sufficient, especially with regard to public-safety concerns? Might low-level lamps be more effective as a lighting source? (Ely). These recommendations strike me as details that are best left for implementation. Some recommendations in other sections are equally fine-grained (3.22: removal/repurposing the volleyball court, for example.) (Olinger). Add *where appropriate* (Rhodeside). Suggest adding Rhodeside’s edits, i.e., “where appropriate.” (Macek).

RECOMMENDATION 3.6

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Make the path ADA compliant.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.6: General agreement in support.

Work Group Comments on 3.6: Presumably the pathway would have to be ADA-compliant, but what are the design implications of such compliance? (Ely). Add *where appropriate* (Rhodeside).

RECOMMENDATION 3.7

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Keep the bike path and the walkway separate to the greatest degree possible.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.7: General agreement in support and to add the words “to the greatest degree possible.”

Work Group Comments on 3.7: Add: *to the greatest extent possible the bike path should not use public streets* (Olinger). Interesting idea, but how practical is such a separation? How would the physical separation be implemented? Who would enforce the separation? Would there be a need for police patrols (the Pathway Police) to enforce the separation? (Ely). Yes, but add *where appropriate* (Rhodeside). This states you should keep the bikes and pedestrians separated (Macek). A concern was raised that separating bikes from pedestrians might encourage bikes to use the streets instead -- an outcome that would conflict with an earlier Work Group recommendation. (Ballard). *To the greatest degree possible*, keep the bike path and the walkway separate. Also suggests that the Work Group, with staff, look at all the actions taken on bicycles to make sure that they tie together (Wood).

RECOMMENDATION 3.10

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Increase outdoor seating.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.10: Consensus in support.

Work Group Comments on 3.10: No comments.

RECOMMENDATION 3.56

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Ensure adequate pedestrian circulation and access throughout the Torpedo Plaza and harbor area, and minimize conflicts between pedestrians and services to river and activities along the river.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.56: General agreement in support with revisions.

Work Group Comments on 3.56: How does this recommendation relate to the food court, the Charthouse, and the entrance(s) to the Torpedo Factory? How do you provide services to the commercial boats and still improve pedestrian circulation? (Ely). The importance of recognizing existing features and planning for the future is noted, including an understanding that new waterfront activities would generate additional pedestrian traffic. (Wood).

RECOMMENDATION 3.57

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~Replace railings and other dock "furniture" to be consistent with overall design guidelines for the waterfront. Use the combined people/dog "Molly" drinking fountain on Torpedo Plaza as a model for drinking fountains elsewhere on the waterfront.~~ Create overall design guidelines to ensure consistency for elements such as paving, lighting, street furniture, etc.

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.57: Consensus in support of revised text.

Work Group Comments on 3.57: The drinking fountain might be a model but this is design not urban planning. The Small Area Plan should concentrate on the latter and leave urban design questions to a later phase (Olinger). What are the overall design guidelines for the waterfront? They need to be consistent (Ely). This is implementation and not planning (Lyle). Maybe also incorporate an earlier comment by Rhodeside with regard to professional standards (Wood).

RECOMMENDATION 3.60

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Work with the new Torpedo Factory governing board to identify and implement initiatives to strengthen the arts center and its role as the heart of the waterfront. Include for consideration ideas generated during the waterfront planning effort.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.60: General agreement in support.

Work Group Comments on 3.60: What are those ideas? (Ely). *Staff noted that examples of how the Torpedo Factory could contribute to public art outside its edifice would include not only public art outside the building but also creating a measure of building transparency, e.g., offering ground level views into the Torpedo Factory from outside.*

RECOMMENDATION 3.61

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Explore direct entry of the building at 101 North Union Street directly from King Street, also known as the Torpedo Factory Arcade, in order to help activate commercial space within the building.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.61: General agreement in support of revised text.

Work Group Comments on 3.61: Is there going to be an entrance off the arcade and if so can that be described? (Wood). *Staff clarified that this recommendation refers to a new entrance from King Street and the WPWG modified the recommendation to make it clear.*

RECOMMENDATION 3.100

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Assess pedestrian/bicycle trail conditions between Windmill Hill Park and Jones Point Park and repair or elevate as needed.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.100: General agreement in support.

Work Group Comments on 3.100: While this trail lies within the waterfront plan area, shouldn't this activity be undertaken independently of the waterfront plan? (Ely).

RECOMMENDATION 3.101

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~Work with the National Park Service and the Virginia Department of Transportation during the implementation of the Jones Point Park Plan to help them address neighborhood issues as they arise.~~

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.101: General agreement to delete this recommendation since this already occurs.

Work Group Comments on 3.101: Why does the waterfront plan have to address this issue? (Ely).

RECOMMENDATION 3.102

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~Over the long term, pursue improvements to the Mount Vernon Trail between Jones Point Park and Hunting Creek.~~

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.102: General agreement to delete this recommendation.

Work Group Comments on 3.102: This activity should be undertaken independently of the waterfront plan because this trail segment lies outside the waterfront plan (Ely).

RECOMMENDATION 3.103

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Request the National Park Service to begin a Daingerfield Island master plan process and address resident proposals for a waterside boardwalk and other features.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.103: General agreement in support after much discussion.

Work Group Comments on 3.103: How is this relevant to the plan? (Ballard). Exactly the same wording needs to be used in a new recommendation that addresses the GenOn site as the Daingerfield Island (Wood). This activity should be undertaken independently of the waterfront plan because this trail segment lies outside the waterfront plan (Ely). Keep it in (Macek). Put both in: Daingerfield and GenOn. (Olinger). Take both out. (Lyle).

RECOMMENDATION 3.104

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~Pursue opportunities to provide pedestrian access between Potomac Yard and the Mount Vernon Trail along the George Washington Memorial Parkway.~~

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.104: Majority agreed to remove this recommendation because the location is outside of the Plan area.

Work Group Comments on 3.104: This should come out; it has no relationship to the waterfront. (Ely). It is a new neighborhood that should have some connection to the waterfront; I would vote to not taking it out (Macek). It does not have a relationship to the waterfront and should come out. (Smedberg).

Foot of King Street

The Work Group supports a significant public space at the foot of King Street that acts as a gateway and functions as a focal point for pedestrian-related activities. This public space should function as a hub to orient visitors and connect King Street, Old Town, and the history of the waterfront with today's maritime activities including the water taxi, commercial boats, historic vessels, and private pleasure boats. Ongoing negotiations with the Old Dominion Boat Club (ODBC) regarding property issues should encourage innovative planning and implementation in this key area of the waterfront. To facilitate this vision, the Work Group recommends pursuing the elimination of the existing parking lot and determination of viable parking alternatives through negotiations with the ODBC—and not through eminent domain actions. Regardless of these negotiations, the City should proceed with developing this public space, incorporating the unit block of King Street and King Street Park. An important element of this recommendation is the closure of the unit block of King Street to traffic. This public space should be top quality and must be designed to complement any eventual property agreements in this area. The Work Group supports a new commercial pier in the vicinity of King Street with facilities to support water taxis, a historic ship, and public access to the waterfront.

Summary of Work Group Foot of King Street Findings

- The Work Group recommended modifications to the Public Realm – Foot of King Street recommendations as follows:
 - 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.~~
 - 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. 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 functions as the focal point of pedestrian-related waterfront activities for residents and visitors.~~
 - New Recommendation: 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.
 - 3.71: Orient and design the public space park/plaza in such a way as to accommodate multi-seasonal programming, to include vending carts, moveable tables, chairs, and umbrellas in the warmer months and an ice rink during the winter. If an ice rink is not feasible in this location, other waterfront locations should be considered, such as the foot of Prince Street near The Beachcombers Restaurant site.

- 3.72: ~~Include a fountain or other water feature, and identify or create an area to be used as a small stage or performance area as part of the final plaza design of this public space or in nearby Waterfront Park. Any performance area should be designed to be viewed, to the greatest extent possible, from both Fitzgerald Square and Waterfront Park.~~
- 3.75: ~~Negotiate parking lot land transfer or acquisition with ODBC.~~
- 3.77: ~~Create a new commercial pier off Fitzgerald Square in the vicinity of King Street to accommodate water taxis and historical vessels. [Move to the implementation section: 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 and recognize the different operational needs of water taxis and other commercial boating operations.]~~
- 3.78: ~~Attract a tall ship or other ship of character, preferably to be berthed at the new pier and visible from King Street. In addition, there should be other berthing opportunities along the waterfront for other ships.~~
- 3.80: ~~Negotiate dock and boat ramp agreements with ODBC.~~

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.

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

Disagreed: Ely

Review of Plan Recommendations for the Foot of King Street

RECOMMENDATION 3.62

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Implement the vision of the Plan for King Street at the river, Waterfront Park, and the City marina. The component elements of this vision are outlined below but the sequence and timing of the elements will vary based on the unique challenges and opportunities of each element. Phasing is also addressed in Chapter 5 of this Plan.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: This is an introductory statement; the Work Group addressed their issues through changes to the recommendations that follow.

Work Group Comments: Our plan statements call for a significant public space at this location (see E1), not a public plaza/promenade from Union Street to the riverbank. Accomplishment of this recommendation depends on judicial reversal of federal court settlement with the Boat Club and over dependence on this one approach to development at the foot of King Street 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 development outlined in the plan (Wood). This is an impractical vision, in part because the concept of a Fitzgerald Square at the bottom of King Street is a non-starter (Ely).

RECOMMENDATION 3.63

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~Create an exceptional public plaza/promenade from Union Street to the riverbank, replacing the unit block of King Street and King Street Park.~~

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Consensus to delete this recommendation because the issue is addressed in the revision of recommendation 3.68 below.

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

RECOMMENDATION 3.64

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Limit vehicular access to the unit block of King Street and The Strand between Prince and King Streets to emergency vehicles, deliveries (limited hours), motor coaches, and the King Street Trolley. The Strand would also be open to vehicles accessing the parking garages and lots that have entrances on this block of The Strand.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: There was general agreement in support of this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: There are so many exceptions to this proposed limited access as to make it non-workable. Also, this proposal does not address the continued public use of Wales Alley as a two-way street. Implementing this recommendation would have such serious consequences as to make it completely in practical due to the number of vehicles that would still need to traverse the Strand to get to the ODBC parking lot. Also, this recommendation does not address vehicles traveling through Wales Alley. The ODBC won that access right in Circuit Court and is likely to prevail in the City's appeal to the Virginia Supreme Court. (Ely). Prohibit access by motor coaches (Rhodeside). No; curb cut language regarding buildings facing public space conflicts with this recommendation. Also, Trolleys don't need to transit this far down King Street and further congest traffic (Wood).

RECOMMENDATION 3.68

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~*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.*~~ *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 functions as the focal point of pedestrian-related waterfront activities for residents and visitors.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Majority support revised text (Ely opposed) as addressing members' issues.

Work Group Comments: Ely strongly dissents from this statement – there simply will not be enough room for a “significant public space” at the bottom of King Street since the ODBC parking lot is going to stay right where it is. Eliminating the Boat Club parking lot would further exacerbate parking problems in the waterfront area. It has been irresponsible of City staff not to consider realistic alternatives for providing a convenient replacement for the Club parking lot once the building in Waterfront Park was scratched from the waterfront plan. (Ely) This should no longer be discussed; the plan should move forward without ODBC (Lyle). See above (Ballard). 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).

RECOMMENDATION 3.69

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~Consider~~ *Pursue eliminating the ODBC parking lot along The Strand through negotiation with the ODBC.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Majority support revised text (Ely opposed) as addressing members' issues.

Work Group Comments: We need to look at an alternate plan that beautifies the parking and replans the area (Ballard). 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). Add the word "preferably" after The Strand; the parcel is too important to tie the City's hands (Olinger). 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) This idea is an absolute non-starter. Drop it! (Ely) This should no longer be discussed; the plan should move forward without ODBC (Lyle).

NEW RECOMMENDATION

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *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.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Majority in support of new recommendation, with Ely disagreeing.

Work Group Comments: The ODBC has long stood ready to improve the appearance of the fence encompassing its parking lot/boat storage/boat-launching facility. For public safety reasons I strongly oppose creating a passageway along the river from King Street Park to Waterfront Park. Due to its isolated location and blocked view from King and Strand, this walkway could easily become "Muggers Alley." (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.71

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Orient and design the park/plaza in such a way as to accommodate multi-seasonal programming, to include vending carts, moveable tables, chairs, and umbrellas in the warmer months and an ice rink during the winter. If an ice rink is not feasible in this location, other waterfront locations should be considered, such as the foot of Prince Street near The Beachcombers Restaurant site.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group chose not have a roundtable discussion of this recommendation. A position of majority support with Ely disagreeing is based upon discussion by the Work Group of related recommendations as well as written comments on this recommendation. An additional sentence is recommended to address the Work Group comment that the ice rink may be a desirable feature on the waterfront but not necessarily in this location.

Work Group Comments: The underlying design concept is a non-starter, so these ideas have no relevance to a revised waterfront plan (Ely). This should be thought through without ODBC (Lyle). Alternatives for this activity need to be explored (e.g., at the foot of Prince St in area near the Beachcomber) Creating a public space that links the foot of King Street, King Street Park, facilitated by virtual elimination of vehicles, except for emergency vehicle access could complement this arrangement. (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 3.72

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Include a fountain or other water feature, and identify or create an area to be used as a small stage or performance area as part of the final ~~plaza~~ design of this public space or in nearby Waterfront Park. ~~Any performance area should be designed to be viewed, to the greatest extent possible, from both Fitzgerald Square and Waterfront Park.~~*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group chose not have a roundtable discussion of this recommendation but they discussed related recommendations and provided written comments on this recommendation. The recommendation is edited to address the changes made by the Work Group to other recommendations; for example, by being less specific about the location and function of these design elements.

Work Group Comments: The underlying design concept is a non-starter, so these ideas have no relevance to a revised waterfront plan (Ely). See above (Ballard). 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).

RECOMMENDATION 3.75

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~Negotiate parking lot land transfer or acquisition with ODBC.~~

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Consensus to delete recommendation because the issue is addressed in recommendation 3.69.

Work Group Comments: See comments for recommendation 3.69.

RECOMMENDATION 3.77

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~Create a new commercial pier off Fitzgerald Square in the vicinity of King Street to accommodate water taxis and historical vessels. [Move to the implementation section: 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 and recognize the different operational needs of water taxis and other commercial boating operations.]~~

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Majority in support of revised recommendation (including moving the statement regarding pier design to implementation) with Ely disagreeing.

Work Group Comments: Also supports Plan Statement E2 (Macek). 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). Pier should be relocated (Lyle). Consider line of sight to the river in locating berthing facilities for boats (Rhodeside). See above (Ballard). Conflicts with language in H3 Plan Statement in Marina statements (Wood). 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).

RECOMMENDATION 3.78

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~Attract a tall ship or other ship of character, preferably to be berthed at the new pier and visible from King Street.~~ In addition, there should be other berthing opportunities along the waterfront for other ships.

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Majority in support of revised text with Ely disagreeing.

Work Group Comments: Also supports Plan Statement E2 (Macek). 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). This is implementation and not planning (Lyle). See comment for 3.77 (Rhodeside)

RECOMMENDATION 3.80

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~Negotiate dock and boat ramp agreements with ODBC.~~

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Consensus to remove recommendation as the issue is addressed in other recommendations.

Work Group Comments: Also supports Plan Statement E2 (Macek). What does this statement mean? (Ely). Move forward without ODBC (Lyle). What does this mean? (Olinger).

Parks and Public Spaces

Alexandria's waterfront parks and public spaces have the potential to be an asset for our City, the region, and the nation. The Work Group believes the parks and public spaces of the waterfront should be considered an integrated system and should have a holistic design vision that is respectful of our history and achieves a high standard of style, architecture, and artistry. Our historic waterfront has a story that needs to be told and experienced with facilities, activities, and services that support both passive and active uses. Improved maintenance is an absolute must; at present, resources are insufficient to maintain a waterfront we can all be proud of. Management and maintenance of parks and public spaces must be improved. This unique public space is both a tidal wetland and a restricted protective area linked to the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Environmental requirements, the goals of the City's Eco-Charter, and flood mitigation measures must be accomplished without limiting public access and enjoyment. New park space along The Strand, from Waterfront Park to Wolfe Street, must be constructed, celebrated, and enjoyed early in implementation as a major addition to a newly vibrant waterfront and a clear signal to the community of the importance of public amenities.

Summary of Work Group Parks and Public Spaces Findings

- Management and maintenance of waterfront parks and public spaces must be a priority of the City, particularly as the City implements the Plan. Maintenance practices should change immediately to signal to the public that focus and attention will be paid to the impending and significant public investment to Alexandria's waterfront. There should be ready access to equipment but having park operations and support facilities proximate to the waterfront should not sacrifice valuable property.
- In order to stage a variety of activities in the vibrant waterfront public spaces, support infrastructure must be enhanced. Such things as power to support audio, video, lighting, and vendor requirements or seating, stages, and platform supports should be incorporated into any park improvements.
- Planning and programming of activities in the parks and public spaces is an important responsibility that requires a more creative approach if the City intends to foster a waterfront that remains fresh and vibrant. City staff should renew its approach to support programming along an integrated waterfront. It should solicit public input and develop an annual program of creative and innovative activities and events sponsored by the City, non-profits, citizens, and other organizations. Staff should review its current procedures and make necessary changes to ensure it has the ability to coordinate the increased activities envisioned on the waterfront (e.g., pre-event organization, insurance, advertisement, site support, execution, and clean-up).
- The Work Group recommended modifications to the parks and public spaces recommendations as follows:

- 3.35: Retain the rail spur through Oronoco Bay Park, ~~partially as it is needed by coal trains to continue to serve the GenOn Energy, Inc. Plant, and partially~~ to support railroad-themed park elements and historic railroad interpretation. The portion of the rail line on Robinson Terminal North property ~~will~~ may not be needed when ~~redevelopment takes place~~ Robinson Terminal North ceases operations.
- 3.87: Establish The Strand area, south of Prince Street, as a cultural anchor of the waterfront, with reference to emphasis on history and art. In planning and implementation, consider the public realm from King Street to Robinson Terminal South holistically.
- 3.90: [In the expanded Point Lumley Park] Provide varied activities and recreation opportunities in the park, such as a model boat basin, climbable ship's rigging, rowboat or canoe rental, rented bocce or croquet, and others. Look to other waterfronts worldwide for inspiration.
- New Recommendation: The parks and public spaces of the waterfront should be considered an integrated system and should have a holistic design vision.

Work Group Plan Statements on Parks and Public Spaces

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Note: It was noted that 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: Rhodaside, Wood, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard, and Ely.

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

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

Review of Plan Recommendations for Parks and Public Spaces

RECOMMENDATION 3.17

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *At the end of Montgomery Street, consider low impact hardscape options and enhance the observation area at the point, possibly with a set of steps leading down to the river and vertical elements to frame the view and possibly angled to the north to better capture views of the nation’s capital.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 3.18

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *The Plan recommends only minor enhancements to Rivergate City Park. Due to limited nearby parking and proximity to residences, the current level of activity in the park is appropriate.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 3.19

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *[At Rivergate City Park] Maintain a strong connection to the river; re-orient the pathways so that the main “through” pathway is the one that takes visitors along the river’s edge.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: This is fine as long as private-property rights are respected. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.20

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Provide additional plantings featuring native plants in the western half of the park, in part to subtly orient visitors toward the more public, eastern section of the park.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 3.22

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Keep options open for removal/repurposing of the existing volleyball court in this location.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 3.23

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *The Plan recommends no changes to the rowing facility. The Center should be maintained and enhanced as necessary, in order to continue its successful operation.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 3.24

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Redesign the mews between the United Way building and Sheet Metal Workers Building to create a more open, visible, and safe extension of the Wythe Street viewshed toward the river. The current condition is a cluttered and dark ramble and should be a major entry to the park, complete with belvedere and orientation space at the intersection of Wythe Street and the Mount Vernon Trail.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 3.26

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Re-grade the park to create a single shallow sloped lawn, creating a more flexible amphitheater-like space facing Oronoco Bay for performances and events ~~facing Oronoco Bay~~.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group supports this recommendation. Text revised to provide clarity, per Work Group member comments.

