

3
3-27-13

Gloria Sitton

From: Jackie Henderson
Sent: Monday, March 25, 2013 12:47 PM
To: Allison Silberberg
Cc: Gloria Sitton; William Euille; Del Pepper; Jane McDonald; John Chapman; Justin Wilson; LaShawn Timmons; Lillian Thompson; Mark McHugh; Nancy Lacey; Nancy Lavalle; Paul Smedberg; Timothy Lovain; Wendy Donohue
Subject: RE: Regarding the minutes
Attachments: VERBATIM OF VICE MAYOR SILBERBERG COMMENTS FROM 2.docx; march 12 email.pdf; march 12 verbatim.docx

Hi Allison—

You are correct in that there was discussion about your proposed changes to the minutes of February 23. As you may know, our minutes are action minutes and do not reflect the discussion of the item. Therefore, since the motion on March 12 was to approve the February 23 minutes as submitted, that is what is reflected in the minutes.

I have prepared a verbatim of your comments from February 23 (they are attached), the discussion from March 12, (also attached), and the email that went to City Council on March 12 (attached) in which I noted your proposed correction to the February 23 minutes. All of these will be made part of the permanent record for those meetings.

I have spoken to Mayor Euille about reconsideration of the February 23 minutes and he has stated he did not wish to bring them back for reconsideration. If you wish to bring up reconsideration of the minutes of either February 23 or March 12, you may do so on Wednesday night.

I am copying City Council on this email so that they are aware that you want reconsideration of the minutes.

Jackie

-----Original Message-----

From: Allison Silberberg
Sent: Sunday, March 24, 2013 12:00 PM
To: Jackie Henderson
Cc: Mark McHugh
Subject: Regarding the minutes

Hi Jackie,

Just a quick note about the minutes.

First, at the March 12th meeting, there was a good deal of discussion about my change to the minutes for our late February meeting. I agreed to Paul's change that we say that I "suggested" a compromise proposal. He did not object to anything else. Then Justin said a few words. The mayor said we would vote on the minutes and then "reconsider it later" after review of the tape. I repeated his phrase to him and he agreed that we would *reconsider it later*. So I feel that the

March 12th minutes need to reflect that we passed the minutes but with the caveat that we would reconsider them later.

Second, we need to reconsider those minutes.

Thanks very much...Allison

Allison Silberberg
Vice Mayor of Alexandria
Author of "Visionaries In Our Midst"
allison.silberberg@alexandriava.gov
703-746-3989

Jackie Henderson

From: Jackie Henderson
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2013 3:06 PM
To: Allison Silberberg; bill euille; del pepper; Jane McDonald; John Chapman; justin wilson; lashawn timmons; lillian thompson; mark mchugh; nancy lacey; nancy lavalie; paul smedberg; tim lovain; wendy donohue
Cc: Gloria Sitton; rashad.young@alexandriava.gov; Jerome Fletcher; James Banks
Subject: correction to Feb 23 public hearing minutes

Good afternoon—

Vice Mayor Silberberg has requested that the following be changed in the February 23 minutes, on page four at the end of the public discussion. Please see below and please adopt the minutes this evening with this change.

Vice Mayor Silberberg submitted letters ~~from the community~~ from the Old Town Civic Association, The National Trust for Historic Preservation, Preservation Virginia, former Mayor/former State Senator Patsy Ticer, and folk legend/humanitarian Pete Seeger regarding the waterfront issue and stated that she is seeking a compromise, specifically going from two hotels to one for the community on the waterfront plan.

Jackie M. Henderson
City Clerk and Clerk of Council
(703) 746-3975

VERBATIM OF VICE MAYOR SILBERBERG COMMENTS FROM 2/23/13 PUBLIC HEARING MEETING

Thank you, Mayor Euille. I was just going to say to Ms. Papp, that I really frankly had not heard that argument before.

And given all of our concerns with the budget coming out, the proposal, on Tuesday and everything, I know that all of us are concerned about the credit rating. We all share that. But I hadn't heard that in terms of the Waterfront. That particular argument. And in terms of the Waterfront, a number of people spoke. We have a number of issues, the public discussion is such a good process that we do this. And of course we reach out to the community. We are going to Landmark, Watergate I mean, on Monday night with Mark Jinks and others, and the Mayor. A number of issues were raised today regarding Beauregard, regarding the ramp, feral cats and everything. But we really are concerned.

I know that my colleagues and I work hard but I think that your point is well taken. And I just want to comment because we do have this big issue before us. It is something that we have talked about publicly and privately and continue to talk about. It will go before the Planning Commission as you know and come back to Council. And a number of people raised other points, text amendments and other things. I tend to, I just wanted to say to my friends and colleagues I just hope that we do the wise thing.

