



HA and WORA City Dock Community Listening Session Comments

Wednesday, September 4th, at the William Paca House and Garden

Resiliency

- get resiliency going; get flood barrier protection started now; shovels in the ground ASAP
- pretty clear that the resilience part of the plan has the backing of the attendees
- heard get on with the sea wall now and settle the park etc. later—and with much better citizen input
- flooding is not act of nature, but act of man (sewer system); fully support resiliency; wastewater must also be dealt with
- removal of surface parking and replacement with a joyful park is a good thing; resiliency now, shovels in the ground
- resiliency initially started this effort and should still be focus. City should decouple the resiliency from the improvements; move forward where there is universal consensus.
- what does MWC have to do with resiliency?
- FEMA requires environmental impact statement; we need an update on this
- next steps should be to move forward resiliency—with updates on permitting process and signed contracts
- current conditions (flooding) not fair to businesses, support for plan that keeps businesses open; move forward with consensus pieces
- city pumps are not always available; is anything the city is doing or even considering helping businesses and residences in the zone? Rather than keep funding recovery efforts, the city should help the businesses, and maybe homes, get ahead of the problem; this might include more of the portable and relatively easily deployable filled tubes to literally stem the tide.
- you don't have to be an expert to know that MWC on water's edge is not resilient; the MWC is the one thing that doesn't make sense—draw up another plan without it
- unless and until ample flood resistance is cranked into the plan, stop now
- is the city maintaining the current pump system?
- The project has been characterized relentlessly as addressing resiliency but what exactly is being protected? Where is the risk analysis for this project and how does the project address those risks?

-it is critically important that we move forward with flood mitigation measures as well as the park/open space improvements while we have the momentum. Concerned that if the project is delayed, it will not be started while the current mayor and council are still in office.

-No improvements are proposed for the bulkhead around Susan Cambell Park that was built in 2007 and is now beginning to fail. The park is sinking, the pavement failing, the drains are lower than pavement level, and part of the bulkhead is overtopped a couple of times per year by extreme high tides such as the one that occurred during the Boat Show a few years ago. Despite this, the only work proposed for this piece of infrastructure are significant cosmetic improvements for the park including replacement of pavement with lawn. Since these will be routinely flooded and quickly deteriorate, what is the life expectancy for these improvements and what are the life cycle costs of maintaining them under these conditions? How much will the repair and replacement of the bulkhead and docks that are not included in this project cost? Will Susan Campbell Park simply be sacrificed? What is the risk that a major storm could destroy the bulkhead, releasing potentially contaminated fill into the Chesapeake Bay?

-The flood barriers proposed stop at the Fleet Reserve Club and therefore the City Dock will continue to flood as high tides and storm surges will simply flow through and around the Annapolis Waterfront hotel and up and over the bulkhead at the foot of Duke of Gloucester Street. During the Planning Commission review process when this was brought up, the plan was pitched as a "phase 1" of a larger plan that would provide complete protection. Thus far no plan has been presented for addressing the unprotected shoreline from Fleet Reserve to the Spa Creek Bridge – a waterfront that is at least as long as the current "phase 1" flood barrier. Where is the complete plan and what is the complete cost?

-The current plan calls for flood control features from the Naval Academy to the Fleet Reserve Club – approximately half of the vulnerable waterfront. The bulkhead around Susan Campbell Park is a significant future project almost as long as the currently proposed improvements. If the current plan costs \$30M (which is not certain given lack of transparency), the future work could cost another \$60M. It is imperative that the city present a long-range plan for flood protection of the city before the city spends that \$60M on a mediocre, over-priced park that could easily be replaced with a lawn and trees and few benches and dog waste stations.

Maritime Welcome Center (MWC)

-doesn't think MWC was really in CDAC

-MWC is point of contention; reach consensus and not this take or leave attitude. Focus on MWC is 'anti-resiliency'

- we need a building that provides the necessary amenities we need; we do not need a spa

-having the proposed new MWC (housed with the harbor master) all the way at the end of the seaward end of City Dock is unhelpful; OK, I guess, if one arrives by boat, but most do not

-architect is not open to feedback, but the taxpayer is paying for this

-MWC design has improved but it still needs a diet

-no to basement, it will flood

-property owner in project area has never been contacted by the city to discuss design

-over-scaled building will pave the way for a height variance for a hotel; we all know it is coming

-support for MWC—no view now until you get to end of Dock Street; elevated (2nd story) MWC will provide views; get it built quickly

-MWC has glaring glass that will require high maintenance and conditioning costs; basement at water's edge questionable

-we don't want modern glass and metal buildings in our historic city on the waterfront

-we don't need a gaudy hyper-expensive modern monument at City Dock

-some, especially younger people, are excited about the glass building. Can it be scaled back to just being a visitor center, smaller, with no other focus? A bit larger than the old treasury building—a little jewel box.