Work Group Comments: Facing Oronoco bay? Wouldn't musicians or other performances face away from the river towards an audience seated on the "shallow sloped lawn?" (Wood). *Staff agrees the wording suggests the performances would face the bay but the intent is for the amphitheater to face the bay.*

RECOMMENDATION 3.27

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Redesign the major paths into a pair of intersecting curved walks to better frame the single great lawn. One of these arcs would include the Mount Vernon bicycle path so that users of the path would automatically traverse through the park instead of past it.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 3.28

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Erect a large shade structure at water's edge to provide an overlook, picnic shelter, or stage. This structure would become the focal point of the park and should be a significant work of garden architecture. It may be fitted with solar panels on the roof to provide power for small events or ceiling fans.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 3.31

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Allow a successional forest to emerge on the north side of the park, extending the natural landscape of the tidal flats to the adjoining uplands. The intent is to plant a variety of trees, shrubs, and groundcovers, and to end the practice of mowing in a small area, allowing that area to evolve naturally. This could be an excellent interpretive and research opportunity for City school children to discover the restorative power of nature.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 3.32

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *A small children’s play area is proposed, with recreation equipment and water features – uniquely designed by artists – perhaps comprised of recycled materials or even carefully screened flotsam from the river, so children will see a direct relationship to natural and cultural cycles.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: But what will be done about the flotsam which is hard not to see anywhere along the river (Ely). *Staff notes the Plan recommends significantly increasing the budget for maintenance, including for removal of waterborne debris, and staff included the capital and operating costs of debris-removal equipment in the financial assumptions for the Plan.*

RECOMMENDATION 3.35

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Retain the rail spur through Oronoco Bay Park, ~~partially as it is needed by coal trains to continue to serve the GenOn Energy, Inc. Plant, and partially to support railroad-themed park elements and historic railroad interpretation.~~ The portion of the rail line on Robinson Terminal North property will may not be needed when ~~redevelopment takes place~~ Robinson Terminal North ceases operations.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group chose not have a roundtable discussion of this recommendation. It has been updated to reflect the upcoming closure of the GenOn Energy, Inc. plant and to reflect Work Group member comments.

Work Group Comments: Yes, although the rail spur into the RTN should be left in place until the use of this site is determined (Wood). Now that the GenOn plant will cease operating within a year, it is highly unlikely that the rail spur will remain in place much past the closure of the GenOn plant. This portion of the plan needs to be completely rethought in light of the forthcoming GenOn closure. The question as to who will acquire title to the right-of-way now occupied by the rail spur to the North Terminal also must be determined. (Ely).

RECOMMENDATION 3.37

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Retired railroad box cars could also serve as park buildings containing services for park users, such a place to borrow bocce and croquet sets, chess pieces, or horseshoes.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Majority in support. The Work Group chose not have a roundtable discussion of this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Yes, but the maintenance of these railcars must be budgeted and align with strict standards. (Wood). The absence of a rail spur must be considered with regard to the box car idea (Ely).

RECOMMENDATION 3.39

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Activities that would place people in direct contact with water near the sewer outfall or the creosote seepage area are not envisioned. For that reason, the Plan does not recommend use of the Bay for water-related activities, including paddle boating. The Plan recommends continuing to pursue separation of storm and sanitary sewers when possible.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: General agreement in support. The Work Group chose not have a roundtable discussion of this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Sewer separation is a huge issue along the entire waterfront, and especially at this point where pollutants continue to leach into the river (Ely).

RECOMMENDATION 3.42

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Retain the current character and use of Founders Park.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Consensus in support. The Work Group chose not have a roundtable discussion of this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: This park is OK but should be enhanced with the hardscape and planting improvements implemented in other areas of the waterfront (Rhodeside).

RECOMMENDATION 3.46

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Rebuild and realign the bulkhead with a gently curving and much wider promenade that would intuitively lead pedestrians from Founders Park around the Chart House to the Torpedo Plaza.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 3.48

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *In conjunction with changes to the Food Court and Chart House, relocate the dining area rear staircase to be adjacent to the promenade, possibly bridging the “alley” with a walkway or small dining terrace for the Chart House. Address handicapped access with an outdoor lift.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Consensus in support. The Work Group chose not have a roundtable discussion of this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: The future uses of the food court must be evaluated in addressing the issues raised by this recommendation. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.51

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Work with the leaseholder of the Food Court to attract more successful uses that better meet resident and visitor needs, including options such as a market hall, cultural venue, restaurants or shops featuring locally-made goods. The Plan supports interior and exterior changes to the Food Court structure, including replacement, that are necessary to accommodate more successful uses. A renovated or replaced Food Court structure should be designed to actively engage with Torpedo Plaza and harbor activity, better address the use conflicts and other design problems in Thompsons Alley, and generally maintain a similar height and footprint as the current building.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Consensus in support. The Work Group chose not have a roundtable discussion of this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: This is worth a full discussion. A better organized Food Court might serve an otherwise underserved visitor population. Are there other uses that are practical? Could the building be re-used rather than replaced? Do we want another full service restaurant at Torpedo Plaza? (Olinger)

RECOMMENDATION 3.52

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Prepare a comprehensive redesign of the access area in front of the Chart House and Food Court, providing a unified series of terraces or decks that gradually rise to the main floor level for both buildings and better define the outdoor space at Torpedo Plaza. Replace the handicap ramp between the two structures with a lift, retaining the ramp along the western edge of the Food Court.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 3.53

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Evaluate the utility of the bandstand outside the Food Court for more active programming or demolition.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

Work Group Comments: See comment above. (Ely) Potentially, it's an asset. Who programs its use? What can be done to make it more effective? (Olinger)

RECOMMENDATION 3.55

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Encourage ~~programming~~ active use of the outdoor vending sites adjacent to the Torpedo Factory, including more intensive uses than are currently permitted, such as outdoor food/beverage service. Delineate the space with planters, art, or other hardscape features to help with wayfinding and visibility. Encourage visitors to linger with shade structures or tables with umbrellas.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group chose not to discuss this recommendation. Edits are based upon Work Group member comments.

Work Group Comments: Yes, but....this is actually a very congested plaza during peak use and additional commercial activity here will only increase this congestion. Additional features on this plaza must be accomplished in a studied and selective fashion. (Wood). What exactly is the problem here? Spontaneity rather than "programmed" may be a better choice. Do we really want another food court here? (Olinger) Yes, but delete vending with dining (Rhodeside).

RECOMMENDATION 3.73

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Implement a redesigned Waterfront Park to include a newly landscaped lawn framed by the existing willow oaks and new tree plantings.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Consensus in support. The Work Group provided written comments on this recommendation; the discussion focused on the importance of early implementation of this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Key question: How will the park be redesigned? (Ely). Consideration should be given to remove vegetation if vegetation blocks views of the river and other open spaces (Rhodeside). We need to implement this immediately upon adoption of the Plan (Ballard).

RECOMMENDATION 3.76

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Encourage the active enjoyment of Waterfront Park with elements such as: food and other carts, tables and chairs, small scale recreation activities, and programming of events, displays or performances providing entertainment, culture, history and the arts.*

- *Kiosks and other temporary or seasonal structures serving as outdoor cafes, unique retail (such as made in Alexandria items), cultural or history-themed displays.*
- *An open-air market structure or pergola, suitable for farmer's markets, art shows, and the like, possibly glass enclosed in winter to support ice skating and other winter recreation activities.*
- *A new public pier, which will serve both to bring park users out onto the water as well as a location for water taxis and other boats to bring visitors to Alexandria.*
- *Permanent and/or visiting historic ships and other ships of character.*
- *A stage supporting performances, movies, and other entertainment or cultural events, using the natural slope of Waterfront Park and the low berms or seating walls of the flood mitigation strategy to allow park users to view the stage.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group chose not have a roundtable discussion of this recommendation but they discussed related recommendations and provided written comments on this recommendation. Recommendation 3.89 could be edited, or a new recommendation created, to address the comment that the planned series of Strand public spaces should be thought of and treated holistically.

Work Group Comments: Also supports Plan Statement E2 (Macek). These ideas could lead to an overuse of the park and add to the street and sidewalk congestion in the King-Union area. Further, the idea of placing a new dock off Waterfront Park to serve the water taxis begs the question of the best location along the waterfront for all the commercial boats, including the water taxi. That most important waterfront issue is not addressed satisfactorily by the waterfront plan in its present iteration (Ely). Yes, but...this redesigned space runs from the ODBC parking lot down to the "civic building." We need to begin describing this entire space more correctly as the Strand in accordance with the History

plan, or something similar. The language in this recommendation should agree with similar language in 3.89 (Wood).

RECOMMENDATION 3.86

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Draw inspiration from The Strand’s role in Alexandria’s history as a working waterfront in public improvements, private development, and programming, including park design and the scale and positioning of new development in this area.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: This is a vague and therefore meaningless recommendation (Ely).

RECOMMENDATION 3.87

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Establish The Strand area, south of Prince Street, as a cultural anchor of the waterfront, with reference to emphasis on history and art. In planning and implementation, consider the public realm from King Street to Robinson Terminal South holistically.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group chose not to discuss this recommendation. Edits are based upon member comments.

Work Group Comments: Consider integrating existing Waterfront Park and The Strand in planning and development. This entire strip deserves more of a historical treatment. Waterfront Park is not an adequate historical name. The Strand may work, but our historians may have a different alternative to consider. (Wood). Substitute reference to for emphasis on (Rhodeside)

RECOMMENDATION 3.89

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Complete the acquisition of the waterside properties between Prince and Duke Streets and develop them as a public park showcasing shipbuilding, and other important elements of the City’s past. Look to the History Plan and the Art Plan for guidance in park features and structures, naming, historic interpretation, and art.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Eminent domain should not be used to acquire the Mann and Sweeney properties. (Ely). Eminent domain should not be used for acquisition (Lyle).

RECOMMENDATION 3.90

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: [In the expanded Point Lumley Park] *Provide varied activities and recreation opportunities in the park, such as a model boat basin, climbable ship's rigging, rowboat or canoe rental, rented bocce or croquet, and others. Look to other waterfronts worldwide for inspiration.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group chose not to discuss this recommendation. Edits are based upon Work Group member comments.

Work Group Comments: Yes, and more. Recommendation should ask the city to review waterfront park activities in light of other successful waterfronts in the world. (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 3.91

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: [In the expanded Point Lumley Park] *Consider a ~~civic building~~ civic structure in the park, with potential uses including history, art, or shipbuilding activities, as well as services for park users and other park functions. Relocate the Seaport Foundation's floating building to the foot of Duke Street. Provide one or more temporary or permanent berths for historic ships.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group chose not to discuss this recommendation. Edits are based upon Work Group member comments.

Work Group Comments: This civic building could be here or elsewhere along the waterfront. If it is located here, it further intensifies density in this very small area of the waterfront. Since the recommendation simply says "Consider" we need to find a way to be more specific about recommending further study to identify options for its location. And, since this building currently is counted as the only money spent in the WFP for Arts and History, we need to evaluate whether this is the right allocation of money in total for Arts and History. And, we need to figure out just how many historic ships we want and where we want them berthed. I count four places currently, RNC, King Street Pier, and here. (Wood) Say civic structure instead of civic building (Rhodeside). Which park is being referred to here? (Ely)

NEW RECOMMENDATION

Text for the Draft Waterfront Plan: *The parks and public spaces of the Waterfront should be considered an integrated system and should have a holistic design vision.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends adding this recommendation.

Work Group comments on this recommendation: 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)

Marina, Piers and Shoreline

The Work Group supports the intent of the Plan to create a more natural, inviting, and environmentally sound shoreline. There should be equal attention paid to activities along the waterfront as well as from water to land. There should be a comprehensive approach to boating. City marina facilities should be improved to support existing and expanded commercial vessel operations north of King Street, including tour boats, dinner cruises, and excursions. To retain integrity with Alexandria's maritime heritage, the Work Group recommends that the ability to dock large vessels be retained. To minimize dredging expenses, consider docking large shallow-draft vessels at Robinson Terminal North while maintaining the option of docking deep-draft vessels at Robinson Terminal South. The pleasure boat marina should be modern and well-maintained and located so as to avoid conflicts with commercial vessels. The marina should be a self-sufficient enterprise and accommodate both lease slip holders and day trippers. Finally, while a public boat launch for trailered vessels should not be located in Old Town, launch sites for canoes, kayaks, and other self-propelled watercraft are encouraged near Rivergate Park and Windmill Hill Park, in addition to the new launch in Jones Point Park.

Summary of Work Group Marina, Piers and Shoreline Findings

- Alexandria is a maritime City and must retain its heritage. The City must make key decisions about future marina facilities: Their location, improved infrastructure and amenities, supporting services, and the mix of public and private operations. The end goal is a marina that is economically viable and better serves the boating public and lures maritime visitors to Alexandria, yet is compatible with its neighbors and is compatible with the historic fabric of Old Town. The separation of commercial and pleasure boat activity is a vital first step in future planning for existing and expanded waterfront activities.
- Boating is an activity that is integral to the waterfront and boating needs should be addressed in a holistic and comprehensive way. Future engineering and design should address how to accommodate these needs in the right locations.
- The Work Group recommended modifications to traffic and circulation Plan recommendations as follows:
 - 3.16: Provide a location for the public to launch (or land) canoes, ~~and~~ kayaks, and other self-propelled watercraft at Rivergate Park or through joint-use of the City-owned Rowing Facility.
 - New Recommendation: 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.

- 3.58: Rebuild the bulkhead in areas where it is failing in a way that is compatible with other newly designed bulkheads in the waterfront.
- 3.81: ~~Utilize the existing City Marina where local cruise vessels and the water taxis are currently docked as an expanded area for local cruise ships.~~ The Alexandria waterfront shall provide sufficient dock space and other facilities required to support existing and expanded commercial vessel operations, including tour boats and water taxis.
- 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. 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 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.~~
- 3.83: ~~Retain the capacity for deep water docking large vessels at Robinson Terminal North and —until the marina is constructed—Robinson Terminal South. To minimize dredging expenses, consider docking large shallow-draft vessels at Robinson Terminal North while maintaining the option of docking deep-draft vessels at Robinson Terminal South.~~
- 3.84: ~~Consider transient (but not overnight) docking of pleasure boats in one or more locations along the shore between the new King Street pier and Robinson Terminal South.~~
- 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 daytrippers visiting by boat. Appropriate accommodation should be made for daytrippers visiting by boat.~~

Work Group Plan Statements on Marina, Piers and Shoreline

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, Rhodesside, 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, Rhodesside, 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, Rhodesside, 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.

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

Agreed: Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodesside, 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, Rhodesside, Wood.

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

Agreed: Ely, Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodesside, Wood.

Proposed statement that was not agreed to “New public piers should not impinge on legally existing private piers.”

Agreed: Ely, Wood.

Disagreed: Lyle, Macek, Olinger, Rhodesside.

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

Review of Plan Recommendations for Marina, Piers and Shoreline

RECOMMENDATION 3.16

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Provide a location for the public to launch (or land) canoes, ~~and~~ kayaks, and other self-propelled watercraft at Rivergate Park or through joint-use of the City-owned Rowing Facility.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group chose not to discuss this recommendation. Edits based upon Work Group member comments.

Work Group Comments: We need to discuss further as the location needs to be more relevant to the King Street core. (Ballard) Yes, but....Although we speak of similar small boat activity at Pt. Lumley, there is no real recommendation in this list that addresses the specifics of this proposal. (Wood) Where is the key question here? (Ely) "...and other self-propelled water craft" (Lyle)

NEW RECOMMENDATION

Text for the Draft Waterfront Plan: *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.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: After discussion, general agreement in support of a new recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 3.29

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Create a series of terraced wetlands on the south side of the park that recapture the historic drainage swale called Ralph's Gutt. These terraces would be graded into the current ground and planted with aquatic plants which will naturally cleanse the storm water before it enters the river. Boardwalks can cross the wetlands to connect pedestrian desire lines and create opportunities for interpretive education. These wetland enhancements could involve day-lighting the storm water pipes that currently convey the water under the park to the bay.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Yes, but not sure what "daylighting" means in this context (Wood). *Staff addressed the daylighting question in a presentation on environmental issues.*

RECOMMENDATION 3.30

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Explore opportunities to reduce the impact of the combined sewer overflow (CSO) outfall that discharges at the foot of Pendleton Street. Options include installing a retention basin to reduce the volume of combined sewage discharged into the river during rain events and incorporating features into the proposed extension of Pendleton Street that would direct CSOs away from Oronoco Bay.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: This is a critical long-term issue that the City must address. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.33

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Replace the existing curved boardwalk along the north edge of Oronoco Bay with one that better handles tide changes and extend the boardwalk to the end of the point to maximize views. Impacts on waterfowl breeding should be avoided, and the point should be evaluated for potential enhancement as an avian sanctuary. The Plan suggests a series of floating islands in the bay, continuing the arc created by the boardwalk and containing water-cleansing plants.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Hasn't the City just issued a contract to rebuild the existing boardwalk? How will that rebuilt boardwalk fit into the plan? (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.34

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Replace the existing rip rap with a more natural and inviting shoreline treatment, to include native plants.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Yes, in accordance with H4 Plan statement (Wood).

RECOMMENDATION 3.44

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Where possible, replace existing large diameter rip-rap with appropriate (native and/or historic) plantings, using an engineered shoreline restoration system where necessary, in order to achieve the naturalized shoreline envisioned by the Plan. Consider interpretive signage or other means to explain the system to passersby, and to encourage ecologically friendly use and a “tread lightly” mentality in this sensitive area.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Yes, in accordance with H4 Plan statement (Wood).

RECOMMENDATION 3.45

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *If rip-rap is retained in some locations, incorporate larger, flatter boulders to provide informal seating areas along the water’s edge.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 3.50

Text from the Waterfront Plan: *Provide parking for electric carts to bring mobility-impaired visitors to commercial boat docks and other Torpedo Plaza locations.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: The issue of where airport-style golf carts should be parked can be judged only in the context of a comprehensive plan for the docking and servicing of the commercial boats.

RECOMMENDATION 3.58

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Rebuild the bulkhead in areas where it is failing in a way that is compatible with other newly designed bulkheads in the waterfront.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group chose not to discuss this recommendation. Edits are based upon WPWG member comments.

Work Group Comments: This rebuilding, of course, is merely an ongoing waterfront maintenance issue and should not be considered as an element of the waterfront plan. (Ely) Compatible with other newly designed bulkheads in the waterfront (Rhodeside).

RECOMMENDATION 3.59

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *In conjunction with improvements to the City marina, provide a better location for dockmaster functions.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: That assumes that the existing marina will be retained more or less as is. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.67

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Complete repairs to bulkheads and other facilities as needed, as well as marina upgrades consistent with the long-term vision of the Plan.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: These repairs, of course, are merely an ongoing waterfront maintenance issue and should not be considered as an element of the waterfront plan. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.81

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~*Utilize the existing City Marina where local cruise vessels and the water taxis are currently docked as an expanded area for local cruise ships.*~~ *The Alexandria waterfront shall provide sufficient dock space and other facilities required to support existing and expanded commercial vessel operations, including tour boats and water taxis.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group chose not to discuss this recommendation. Edits based upon member comments.

Work Group Comments: Modify by introducing the following text before the existing sentence, or adding as another recommendation: “The Alexandria Waterfront shall provide sufficient dock space and other facilities required to support existing and expanded commercial vessel operations, including tour boats and water taxis.” (Macek). Yes, but...must account for ODBC rights and existing slips; City plans and suggested developments south of the ODBC property may cause the movement of ODBC slips north (Wood). It is not clear what this recommendation entails, specifically with regard to the idea of an expanded area for local cruise ships. Where would that expanded area be and what additional ships would it serve? (Ely).

RECOMMENDATION 3.82

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~Create a new pleasure boat marina at Robinson Terminal South. Consider private construction and operation, possibly in conjunction with a redeveloped Robinson Terminal South. 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 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.~~

Summary of Work Group Discussion: General agreement in support of this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: 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. In addition, City staff has not conducted the engineering work needed to determine the feasibility of building a new marina anywhere along the waterfront. Further the financial feasibility of continuing the operation of the existing marina facilities is highly questionable. (Ely). 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) 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, i.e....the waterfront ...could include a significant new public amenity, like a marina. (Wood) 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)

RECOMMENDATION 3.83

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Retain the capacity for ~~deep-water~~ docking large vessels at Robinson Terminal North and ~~—until the marina is constructed—~~ Robinson Terminal South. To minimize dredging expenses, consider docking large shallow-draft vessels at Robinson Terminal North while maintaining the option of docking deep-draft vessels at Robinson Terminal South.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: To maintain the authenticity and integrity of the Alexandria Waterfront, the WPWG recommends that the ability to dock large vessels at Robinson Terminal North and South be retained. Because channel depths are naturally deeper at Robinson Terminal South, this is the optimal location for deeper draft vessels. Providing dock facilities at Robinson Terminal North to limited to shallower vessels will retain its utility yet minimize potential dredging costs.

Work Group Comments: The feasibility of docking deep-draft vessels at Robinson Terminal North is highly suspect due to the relatively shallow draft at that dock and the cost of maintaining a sufficient depth through dredging. Most large vessels draw more water than is generally available at the north pier. Although large vessels could not be docked at Robinson Terminal South if the proposed pleasure-boat marina was built there, since the Army Corps of Engineers is highly unlikely to approve the construction of such a marina, presumably large vessels could dock there, provided sufficient water depth is maintained at that dock. However, the question then arises as to how any activities related to large vessels docked at the south terminal would relate to activities taking place on the redeveloped south-terminal site. Given how few large vessels now visit Alexandria, does it make sense to maintain two docks for large vessels? Might it make more sense to utilize the South Terminal dock for that purpose while incorporating the North Terminal pier into a West's Point maritime museum where a historic ship also would be docked? (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.84

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *~~Consider transient (but not overnight) docking of pleasure boats in one or more locations along the shore between the new King Street pier and Robinson Terminal South.~~*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Deleted because the issue is addressed by recommendation 4.31, which was re-written by the Work Group.

