

DRAFT PROCEEDINGS
City of Annapolis
Market House Charrette

On the lovely spring day of May 30, 2009, in the Annapolis City Council Chambers, approximately one hundred citizens of Annapolis – with varied, positions, interests and perspectives – participated in a charrette about their preferences for the future of the Annapolis Market House.¹ (See Appendix A for the Participants List.) After they were welcomed at 10:00 A.M., the citizens agreed to a list of ground rules² and a set of roles for the participants, facilitators, and recorders in the charrette.³ As the agenda in Appendix B shows, participants then focused their attention on the three goals of the meeting:

1. Share information;
2. Consider the meaning, value, adequacy, and implications for action of a draft mission statement and three draft goal statements; and
3. Arrive at a consensus of mission and goals.

Following preliminaries, participants listened to two presentations – the first by the Mayor of the City of Annapolis, Ellen Moyer, and the second by the Director of Central Services for the City of Annapolis, Rob Schuetz.

Remarks by Mayor Moyer

Mayor Moyer presented a paper titled “Annapolis Market House ... Some of its History: A Look Back as We Move Forward.” (See Appendix C for the full text of the mayor’s remarks.) Moyer described the long history, economic function, and cultural ubiquity of public markets. The Annapolis Market, she said, dates to 1695, and a Market House has stood at the head of City Dock since 1784. The mayor noted that despite political efforts during the 1960s to raze the Annapolis Market House, its value as “an

¹ A “charrette” may be defined as a meeting in which people design solutions for a common issue – in this case, preferences for the future of the Annapolis Market House. Typically, charrettes emphasize collaboration, promote joint ownership of solutions, and attempt to defuse confrontational attitudes that may surround a given issue.

² The ground rules follow:

- Stay on subject;
- Hold one conversation per group;
- Listen respectfully;
- No one dominates;
- Make comments brief;
- Have no hidden agendas;
- Work collaboratively;
- Stay on the agenda;
- Cell phones on “quiet”; and
- Have civil discussions.

³ The role statement for **participants** was that they would be actively engaged and faithful to the ground rules; for **facilitators**, the statement indicated they would be neutral about issues but advocates for the process; and for **recorders**, the statement said they would strive for accuracy.

exceptional example of a people's landmark" and a "real asset to the community" prevailed.⁴ Renovated in 1972, 1995, and 2003, the Market House has suffered through a series of disappointing experiences in recent years, Mayor Moyer said. She described those experiences as follows:

- An unsuccessful effort to become a farmers' market, attempted in 2002;
- An effort in 2005, eventually aborted, to contract for a master lease agreement with Dean & DeLuca for management of the Market;
- The withdrawal, also in 2005, of a contract with Annapolis Seafood and Dean & DeLuca as partners;
- And, subsequently, a failed effort by Site Realty Corporation to manage the Market.

The last disappointment has been diagnosed by Franpoint, a firm that nurtures restaurant franchises, the mayor said. Using a report written by Franpoint and dated May 14, 2009, Moyer cited the following factors for the failure:⁵

- Unproven tenants;
- The location of the Market House in the middle of a tourist-driven trade area;
- Site handicaps, including limited signage and parking, and intense competition from nearby food options;
- A lack of charm and personality to the building;
- A business plan that was based on a mall-like food court, rather than on a Market House;
- Negligence in maintaining and marketing the premises;
- Failure to note the presence of 4.5 million annual visitors vs. 36,000 residents in Annapolis;
- Relatively high tenant rents;
- Failure to create an overall marketing concept;
- Failure to take the advice of the corporation's architect;
- A poor layout of space;
- An uninviting look;
- Unwise selection of tenants; and
- Failure to consider adequate air-conditioning needs.

Mayor Moyer ended her remarks by saying the charrette was designed to help avoid the mistakes of the past and to set the stage for a successful Annapolis Market House. The principles of success, she said, include "a distinct concept, focus, professionalism, and marketing."

Remarks by Director Schuetz

⁴ St. Clair Wright, pioneering historic preservationist for Annapolis, called the Market House a "people's landmark," and the Annapolis City Council, in 1972, recommended that the Market House be made a "real asset."

⁵ The Franpoint report may be found on the City of Annapolis website.

Director Schuetz spoke, first, of challenges facing the redevelopment of the Market House. These included meeting the Market House policy and zoning regulations, as provided by the City Code. (See Appendix D for a copy of the City Code for Market House Policy.) A related challenge is to obtain approval from the Historic Preservation Commission, which has authority over exterior changes to the Market House. Other challenges include restrictions on signage, “glass on four sides” (meaning there is no back to the building), no dedicated parking, no tenant storage, almost no building maintenance storage, and only tiny trash facilities.

In reference to heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning (HVAC) systems, Schuetz spoke of physical realities. Space exists in the Market House mezzanine, he said, for placing HVAC equipment, which must be designed to handle the requirements for a building in which food is being prepared. For the long-term, noted Schuetz, the City is studying the option of a geothermal heating and cooling system.

Long-term success, the Director said, must satisfy the City government, private businesses, and citizens. The City must break even and wants happy citizens and tourists. To survive, private businesses must be profitable. And citizens desire an active centerpiece to the downtown area. Ideas to satisfy all the needs and expectations include; altering the interior of the Market House to give views of the exterior back to the public; and making use of its glass as a way to improve interaction between the inside and outside of the building.

Over the coming summer and fall, according to Schuetz, the City is working to fill the Market House with short-term tenants, even while it works on design, permits, and reconstruction of the structure. A draft time-line projects a Grand Opening in May of 2010.