-fine with keeping and modernizing the existing harbor master/visitor center building. Do not think we need to build a new harbor master building or have a fancy new visitor's center. That can be considered in the future if needed.

-against any new building that would sit out in front of Latitude 38 and block off any water views. New buildings should be in line with the existing.

-thinks Visit Annapolis is wrong tenant at MWC, and we don't need an oyster bar there—it's unfair to competition

-if an oyster bar is needed or any other food service, Latitude 38 can handle all food service

-change MWC name to Waterfront Welcome Center to tell heritage story of Annapolis

-no building to block view of water from top of Main Street

-suggested reuse of existing buildings is excellent idea

- new construction is abusive to our environment. There are already too many structures in the world, and in Annapolis. Repurposing existing structures is vastly preferred from an environmental standpoint and for preservation purposes.

-a sensible solution idea: Rather than build a hugely expensive and impractical MWC at the water's edge, Annapolis should negotiate to purchase the Latitude 38 building and plan to convert it to a new Harbormaster location and transient boater facility (adaptive reuse). Burtis can be incorporated into this redevelopment. Funding sources, most notably FEMA, would respond favorably to such an adaptive reuse strategy. With this approach, the viewshed would actually improve as the existing harbormaster building is removed and the renovated Latitude 38 and Burtis Buildings satisfy all needs. Food for thought.

-points well taken tonight, but supportive of MWC and Burtis and excited about oyster bar with living history; sees validation of Burtis

-it is disingenuous to tout this as a consensus plan when several members of the CDAC have come forth indicating the proposed design does not reflect the consensus plan. The head of CDAC and the chair of the design team have an obvious conflict of interest and should explain in detail why they drastically deviated from the consensus plan in designing the MWC.

-please remove the visitors center from the CD redevelopment plan. Let's get on with the important work and leave the contentious matter of the MWC for discussion after the resiliency work is completed.

-thinking "outside-the-box" of the Susan Campbell/Dock Street Park area: how about a much downsized Harbor Master facility with public restrooms (no showers) located adjacent to the Burtis House, and a Maritime Visitors Service Facility (appropriately scaled) to be built in the City owned parking lot between 110 Compromise Street and the Fleet Reserve Club, with showers, rest rooms and an information kiosk.

-vigorously opposed to the MWC as proposed; alternatives might satisfy the mayor's visions of grandeur while saving the important vista from the current proposed location for the MWC. Suppose the bulk of the MWC remains as large, or even larger, than currently proposed but the location is shifted to the opposite side of the Burtis House—ie the foot of Prince George St abutting the USNA wall. The city owns the street and could spread out the MWC footprint event further up Prince George to have above ground shower and laundry facilities for boaters. The mayor could then have a grand conference room and balcony on the 2nd floor without intruding on the space and viewpoints from the main sections of City Dock and without obstructing the view of the Burtis House from City Dock. The Burtis House becomes the "historic" entryway to the new MWC. Not really in favor of bulking up the end of Prince George, but this is a possible "less bad" alternative than bulking up a prime spot on the City Dock.

Cost and Maintenance

-future generations will have to live with this: view, cost, maintenance; how will this project reflect and impact future generations?

-we need to know construction and maintenance costs

-this is public land and a public money, but the math is fuzzy

-maintenance and operating costs for park; will we need technical personnel? A new category of employee?

-executing manually deployable barriers will require trained city employees

-two residents currently water planters at end of Prince George Street and have to carry water down there

-parking garage revenue (from the "sweetheart deal" with the garage operator) is insufficient; will paid parking spread to other neighborhoods to make up deficit?

-this is an intensely used area. cost of insurance? High risk when the city self-insures; plan includes elements that will increase insurance needs. What is the cost to insure elements such as a splash fountain?