Work Group Comments: There will not be a new pier at the bottom of King Street, so this recommendation needs to be rethought. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 4.26

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *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).*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Consensus in support of revised text.

Work Group Comments: 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) State that pleasure marina “should be moved elsewhere” instead of “to the south.” Also supports Plan Statement H6. (Macek). No mention of restoring the viability of the city marina. Additional pleasure boat marina space should be sought on the river. (Wood) Segregating commercial boats from pleasure boats is highly desirable but a marina off the south Robinson Terminal is a non-starter. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 4.27

Text from the Waterfront Plan: *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.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: General agreement in support of revised text.

Work Group Comments: Needs further discussion in lieu of potential ODBC changes. (Ballard) 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) 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) 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) May need to be moved away from ODBC (Lyle)

RECOMMENDATION 4.28

Text from the Waterfront Plan: *The Plan recommends locating lower-frequency commercial boat operations, such as regular lunch and dinner cruises and charters, at the wharf near the Chart House and on an expanded Cameron Street wharf. If needed, a third commercial pier is recommended between Thompsons Alley and Founders Park.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: A huge question remains as to whether commercial-boat docks in the vicinity of the Chart House can be provided with adequate facilities, such as passenger drop-off and pick-up, delivery of supplies and trash removal, refueling, etc. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 4.29

Text from the Waterfront Plan: *All public locations in the commercial and pleasure boat marinas should be accessible, including facilities for boarding vessels. The Plan recommends that a parking station for airport-style golf carts be provided in the Food Court parking garage so that carts can be employed by the private sector to shuttle mobility-impaired passengers to commercial boats.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: The issue of where airport-style golf carts should be parked can be judged only in the context of a comprehensive plan for the docking and servicing of the commercial boats. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 4.30

Text from the Waterfront Plan: *Deep-water docking should be retained at the Robinson Terminal North location.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: This recommendation may require substantial dredging at the north terminal. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 4.31

Text from the Waterfront Plan: ~~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 daytrippers visiting by boat. Appropriate accommodation should be made for daytrippers visiting by boat.~~

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group supports the recommendation as revised.

Work Group Comments: 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). 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). See comments above (Wood). 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 Harbour 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)

RECOMMENDATION 4.32

Text from the Waterfront Plan: *Ensure all ancillary facilities needed to operate the marina in an efficient manner are provided and that appropriate amenities are provided for boaters and commercial passengers visiting the waterfront.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Similar to suggested revision to 3.82 that reads, “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.” Also supports Plan Statement H6. (Macek). 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)

RECOMMENDATION 4.33

Text from the Waterfront Plan: *Commuter service with a stop in Alexandria via marine vessel should be encouraged with Potomac River speed limitations along Alexandria lifted for such vessels as long as low-wake boats are used.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: No information has been presented with regard to Potomac River speed limits. Is this recommendation appropriate to the plan? (Olinger) Proponents of commuter-boat travel on the Potomac have acknowledged that it is not practical to have an intermediate stop in Old Town for boats originating down river because the Old Town stop would add too much time to the trip. Also, the issue of excessive wakes along the Alexandria waterfront raises serious questions about the practicality or desirability of having commuter boats running up and down the Potomac. (Ely)

Art and History

Art and history must be fundamental to the design and development of the Alexandria waterfront. The Plan calls for an Art Walk and artistic finishes along the entire waterfront. The depiction of Alexandria’s living history will be equally emphasized. The art and history recommendations found in the **Alexandria Waterfront Public Art Proposal** and the **Alexandria Waterfront History Plan** form a strong basis for actions. A similar plan for art and history programming should be developed and could be equally useful. The central role envisioned for art and history across the entire waterfront is not matched by a sufficient or assured funding strategy in the Plan. The cost of maintenance and staging of art and history elements should be better specified within the Plan. The function and illustrative design of “cultural anchor(s)” needs to be further described to guide implementation and desirable growth—the discussion of cultural anchors in the History Plan is a good model.

Summary of Work Group Art and History Findings

- A cultural hub must provide more than historical wayfinding. It should tell the story of Alexandria’s seaport history in a way that is not conveyed by existing city museums. Consider coupling a seaport historical center of reasonable size with appropriate commercial activity such as a café, gallery, small auditorium, or museum shop to help sustain the facility. Along The Strand, a cultural hub could be located at The Beachcombers Restaurant site or share a structure with the civic center and park maintenance facility proposed for this area. Another potential location for a cultural hub is West’s Point.
- The Work Group endorses several new art and history recommendations as follows:
 - New Recommendation: 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.
 - New Recommendation: As the Plan is implemented, the City should take proactive measures to attract new cultural institutions on the Alexandria waterfront that complement its history and existing cultural institutions.
 - New Recommendation: Funding by the Plan for art and History should reflect the importance of these elements to the overall Plan.
 - New Recommendation: West’s Point represents the origins of Alexandria and was the site of much of the City’s early seaport history. Therefore, this historic wharf should emphasize significant activities that occurred here, such as tobacco shipment, the transit of military forces, Fishtown, railroads, and the gasworks. This may be accomplished

through multiple approaches, including: interpretive artwork, text, and signage; sculpture; historically inspired building design; rail linkage; and landscaping. West's Point could also be a good location for a maritime museum and the docking of an historic ship.

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.”

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.

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

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

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

Agreed: Ely, Macek, Rhodeside, 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.

Review of Plan Recommendations for Art and History

RECOMMENDATION 3.2

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Inscribe historical quotations along the pathway where appropriate.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group chose not to discuss this recommendation. Edits based upon Work Group member comments.

Work Group Comments: This is a next-to-meaningless recommendation. (Ely) These recommendations strike me as details that are best left for implementation. Some recommendations in other sections are equally fine-grained. (3.22: removal/repurposing the volleyball court, for example.) (Olinger) Implementation and not planning (Lyle). ...where appropriate (Rhodeside)

RECOMMENDATION 3.4

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Add where appropriate materials such as glass, oyster shells, coral, fish bones, colored stones etc. as aggregate to the paving material and to reflect past activities occurring in a given area.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: What would be the context in which these "placements" would take place? Just scattering bits and pieces about would be a meaningless exercise. This is a recommendation that needs a lot more thought and development. (Ely) These recommendations strike me as details that are best left for implementation. Some recommendations in other sections are equally fine-grained. (3.22: removal/repurposing the volleyball court, for example.) (Olinger) Implementation and not planning (Lyle)

RECOMMENDATION 3.8

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Commission and install public art in this area using light as an integral element and inspired by the suggestions of the Art Plan, such as using solar collectors and working with the owners of Canal Center and the energy plant to build a private/public collaboration as an alternative energy/public art project.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: What does alternative energy have to do with arts and history? (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.9

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Establish a cultural anchor on the northern end of the Art Walk by tying park activities into cultural facilities.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Also supports Plan Statement I6 (Macek). Yes, but...suggestion elsewhere for a cultural anchor in the south (Point Lumley). How do these two ideas work together? (Wood) The idea of a cultural center needs substantial fleshing out. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.12

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Establish Tide Lock Park as the gateway to the Art Walk, with in-pavement lighting and signage to distinguish the Art Walk from the bike path.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 3.13

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Increase programming of the park, focused on history and the arts (including performances).*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: This would be an ongoing activity and is not properly part of the waterfront plan. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.14

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Consider additional physical elements that explain or evoke the importance of the canal site in the City's history. Replace and augment the existing interpretive signage as recommended by the History Plan.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 3.15

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Take greater advantage of the tide lock basin as an interactive water feature. Incorporate glass to evoke the City's glassmaking history. Commission an artistically engineered bridge.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 3.21

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Commission artist-designed seating to increase enjoyment of the park's views of the river and contribute to the unique identity of Rivergate Park. Additional art elements may incorporate original tide lock stones.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: What is special about "artist-designed" seating? Are all seat-designers artists, skilled in the art of seat design?

RECOMMENDATION 3.25

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Enliven the garage walls lining the western edge of the park with public art, lighting, and landscaping.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: What garage is being referred to? Shouldn't all public garages be made lighter and more appealing so as to draw in more parkers? (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.36

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Implement the Art Walk proposal, with public art featured in several locations throughout the park. Performing arts would be emphasized with outdoor performances at the proposed waterfront stage structure and possibly a “boxcar theater.” Other ideas include a sculptural picnic area, with artist-designed tables and benches, temporary sculpture exhibits around the boardwalk and sculptural elements for bird perching and nesting.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: The devil is in the details. The danger here is that many of these artistic flourishes will detract from Old Town's unique historic character. Also, inadequate City maintenance of these accouterments may soon lead to a shabby look along the waterfront. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.43

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Prepare and implement a new park plan that incorporates the History Plan’s recommendations for historic interpretation and the Art Plan’s recommendations for public art, and improve landscaping, park furniture, and wayfinding and lighting. Consider naming an important park element, such as the walking path, after Ellen Pickering.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 3.49

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Look to the History Plan and Art Plan for guidance to improve Thompsons Alley with the use of special paving, artistic elements, lighting, or minor façade treatment to help screen the parking garage and “back of house” activities, beautify the alley, interpret, and assist in wayfinding for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: *The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.*

Work Group Comments: What is done in Thompson's Alley, in terms of "back of the house" activities relates not only to the Chart House and the food court but also to the commercial-boat activities. The jumbled, congested nature of that area will require well-thought-out, detailed planning to ensure that all the pieces fit together well. It may be that Thompsons Alley should be viewed as a utilitarian workplace rather than as a public venue. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.54

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Because this site has often played a key role in Alexandria's history and its identity as an arts destination, look to the History Plan and the Art Plan for guidance in designing the spaces, as inspiration for providing new features of all kinds, and for historic interpretation (including naming). Celebrate the Torpedo Factory Art Center with public art at a variety of scales in the public spaces surrounding the building.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 3.70

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *The detailed design of the new park/plaza should look to both the History Plan and the Art Plan for guidance in design, functionality, and historic interpretation (including naming). An iconic piece of public art is suitable for this location. The design could include an open-air structure suitable for hosting a variety of public activities and private events as well as an information kiosk to provide a concierge role for arriving visitors.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Also supports Plan Statement I6 (Macek) Yes, but...this is not yet a plaza, but is a public space. Also, the over water plaza shown in figure 21, pg 62 is not feasible given ODBC structures. (Wood) As noted elsewhere, Fitzgerald Park/plaza-whatever is a non-starter. The activities mentioned here belong elsewhere, or not at all. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.79

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Incorporate where appropriate interpretive elements which recall or pay homage to the historic wharves in and around this location.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

RECOMMENDATION 3.92

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Create a varied water's edge with piers, inlets, boat ramps – consistent with the shapes of wharves in Alexandria's history. Continue the waterside public promenade, using small drawbridges over inlets to maintain a continuous path while allowing for a varied shoreline. Echo or recall the historic shoreline with landside features.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: This is a vague and therefore not a particularly meaningful recommendation. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.94

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Preserve, restore, and adaptively reuse all of the historic warehouses in The Strand area, with emphasis on cultural uses or uses that allow these elements of the City's past to be open to the public.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Beyond the two buildings that Brandt has plans for, which other buildings are candidates? Will the Brandt buildings have retail commercial on the ground floors per the Plan? (Again) Where will the tenants of these grandfathered buildings park? (Olinger) Mr. Brandt apparently has other ideas for the historic buildings he is buying. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.95

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Pursue the use of one or more of the warehouses, or the civic building in the park, as a history center as described in the History Plan.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Yes, but we missed that boat! (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 3.99

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Implement the adopted Windmill Hill Park Plan. Ensure consistency with the balance of the waterfront in terms of design of paths, facilities, and other park elements. Look to the History Plan and the Art Plan for guidance for public art and historic interpretation within the park. In particular, implement the proposal to complete and conclude the Art Walk in Pomander Park.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: The long-overdue rehabilitation of Windmill Hill Park should not be considered to be an element of the waterfront plan. (Ely) What happened to the CIP funding for this project? (Olinger)

NEW RECOMMENDATION

Text for the Draft Waterfront Plan: *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.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Consensus in support of this new recommendation.

NEW RECOMMENDATION

Text for the Draft Waterfront Plan: *As the Plan is implemented, 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.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Consensus in support of this new recommendation.

NEW RECOMMENDATION

Text for the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Funding by the Plan for art and history should reflect the importance of these elements to the overall plan.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: Consensus in support of this new recommendation.

NEW RECOMMENDATION

Text for the Draft Waterfront Plan: West's Point represents the origins of Alexandria and was the site of much of the City's early seaport history. Therefore, this historic wharf should emphasize significant activities that occurred here, such as tobacco shipment, the transit of military forces, Fishtown, railroads, and the gasworks. This may be accomplished through multiple approaches, including interpretive artwork, text, and signage, sculpture, historically inspired building design, rail linkage, and landscaping. West's Point could also be a good location for a maritime museum and the docking of an historic ship.

Summary of Work Group: Consensus in support of this new recommendation.

Work Group Comments: West's Point would be an excellent location for a maritime museum which focused on the history of maritime activities along the Potomac. This also is where any historic ship should be docked since such a ship would be a natural extension of the museum. (Ely)

Flood Mitigation

The Work Group agrees that the next phase of the flood mitigation project is a more detailed design and engineering study of the two proposed strategies to determine a feasible and cost-effective way forward. A benefit cost assessment would be crucial at this stage. The Work Group is concerned about the proposal to elevate the unit block of King Street and the nearby Strand and suggests that the next phase of study address those concerns. The significant public space and pedestrian focus at the foot of King Street will be a significant investment for the City that warrants a sound flood mitigation plan.

Summary of Work Group Flood Mitigation Findings

- It is important to reduce the impact of flooding. The impact of frequent nuisance flooding (up to 6.0 feet above sea level) may be reduced through mitigation measures. Flood mitigation should be implemented in a way that is compatible with the historic character of Old Town and demonstrates a real return on public investment. We believe the concept to elevate the foot of King Street has serious design and engineering issues. We recommend that detailed engineering studies be completed to refine flood mitigation concepts to achieve a more feasible and cost effective alternative in this area. We note that these improvements will not prevent the effects of more severe flooding that will still occur, but encourage mitigation of routine nuisance flooding if cost effective.
- Include the following new recommendation: *The next phase of the design and engineering of the comprehensive strategy to mitigate flooding should take into consideration: drainage impacts on existing buildings, storm sewers, vehicle and pedestrian access issues, and visual and historic character. Consider impacts of nuisance flooding along the entire Waterfront within this comprehensive strategy.*

Work Group Plan Statements on Flood Mitigation

A plan should include a proposal for flood mitigation.

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

Note: 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. Ely agreed with Olinger.

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: 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.

Review of Plan Recommendations for Flood Mitigation

NEW RECOMMENDATION

Text for the Draft Waterfront Plan: *The next phase of the design and engineering of the comprehensive strategy to mitigate flooding should take into consideration: drainage impacts on existing buildings, storm sewers, vehicle and pedestrian access issues, and visual and historic character. Consider impacts of nuisance flooding along the entire Waterfront within this comprehensive strategy.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group suggested adding this recommendation in light of their plan statement that identifies issues that should be addressed during the next, more detailed, phase of flood mitigation – design and engineering studies.

Work Group Comments: See comments for 3.65.

RECOMMENDATION 3.65

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Implement initial elements of the comprehensive strategy to mitigate nuisance flooding by elevating the unit block of King Street and The Strand as feasible.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.65: The Work Group suggested adding a new recommendation and the words “as feasible” to this recommendation to clarify that additional study is needed before this project can be recommended for implementation.

Work Group Comments on 3.65: Explore the viability of this aspect of the flood mitigation plan (elevation of King Street. (Ballard). Believes elevation measures should be studied and too much

attention has been given to nuisance flooding (Ely). Note to add “as feasible.” (Macek). It is premature to call for this degree of implementation and attendant without an engineering study. (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 3.74

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Integrate low flood walls into the design of the park in order to protect against frequent flooding. To the extent possible, walls should be constructed to be used as functional seating elements and to allow park users to view the stage.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.74: General agreement in support. The requested reference to drainage in the flood mitigation plan statement is referenced in a new recommendation.

Work Group Comments on 3.74: Would like a cost benefit analysis to address capital and maintenance/operating costs (Ely). I agree with this statement as far as it goes, but I believe we need to add additional sentences here that address the further elements of flood protection found in our plan statement (Wood).

Parking

The Work Group emphasizes the importance of immediate implementation of the parking recommendations of the Plan, including guidelines for new commercial development, increased waterfront activity, and provisions protecting residential parking. The Work Group modified language to clarify that all new parking is to be on site below grade. This is acknowledged to be a difficult design requirement, but is vital to protecting public access and the beauty of the waterfront. Relief from this requirement as the waterfront develops should not be permitted. Work Group members suggest adding a recommendation to use pricing to incentivize use of parking spaces away from the waterfront and to encourage use of garages. The Work Group also strengthened language related to valet parking and to the time periods when garage parking is available to the general public.

Summary of Work Group Parking Findings

- The City should begin immediate implementation of the parking recommendations contained in the Plan’s Transportation, Circulation, and Parking chapter and the **Old Town Area Parking Study**. We believe that parking is a problem in the vicinity of the Waterfront today, with limited potential increase for growth in capacity. Within the Plan, parking at redevelopment sites will be accommodated on site below grade, and surface parking lots are discouraged. Due to the cost and challenge of this approach, any increase in parking will be small. Any parking beyond what is required at development sites will be constrained and provide very few additional spaces to the public. In addition, some existing surface parking will be displaced, and the City should account for this in implementation of the Plan. Therefore, the parking management concepts outlined in this chapter—which include wayfinding, valet parking, shuttle services, and pricing—must begin to be tested and should be proven to ensure effective measures are present to guide implementation of the Plan. Another possible approach is to limit development, and thereby attendant parking demands. Implementation should include a rigorous assessment plan with specific performance metrics to ensure goals and objectives are being achieved.
- Other possible approaches include:
 - limiting development, and thereby reducing attendant parking demands; and
 - using City funds to construct additional public parking in the waterfront area in conjunction with commercial redevelopment.
- Modify Recommendation 4.34(c) to include the following statement: Implementation of valet parking should not add to congestion or create queuing backups on Old Town streets.
- Modify Recommendation 4.38 to include the following statement: Use pricing to incentivize parking away from the waterfront and consider using pricing to encourage use of garages.

Work Group Plan Statements on Parking

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

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

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.

Note: Members noted the importance of addressing handicapped 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.

Review of Plan Recommendations for Parking

RECOMMENDATION 4.34

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *The Plan recommends that a Waterfront Parking Implementation Plan be created in order to articulate those actions that must proceed in the future to support the Plan and the events that are deemed appropriate triggers for such actions. It should include at least four specific categories of implementation measures both to create additional parking opportunities and to protect existing residential areas:*

- *a. Public garage capacity. Monitoring utilization in existing public garages, setting triggers for the need for a specific number of new parking spaces to be added to parking capacity at peak times. For example, assuming full utilization of on street parking, when the utilization of public garages in the waterfront core area reaches a level of 85% use, then additional parking spaces would be added to the parking capacity during peak times, through the use of garage attendants, valet parking programs, and the opening of now private garages (supported with appropriate wayfinding signage).*
- *b. Waterfront development. Requiring additional parking capacity at the point that new parking demand generators are constructed on the waterfront.*
- *c. Valet parking. Implementing a systematic valet parking program generally for Old Town and King Street, with specific emphasis on the waterfront core area. Implementation of valet parking should not add to congestion or create queuing backups on Old Town streets.*
- *d. Protecting residential parking. Testing and monitoring the effect of waterfront development on residential parking areas, with the understanding that additional protective measures should be taken to protect those residential parking areas. The Parking Implementation Plan should be created immediately after the adoption of the Plan. It should be led by a multi-agency team and also be assisted by the advice of stakeholders affected by parking issues in the waterfront area.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.34

- Consensus on the need to implement the Parking Implementation Plan immediately.
- General agreement to add a statement regarding implementing valet parking without creating new problems (congestion and queuing on Old Town streets)
- Wood indicated that 4.34 (b).continued to remain a problem for him.
- Ely finds that the parking portions of the waterfront plan represent one of the greatest deficiencies in the plan. The thrust of the plan is to reduce the number of publicly available parking spaces in the waterfront area, increase parking demand through more intense development of the waterfront area, and try to bridge that gap through such untried devices as wayfinding signs, valet parking, trying to get private garage owners to open up their garages to the public, and garage attendants. That is a bridge too far. Additionally, far too little attention has been paid to tour-bus traffic and parking along and near the

waterfront. Council should not adopt a waterfront plan until these proposed solutions to Old Town's widespread parking problems have been thoroughly tested and proved out.