I want to share with you all just one quick thing. And that is, I think that you are member of the Old Town Civic Association as I recall. No? Sorry. I have just seen you there. I apologize. But Old Town Civic a year or year and half ago released a statement about the Waterfront Plan. And I actually have a copy of that. As many of you know I have been trying to seek a compromise between what is the plan and what some people want zero hotels and the middle ground would be one small boutique, I feel.

And I just hadn't heard that argument. And I just wanted to say that in terms of historic preservation, the National Trust for Historic Preservation has expressed support for my point as well as the local/state, sorry the statewide group called Preservation Virginia. As well as former Mayor, former State Senator Patsy Ticer has written in a letter to me. And then the national icon, Pete Seeger, has also expressed support for doing what we can to preserve the Waterfront. Now, I actually brought copies of those letters today. I just wanted to share that because we are a very collegial group. And we want our citizenry to participate of course. It's a representative government. But this is a really big issue. As we move forward I would just encourage all of us to be very diplomatic and careful with our words and the tenor of our words. But I do think these letters of support regarding the Waterfront that I have are pretty indicative of the larger question.

March 12 verbatim:

Item #3: approval of minutes

EUILLE: Motion by Ms. Pepper, seconded by Mr. Wilson to approve the minutes. We have a change to the minutes, I believe, Vice Mayor Silberberg. Mr. Smedberg.

SMEDBERG: I actually just saw that email before we went into our work session. And I do have one question. I don't mind listing the letters, but I do have a little bit of concern about the change that actually suggests there was a compromise put forward. I think in this case it's important that if that were to take place that it actually be sent to us in sort of a written form, understanding that it would mean opening up the entire plan again for consideration to have a compromise, because the plan has already been passed. So I just want to make sure that we're conveying the right message there that maybe the Vice Mayor was suggesting that there might be a compromise coming forward as opposed that there was actually a compromise put forward that evening. I just want to make sure that that's accurately reflected if the will of the Council is to accept those changes, because I think in the past when we've had this, they have been in more formal presentation other than just presented in minutes.

* * * * *

SILBERBERG: And Councilman Smedberg's point is well taken and I just wanted the minutes to reflect the record. I didn't have a chance to read the minutes until today. I saw it and I thought, well, that doesn't really reflect exactly what I said. It was so vague. And I respect the fact that the minutes are not an exact replication of everything that we say and do. But it didn't really reflect the spirit of what I had said, and so I thought I should adjust it. I certainly did submit five letters for the public record, I thought that could be listed. Number two is I actually made a quick statement regarding a possible compromise proposal that we might discuss in the future. It was so vague that I thought if anyone looked at this in 50 years, they wouldn't have any idea what happened at the meeting unless they went back to the tape, if tapes still exist. So I just felt it was worth a quick change and if you wanted to say, Councilman Smedberg, that it says that I suggested the possibility of a future discussion regarding a compromise proposal, I would be open to that. Is that what you think?

SMEDBERG: Yea, I think that would be more appropriate, because we all make casual comments up here that aren't reflected in the minutes, and I think that's the key point.

SILBERBERG: Right. In my case, in that particular case, I didn't consider it really casual but if your....

SMEDBERG: I thought that's what you said.

SILBERBERG: Would you be open to it?

SMEDBERG: Yea, that would be a more accurate reflection in my personal view. And it may not be the view of others. I don't want to go on long with this. But I do think it's an important point just because of the issue and I don't want it to reflect something that really isn't accurate.

WILSON: I kind of, I wouldn't want to see us get to the kind of Congressional business where we revise and extend our previous remarks like they do up on the Hill when they have some additional things they want to say later. It seems like the only thing that was perhaps a little different about what's in the Clerk's minutes is it says submitted letters from the community. The letters seem like they were also from outside the community as well, so maybe just saying submitted letters regarding the waterfront issue and stated she is seeking a compromise for the community on the waterfront plan. That seems like it's an accurate depiction of what occurred. At least in my recollection.

SILBERBERG: Well I think stating what the five letters are given their national prominence in terms of that I don't think that's a big deal to reflect that. They are in the public record.

WILSON: Ultimately I don't think this is that important. This is minutes. But it's not worth an argument as far as I'm concerned.

EUILLÉ: We have a motion and a second. There are corrections, allegedly corrections to the minutes of February 23. If we're clear in terms of what those corrections are, fine, if not, I'm going to suggest that the corrections to the 23rd not be acknowledged at this meeting, and that we then review the tapes and the minutes, the written notes, and make the corrections at a subsequent meeting.

PEPPER: I prefer to do that.

EUILLÉ: Alright, no corrections to the minutes. We can correct the minutes, well, we can revisit the minutes for those that voted in favor of the minutes, at the later date. So with that we have the minutes of February 23/26, we have a motion and a second. Further discussion.

SILBERBERG: With the corrections.

EUILLÉ: No corrections. We will review the tape and the written notes and bring it back for reconsideration. All those in favor, say aye. Opposed, no. Ayes have it. Motion carries.