-lack of transparency is main issue, and maybe an intentional attempt to deceive. The project is all paid for—really?

-we need transparency with regards to FEMA money

-we need costs before the current harbor master building is demolished; we need to know where the harbor master function goes before demolition

-biggest concern is upkeep; city doesn't even keep weeds under control; wants park if it can stay beautiful; need maintenance plan

-not surprised by current emphasis of the plan; visitor gets the benefit and resident gets the bill

-how much city property is encumbered by the bonds and financing for Hillman Garage and what happens if the revenue does not support the cost of debt service? Is there any risk that the bonds could be foreclosed on and the MWC and or Hillman Garage becomes private property?

-let's take a fiscally responsible approach and completely defined budget to undertake any preservation of our waterfront

Park and Amenities

- pergola stage design does not reflect maritime heritage, look at more options
- fountain is too large; fountain too big for space; fountain too big; HPC can recommend changes
- fountain is over-scaled for the location; compare size with other locations in a similar context
- cultural legacy: tell stories for ourselves and for visitors, it's not yet what it could be
- why splash pad? Make new hotel pay for amenities
- rethink the pergola design and storytelling
- the plan is pretty but lacking in functionality which is vital; consensus plan allowed vehicles; a firetruck backing down Dock St is not a good plan; bus accommodation has disappeared; bathrooms are too far away for those who can't walk a city block; city provided golf carts to mitigate is costly
- flood mitigation addressed and funded before beautification and fountain
- is there really money to maintain a splash park—they are notorious for plumbing issues
- it is mostly for tourists, as one observes the plan
- additional access to public restrooms is something to consider in the area
- shade is critical in this area as a refuge from the sun; support for trees and sun shelters
- we have a great opportunity now to remove the ugly parking in this part of CD and make the space a park for all to enjoy. 100% in support of removing parking at this location now that the new Hillman Garage has been completed and is operational.

Burtis House

- MWC hides Burtis, use Burtis more creatively
- what about vacant lot next to Burtis, can't it take a new building?
- Burtis House was talked about at the beginning of the project but that emphasis has disappeared. This is starting to feel like the disappearance of Hells Point again. Not focusing on Burtis is not focusing on history.
- support preserving and reusing the Burtis House and not have it obscured by a new structure
- the MWC addition to the Burtis House in no way respects the historic character of Annapolis

General and Misc.

- lack of transparency
- the boat show is an important economic driver—keep it in mind with planning for CD
- too many boat slips on CD and houseboats are a bad idea
- hopes elected officials are listening and that residents will stick together
- what is current timeline for review and approvals?
- WORA submitted questions to mayor which he has refused to answer; will Harry Huntley get answers?
- Annapolis is too small for us to have to work so hard to get basic information

-lots of passion and brilliant words from residents, but who is listening? The passion has to go on. We need HA and WORA to guide us through this change.

-the new park design at the end of Prince George Street is a positive

-resident and business owner presence shows passion; what about the legacy of this town being passed on to kids and grandkids?

-What was submitted to FEMA and what was their feedback?

-let's work together with all so that everyone gets what is necessary to make a beautiful project

-no boutique hotel

-HA should be more involved with planning to honor our cultural legacy

-Think about the next generation who is inheriting this plan. We don't have that many water views remaining that enhance our connections with the bay. Will this new plan allow you to see the water from the market house? Has a true analysis of how this will affect the views been done?

-it is essential that we keep businesses open – the city must prioritize this. There is some obligation on behalf of the city to defend our businesses.

-ADA accessibility is lacking, which deviates from the original plan in providing accommodations for buses, people who are handicapped, senior citizens, and school children. Believes the plan actually discriminates against the handicapped. The idea of golf carts to augment access is ill advised without costs to operate and maintain.

-need to tell the story through a heritage point of view – what it represents for the whole community

-listening session: great event, one of a kind gathering, tremendous turnout validates need for such an event

-vehicular access (car and bus) access to the dock is not in the plan; Watermark and others, mostly visitors, will suffer

-nowhere in the discussion or the plan is there an interim plan for a “Welcome to Annapolis” temporary welcome center/place in the region of City Dock; same goes for restroom facilities

-Annapolis 250 and Annapolis as a National Park Service Gateway to the Chesapeake Bay are not addressed in the context of City Dock during construction and at the end of the process