Work Group Comments on 4.34

4.34 (a).Capacity of Garages

- Make the Parking Implementation Program a high priority. For instance, the City should look at opportunities at each development to obtain Public spaces in the newly constructed parking garages. (Ballard)
- The Waterfront Parking Implementation Plan must be developed now (Olinger)
- Displaced parking, such as the parking lots across from Chadwick's must be replaced 100%; and peak parking-space needs must be fully provided (Ely)
- Need for further evaluation of parking and traffic capacity. (Wood)

4.34 (b).Waterfront Development

- How much more parking is needed and where will it be located? (Ely)
- Parking requirements should consider the use of the building. (Lyle)
- Limit new parking to off-site, enclosed garages. (Rhodeside)
- Look at traffic capacity (especially south of King Street), parking inventory and pedestrian issues together and undertake the Union Street Study now through a 90-day (or so).time frame. (Wood)

4.34 (c).Valet Parking

- Reliance on valet parking is a highly dubious proposition (Ely)
- Valet parking can be a contributor to congestion; limit it to target groups such as the handicapped, families with children, etc. (Lyle)
- Alexandria garages do not have valet entrances; queuing problem will need to be minimized (Wood)

4.34 (d).Residential Parking

- More restrictive parking rules for residential areas, such as resident only parking, could be very detrimental to Old Town's livability by negatively impacting the sales volume of local shops. (Ely)
- A suggestion that the Work Group's report recommend providing residents and OTCA with details, related to restrictions, to facilitate their early input into the process (Ely)
- The Plan notes in two places that street parking is saturated or near capacity. (Wood)
- Check the OTAPS study to determine if it includes concrete recommendations relating to parking on public streets. (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 4.35

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Before new restaurant uses that place significant new demand for parking are allowed through the SUP process, parking solutions to meet that new demand shall be calculated, identified and discussed in the SUP report recommendations in order to ensure that sufficient parking is in place contemporaneously with the opening of the restaurant.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.35: General agreement with the modification inserting the word “shall” as noted above. Olinger suggested that language be strengthened to no new restaurant shall proceed until there is a satisfactory resolution of its parking, but there was not agreement on that change.

Work Group Comments on 4.35

- A good definition of “parking solutions” is needed; important that parking approval parameters are defined for the restaurants. (Ballard)
- Determine how much more restaurant space would be desirable east of Fairfax Street -- the less space the less need for additional parking. (Ely)
- No new restaurant should be approved until its parking issues are satisfactorily resolved (Olinger)
- Believes that restaurants add to a very vibrant environment; consequently, the City’s policy should be to work with restaurants to figure out parking in a supportive way. (Rhodeside)
- Look at the types/amounts of parking each kind of revenue-producing activity (restaurants, hotels, cultural, etc.) will generate and how to accommodate the parking in some creative way; there will be a need to understand parking needs on a Friday night for all uses – does not believe the City has “nailed that” yet; and wants to see capacity addressed somewhere in 4.34 or 4.35. (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 4.36

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Continue to implement the City’s Wayfinding Program to facilitate access to public parking facilities throughout the waterfront planning area.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.36: General agreement in support of the recommendation.

Work Group Comments on 4.36: The current city's wayfinding program has yet to show success and shouldn't be emulated without empirical proof it works. Would like to see a metric to gauge success. (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 4.37

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Continue to implement the recommendations of the February 2010 Old Town Alexandria Area Parking Study and the 2010 Old Town Alexandria Area Parking Work Group, including those strategies designed to encourage use of on-street spaces in shopping areas for short-term visits, to encourage the use of parking garages for longer-term parking, and to protect residential areas from excessive parking impacts.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.37: General agreement, with suggestions as noted in the comments.

Work Group Comments on 4.37:

- In response to a question from Ely, staff provided ideas from the OTAPS study that might be considered to help residents manage street parking for themselves, visitors, and caregivers. Such ideas might include overnight restrictions, extension of resident-only parking areas, and restricting one side of the street for resident parking and the other side for visitor parking.
- A suggestion that the Work Group Report provide residents and OTCA with details related to residential parking restrictions, to facility their early input into the process. Residence-only parking restrictions will inconvenience residents and harm nearby retail businesses. (Ely)
- The Plan includes in two places that street parking is saturated or near capacity (Wood)
- Suggestion to check the OTAPS study to determine if it includes concrete recommendations relating to parking on public streets (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 4.38

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Consider implementing new parking technologies such as smart phone applications that show locations, rates, and spaces available in parking garages. Use pricing to incentivize parking away from the waterfront and consider using pricing to encourage use of garages.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.38: Consensus on 4.38 and on a new recommendation related to pricing.

Work Group Comments on 4.38 and new recommendation:

- A suggestion for discount parking for Alexandria citizens who park their appropriately “stickered” cars in garages; explore similar discounts for parking meters when using a credit/debit card bearing an Alexandria zip code.
- A suggestion to increase the cost of street parking to encourage people into the garages like DC is doing; this can also increase revenue for the City. (Lyle)
- This idea needs much more development so its feasibility can be properly assessed. Merchants should be consulted for increases to meter parking. City staff have not provided meaningful information as to what the pricing incentives would be. (Ely)

Traffic and Circulation

A vibrant waterfront, by its very nature, will generate increased activity. Additional activity is highly desirable, but the attendant traffic impacts must be managed with clear foresight to prevent harmful impacts to the unique historic character and livability of Old Town. Because of its constrained capacity, the street network near the waterfront can only accept a small amount of additional traffic. Therefore, the Work Group recommends that the City conduct a study of traffic and circulation along the Union Street corridor and adjacent Old Town streets, including how it functions for users of all modes of travel, prior to the approval of redevelopment in the Plan area. This study should offer recommendations and insights to help manage any projected increase in traffic congestion at the river along Union Street and within the proximate street grid. The Work Group also made amendments to the traffic and circulation recommendations so that they conform to positions taken by the Work Group in other areas – for example, revising references to Fitzgerald Square and the foot of King Street. The Work Group supports proactive measures to reduce or eliminate conflicts between vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians, e.g., routing, enforcement, and engineering. The Work Group also supports exploration of additional short-distance transit options to improve access to and movement along the waterfront. The effect of these transit options should be to enhance, not hurt, businesses along the routes.

Summary of Work Group Traffic and Circulation Findings

- Union Street traffic impacts must be understood. The Work Group strongly recommends that the City complete a transportation management study along the Union Street corridor and adjacent Old Town streets. The Work Group envisions that Union Street will be a pedestrian-friendly corridor with additional street-level retail south of King Street and in near Robinson Terminal North. The Work Group anticipates new pedestrian activities within a pedestrian zone at the end of King Street, which is already a congested intersection. At the same time, additional development in the vicinity of the waterfront will create new demands on the transportation network, including increased vehicular traffic, commercial deliveries, bicycles, taxis, motor coaches, and shuttle buses, and parking. With these new demands and anticipated requirements and a finite capacity of the existing traffic grid, the City needs to use innovative methods to manage and control this finite capacity, including through the Special Use Permit (SUP) process, to help mitigate the impacts on the community. A Union Street transportation management study will provide the data and planning guidance necessary to alleviate transportation impacts, and should be completed prior to approval of any new development on the waterfront. Some in the Work Group feel that this is so critical that Plan adoption should not proceed before this study is completed.
- The Work Group recommended modifications to traffic and circulation Plan recommendations as follows:

- 4.3: ~~Explore signal timing adjustments and the addition of protected left turn movements on Washington Street.~~
- New Recommendation: A Transportation Management Plan that comprehensively addresses parking, motor coach, freight loading, and other impacts along the Union Street corridor should be completed prior to approval of any new development.
- 4.4: ~~Enlarge the pedestrian hub at King and Union Streets by closing the unit block to most vehicular traffic, maintaining police, fire, EMS, and delivery, trolley and motor coach access as necessary. Creating Fitzgerald Square a significant public space will to give pedestrians more room to congregate, but also allowing and allow them a sense of where they are in relation to other points of interest along the waterfront. Consider eliminating on-street parking along the unit block of King and at the immediate intersection of King and Union Street.~~
- 4.6: ~~Implementing the Art Walk concept, as just an example, provides visual interest all along the riverside path, which will be physically continuous. It will give people more reason to move from King Street at Union Street and start their waterfront experience somewhere other than King and Union Streets.~~
- 4.9: **Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan to be deleted:** ~~Further, the Plan recommends pedestrian safety improvements at high conflict intersections, with specific locations identified in Figure 37: Crash Map.~~ **Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan to be relocated to body of Plan document:** *To improve pedestrian safety in general and, in particular, between pedestrians and bicyclists and pedestrians and vehicles, the City regularly improves sidewalks, signs and markings, and installs ADA accessible ramps and encourages the use of City-designated bicycle routes by cyclists. In terms of pedestrian and vehicular conflicts, crash analysis shows that injuries tend to be minor because of the slow speeds occurring at these high conflict intersections.*
- 4.13: *Provide improved signage for bicyclists to improve safety and help delineate the urban section of the Mount Vernon Trail between Bashford Lane and Green Street. Encourage through traffic to use Royal Street as a preferred route through Old Town.*
- 4.17: *Apply and enforce on and off road bicycle laws to help improve bicycle safety and minimize pedestrian and bicycle conflicts and vehicular and bicycle conflicts as recommended in the **2008 Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility Plan.** The City should proactively explore and implement urban design approaches that help minimize these conflicts.*
- 4.24: ~~Maintain turn-around area for trolleys at the foot of King Street. Modify the trolley route to conform to the new vision of the foot of King Street and to maintain the linkages between the King Street Trolley and the waterfront and water-based modes of transport.~~

- 4.25: As Plan implementation affects motor coach parking needs and locations, study and relocate locations as necessary, identify motor coach drop off and parking locations that are not in conflict with public or private facilities on Union Street. Include potential increase in motor coach traffic in the Union Street Traffic Study.

Work Group Plan Statements on Traffic and Circulation

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

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

Proposed amendment to include Gibbon Street to Union Street Study failed on a 3-4 vote.

Agreed: Rhodeside, Wood, Ely.

Disagreed: Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ballard.

Note: 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.

Review of Plan Recommendations for Traffic and Circulation

RECOMMENDATION 3.88

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Create a comfortable pedestrian-focused zone along The Strand from King Street to Point Lumley, limiting vehicular access where possible. Open alleyways and other east-west links between Union Street and the river.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 3.88: General agreement in support.

Work Group Comments on 3.88:

- WPWG members requested, and were given, assurance that the Plan includes language protecting vehicular access to properties in this location.
- As noted elsewhere in this report, I am highly skeptical of the practicality of limiting vehicle access in the manner proposed here (Ely).

RECOMMENDATION 4.1

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Complete implementation of the City's Wayfinding Program to facilitate access to and throughout the planning area, to provide pedestrian and bicycle way-finding, and to direct motorists to parking garages.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.1: Consensus in support.

Work Group Comments on 4.1: Encourage bike parking away in the garages and away from the waterfront (Lyle). Be sure to use a metric to measure the success of the Wayfinding program. (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 4.2

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Enhance the current carpool and bus ridership campaign.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.2: Consensus in support.

Work Group Comments on 4.2: Wood recommended adding "...particularly as it applies to the employees of waterfront activities" because he believes this recommendation has marginal relevance to the waterfront, the tourists and business travelers who may come here, and the overall reduction of pedestrian traffic, particularly as it applies to development south of King Street (no busses transit this area in the core area). Wood also stated that there is a need to insure that the Waterfront Plan provides detailed suggestions regarding innovative people-moving and shuttle transport options to and from the waterfront. Ballard did not see the direct relevance to the plan, unless this is for employees of local businesses. Ely questions the practicality and appeal of carpooling in the waterfront area.

RECOMMENDATION 4.3

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~Explore signal timing adjustments and the addition of protected left turn movements on Washington Street.~~

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.3: Consensus to remove this recommendation.

Work Group Comments on 4.3: This is a terrible idea that has absolutely no relationship to the waterfront plan (Ely). The relevance to the Plan Area is distant at best. This recommendation should be removed (Olinger). This recommendation has nothing to do with solving any relevant problem in the waterfront core area (Wood).

NEW RECOMMENDATION

Proposed Text for the Draft Waterfront Plan: A Transportation Management Plan that comprehensively addresses parking, motor coach, freight loading, and other impacts along the Union Street corridor should be completed prior to approval of any new development.

Summary of Work Group Discussion of New Recommendation: Consensus in support.

RECOMMENDATION 4.4

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: ~~Enlarge the pedestrian hub at King and Union Streets by closing the unit block to most vehicular traffic, maintaining police, fire, EMS, and delivery, trolley and motor coach access as necessary. Creating Fitzgerald Square a significant public space will to give pedestrians more room to congregate, but also allowing and allow them a sense of where they are in relation to other points of interest along the waterfront.~~

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.4: There was no consensus on this recommendation; Work Group comments focused on the reference to Fitzgerald Square. However, during discussion of the public realm, WPWG members did reach agreement that the Plan should call for a “significant public space” at the foot of King Street. The edits to recommendation 4.4 above reflect this view.

Work Group Comments on 4.4:

- Look at this closely in terms of an alternate if Fitzgerald Square is taken out of the plan (Ballard).
- Fitzgerald Square should be dropped from the plan. Consider moving the public space further south, with the Beachcomber becoming one of the foci. Access to the ODBC parking lot also must be maintained. This concept – creating a significant public space at the bottom of King Street – is too ill-defined at this time given that the City has yet to acknowledge that the Boat Club parking lot will retain its present footprint. What benefit would eliminating this parking create? Also, the “or more” phrase opens the door to eliminating much more than 100 feet of parking in each direction. Given the shortage of parking in the lower King Street area, Council

should be very cautious about eliminating any parking. If the water-taxi dock was placed behind the Torpedo Factory, signs could easily direct people to King Street. (Ely).

- Our plan statements call for a significant public space at this location, not Fitzgerald Square (see E1, Public Realm - Foot of King). The other statements about amenities at this location are acceptable (Wood). The City should not be vague on the subject of what happens at the foot of King Street. Create a pedestrian focused publicly owned open space at the foot of King Street (Rhodeside).

RECOMMENDATION 4.5

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Placing key ~~destinations~~ activities along the waterfront will help disperse pedestrians and vehicles both north and south of King Street.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.5: Consensus to modify the recommendation by replacing the word “destinations” with “activities.”

Work Group Comments on 4.5: True, but what are those "key destinations?" The devil is in the details (Ely). Locate focal point destinations (Rhodeside). Rather than *destinations*, insert the word *activities* (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 4.6

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Implementing the Art Walk concept, ~~as just an example,~~ provides visual interest all along the riverside path, which will be physically continuous. ~~It will give people more reason to move from King Street at Union Street and start their waterfront experience somewhere other than King and Union Streets.~~*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.6: Consensus to modify the recommendation as noted above.

Work Group Comments on 4.6: The Art Walk concept is fine but any "riverside path" must not intrude on privately owned riverfront land, such as the ODBC properties (Ely). Delete second sentence. Also, believes pedestrian activity adds to vitality; doesn't like terminology "pedestrian congestion" (Rhodeside). People are not the problem; the problem is that too much space is being reserved for cars (Macek). The Art Walk is initiated in the north, but it may want to start in the middle and move north (history).and south (seafaring activities). (Wood).

RECOMMENDATION 4.7

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Implementing the adopted Wayfinding Program will guide pedestrians to key ~~destinations~~ activities.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.7: Consensus to modify the recommendation as noted above.

Work Group Comments on 4.7: Wayfinding may rely not only on signage but perhaps also docents and other creative waterfront tour activities (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 4.8

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Using pedestrian counters at strategic locations along the waterfront and frequent monitoring and tracking of the counts to enable adjustments when necessary to strategies designed to address pedestrian congestion.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.8: There was no consensus on this recommendation, in part because there was a lack of agreement about “pedestrian congestion” as a valid issue.

Work Group Comments on 4.8: The key to reducing pedestrian congestion, such as at King and Union, is not overloading the waterfront with traffic-generating development (Ely). Pedestrian congestion is not a valid issue (Rhodeside). The Union Street congestion problem is related to traffic, not pedestrians, and a Union Street study will help with this. (Lyle). Consider how to reflect that pedestrian and patron vibrancy does not overwhelm capacity. Counters should be carefully positioned, not forgetting that Union Street is probably more constricted on the south end now because of the Windmill Hill Park Plan (Wood).

RECOMMENDATION 4.9

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan to be deleted: ~~*Further, the Plan recommends pedestrian safety improvements at high conflict intersections, with specific locations identified in Figure 37: Crash Map.*~~

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan to be relocated to body of Plan document: *To improve pedestrian safety in general and, in particular, between pedestrians and bicyclists and pedestrians and vehicles, the City regularly improves sidewalks, signs and markings, and installs ADA accessible ramps and encourages the use of City-designated bicycle routes by cyclists. In terms of pedestrian and vehicular conflicts, crash analysis shows that injuries tend to be minor because of the slow speeds occurring at these high conflict intersections.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.9: Delete recommendation as it is a duplicate of 4.11 and relocate explanatory text to body of Plan document.

Work Group Comments on 4.9: An alternative is not to approve property developments that will increase sidewalk congestion at key intersections and times that already are oversaturated with people

(Ely). Conduct a pedestrian/bicycle/traffic study at heavily used intersections (Lyle). Implement pedestrian safety improvements at high-conflict intersections (Rhodeside). Traffic moving down Franklin to the river from Route 1 (the most likely arterial route).must proceed north on Union through Windmill Hill Park. This whole stretch of Union is the primary route for bicycles moving from Jones Point to locations north. Pedestrian and bicyclist hazards must be mitigated (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 4.10

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Add pedestrian facilities including pedestrian signals where appropriate and accessible curb-ramps where missing.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.10: General agreement in support.

Work Group Comments on 4.10: Presumably pedestrian signals mean traffic lights. The area east of Washington Street would not need more traffic lights if there is only a modest increase in occupied square footage east of Washington Street (Ely). Does this presuppose lights at intersections along Union? (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 4.11

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Implement pedestrian safety improvements at high-conflict intersections, with specific locations depicted in Figure 37: Crash Map.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.11: General agreement in support.

Work Group Comments on 4.11: What would those safety improvements be and at what locations? (Ely). See comments at 4.9 (Wood).

RECOMMENDATION 4.12

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Accessible pedestrian infrastructure should be incorporated into new pedestrian facilities and the current practice of inclusion of the Commission on Persons with Disabilities at 30% design should be continued in the design of public infrastructure, public art and historic interpretation to make sure that persons who are vision, hearing and mobility impaired have full access to interior and exterior public resources, including the marina. Such access plans need to be coordinated with federal boat standards.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.12: Consensus in support, with members confirming that this recommendation relates to handicapped accessibility and would be relevant to both marinas.

Work Group Comments on 4.12: The proposed marina off the south Robinson Terminal is a non-starter so that aspect of this recommendation should be dropped (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 4.13

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Provide improved signage for bicyclists to improve safety and help delineate the urban section of the Mount Vernon Trail between Bashford Lane and Green Street. Encourage through traffic to use Royal Street as a preferred route through Old Town.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.13: General agreement to revise the recommendation to add more clarity around the terminology *urban section*.

Work Group Comments on 4.13: Traffic laws should be vigorously enforced against bicyclists, specifically the requirement that all bicycles, like cars, must stop at stop signs (Ely). Take thru bicycle traffic away from the waterfront (Lyle). Add sentence, “Encourage through traffic to use Royal Street as a preferred route through Old Town” (Macek). Can bicycles be taken off the public streets? Staff response is that Virginia law protects the use of public streets by bicycles as well as motor vehicles (Olinger). Not clear as to what the urban section means, but believes there should be a preferred route, with appropriate caution signage for motor vehicles and bicycles at cross streets (Wood). Make the waterfront bicycle-friendly through accommodations such as bike racks, clear signage and other measures (Rhodeside)

RECOMMENDATION 4.14

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Implement a bike sharing station to connect the waterfront to a larger regional system that will extend the reach of transit and the parking system as part of a City-wide program.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.14: While there were several comments, there was no consensus supporting change to the recommendation.

Work Group Comments on 4.14: More bike sharing means more bikes and bike-car conflicts, raising the injury rate for both bicyclists and pedestrians (Ely). Preferably at metro stations (Lyle). Bicyclists should be encouraged to park their bikes and enjoy the waterfront area as pedestrians (Rhodeside).

RECOMMENDATION 4.15

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Rehabilitate and make surface improvements to the Mount Vernon Trail.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.15: General agreement in support, with the exception of Ely, who thinks the recommendation is unnecessary.

Work Group Comments on 4.15: What does this entail and where would these improvements be? (Ely). Collaborate with NPS (Rhodeside). *Staff clarified that the statement refers to the Mount Vernon Trail portions within the City and recognizes that these portions will require some routine paving and*

repair. Even though this is a National Park Service responsibility, planners chose to make it clear for stakeholders that these improvements would be addressed.

RECOMMENDATION 4.16

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Reconnect waterfront bicycle routes to Jones Point Park as part of the renovation efforts for that park.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.16: Consensus in support. No discussion.

RECOMMENDATION 4.17

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Apply and enforce on and off road bicycle laws to help improve bicycle safety and minimize pedestrian and bicycle conflicts and vehicular and bicycle conflicts as recommended in the 2008 Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility Plan. The City should proactively explore and implement urban design approaches that help minimize these conflicts.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.17: General agreement in support with agreement to include in the report that the Plan does not proactively address design opportunities to minimize conflicts between pedestrian, vehicular and bicycle traffic but it should do so.

Work Group Comments on 4.17: We need to discuss the use of bikes on Union Street (Ballard). The challenge is getting the police to enforce traffic laws against bicyclists. Need measures that remind bicyclists to respect traffic regulations (Ely). Encourage measures that can divert more use to Royal Street (Macek). Strongly recommends that the City develop ways to encourage bicyclists to use routes other than Union Street and Royal Street to the greatest extent possible (Olinger). The goal should be to design bike paths, pedestrian routes, and auto routes to eliminate conflicts. The report should highlight opportunities to incorporate in the waterfront good design to minimize conflicts between pedestrians, vehicles and bicyclists (Wood).

RECOMMENDATION 4.18

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Provide additional bicycle parking on the waterfront in Oronoco Bay Park and near at the foot of King Street with more racks and/or covered bicycle shelters.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.18: General agreement in support of this recommendation, acknowledging that it is more a question of how it is done

Work Group Comments on 4.18: More bike racks will take space away from either cars and parking or sidewalks, further adding to street and sidewalk congestion. Also, the bike shelters could be unsightly (Ely). Locate bike parking away from the foot of King Street (Lyle). Bicycle parking should be part of design (Wood). It was noted that the Waterfront Committee had, a day earlier, been briefed by T&ES about the City's planning efforts to identify bike share stations for the waterfront area (Macek). It is important to be sensitive to aesthetics (Smedberg).

RECOMMENDATION 4.19

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Explore improved bicycle facilities on North Union Street and North Royal Street, as recommended in the 2008 Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility Plan.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.19: General agreement in support with a recognition that there should be more attention given to The Strand area, along with North Union Street and North Royal Street.

Work Group Comments on 4.19: More bike racks will take space away from either cars and parking or sidewalks, further adding to street and sidewalk congestion. Also, the bike shelters could be unsightly (Ely). The idea of addressing the 'extended Strand' area should be included along with other areas such as North Union Street and North Royal Street (Wood). Not sure why the 2008 Pedestrian and Bicycle Mobility Plan is included as part of this; more attention should be given to The Strand area. (Smedberg)

RECOMMENDATION 4.20

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Continually assess existing transit service to determine where enhancements are needed.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.20: Consensus in support, with the need to add a reference here or in one of the related recommendations that there should be new ideas generated for moving people from outside the core into the core.

Work Group Comments on 4.20: Still not sure what the recommendation means and how the Union Street Study would relate to this recommendation (Ely). The plan statement related to the Union Street Study should be a recommendation. (Macek). Concern that this and the next several recommendations through 4.25 do not get to how to develop new innovations to get people from outside the core area into the core area. (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 4.21

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Consider transportation linkages between the waterfront, Braddock Road Metro, Potomac Yard and Del Ray ~~as a long term goal.~~*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.21: General agreement, with attention to Work Group comments.

Work Group Comments on 4.21: The big question is what might those linkages be? Street cars, BRT, motorized trolleys. Over what routes? (Ely). Add short term also (Rhodeside). Several members noted the recommendation as written is benign and does not automatically open the door to street cars (Macek and Wood). Alexandria has only one east/west connection and that is the trolley; if you want

to bring vibrancy you will need something more. (Wood). Additional north-south connections may also be needed (Lyle).

RECOMMENDATION 4.22

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Increase King Street trolley service between the King Street Metrorail station and the waterfront by decreasing headways and reinstating longer hours of operation.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.22: General agreement in support, with attention to Work Group comments.

Work Group Comments on 4.22: Moving people faster to lower King Street may pull retail business away from shops further up King Street. Merchants should be consulted. I have heard additional complaints from King Street merchants as far east as St Asaph about the trolleys whisking potential customers past them down to the waterfront area. This is highly discriminatory to upper King Street merchants who pay taxes, too (Ely). There should be mention of north south service to waterfront activities along with east-west along King Street (Wood). This requires more analysis (Olinger).

RECOMMENDATION 4.23

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *In the short and mid-term explore use of shuttle and other short-distance transportation services for those utilizing remote parking facilities and Metro Stations during special events and other activities as the City directs.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.23: Consensus in support of the revised text.

Work Group Comments on 4.23: There was interest, again, in having Report language that short-distance transit ideas should be considered for special events and other activities (Wood).

RECOMMENDATION 4.24

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *~~Maintain turn-around area for trolleys at the foot of King Street.~~ Modify the Trolley route to conform to the new vision of the foot of King Street and to maintain the linkages between the King Street Trolley and the waterfront and water-based modes of transport.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.24: General agreement for revised recommendation.

Work Group Comments on 4.24: We need to discuss this in the event that Fitzgerald Square is taken out of the plan (Ballard). This turnaround space would be just one element of the resign of traffic flows at the bottom of King Street This assumes a dock south of King Street. Signs at a water taxi dock behind the Torpedo Factory could easily guide arriving passengers to the trolley stop. (Ely). But perhaps not east of The Strand (Rhodeside). The foot of King Street is to be a significant public space, not a trolley turnaround point. One alternative may be to use City Hall square as a drop off point, left on

Fairfax, back West on Cameron, finish at Metro (to include Braddock Metro in the future) (Wood). It is important to keep the unit block of King Street pedestrian (Smedberg). Trolley service is a link between the King Street Metro station and the waterfront, including the water taxis (Macek).

RECOMMENDATION 4.25

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *As Plan implementation affects motor coach parking needs and locations, study and relocate locations as necessary, identify motor coach drop off and parking locations that are not in conflict with public or private facilities on Union Street. Include potential increase in motor coach traffic in the Union Street Traffic Study.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion of 4.25: Consensus in support with the above noted modifications.

Work Group Comments on 4.25: Identify motor coach drop off and parking locations that are not in conflict with public or private facilities (Rhodeside). This topic needs early attention, particularly in terms of the routes of motor coaches and where they will park and wait to pick up passengers. Given the serious negative impact of motorcoaches on Old Town, there still has not been sufficient development of ideas and alternatives for tour-bus passenger drop-off and pick-up (Ely). Such details as Ely has noted would be more appropriate for the Motor Coach Task Force (Lyle). Incorporate Rhodeside's comments (Smedberg). Motor coach traffic and hotels should be addressed within the Union Street Study (Wood).

Private Realm

Work Group members broadly acknowledged that mixed-use, commercial development was likely and desirable and environmental concerns must be addressed. There is consensus among Work Group members that given the high value of waterfront land, by-right development is unlikely and undesirable. By amending the Development Guidelines for each development site (Robinson Terminal North, Robinson Terminal South, and the Cummings-Turner Block) the Work Group seeks to make Plan language more flexible and less prescriptive, to encourage mixed-use commercial activities, to favor active and welcoming ground-floor uses such as retail and cultural use, and to control residential use and design to ensure its compatibility with the anticipated activity and increased public access desired along the waterfront. In addition, specific recommendations are offered regarding the Policy for Restaurant/Hotel/Commercial Uses to mitigate negative impacts of development. There was extensive discussion regarding the scale, size, and nature of development. Environmental expectations are emphasized.

Summary of Work Group Private Realm Findings

- There is clear agreement on the need to balance development with high quality open space while preserving the historic nature of Old Town. Private contributions supporting public uses, waterfront infrastructure, and quality public spaces (including arts, history, and recreational elements) are important expectations of developers. Environmental amenities, particularly added green space as a priority amenity, should be prominent features of development sites, above and beyond the minimum required. In all cases, ground-floor uses should primarily serve the public and complement activities envisioned for public spaces. Cultural uses (museums, galleries, classrooms, performance venues, etc.) should be specifically encouraged to anchor development, support activity, and facilitate a variety of attractions. Programming these uses, along with promoting well-designed commercial activities, can help disperse visitors and density up and down the waterfront to ease congestion. Residential development should be significantly controlled so as not to inhibit public access and enjoyment of activities in adjacent public space. Townhomes, in particular, seemed inconsistent with this objective. For any development proposal, it is important to assess, account for, and, if necessary, mitigate the different externalities (e.g., traffic and circulation, parking, noise, odors, etc.) associated with added density at each development site.
- There is fundamental disagreement over the scale, size, and nature of development as it impacts the historic fabric of Old Town and the appropriate representation of the historic waterfront. This issue is not development versus no development, but instead involves the difference in density between settlement agreements with Robison Terminal Warehouse Corporation and the 1992 Alexandria Master Plan that serves as the basis for the W-1 zoning. A secondary issue involves the number and size of hotels as a permitted use. There are two primary sentiments expressed regarding this disagreement.

On one side, the additional density and uses proposed in the Plan—including hotels—are found to be modest and necessary to promote an enlivened and commercially viable waterfront that facilitates private investment in the public spaces envisioned by the Plan. Private and public realm Plan recommendations, as modified by the Work Group, are thought to be sufficient to address the attendant external impacts of development. The proposed number of hotels and hotel rooms is supported as long as the Development Guidelines are stringently applied. Adopting the uses proposed in changes to W-1 zoning and allowing the density specified in the settlement agreements provides a greater degree of certainty to the planning process as it potentially mitigates the likelihood of litigation by property owners. These proposed changes also provide revenues to fund implementation of the Plan in a timely fashion.

Alternatively, the other side feels that the zoning specified by the 1992 Master Plan remains appropriate and legally defensible, based on City staff explanations. The City's calculations show that this Plan can be funded over an acceptable timeframe without hotels and with no change in W-1 zoning. Density and developmental rights, coupled with the Work Group's recommended amendments to Plan Developmental Goals and Guidelines, are entirely adequate to achieve the amenities necessary for a vibrant waterfront and there is no need to change the W-1 zoning. Substantial development can and will take place under existing zoning and further increases will only add to the strains placed on the already fragile surrounding neighborhood. Hotels are not entirely ruled out, in this opposing view, as an allowable mixed use development if W-1 zoning was changed to allow this specific use without an accompanying increase in density. But, the number of proposed hotels (3) and their impact and on traffic congestion and the historical fabric of Old Town in this area makes the hotel alternative extremely undesirable or outright unacceptable. The economic viability and appropriateness of hotels, particularly the proposed limit of 450 rooms, is challenged due to misgivings expressed in developer input and serious physical shortcomings of the sites (e.g. distance from Metro, additional traffic congestion and parking impacts). Given the critical nature of revenues from hotel developments to support the finances of this Plan, over-emphasis of this one commercial solution—when compared to other commercial uses—could create a long-term fiscal shortfall in revenues needed to help implement the Plan if the number of hotels and rooms was not market viable.

- A central issue regarding the private realm is a proposed change in W-1 zoning. Such a change would amend the 1992 City of Alexandria Master Plan and as such must be carefully considered since it could potentially establish precedence for similar changes or cause unintended consequences in other parts of the City. The specific changes proposed concern the addition of hotels, deletion of a small number of uses, specific references to Development Goals and Guidelines proposed for the Plan, and a change in permitted heights to make consistent across City plans. Likely development, whether under existing or amended W-1 zoning, would in almost all instances seek a SUP from the City. This is an important control on any development, particularly to ensure public amenities are secured and appropriate guidelines are applied for design, construction, and operation of developments. It should be noted that hotels could potentially be allowed without an increase in density through simple amendment of the special uses permitted in the W-1 zone.

- Commercial development in the W1 zone falls entirely within the RPA of the Chesapeake River watershed. As such, the provisions of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Act and the City’s own zoning provisions implementing this Act are especially relevant. Increases in impervious surfaces, storm water runoff, and overall density pose challenges to the City in its compliance with ever more restrictive standards for pollution control and environmental remediation. As indicated in the Work Group suggested changes to the Developmental Goals and Guidelines, expectations of developers regarding environmental amenities (e.g. catchment and runoff control, green practices, buffer zones, etc.) must go beyond the minimums expected. The City must exercise leadership in its environmental stewardship over the City’s waterfront as well as strong management.
- Members discussed the Plan’s proposed Policy for Restaurant/Hotel/Commercial Uses:
 - The Work Group acknowledges a public desire for additional dining options along the waterfront. It is important that new waterfront restaurants be considered within the context of the high number of existing King Street and Old Town restaurants in this historic area. Although there was discussion of whether to limit the sum total of waterfront-area restaurants to a particular square footage to prevent oversaturation of restaurants and the related negative impact on the surrounding neighborhoods, there are no recommended changes to the proposed policy. However, the consensus of the Work Group is to avoid a food court or “restaurant row” atmosphere while potentially allowing new options.
 - Although there is no consensus on the need for hotels, the Work Group expresses general agreement in support of this policy. Work Group recommends a modification to better reflect meeting room sizes appropriate for the size of the hotel without an arbitrary capacity limit of 50 persons. This modification is intended to be more flexible with this constraint, but the intent remains to be consistent with the Planning Commission’s desire to prevent convention-sized meeting space. In similar discussions about the number of hotel rooms, some members felt that the 150 room limit per hotel at three sites (450 rooms total) was equally arbitrary and suggested adjusting the limit downward to mitigate impacts from hotels. The hotel study supporting the Plan did not address the question of the minimum number of rooms necessary for a hotel to be market viable in this area. There is no agreement to change the recommended number of no more than 3 hotels of 150 rooms each (450 rooms total), with no more than one hotel at each of the three development sites. Narrative text in the implementation section of the Plan needs to be made consistent with the three hotel limit by eliminating references to a second hotel on the Cummings-Turner block.
- The Development Guidelines for the Robinson Terminal North, Robinson Terminal South, and Cummings-Turner properties contained in the Plan are intended to be additive to the requirements specified in City planning documents. Current City planning documents contain insufficient guidelines to achieve the vision of the Plan. The Work Group’s suggested

modifications to the guidelines and recommendations of the Plan provide important amplifying language to ensure the public's goals for architecture and site design, land use, historic preservation, public art, public spaces, and other public benefits are met.

- The Work Group recommended the addition of the following new Plan recommendation: Development Guidelines for the Cummings-Turner block are detailed in the Proposed Zoning for Private Development Sites section at the end of this chapter.
- The Work Group recommended modifications to the Policy for Restaurant/Hotel/Commercial Uses as follows:
 - 4. *In making its determination, City Council shall consider the following factors as applied to the proposed use:*
 - b. *Restaurant*
 - iii. *The extent to which alcohol consumption will predominate over food consumption and situated so as to potentially disturb residential areas and negatively impact waterfront public spaces.*
 - b. *Hotel*
 - ii. *The type and size of hotel, and whether it is designed to attract large conventions, banquets, or other functions (such as trade shows). Hotels shall be “boutique” hotels: that is, hotels with 150 rooms or less, no ballroom, and meeting rooms for on-site use by guests. for no more than 50 people.*
- The Work Group recommended modifications to the Robinson Terminal North Development Guidelines as follows:
 - 2: *The preferred use on the site ~~east of Union Street above the first floor is a boutique hotel. The second preferred use would be for office~~ is mixed use, emphasizing arts, history and culture (including a museum) and including vibrant commercial uses (such as hotel).*
 - 4: *Residential use should not be the primary use of the site. ~~is specifically discouraged east of Union Street unless, as part of SUP and approval,~~ The location, design and specific type of residential use proposed must coexist well with the other uses on the site and planned public activity in the public spaces adjacent to the residential development; and provide a welcoming presence to visitors to the waterfront; and preferably not include permanent owner occupied residential units. Ground floor residential units are not permitted.*
 - 13: ~~Upon~~ As part of redevelopment, on and off site public amenities shall be provided by the developer of the site. The specific amenities to be provided will be determined during the development review process. Desirable public amenities include...
 - Environmental amenities, above and beyond the minimum required.

- The Work Group recommended modifications to the Robinson Terminal South Development Guidelines as follows:
 - 2: ~~The preferred use on the site east of The Strand above the first floor is a boutique hotel. The second preferred use would be for office.~~ is mixed use, emphasizing arts, history and culture (including a museum) and including vibrant commercial uses (such as hotel). In particular, facilitate the vision for The Strand and its uses.
 - 13: As part of redevelopment, on and off site public amenities shall be provided by the developer of the site. The specific amenities to be provided will be determined during the development review process. Desirable public amenities include...
 - Environmental amenities, above and beyond the minimum required.
- The Work Group recommended the following modification to the Cummings-Turner block Development Guidelines:
 - 2: The preferred use on the site is mixed use, emphasizing arts, history and culture (including a museum) and including vibrant commercial uses (such as hotel). ~~On this block, the required use facing The Strand above the first floor is boutique hotel.~~

Work Group Plan Statements on the Private Realm

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

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

Disagree: Ely.

Notes: Ely felt “additional” conveys an open-ended amount and wanted “should be” changed to “could be.” Lyle would not support adding a limit on development to this statement. Macek noted that “mixed use” refers to “aggregate uses along the waterfront” not to mixed use on every parcel.

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, 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, 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, Rhodeside.

Note: 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, Rhodeside.

Disagreed: Wood, Ely.

Abstained: Olinger.

Note: 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 using the 150-room size for boutique hotels put them in a difficult commercial situation. Macek noted that hotels need to be mentioned specifically because this is the only use not allowed in the current zoning.

The permitted heights on redevelopment sites should be the existing height district limits.

Agreed: Ballard, Lyle, Macek, Rhodeside.

Disagreed: Olinger, Ely.

Abstained: Wood.

Note: 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.

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: Rhodeside noted that the intent is to not impose architecture that is faux-looking and to clarify that 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.

Note: Ely asked how the word "significant" is defined and staff responded by stating that it is not possible now to say exactly what new development will contribute but it is a clear

expectation that it will not be something small. Wood: Change the word should to must. Olinger: increased density has not been fully discussed.

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

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

Note: 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, and indicated that Cameron Station includes levels that are below grade and in some cases at the water table. Macek noted that developers came in and did not raise issues with underground parking. Wood stated that underground parking was only discussed in the context of one project when the developers were here. Rhodeside suggested this statement should include both new and renovated buildings. Ballard expressed concern about adding renovated buildings.

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.

Note: 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.

Review of Plan Recommendations for the Private Realm

RECOMMENDATION 3.11

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Continue discussions with Crowne Plaza Hotel representatives on the possible incorporation of urban design elements to the site to make it more pedestrian and urban friendly. See also pages 81 and 82.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Yes, but....Per our plan statement, J2, we should get more specific in our redevelopment guidelines as we discuss with current and future landowners and redevelopers. For example, what are the current guidelines for purchasers of the land and buildings in Cummings-Turner dealing with elements detailed in J2? (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 3.40

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *If the Sheet Metals Workers building were to be redeveloped, such redevelopment shall provide a high level of pedestrian and visual connectivity between the redeveloped property and Oronoco Bay Park. Provided that the redevelopment is compatible with the uses in Oronoco Bay Park, a rezoning may be considered.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments:

- Unclear as to what sort of rezoning is considered (spot zoning?). Also, this requirement for pedestrian and visual connectivity is well short of plan statements J2 and J3. Also, it's not clear that the 450 room criteria for waterfront hotels applies to this parcel, should hotels be permitted development. It is within the Waterfront Plan Boundary and should be included under such a constraint on hotels (Wood).
- The Sheet Metal Workers building should be included in the waterfront planning area just as should the GenOn site (Ely).
- Explain the rezoning question please (Olinger).
- The site has been purchased and a by-right plan is underway (Ballard).

RECOMMENDATION 3.41

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Adopt Development Guidelines for Robinson Terminal North. These are detailed in the Proposed Zoning for Private Development Sites section at the end of this chapter.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommended changes to particular requirements of the Development Guidelines for Robinson Terminal North. These include preferred uses, residential controls, design expectations, public amenities provision, and development density and height. These are described in full in the discussion of the Development Guidelines for this site.

Work Group Comments:

- [Agree], however, my recommendation is that the denser the development on this site the better. (Rhodeside)
- There has not been any compelling rationale provided to adopt these guidelines with their dramatic increases in density over current zoning. Current zoning allows an increase of 112% over existing development. This zoning is legal, by the city's own claim. It is more than adequate since it provides the height required for potential development as well as greatly increased FAR. It reflects the consensus of the federal settlement with all parties as well as the City's own Master Planning documents. Any "nexus" between density and amenities is purely subjective as repeatedly stated. There are no guarantees. With such dramatic increase in density (from 160% to 335% across the properties), FAR, and height, there is no amount of amenities on these sites

and along the waterfront that can offset such massive scale hard against the 17th and 18th century grid of historic Old Town. While the "nexus" and its tradeoff between density and amenities is subjective, the negative impact of such massive scale development on the river access is as real as any walk through Ford's landing, Harborside, and the riverside path east of the Chart House reveals. The canyon effects north on Union from the Torpedo Factory will be repeated to the south on Union. If the Sheet Metal Workers Building could be considered for rezoning if its proposed use met the intended uses of Oronoco Bay Park, it is equally appropriate to say the same about redevelopment plans, if and when, they come forward to the city from RTN, RTS, or CT. Now is not the time to relieve these landowners from legal, adequate, and binding constraints, in the absence of amenity proposals, completed traffic and environmental impact studies, and flood analysis beyond the conceptual details in the WFP. (Wood)

- The proposed plan for Robinson Terminal North (RTN) needs a complete rethink. First, there should be no hotels on that site. Second, a means should be developed to permit maximum use of this site as public open space and for a museum/cultural facility related to the Potomac and its maritime history. The City should explore swapping City-owned land elsewhere in Alexandria for some or all of the RTN site and/or selling development rights on this site for use elsewhere in the City. Public access to the river by other types of privately owned properties has been greatly overstated. The best way to provide increased public access to the river is through actual open space – grass, trees, and public facilities, such as a museum. (Ely)
- By right use should be a last resort. (Lyle)
- I believe this is code for increasing density & height and incorporating new uses. This needs to be fully discussed. I am opposed to any increase in density and can only support hotel use if it is further limited as to number & size of hotels. Congestion (vehicular, pedestrian & parking) is presently a major issue in the area. Proposed parking solutions are nothing more than “smoke & mirrors”. The Plan does nothing to improve the existing situation and will only make things much worse. Under existing zoning some 651,000 sf. can be built. Increasing density to add another 161,000 of development is totally unacceptable. (Olinger)

RECOMMENDATION 3.66

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Retain the ODBC building with ongoing use by the ODBC.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments:

- Both the ODBC clubhouse and the ODBC parking lot should stay right where they are. (Ely)
- Leave ODBC out of the process. (Lyle)
- Discussions between ODBC & the City should continue. (Olinger)
- I think this should be changed to include the ODBC parking lot and discuss beautification (Ballard)

RECOMMENDATION 3.93

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Continue to pursue reuse or reconstruction of The Beachcombers Restaurant building as a working restaurant, provided it is financially feasible without public subsidy. Demolish this building if an economically viable use is infeasible.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, although members note that the site could be a viable location for desired cultural uses instead of a restaurant.

Work Group Comments:

- Yes, but...this space or building could be used for a visitor's center, waterfront museum, or other cultural activity. A restaurant is not the only use for this footprint. (Wood)
- If a restaurant is not feasible in the Beachcomber, perhaps another economically viable use can be found for the building. (Ely)
- Is this minimal building worth the effort? If restaurant space in the Plan area is to be limited, is this the best place for it? What about parking and access? (Olinger)

NEW RECOMMENDATION

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Development Guidelines for the Cummings-Turner block are detailed in the Proposed Zoning for Private Development Sites section at the end of this chapter.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommended changes to particular requirements of the Development Guidelines for the Cummings-Turner block. These include preferred uses, residential controls, design expectations, and cooperative arrangements between landowners. These are described in full in the discussion of the Development Guidelines for this site.

There was no numbered Plan recommendation in the draft Plan pointing to the Development Guidelines for this development site. The new Plan recommendation remedies this.

RECOMMENDATION 3.96

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Development Guidelines for Robinson Terminal South are detailed in the Proposed Zoning for Private Development Sites section at the end of this chapter.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommended changes to particular requirements of the Development Guidelines for Robinson Terminal South. These include preferred uses, residential controls, interaction with adjacent public space, design expectations, potential marina location, and development density and height. These are described in full in the discussion of the Development Guidelines for this site.

Work Group Comments:

- There has not been any compelling rationale provided to adopt these guidelines with their dramatic increases in density over current zoning. Current zoning allows an increase of 112% over existing development. This zoning is legal, by the city's own claim. It is more than adequate since it provides the height required for potential development as well as greatly increased FAR. It reflects the consensus of the federal settlement with all parties as well as the City's own Master Planning documents. Any "nexus" between density and amenities is purely subjective as repeatedly stated. There are no guarantees. With such dramatic increase in density (from 160% to 335% across the properties), FAR, and height, there is no amount of amenities on these sites and along the waterfront that can offset such massive scale hard against the 17th and 18th century grid of historic Old Town. While the "nexus" and its tradeoff between density and amenities is subjective, the negative impact of such massive scale development on the river access is as real as any walk through Ford's landing, Harborside, and the riverside path east of the Chart House reveals. The canyon effects north on Union from the Torpedo Factory will be repeated to the south on Union. If the Sheet Metal Workers Building could be considered for rezoning if its proposed use met the intended uses of Oronoco Bay Park, it is equally appropriate to say the same about redevelopment plans, if and when, they come forward to the city from RTN, RTS, or CT. Now is not the time to relieve these landowners from legal, adequate, and binding constraints, in the absence of amenity proposals, completed traffic and environmental impact studies, and flood analysis beyond the conceptual details in the WFP. (Wood)
- The comments above with regard to RTN apply to Robinson Terminal South (RTS). Additionally any plan to build a marina off the RTS pier should be scrapped as the Army Corp of Engineers will not permit that marina. (Ely)
- Same comments as 3.41, above. Density and use are the key issues. The discussion as to whether the so-called "goodies" in the Plan are worth the attributed costs and the resultant net increase in density has never taken place. Improvements requiring increased density to throw off more revenue to pay for benefits just aren't worth the damage that will be inflicted on the area & the city. We need to look carefully at the trade-offs.(Olinger)

RECOMMENDATION 3.97

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Pursue the concept of a limited public access agreement along the waterside of Robinson Terminal South in collaboration with the landowners of the property.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation, although members note that the site could be a viable location for added green space, a connection between The Strand and Wolfe Street, and additional green space to assist with environmental remediation.

Work Group Comments:

- No; there are a number of things that could and should be pursued here. Additional parkland could be sought with price negotiations and payment options explored by the city. As it now stands in the plan, there's a hotel on the waterfront here. If development must happen, all efforts must be made to move it off the river. The marina is an acknowledged "non starter" so any rationale to put the hotel on the river to facilitate the marina is purely specious. There are a number of historic buildings here that offer great utility for public amenities. The historic warehouses on Cummings-Turner are no longer available, apparently, for the many recommended public uses suggested in the plan. CAAWP's alternative offers a variety of ways to buy and finance public space. The waterfront land east of the Strand extending to Wolf is an ideal parcel to consider and target. Its development is indicated in the last phase of implementation in the plan which allows accumulation of Open Space funds, for example, over 10 years. Alternatively, a specific parcel of parkland could rally public and private support for financing, especially if it's clearly acknowledged that the owner deserves just payment or other economic benefits. (Wood)
- This concept needs fleshing out. (Ely)

RECOMMENDATION 3.98

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *In coordination with the redevelopment of Robinson Terminal South, pursue expansion of Roberdeau Park west on Wolfe Street as is generally depicted on the illustrative plan.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Comments: See comment above. (Wood)

RECOMMENDATION 3.105

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Support redevelopment of the North Old Town parcels in the Plan area when redevelopment is compatible with existing uses, will improve the relationship of buildings to the street and will provide an active presence at the street level.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this recommendation.

Work Group Comments: Yes, but...This is perfect place to include GenOn and its redevelopment. This reinforces the language found on page 82, just in front of this recommendation on page 83. (Wood)

Review of Policy for Restaurant/Hotel/Commercial Uses

RESTAURANT, HOTEL, AND COMMERCIAL POLICIES 1-3 (PAGE 85)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Each SUP for a restaurant, hotel, entertainment, or other commercial use on the waterfront must be reviewed, and appropriate findings made, according to the following guidelines:*

1. *City Council shall not approve an SUP for a use on the waterfront unless it finds that the use does not create significant negative impacts on the vitality and character of King Street or the character and enjoyment of nearby residential neighborhoods*
2. *City Council shall consider the cumulative effect of the proposal and the number of already established uses in the nearby area.*
3. *In the case of an expansion or other intensification, the entire operation shall be taken into account in determining the impact on King Street and nearby residential neighborhoods.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to these policies, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

RESTAURANT, HOTEL, AND COMMERCIAL POLICY 4a (PAGE 85)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan:

4. *In making its determination, City Council shall consider the following factors as applied to the proposed use:*
 - a. *Restaurant*
 - i. *The potential for undue congestion of pedestrians or vehicles;*
 - ii. *The extent to which the use is open in the late night hours and situated so as to potentially disturb residential areas;*
 - iii. *The extent to which alcohol consumption will predominate over food consumption and situated so as to potentially disturb residential areas and negatively impact waterfront public spaces.*
 - iv. *The availability of off-street parking for the restaurant's patrons and employees, including whether the restaurant has contracted with nearby garages for additional off-street parking for patrons and/or employees.*
 - v. *The predicted extent of litter generated;*
 - vi. *The potential for loud or otherwise inappropriate noise; and*
 - vii. *The extent to which other restaurants already exist in the same area. Restaurant uses should not be located in such proximity as to detract from the character and authenticity of the waterfront by creating a monoculture similar to a Food Court or "restaurant row" environment.*
 - viii. *The extent to which the hotel provides incentives for employees who are able to use transit.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion:

The Work Group expressed general agreement in support of this policy, and recommended several modifications as indicated above to strengthen it. Members focused discussion on Policy 4-a-vii, noting the importance of considering new waterfront restaurants within the context of existing King Street and Old Town restaurants. There was discussion of whether to limit the sum total of waterfront-area restaurants to a particular square footage to prevent oversaturation of restaurants, but no new policy was proposed.

Work Group Comments:

- **Policy 4-a-ii:**
 - This language may suffice for a restaurant or hotel in other commercial areas of Alexandria. We need to add additional language that protects the peaceful enjoyment, the appropriate active uses, and the family orientation of our waterfront. The language is too generic. (Wood)
 - Specific criteria have to be established for RHC SUPs. Without standards for measuring the impact of such uses, the SUP process is no more than a rhetorical exercise. 50,000 sf. equals 7 restaurants the size of “Virtue”. Are we trying to reinforce the “restaurant row” image? How would the s.f. limit be enforced and would it stand up to a law suit? In any case, the Restaurant/Hotel/Commercial Policy needs to include specific criteria for restaurants (examples: no more than 25% of the street frontage of any block; or a total predetermined retail/restaurant space ratio). (Olinger)
 - Times and locations? (Ballard)

- **Policy 4-a-iii:**
 - See above (Wood)
 - See above (Olinger)
 - Need to discuss percentages (Ballard)

- **Policy 4-a-v:**
 - We ask for relocation of litter and pickup for Chart House and the Food Court. We need to ask for similar design and responsibilities for properties on the waterfront. The language is too generic. (Wood)
 - See above. (Olinger)

- **Policy 4-a-vi:**
 - Yes, but...again need to make the language less generic, as it relates to the waterfront. (Wood)
 - See above. (Olinger)

- **Policy 4-a-vii:**
 - Given that Old Town is adequately served by many fine restaurants, especially near the waterfront, the City should approve little in the way of additional restaurant space along or near the waterfront. (Ely)

- Specific criteria have to be established for RHC SUPs. Without standards for measuring the impact of such uses, the SUP process is no more than a rhetorical exercise. (Olinger)
- Need to discuss guidelines (Ballard)

RESTAURANT, HOTEL, AND COMMERCIAL POLICY 4b (PAGE 85)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan:

4. *In making its determination, City Council shall consider the following factors as applied to the proposed use:*

b. Hotel

i. The potential for undue congestion of pedestrians or vehicles;

ii. The type and size of hotel, and whether it is designed to attract large conventions, banquets, or other functions (such as trade shows). Hotels shall be “boutique” hotels: that is, hotels with 150 rooms or less, no ballroom, and meeting rooms for on-site use by guests. for no more than 50 people.

iii. The ability of the hotel to accommodate, and screen all of its service needs on site, including loading and delivery operations.

iv. Parking for visitors, customers and employees must be provided on site. Additional parking may be provided by contract with a nearby garage for patrons and/or employees. Although the Plan anticipates low parking ratios, the applied ratio must be consistent with industry norms for similar hotels.

v. The extent to which garage spaces will be available to the public. Parking garages must be operated so that they are open to the public at least at peak times.

vi. A restaurant within a hotel that is open to the public shall be the subject of a separate SUP and the same requirements as other restaurants.

vii. The location of the hotel and whether its layout is designed to produce the least impact on nearby residential areas and on the lower King Street area.

viii. The extent to which the hotel provides incentives for employees who are able to use transit.

Summary of Work Group Discussion:

The Work Group expressed general agreement in support of this policy as modified to better reflect meeting room sizes appropriate for the size of the hotel without an arbitrary capacity limit of 50 persons. This modification was intended to be more flexible with this constraint, but the intent remains to be consistent with the Planning Commission’s desire to prevent convention-sized meeting space. In similar discussions about the number of hotel rooms, some members felt that the 150 room limit per hotel at three sites (450 rooms total) was equally arbitrary and suggested adjusting the limit downward to mitigate impacts from hotels. The hotel study supporting the Plan did not address the question of the minimum number of rooms necessary for a hotel to be market viable in this area. There was no agreement to change the recommended number of no more than 3 hotels of 150 rooms each (450 rooms total), with no more than one hotel at each of the three development sites. Narrative text in the implementation section of the Plan needs to be made consistent with the three hotel limit by eliminating references to a second hotel on the Cummings-Turner block.

Work Group Comments:

- **Policy 4-b-ii:**
 - The focus on hotels is misleading, economically dangerous, and prevents full examination of alternatives. The owners of RTN and RTS, in their own studies conducted by their own experts, state that hotels are not feasible or economically viable. Hotels are not required to be developed on these sites, but this plan depends on hotels to succeed. This plan relies exclusively on hotel development to meet its financial objectives. The four hotels in the plan (three on South Union and one on North Union) do not fill any foreseeable shortage, depend on flawed analysis (see study done by Marriott for RT), deprive current hotels of needed occupancy, compound traffic and congestion problems, and amount to directed land speculation by the city. Redevelopment is needed, desirable, and most probable. We need to find a compromise that is economically viable, on a scale that matches this locale, and brings necessary vibrancy to the waterfront. FOUR HOTELS are not needed and, by assertions contained in CT and RT statements, should not be built. (Wood)
 - No new hotels should be authorized east of Lee Street. Also, need to acknowledge that the 1983 settlement agreement governing the eventual redevelopment of the Robinson Terminal properties would have to be amended to permit hotels on those two sites. There can be no assurance that the federal court with jurisdiction over the settlement agreement would agree to such a modification. (Ely)
 - Specific criteria have to be established for RHC SUPs. Without standards for measuring the impact of such uses, the SUP process is no more than a rhetorical exercise. The number of hotels and rooms has yet to be fully discussed. A 150 room is just too big. Once “hotels” is an accepted land use in the W-1 Zone, how can the number of hotels or rooms be enforced? Would it stand up against a law suit from a property owner wanting to build a 4th or 5th hotel? On the other hand, we know that the plan cannot require hotels. Where does this leave us? (Olinger)
 - Discuss 450 rooms versus the number of hotels- 3/4 Also, discuss meeting rooms (Ballard)
- **Policy 4-b-vi:**
 - See previous comment. (Ely)
 - Specific criteria have to be established for RHC SUPs. Without standards for measuring the impact of such uses, the SUP process is no more than a rhetorical exercise. (Olinger)
 - What has been done in the past--Lorien, etc. (Ballard)
- **Policy 4-b-vii:**
 - This focus on hotels is misleading in the absence of language addressing other, better development alternatives. See above. As written, this guideline is too generic regarding its impact. It should not impact lower King Street. In fact it should enhance this area of King Street and the entire Waterfront. We need to recast these statements to not only state what the restrictions may be, but also describe the positive nature of attributes provided by development. (Wood)
 - See previous comment. (Ely)
 - See previous comment. (Olinger)

RESTAURANT, HOTEL, AND COMMERCIAL POLICY 4c (PAGE 85)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan:

4. *In making its determination, City Council shall consider the following factors as applied to the proposed use:*
 - c. *Other commercial uses: Factors from the above lists shall be applied as relevant to the specific SUP under consideration.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this policy, with no comments and no roundtable discussion.

Review of Development Guidelines for Robinson Terminal North

The Work Group recommended changes to particular requirements of the Development Guidelines for Robinson Terminal North. These include preferred uses, residential controls, design expectations, public amenities provision, and development density and height. These are described in full below.

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 1 (PAGE 92)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Active uses should be part of any development and should constitute the predominant ground floor uses. Active ground floor uses shall be generally located as depicted in the Public Space and Active Frontages Diagram (Figure 31), and shall consist of uses that are open and welcoming to the public during normal business hours, such as lobbies, restaurants, retail, civic or cultural uses.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 2 (PAGE 92)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *The preferred use on the site ~~east of Union Street above the first floor is a boutique hotel. The second preferred use would be for office~~ is mixed use, emphasizing arts, history and culture (including a museum) and including vibrant commercial uses (such as hotel).*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group expressed general agreement in support of the changes summarized above, which remove the specific reference to Union Street and boutique hotels and instead specify a preference for *mixed-use, emphasizing arts, history and culture (including a museum) and including commercial uses (such as a hotel)*. The Work Group agreed to call out museum and hotel, both in parentheses as noted. Some members expressed concerns about total number of hotels and hotel rooms as determined by the Planning Commission, as well as the manner in which these limits were selected.

Work Group Comments:

- The focus on hotels is misleading, economically dangerous, and prevents full examination of alternatives. The owners of RTN and RTS, in their own studies conducted by their own experts, state that hotels are not feasible or economically viable. Hotels are not required to be developed on these sites, but this plan depends on hotels to succeed. This plan relies exclusively on hotel development to meet its financial objectives. The four hotels in the plan (three on South Union and one on North Union) do not fill any foreseeable shortage, depend on flawed analysis (see study done by Marriott for RT), deprive current hotels of needed occupancy, compound traffic and congestion problems, and amount to directed land speculation by the city. Redevelopment is needed, desirable, and most probable. We need to find a compromise that is economically viable, on a scale that matches this locale, and brings necessary vibrancy to the waterfront. FOUR HOTELS are not needed and, by assertions

contained in CT and RT statements, should not be built. If ever there was a location for a city supported public space, it is on West's Point. (Wood)

- No hotels east of Lee Street (Ely).
- See prior comment. (Olinger)

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 3 (PAGE 92)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Residential use and design should be compatible with a high level of public activity and located away from the water.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline, with no roundtable discussion.

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 4 (PAGE 92)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Residential use should not be the primary use of the site. ~~is specifically discouraged east of Union Street unless, as part of SUP and approval,~~ The location, design and specific type of residential use proposed must coexist well with the other uses on the site and planned public activity in the public spaces adjacent to the residential development; ~~and provide a welcoming presence to visitors to the waterfront; and preferably not include permanent owner occupied residential units.~~ Ground floor residential units are not permitted.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group expressed consensus to emphasize that residential was not a preferred primary use of the site, to specify that residential must coexist with other uses, and to eliminate the last phrase which reads *preferably not include permanent owner occupied residential units.*

Work Group Comments:

- Yes, but...not sure what last sentence means. We may allow residential development, but not for permanent residences?(Wood)
- The City should be more welcoming towards the construction of new, high-end residences -- townhomes and condos -- near the waterfront. (Ely)
- Why do we prefer that residential units not be “permanent owner occupied”? (Olinger)
- Discuss permanent owner occupied language (Ballard)

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 5 (PAGE 92)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *The streetscape and pedestrian experience along North Union Street should be enhanced; in addition to undergrounding utilities, providing street trees and appropriate light fixtures, Union Street should present an obvious continuation of pedestrian access between open space areas to the north and south and be improved with, at minimum, wide sidewalks, landscaping and special street paving.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline, with no roundtable discussion.

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 6 (PAGE 93)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Historic interpretation, consistent with the recommendations of the History Plan, should inform every aspect of the design of the redevelopment and adjacent public spaces, with particular attention given to the West's Point site which is the area which extends from the water west up Oronoco Street to Union Street, and represents the origins of Alexandria.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline, with no roundtable discussion.

Work Group Comments:

- Delete "every"; substitute "aspects of the design where suitable and appropriate". (Rhodeside)
- See above. (Wood)

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 7 (PAGE 93)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Encourage modern design inspired by historic precedent (such as 18th century Alexandria warehouse architecture) while maintaining compatibility with nearby residential neighborhoods and ensuring compliance with the Potomac River Vicinity Height District regulations and appropriate guidelines. Reflect historic east-west orientation of buildings, alleys and wharves.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline. There was some concern regarding the connotation of "modern design," but this was understood by members that it pertains to construction and structural aspects of the building and not its façade or external character.

Work Group Comments:

- Language contradicts with J7 and the East West orientation is not in keeping with the City's own models for this site. The sight lines in this area are less important, east to west, then they are north to south. The visual connection between the parks, up the river to the capital, and down the river to the historic core are much more important. (Wood)

- Are we sure we want “18th century warehouse architecture”? How far should we go in dictating design now? (Olinger)
- This language is very troubling as it opens the door to design that will only give lip-service to the unique, historic, and irreplaceable character of Old Town. (Ely)

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 8 (PAGE 93)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Parking for new buildings should be accommodated on site ~~and~~ below grade. Although the Plan anticipates low parking ratios, the applied ratio must be consistent with industry norms for similar hotels.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends only minor changes to this Development Guideline to make consistent with Work Group suggested modifications elsewhere in the plan.

Work Group Comments: The notion of low parking ratios is extremely troubling as it infers that on-site, below-grade parking on redeveloped sites will be insufficient. (Ely)

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 9 (PAGE 93)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *The bulk and scale of the buildings should be stepped down from Union Street toward the water.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

Work Group Comments:

- I can see development stepping up toward the water with lower height along Union (Rhodeside)
- It is equally important to specify that bulk along Union Street should be set back. This also a good place to insert the idea of alleyways and sightlines to the water. (Wood)

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 10 (PAGE 93)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Curb cuts should not be located on any building and/or block frontages facing the water or North Union Street, and should be minimized if facing open space along Oronoco Street.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline, with no roundtable discussion.

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 11 (PAGE 93)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Shoreline treatment at Robinson Terminal North should include native plantings and naturalization where possible.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

Work Group Comments: Only if the configuration of the bulkhead allows such treatment (Rhodeside)

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 12 (PAGE 93)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Redevelopment should be compatible with any biosparging technology, or other bioremediation, being employed by the City in treatment of the Oronoco Outfall-Alexandria Town Gas site located at the eastern end of Oronoco Street.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 13 (PAGE 93)

Text from Waterfront Plan: ~~Upon~~ *As part of redevelopment, on and off site public amenities shall be provided by the developer of the site. The specific amenities to be provided will be determined during the development review process. Desirable public amenities include:*

- *Public art as a prominent feature of the public realm, both on public and private property. The recommendations of the Art Plan should be incorporated, to the greatest extent possible, in the design for the redeveloped warehouses, pier, and public spaces.*
- *Open spaces with public access easements and/or dedications, provided as generally reflected in the Proposed Public Space and Active Frontages (Figure 31). The Plan encourages new open space to be provided on an improved pier, consistent with the federal settlement agreement.*
- *Retention of the Robinson Terminal pier, repaired and expanded to be used as a public space and incorporated into the public space/pedestrian concept for the Plan as a whole. The Plan encourages retaining the pier's ability to accommodate larger ships visiting Alexandria. Use of the pier should be active and welcoming to the general public, and should advance the goal of the uninterrupted public pedestrian walkway along the water's edge. Examples of potential uses include water features, river watching, bocce, horseshoes, shuffleboard, plant and sculpture gardens, or outdoor cafes. Any structure erected on the pier should be temporary in nature, such as a tensile structure, fabric awning, or prefabricated, demountable, glass pavilion. The responsibility for the design, construction, maintenance and programming of the pier and public space will be determined in the future; the Plan recommends close coordination between the City and the developer on all of these issues.*
- *Environmental amenities, above and beyond the minimum required.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: General agreement by the Work Group in support of the Development Guideline as modified. Committee members noted that the Plan should address both on- and off-site public amenities funded by developer contributions, and should better address the provision of desired environmental amenities by developers.

Work Group Comments:

- Yes, but...RTN and its occupation of West's Point needs to be better highlighted, particularly regarding art and history ties and design criteria. If ever there was a place to suggest ties to a significant city managed public space, this ground is where it needs to be. The suggested "civic building" is better cited here, for example, to ease the density in the south. A partnering with a developer - city, developer, and public partner - could result in a great compromise. The design process (competition?), the partnering between commercial and public use, and the revenue potential for all parties make this location a very important setting to get right. (Wood)
- The practicality of docking larger vessels at the RTN pier needs to be reassessed in light of the periodic dredging required to maintain a sufficient water depth at the pier to accommodate larger ships. (Ely)

ROBINSON TERMINAL NORTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 14 (PAGE 93)

Text from Waterfront Plan: *The maximum FAR and floor area allowed is included on the chart on page ~~101~~ 103.*

Work Group Comments: See WPWG Comments under Recommendation 3.41.

Review of Development Guidelines for Robinson Terminal South

The Work Group recommended changes to particular requirements of the Development Guidelines for Robinson Terminal South. These include preferred uses, residential controls, interaction with adjacent public space, design expectations, potential marina location, and development density and height. These are described in full below.

ROBINSON TERMINAL SOUTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 1 (PAGE 96)

Text from Waterfront Plan: *Active uses which welcome the public should be part of any development, and constitute the predominant ground floor uses. Active ground floor uses shall be located as generally depicted in the Public Space and Active Frontages Diagram (Figure 34), and shall consist of uses that are open and welcoming to the public during normal business hours, such as lobbies, restaurants, retail, civic or cultural uses.*

Summary of WPWG Discussion: The WPWG recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

WPWG Comments: Are lobbies- residential, hotel or commercial- open and welcoming to the public? (Olinger)

ROBINSON TERMINAL SOUTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 2 (PAGE 96)

Text from Waterfront Plan: *The preferred use on the site ~~east of The Strand above the first floor is a boutique hotel. The second preferred use would be for office.~~ is mixed use, emphasizing arts, history and culture (including a museum) and including vibrant commercial uses (such as hotel). In particular, facilitate the vision for The Strand and its uses.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: There was general agreement by the Work Group in support of the Development Guideline as modified. This is a parallel statement to Robinson Terminal North's Development Guideline 2. The WPWG agreed to additional modifications to address The Strand even though the modifications may be a little duplicative of other statements in the Plan. Ely opposed the modification based on his opposition to hotels.

Work Group Comments:

- But add: or a combination of office and residential at end of sentence (Rhodeside)
- No; The focus on hotels is misleading, economically dangerous, and prevents full examination of alternatives. The owners of RTN and RTS, in their own studies conducted by their own experts, state that hotels are not feasible or economically viable. Hotels are not required to be developed on these sites, but this plan depends on hotels to succeed. This plan relies exclusively on hotel development to meet its financial objectives. The four hotels in the plan (three on South Union and one on North Union) do not fill any foreseeable shortage, depend on flawed analysis (see study done by Marriott for RT), deprive current hotels of needed occupancy, compound traffic and congestion problems, and amount to directed land

speculation by the city. Redevelopment is needed, desirable, and most probable. We need to find a compromise that is economically viable, on a scale that matches this locale, and brings necessary vibrancy to the waterfront. FOUR HOTELS are not needed and, by assertions contained in CT and RT statements, should not be built. (Wood)

ROBINSON TERMINAL SOUTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 3 (PAGE 96)

Text from Waterfront Plan: *Residential use and design should be compatible with a high level of public activity and located away from the water.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

Work Group Comments: Are lobbies—residential, hotel or commercial—open and welcoming to the public? “Residential use should be compatible with a high level of public activity”...does this dictate the type of residential use? If so, what does it mean? (Olinger)

ROBINSON TERMINAL SOUTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 4 (PAGE 96)

Text from Waterfront Plan: *Residential use is specifically discouraged east of The Strand unless, as part of SUP and approval, the location, design and specific type of residential proposed is found to: coexist well with planned public activity in the public spaces adjacent to the residential development; provide a welcoming presence to visitors to the waterfront; and preferably not include permanent owner occupied residential units.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

Work Group Comments:

- The City should be more welcoming towards the construction of new, high-end residences—townhomes and condos—near the waterfront. (Ely)

ROBINSON TERMINAL SOUTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 5, 6, 7 (PAGE 96)

Text from Waterfront Plan:

5. *The streetscape and pedestrian experience along South Union Street, The Strand, Duke Street and Wolfe Street should be enhanced; in addition to special pavement, undergrounding utilities, street trees and appropriate light fixtures, and design should enhance the views of the water, pedestrian access and porosity and reflect the historic orientation of buildings and alleyways.*
6. *A new east west connection north of Wolfe Street between South Union Street and the pier is strongly encouraged.*
7. *An extension of The Strand from Duke Street is strongly encouraged, with a pedestrian-only connection at the The Strand/Wolfe Street intersection to buffer the Harborside community.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to these Development Guidelines.

ROBINSON TERMINAL SOUTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 8 (PAGE 96)

Text from Waterfront Plan: *Historic interpretation, consistent with the recommendations of the History Plan, should inform every aspect of the design of the redevelopment and adjacent public spaces, including recognition of the southern point of the original shoreline.*

- *Buildings and open space should reflect Alexandria’s maritime history.*
- *The Plan encourages modern design inspired by historic precedent (such as 18th century Alexandria warehouse architecture) while maintaining compatibility with nearby residential neighborhoods and ensuring compliance with the Potomac River Vicinity Height District regulations.*
- *Architecture should reflect historic east-west orientation of buildings, alleys and wharves.*
- *The historic 2 Duke Street warehouse shall be preserved and adaptively reused.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

Work Group Comments:

- Add same comment as #93 – [delete “every”; substitute “aspects of the design where suitable and appropriate”] (Rhodeside)
- Language is inconsistent with J7. Not clear that there really was an east-west orientation in this part of the waterfront according to the history plan (see pages 66-67. (Wood)
- The notion of "modern design" needs substantial elaboration -- there is modern and there is modern. Any "modern" design must be compatible with Old Town's historic character, otherwise the uniqueness of historic Old Town which attracts free-spending tourists will be destroyed. (Ely)

ROBINSON TERMINAL SOUTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 9, 10 (PAGE 96)

Text from Waterfront Plan:

9. Curb cuts should not be *located* on any building and/or block frontages facing the water or South Union Street, and should be minimized if facing residences along Wolfe Street.
10. Parking for new buildings should be accommodated on site and below grade. Parking for new buildings should be accommodated on site and below grade. Although the Plan anticipates low parking ratios, the applied ratio must be consistent with industry norms for similar hotels.

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to these Development Guidelines.

ROBINSON TERMINAL SOUTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 11 (PAGE 97)

Text from Waterfront Plan: *Shoreline treatment at Robinson Terminal South should include native plantings and naturalization where possible.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

ROBINSON TERMINAL SOUTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 12 (PAGE 97)

Text from Waterfront Plan: *Robinson Terminal South is a potential location for a new and expanded pleasure boat marina. The proposed marina is conceived to be financially self-supporting as either a publicly or privately built and operated marina, and may be developed and operated in conjunction with the landside redevelopment of Robinson Terminal South. If the developer of the Robinson Terminal South development site does not develop the marina, it shall cooperate with the City and others to allow its development by others.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

Work Group Comments: City staff failed to demonstrate the feasibility of such a marina. Further, numerous marine experts have opined that the Army Corps of Engineers would never approve the proposed marina because it would extend into the shipping channel, impeding barge traffic moving along the river. (Ely)

ROBINSON TERMINAL SOUTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 13 (PAGE 97)

Text from Waterfront Plan: *As part of redevelopment, on and off site public amenities shall be provided by the developer of the site. The specific amenities to be provided will be determined during the development review process. Desirable public amenities include:*

- *Public art as a prominent feature of the public realm, both on public and private property. The recommendations of the Art Plan should be incorporated, to the greatest extent possible, in the design for the redeveloped warehouses, pier, and public spaces.*
- *Open spaces with public access easements and/or dedications, provided as generally reflected in the Proposed Public Space and Active Frontages (Figure 34). The Plan encourages new open space to be provided on an improved pier, consistent with the federal settlement agreement. The Plan encourages the use of Parcel E for park, civic, or cultural activities.*
- *Significant improvements shall be designed for Duke, Wolfe and additional street ends with green, pedestrian areas extending from The Strand to the water to expand the waterfront open space area.*
- *A new kayak launching area at the foot of Duke.*
- *Retention of the Robinson Terminal pier, repaired and expanded to be used as a public space and incorporated into the public space/ pedestrian concept for the Plan as a whole. The Plan*

recommends that connections be provided at both the northern and southern ends of the pier, and improvements made to ensure the safety of users. Examples of potential uses on the pier area include water features, river watching, bocce, horseshoes, shuffleboard, plant and sculpture gardens, or outdoor cafes. Until or unless a pleasure boat marina is constructed adjacent to the Robinson Terminal South pier, the use of the pier as a docking location for larger vessels should be maintained.

- *Environmental amenities, above and beyond the minimum required.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: There was general agreement by the Work Group in support of the Development Guideline as modified. The Work Group agreed to make changes parallel to those of Robinson Terminal North Development Guideline #12. The Work Group agreed that the discussion of environmental amenities should also be included.

Work Group Comments: Pleasure boat marina has not been shown to be feasible with even preliminary engineering assessments and economic viability is equally suspect. With the Marina removed, the dock and the uses next to the water are greatly enhanced for the public. A historic ship moored here would be a great anchor and attraction to this end of the Strand. Amenities, as far as they go, are acceptable. City should be asked to examine alternatives that increase park or public space to the greatest extent possible east of the Strand down to Wolfe. (Wood)

ROBINSON TERMINAL SOUTH DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 14 (PAGE 97)

Text from Waterfront Plan: *The maximum FAR and floor area allowed is included on the chart on page ~~101~~ 103.*

Work Group Comments: See Work Group Comments under Recommendation 3.96.

Review of Development Guidelines for the Cummings-Turner Block

The Work Group recommended changes to particular requirements of the Development Guidelines for the Cummings-Turner block. These include the integration of preferred uses, design expectations, and cooperative arrangements between landowners. These are described in full below. The Work Group also discussed the emphasis on the historical importance of buildings at this site and compatibility with park uses.

CUMMINGS-TURNER BLOCK DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 1 (PAGE 101)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Active uses which welcome the public should be part of any development, and constitute the predominant ground floor uses. Active ground floor uses shall be located as generally depicted in the Public Space and Active Frontages Diagram (Figure 34) and shall consist of uses that are open and welcoming to the public during normal business hours, such as lobbies, restaurants, retail, civic or cultural uses.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

Work Group Comments: "Residential use should be compatible with a high level of public activity"... does this dictate the type of residential use? If so, what does it mean? (Olinger) The plan includes no discussion as to what might happen to the Cummings-owned property across from the Art League building (the Solo garage) since it is quite possible that it was included in Cummings' sale of the Art League building. (Ely).

CUMMINGS-TURNER BLOCK DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 2 (PAGE 101)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *The preferred use on the site is mixed use, emphasizing arts, history and culture (including a museum) and including vibrant commercial uses (such as hotel). On this block, the required use facing The Strand above the first floor is boutique hotel.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: There was general agreement by the Work Group in support of the Development Guideline as modified. Ely indicated that he does not support hotels.

Work Group Comments:

- "Required use" should be changed to "preferred use."
- Inconsistent with Table 6; Cummings-Turner "required usage" is not reflected in this table. Further, we know that Turner has already rejected hotel usage in the absence of an integrated block plan and allowance for at least 200 rooms. (Wood)
- Can a hotel be required on the C-T parcel(s)? (Olinger)

CUMMINGS-TURNER BLOCK DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 3 (PAGE 101)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *For the cluster of buildings that includes the historic warehouses, residential (including owner occupied units) is permitted above the first floor along Union Street and around the northwest corner on Prince Street.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

Work Group Comments:

- This should not be granted now. The Lee home is now a private residence due to the city's inattention. The last historic warehouses on the waterfront should remain available for leaseholders....business now, museum later? (Wood)

CUMMINGS-TURNER BLOCK DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 4 (PAGE 101)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Residential use and design should be compatible with a high level of public activity and located a distance from the water. Residential use is specifically discouraged east of South Union Street unless, as part of a SUP and approval, the location, design and specific type of residential proposed is found to face existing residential development across Union Street; coexist well with planned public activity in the public spaces adjacent to the block; and provide a welcoming presence to visitors to the waterfront.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

Work Group Comments: The City should be more welcoming towards the construction of new, high-end residences—townhomes and condos—near the waterfront. (Ely)

CUMMINGS-TURNER BLOCK DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 5 (PAGE 101)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *The streetscape and pedestrian experience along South Union Street, The Strand, Duke Street and Wolfe Street should be enhanced; in addition to special pavement, undergrounding utilities, street trees and appropriate light fixtures, and to enhance the views of the water, pedestrian access and porosity and reflect the historic orientation of buildings and alleyways*

- *At least two midblock breaks between new buildings, with public space, including alleys and courtyards shall be provided extending from South Union Street to The Strand;*
- *A third alleyway between 10 Prince Street and 204 South Union Street shall be opened, with new infill construction permitted, provided that it creates an open, transparent space reflecting the historic alley in that location.*
- *Access to uses within the alleys and courtyards is essential to the pedestrian experience;*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

CUMMINGS-TURNER BLOCK DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 6 (PAGE 101)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Historic interpretation, consistent with the recommendations of History Plan, should inform every aspect of the design of the redevelopment and adjacent public spaces.*

- *Buildings and open space should reflect Alexandria's maritime history.*
- *The Plan encourages modern design inspired by historic precedent (such as 18th Century Alexandria warehouse architecture) while maintaining compatibility with nearby residential neighborhoods and ensuring compliance with the Potomac River Vicinity Height District regulations.*
- *Architecture should reflect historic east-west orientation of buildings, alleys and wharves.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

Work Group Comments:

- Language in conflict with J7. Question: Do the current buildings along the Strand shopping plaza meet this guideline. If so, we have to figure out something more appropriate to guide development. (Wood)
- The notion of "modern design" needs substantial elaboration -- there is modern and there is modern. Any "modern" design must be compatible with Old Town's historic character, otherwise the uniqueness of historic Old Town which attracts free-spending tourists will be destroyed. (Ely)

CUMMINGS-TURNER BLOCK DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 7 (PAGE 102)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Redevelopment of any portion of the block should be coordinated with restoration and adaptive reuse plans for the historic warehouse buildings in the block. As part of any SUP for any development of Cummings property, the applicant shall provide a plan for the restoration and adaptive reuse of the historic buildings at 10 Prince Street, 204 South Union Street and 206 South Union Street. Adaptive reuse should emphasize uses that are open to public access and shall include a civic or cultural use.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends no changes to this Development Guideline.

Work Group Comments:

- It's not clear from Mr. Brandt's briefing he was in full compliance with this intention. (Wood)
- Discuss civic and cultural use (Ballard)

CUMMINGS-TURNER BLOCK DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 (PAGE 102)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan:

8. *Public art should be a prominent feature of the public realm, both on public and private property. The recommendations of the Art Plan should be incorporated, to the extent possible, in the design for the redeveloped warehouses, pier, and public spaces.*
9. *Contribute significantly to the public amenities in the new park between the redevelopment block and the Potomac River, including environmental amenities, above and beyond the minimum required.*
10. *Open space with public access easements and/or dedications shall be provided as generally reflected in the Proposed Public Space and Active Frontages (Figure 34).*
11. *Curb cuts should not be located on any building and/or block frontages facing open space.*
12. *Parking for new buildings should be accommodated on site and below grade. Parking for new buildings should be accommodated on site and below grade. Although the Plan anticipates low parking ratios, the applied ratio must be consistent with industry norms for similar hotels.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group recommends only the change to Development Guideline #9, to make parallel to similar modifications to the Robinson Terminal North and Robinson Terminal South Development Guidelines.

CUMMINGS-TURNER BLOCK DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINES 13 (PAGE 102)

Text from Draft Waterfront Plan: *Both the Cummings and the Turner properties are encouraged to develop jointly under a single scheme and in such a way as to share amenities such as an on-site restaurant or other common space. However, if that does not occur, each site can develop on its own. At ultimate build-out, the underground parking will share a single entrance on ~~Wolfe~~ Duke Street, with a knock out panel provided between the underground garages.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: There was general agreement to support the above Development Guideline as modified. The Work Group agreed to encourage exploration by the City into the cost of additional an additional level of parking in the garage facilities on in redevelopment sites.

Work Group Comments:

- Seems to be too late to accomplish an integrated vision, or is it? (Wood)
- No hotel should be constructed on either the Cummings or Turner sites. Further, the economic feasibility of below-grade parking on those sites or anywhere else east of Lee Street is highly questionable. (Ely)
- Discuss parking garage (Ballard)

CUMMINGS-TURNER BLOCK DEVELOPMENT GUIDELINE 14 (PAGE 102)

Text from Waterfront Plan: *The maximum FAR and floor area allowed is included on the chart on page ~~101~~ 103.*

Work Group Comments: See Work Group Comments under New Recommendation on page 107 of this report.

Implementation and Funding

The Work Group recommends that that implementation of the Plan begin soon after adoption and include development of a design plan, introduction of new activities, and completion of a signature project in public spaces in the core area. Implementation plans require further development and can benefit from management changes within City government augmented by public involvement through a body charged with Plan implementation and waterfront oversight. An early activity will be developing a design plan to ensure a high quality look and feel for waterfront public and private spaces.

Costs of waterfront public improvements should be considered a significant investment from which Alexandria can expect to generate City-wide returns. The Plan will entail significant public costs, and financial calculations that account for projected revenues and expenses over time must be further refined. The recovery of those costs is dependent on the timing and scale of waterfront development. With or without a change in zoning, projected costs of implementing this Plan can be recovered, though the recovery period would vary based on the nature of development. If the waterfront is to be considered an integrated space with a variety of venues and activities, the Work Group recommends that have its own budget identity within the City's Operating Budget and Capital Improvement Program. Opportunities exist to fund improvements, maintenance, and activities through public and private funding, and the City should strengthen current process and take new steps to secure such funding. Funding priorities as reflected in the Plan do not reflect in allocation of public funds the priority accorded to art and history.

Summary of Work Group Implementation and Funding Findings

- A variety of plans, engineering, and design studies are required to turn the concepts expressed in the Plan into a Plan ready for implementation. These include:
 - Assessment of Pilot Parking Program;
 - Union Street Transportation Management Plan;
 - Detailed Design Plan;
 - Flood Mitigation Engineering Study;
 - Pedestrian Flow and Safety Study;
 - Marina Redevelopment Study, including engineering of piers and wharves;
 - Environmental Assessment within overall waterfront design and engineering plan; and
 - A GenOn Small Area Plan
- The assumed implementation period for the Plan is a 15- to 25-year period. In the near-term, it will be important for the City to demonstrate a commitment to implementing the Plan soon after adoption. The Work Group recommends that initial investments and activities be focused in key public spaces proposed by the Plan, including the foot of King Street, Waterfront Park, or new park space along The Strand. These are prominent locations near the heart of the City's waterfront and developments here can signal an exciting new phase for Alexandria's waterfront. However, it is crucial that this Plan be considered with a long-term perspective in

mind. In addition, the phasing of implementation must be clarified through a work plan that clearly demarcates requirements and the timeline for execution to guide public expectations and keep the City on task.

- Development, policy changes, budget allocations, management focus, and adopted practices must seek not only to implement but also to sustain the vision of this waterfront for generations. We urge the City to review its economic model for supporting activities along the waterfront. Some facilities, like the Torpedo Factory Art Center, are highly successful. Others, like the Food Pavilion, are not. This is where proactive steps must be taken to reinforce success and avoid failure.
- The Plan presents illustrative concepts of how waterfront public spaces and private development could be constructed. It serves as a design framework, but not a design plan since pieces are not integrated to present a clear design identity characteristic along the entire waterfront. The development of a design plan should be addressed early in the implementation stage. This must involve public input and City support and could involve a professional design competition, request for proposals, or a similar approach to prompt the highest degree of expert involvement and innovation. The design plan must reflect high design standards to ensure that the waterfront ages gracefully and remains consistent with the historic setting of Old Town.
- Management is critical. Current management of the waterfront is fractured across several City departments, with responsibility for varying aspects of its maintenance and operations. We recommend appointment of a senior director within City government to lead implementation of the Plan, determine priorities, and be held accountable for integrated management of the waterfront, coordination of the activities of City agencies, public entities, and commercial interests, and achievement of the Plan vision. The activities of this office need to be specifically resourced by the City. This senior director should be tasked with preparing and defending an integrated budget for waterfront needs. Other responsibilities may include: coordination of operation of the marina, programming, maintenance of parks and public space, security, facilities maintenance, budget and funds administration, and planning of future needs.
- Public oversight is critical. The City should designate a public body to act in concert with the duties and responsibilities of the senior director charged by the City to manage the waterfront. This body would provide the public input critical to achieving successful implementation of the Plan in accordance with the public interest and within the City's capabilities and resources. This could be a new body, but care must be taken to avoid unnecessary duplication of existing function with existing bodies like the Waterfront Committee. One option is to re-charter the existing Waterfront Committee as a Waterfront Commission and review and revise its membership and function. Another option is to establish a separate Plan Implementation Task Force charged with overseeing implementation of the Plan, which would eventually transfer its responsibilities to a Waterfront Commission when implementation is substantially completed. Consideration should be given to ensuring a voice for residents proximate to waterfront development and civic improvements.

- The Plan contains cost estimates to implement its various features. Additional engineering studies and assessments executed as part of implementation will further refine these numbers. Similarly, the revenue streams from the variety of potential waterfront activities are estimated based on representative uses. With or without changes in zoning, adequate revenues are projected to meet projected costs, although the time period for amortizing costs is longer without rezoning. Regardless of alternatives, Plan phasing, and the mix of uses (and the attendant revenues generated), it is essential that the significant costs of improvements are addressed, but do not create an undue financial burden on the City. If properly implemented, investment in the City’s waterfront can significantly increase City revenues from a variety of sources (lodging, meals, and retail sales taxes). This investment benefits all of Alexandria. From this perspective, City funding of waterfront improvements should be highly prioritized and compete well within the City’s Capital Improvement Program.
- Although art and history are critical elements of the Plan, specific dedicated public funding anticipated within the Plan is relatively small. The Plan projects private funding for the vast majority of history and arts amenities. For such important features within the waterfront vision, funding streams must be more certain. Dedicated funding for these waterfront amenities from public and private sources needs City emphasis and support throughout implementation. One likely source is developer contributions, which will play a significant role in funding public amenities at and adjacent to development sites. In addition, creation of non-profit entities dedicated to supporting the waterfront and its activities should be encouraged and, within legal limits, enabled by the City. Good examples like the Founders Park Community Association and cooperative arrangements similar to this can also complement the City role. A third potential funding source is grant funding from federal, state, and non-profit organizations. Capturing grant funds will likely require dedicated effort by both City staff and volunteers, with Council approval. Grant activities should be managed by the senior director within City government charged with Plan implementation, coordination, and execution.
- The Work Group suggests the following new Plan recommendation: *The application of net additional City revenues generated by redevelopment of the waterfront should generally be dedicated applied to waterfront-area amenities, including parks, programming, and other public uses. The City should prepare an annual waterfront capital and operations budget, and the annual funding should be sufficient for timely implementation of the Plan and annual expenditures should generally be no less than the net annual revenues generated from redevelopment.* The City should estimate and track new revenues generated by increased activities along the waterfront (e.g., hotel and restaurant taxes, property taxes, etc.) and these estimates can help the City explain and rationalize the investment cost made along the waterfront. In adopting this Plan recommendation, the Work Group notes that formally dedicated or partitioned funding may not provide the flexibility Council requires to manage the City. Further, funding may not be sufficient within this notional “lockbox” to fund the Plan and achieve the investments necessary to achieve a vibrant waterfront. The Work Group notes that better geographic identification of capital expenditures not only along the waterfront, but also

in other sections of the City would better inform the public and help facilitate comparative analysis of investments by City staff and Council.

- The Work Group made the following specific recommendations regarding Plan implementation:
 - New: During implementation of improvements to the ODBC parking lot, the 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.
 - Moved from Recommendation 3.77: Pier designs shown in this Plan are illustrative; the 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 and recognize the different operational needs of water taxis and other commercial boating operations.
 - New: Waterfront public spaces should be actively managed – both maintenance and programming – as an integrated system. City staff should be organized in a manner to ensure this integrated approach occurs with a designated senior-level lead manager to establish clear accountability for implementation of the Plan and the necessary resources and authority for consistent progress.

Work Group Plan Statements on Implementation and Funding

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, Rhodeside, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ely, Ballard.

Individuals, groups and cultural institutions should play a strong role in implementing the all aspects of a plan.
Agreed: Wood, Rhodeside, Olinger, Macek, Lyle, Ely, Ballard.

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, Rhodeside, Lyle, Macek, Ely, Ballard.
Abstained: Olinger

Note: Ely 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.” 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.

Review of Plan Recommendations for Implementation and Funding

RECOMMENDATIONS 3.47 and 3.85

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Relocate the City's fire boat and the Seaport Foundation floating facility – the Alexandria Seaport Center- to the foot of Duke Street.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group generally agrees with these parallel recommendations.

REPORT TEXT – PAGE 122

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *The Parking Implementation Plan should be created immediately after the adoption of the Plan. It should be led by a multi-agency team and also be assisted by the advice of stakeholders, affected by parking issues in the waterfront area.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: There was general support for this recommendation. Further discussion of parking recommendations is provided in the Parking chapter of this report.

Work Group Comments:

- The bike plan should be part of this implementation (Lyle)
- The Park Implementation Plan needs to be created & implemented now! More cars trying to park on Old Town streets will only add to the current disastrous situation. (Olinger)

REPORT TEXT – PAGE 129

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *Utilize a phased approach for implementation by coordinating short-, mid-, and long-term activities in a manner that is the most economically and physically viable and efficient for the City.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: There was general support for this recommendation. As described in the Summary of Work Group Implementation and Funding Findings section of this chapter, initial activities must include further planning, design, and engineering to provide a more detailed framework for plan implementation. Additionally, changes to City management and public oversight of Plan implementation is crucial.

Work Group Comments: While implementation is a post adoption item, a more specific framework for the phasing should have a place within the Plan (Ballard).

REPORT TEXT – PAGE 136

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *An Advisory Board for Plan implementation will be established by the City; the model may have multiple committees and will identify roles for the Waterfront Committee and Art and History commissions.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: There was general agreement that there must be unity of effort across both city government and public involvement to ensure successful implementation.

Work Group Comments:

- Multiple citizen committees will fracture the waterfront implementation process, which in turn will empower City staff too much. Citizen oversight of the implementation of a scaled-down waterfront plan should be provided by just one committee dealing with all aspects of the implementation of the waterfront plan. (Ely)
- As a starting point, how will the City organize to implement the Plan? Will there be one entity given the lead? How will actions of the various Departments be coordinated? What would be the role of the Advisory Board? Organizational questions should be addressed even before the “early phasing elements” are pursued. (Olinger)
- While implementation is a post adoption item, a more specific framework for an Advisory Board should have a place within the Plan (Ballard)

REPORT TEXT – PAGE 137

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *The City will pursue early phasing elements outlined in the Plan with immediate attention on predevelopment activities such as tracking, reporting and managing parking; completion of City acquisition of The Strand properties and technical analysis work to convert it to parkland; addressing failing bulkheads; completion of the Union Street study; preparation of ~~CIP~~ the next phase of design and engineering for flood mitigation; pursuing reuse of The Beachcombers Restaurant; completing ODBC negotiations; working with Art and History commissions on early phases of their plans; completing an engineering and permitting plan; and others such as an analysis for a new civic building with a related spatial needs assessment for the Archaeological museum; updating settlement agreements; development of a grants strategy; etc.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group agrees that early-phase implementation not only builds momentum but signals to the public that important changes are coming to their waterfront. The Work Group generally supports the initial activities contemplated in the Plan, with the addition completing the Union Street Transportation Management Plan and necessary engineering studies supporting flood mitigation, as noted above.

Work Group Comments

- I have numerous comments on this recommendation, as follows: One, eminent domain should not be used to acquire the remaining Strand Street properties across from Chadwick’s. Further, the parking spaces on those properties must be replaced with nearby parking spaces.

Two, no construction related to flood mitigation should be undertaken until detailed engineering work has been completed and a comprehensive cost-benefit analysis can justify any flood mitigation work that the City undertakes. Third, there should be no threat of eminent domain in the City's negotiations with the ODBC. Further, the ODBC parking lot should stay right where it is. Fourth, there is no need to try to update the settlement agreements, specifically to permit hotels on the Robinson Terminal properties -- the settlement agreements are fine as they now are. (Ely)

- Yes, but....the traffic and pedestrian safety study on Union and the SE quadrant grid needs to be done immediately, as well. Additionally, the engineering study on cost/benefits for the flood mitigation plan needs to be funded and acted on. More work is also needed early to determine appropriate metrics for traffic mitigation resulting from any traffic initiatives. (Wood)

REPORT TEXT – PAGE 139

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *The Plan supports continued operations of the Art League in a location near the waterfront and the Torpedo Factory.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group generally agrees with this recommendation, with no discussion or additional comments.

REPORT TEXT – PAGE 141

Text from the Draft Waterfront Plan: *The City will identify options for park services and operations, including the storage of park equipment and vehicles; public restrooms; and a marina dockmaster office, showers and laundry room.*

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group agrees that these public facilities are a necessary improvement to the waterfront, but cautions that prime waterfront real estate not be overly devoted to these needs.

Work Group Comments: Yes, but....It is important that the city recognize and act to correct the weak management structure currently in place for Waterfront activities. The absence of an integrated approach to parks, environmental needs, business enhancements, public activities, and financial planning has created the fraying infrastructure and relative inactivity we currently see. The city's approach to the waterfront is too stove piped and unorganized. No one, and everyone, is "in charge." It is frustrating to our intentions and confounding to our citizens. (Wood)

Work Group Comments

- The City has yet to develop a coherent overall plan for docking facilities along the waterfront, so it is premature to say that the fireboat and the Seaport Foundation's floating facility should be relocated to the bottom of Duke Street. (Ely)
- It seems that the commercial activities are shifting upriver. The city's fireboat may belong nearer the concentration of waterfront activity. There is equal worth in shifting this boat to the north terminal site or simply leaving it where it is. (Wood)

- Pending the ultimate location of docks if moved to Waterfront Park (Ballard)

NEW RECOMMENDATION:

The ~~application of~~ net additional City revenues generated by redevelopment of the waterfront should generally be dedicated applied to waterfront-area amenities, including parks, programming, and other public uses.

The City should prepare an annual waterfront capital and operations budget, and the annual funding should be sufficient for timely implementation of the Plan and annual expenditures should generally be no less than the net annual revenues generated from redevelopment.

Summary of Work Group Discussion: The Work Group sought to emphasize the importance of generally applying revenues generated near the waterfront to the waterfront, without being overly restrictive regarding the use of funds as the waterfront is a City resource that should compete favorably for City funds. Work Group members strongly favored making expenditures on the waterfront clear in both the capital and operations budgets of the City.

Work Group Comments:

- Attributing additional revenue to redeveloped properties is far too narrow an approach as more activity along the waterfront should generate additional business activity west of Lee Street as well as east of Lee Street (Ely).
- Suggests this be tabled until the funding discussion (Ballard).
- Would oppose this statement if it implies that only revenues generated within the Waterfront core area should support waterfront amenities. The Waterfront serves the whole City and beyond. Its uniqueness is part of what attracts tourists (and their money) to Alexandria. While I have no problem with tax revenue being generated from the waterfront, there is no basis to require that any public improvement in the area be directly related to internal (8 blocks) revenue generation. Some waterfront improvements have long standing in the CIP (Windmill Hill Park) and others (Nuisance Flood Mitigation) should have been included as well. In addition, we never fully discussed whether it is appropriate that all costs be borne within the 8 block area or conversely, whether funds generated there should be earmarked for waterfront expenditures only. I'm not in favor of either idea (Olinger).
- Would oppose setting a precedent that a neighborhood could ask that revenues generated by activities within their neighborhood be earmarked for use only within their neighborhood. A reference to waterfront maintenance needs to be added to the draft recommendation (Wood).

Environmental Issues

Environmental issues are especially important to the Plan specifically because most of the waterfront lies in the Resource Protection Area and the Resource Management Area of the Chesapeake Bay. The City intends to be a leader in environmental stewardship and has developed and embraced an Eco-City Charter. It promotes environmental considerations through its zoning requirements, policies, and public proclamations. The waterfront is a key area to demonstrate achievement of the highest environmental standards. Promoting the health of the river and protecting the health of citizens through action in this area is a vital act of leadership and an important requirement. The Work Group recommends that environmental impacts be addressed as part of waterfront plan implementation.

Summary of Work Group Environmental Issues Findings

- There was discussion over whether an integrated environmental assessment should be completed for the Plan as a whole, or if individual assessments as development occurred would suffice. The Work Group notes the difficulty of completing a comprehensive assessment of the Plan given the conceptual nature of proposed developments, but it remains important to look forward and identify environmental requirements and potential impacts as implementation of the Plan proceeds. The Work Group recommends that the City address environmental issues for the waterfront as a whole as an explicit element of the waterfront-wide design and engineering plan. In addition, the City should consider the environmental impacts of any City improvement or private redevelopment on the waterfront to address the goals and objectives of the Eco-City charter and capture every opportunity to meet or exceed these requirements.
- Green space is a natural defense against flooding and helps to naturally cleanse storm water runoff into the Potomac River. This is best accomplished through increased parkland, natural shorelines, and limits on impervious surfaces. The Work Group supports the Plan recommendations and Development Guidelines that accomplish these objectives. Portions of the Robinson Terminal properties represent potential open space opportunities and remediation sites along the river, especially those areas with contaminated soil.

WPWG Plan Statements on Environmental Issues

Environmental issues, including water quality, should be addressed in the design and engineering of shoreline treatments and flood mitigation.

A plan should promote the use of Best Practices that lead to more effective Storm Water Management and enhanced Resource Protection Area (RPA) buffers for improved water quality in the Potomac River and Chesapeake Bay.

A plan should support City efforts to remediate sources of contamination from current and past industrial uses found along the waterfront.

A plan should encourage the use of the highest levels of Green Building standards in areas such as water conservation, emissions reduction, recycling of building materials and environmentally sensitive building and landscape design. Waterfront redevelopment should be a leader for the City in green technology.

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 Recommendations for Environmental Issues

Many environmental issues are already addressed by City and other environmental policies, ordinances, regulations and guidelines. The Plan reviews these on pages 28-32. These include shoreline protection, flood plain, flood mitigation, and sea-level rise, Resource Protection Areas, the combined sewer system, and the green building policy. Specific comments by Work Group members on these recommendations are provided in the Parks and Public Spaces and Marina, Piers and Shoreline chapters as indicated by the headers below.

Parks and Public Spaces

- 3.17** At the end of Montgomery Street, consider low impact hardscape options...
- 3.20** [In Rivergate Park] Provide additional plantings featuring native plants in the western half of the park, in part to subtly orient visitors toward the more public, eastern section of the park.
- 3.28** [In Oronoco Bay Park] Erect a large shade structure at water's edge to provide an overlook, picnic shelter, or stage. This structure would become the focal point of the park and should be a significant work of garden architecture. It may be fitted with solar panels on the roof to provide power for small events or ceiling fans.
- 3.31** [In Oronoco Bay Park] Allow a successional forest to emerge on the north side of the park, extending the natural landscape of the tidal flats to the adjoining uplands. The intent is to plant a variety of trees, shrubs, and groundcovers, and to end the practice of mowing in a small area, allowing that area to evolve naturally. This could be an excellent interpretive and research opportunity for city school children to discover the restorative power of nature.

- 3.89** Complete the acquisition of the waterside properties between Prince and Duke Streets and develop them as a public park showcasing shipbuilding, and other important elements of the City's past.

Marina, Piers and Shoreline

- 3.29** [In Oronoco Bay Park] Create a series of terraced wetlands on the south side of the park that recapture the historic drainage swale called Ralph's Gutt. These terraces would be graded into the current ground and planted with aquatic plants which will naturally cleanse the storm water before it enters the river. Boardwalks can cross the wetlands to connect pedestrian desire lines and create opportunities for interpretive education. These wetland enhancements could involve day-lighting the storm water pipes that currently convey the water under the park to the bay.
- 3.30** [In Oronoco Bay Park] Explore opportunities to reduce the impact of the combined sewer overflow (CSO) outfall that discharges at the foot of Pendleton Street. Options include installing a retention basin to reduce the volume of combined sewage discharged into the river during rain events and incorporating features into the proposed extension of Pendleton Street that would direct CSOs away from Oronoco Bay.
- 3.34** Replace the existing rip rap with a more natural and inviting shoreline treatment, to include native plants.
- 3.44** Where possible, replace existing large diameter rip-rap with appropriate (native and/or historic) plantings, using an engineered shoreline restoration system where necessary, in order to achieve the naturalized shoreline envisioned by the Plan. Consider interpretive signage or other means to explain the system to passersby, and to encourage ecologically friendly use and a "tread lightly" mentality in this sensitive area.
- 3.45** If rip-rap is retained in some locations, incorporate larger, flatter boulders to provide informal seating areas along the water's edge.
- 3.58** Rebuild the bulkhead in areas where it is failing.

Additional Environmental References

- The Development Guidelines for Robinson Terminal North say that "Redevelopment should be compatible with any biosparging technology, or other bioremediation, being employed by the City in treatment of the Oronoco Outfall-Alexandria Town Gas site located at the eastern end of Oronoco Street."
- There are several Traffic and Circulation recommendations that encourage mobility by means other than the automobile.

- There are several public realm recommendations that encourage the conversion of pavement, including street ends and surface parking lots, to parks. In the case of privately-owner paved surfaces, conversion to park is accomplished through City purchase, through a negotiated agreement with property owners, or through the redevelopment approval process.