Round-Table Group Discussions and Reports

Following Schuetz’ remarks, participants moved to nine, randomly-assigned, round-table discussion groups. There, assisted by a volunteer facilitator and recorder at each table, the groups considered a draft mission statement and three draft goals for the Market House.⁶

Mission Statement

The round-table groups conversed for about an hour. Then, using recorders’ notes, spokespersons for the groups reported on their discussions. Comments by the whole group occurred once all nine subgroups had reported.

The Mission Statement

⁶ The mission statement and goals draw on work done by the Urban Institute.

Three round-table groups discussed the following **Draft Mission Statement** for the Market House:

“It is the mission of the Annapolis Market House to preserve and develop the spirit of community, which is historically associated with markets that promote local, small business enterprises.”

Recorders’ notes for the three groups that discussed the draft statement follow:

Mission Statement – (Group A)

“It is the mission of the Annapolis Market House to preserve and develop the spirit of community, which is historically associated with markets that promote local, small business enterprises. Desired characteristics are that the Market House:

- 1. Be economically viable as a whole;*
- 2. Be managed by the city; and*
- 3. Evolve according to market conditions.”*

Mission Statement – (Group B)

“It is the mission of the Annapolis Market House to preserve and develop the spirit of community to attract and serve the needs of

- 1. Residents;*
- 2. Workers;*
- 3. Day visitors;*
- 4. Extended visitors;*
- 5. Special-event visitors; and*
- 6. Transient boaters.*

in ways generally associated with traditional markets, providing local food, produce, art, culture, and services.”

Mission Statement – (Group C)

“The mission of the Annapolis Market House is to provide goods and services that consumers want to purchase – presented in a hospitable way, at competitive prices, at convenient times, with reasonable rents to attract desired vendors – while developing, preserving, and enhancing the spirit of community and social interaction.”

Goal #1

Two groups discussed **Draft Goal #1**, which read as follows:

“A goal of the Market House is to create a special public place within the community that is inviting, safe, and lively.”

Reporters for the groups offered the following notes:

Goal #1 – (Group A)

We view “inviting, safe, and lively” as standards of operation, not as goals. We prefer the goal of creating a Market House that is **“uniquely Annapolis.”** We prefer, further, that the Market House be a special public place that creates a synergy among communities that make up Annapolis – e.g., state and local governments, the United States Naval Academy, and the Sailing Hall of Fame. Could the Market House be the common thread among all such communities? That would mean:

- Public access for all;
- A community gathering place;
- Viable, year-round businesses;
- A showcase for the communities, providing information about the local flavor to tourists and residents alike;
- Outreach! – bringing people in, but also reaching out to, for example, local residents, transient and local boaters, and tourists;
- Sustainability – environmental, social, economic;
- A place with a soul; and
- Honoring the Chesapeake Bay, which also makes the locale “uniquely Annapolis” by saying, “Annapolis is a special place.”

“Inviting, safe and lively” are non-negotiable standards, we believe. The goals that can encompass and meet the needs of the various communities are as follows:

- Uniquely Annapolis;
- An asset to communities; and
- Sustainable.

Goal #1 – (Group B)

Terms in this goal need to be defined. We view **“inviting”** as the ability to draw residents back to downtown. It means “affordable to the public” and offering “a variety of items.” Further, “inviting” means attracting students from St. Mary’s, St. John’s, and the Naval Academy, state workers, and transient boaters. “Inviting” means quality products – fresh foods, items unique to Annapolis, seafood, crabs, and local produce. We suggest considering, although it may be viewed as heresy, removing parking spaces around the Market House. Within the Market House, we prefer the promotion of city businesses and an improved facility layout. **“Lively”** for us means support for local arts,

local musicians, and the use of Hopkins Plaza for concerts and displays of local arts and crafts.

Goal #2

Two groups discussed **Draft Goal #2**, which was:

“A goal of the Market House is to provide space for locally-owned businesses operated by their owners.”

The groups offered the following comments:

Goal #2 – (Group A)

“Locally-owned,” for us, means owned by a Maryland resident and incorporated in Maryland. Locally-owned franchise businesses would be within our definition, but a franchise must fit into a Market House scheme. Lease preference should go to providers of Maryland goods and services. Locally-owned also includes, for us, transient vendors – such as art sellers, movie providers, and flower marketers – who conduct their business on space outside the Market House.

We prefer to see “operated by their owners” changed to “managed by their owners.” Further, we advocate that vendors have renewable, multi-year leases, and that they operate year-round. Concerning implementation of this goal, we prefer:

- A mix of vendors;
- Allowing vendors to change the mix of their products seasonally, as it is profitable to do so;
- Aligning the management of the Market House with the Annapolis Business Association.

Goal #2 – (Group B)

“Locally-owned,” for us, means Maryland-based, although some in our group felt the term should mean “based in the Mid-Atlantic Region.” We agreed that “locally-owned” should not get in the way of being successful. In addition, “operated by owners” means, for us, that an owner would provide for the majority of oversight.

There are implications of the goal as we have revised it:

- An independent, professional, and experienced Market House Manager is critical, and that role should not be filled by an employee of the City of Annapolis or by a leasing company; and
- Management should be responsible, making sure the market mix is as intended.

Having vendors on the exterior of the Market House would be an alternative to signage. Most importantly for us, the market must work. We suggest consideration of a community-based corporation for implementation.

Goal #3

The last two groups discussed **Draft Goal #3**, which was:

“A goal of the Market House is to attract shoppers to the downtown area of Annapolis.”

Reports on the discussions about Goal #3 follow.

Goal #3 – (Group A)

The Market House should, in our view, enhance the vitality of Annapolis. Highly important is “local flavor”; that will help attract tourist business. The Market House should have the “Annapolis brand.”

The shoppers we seek to attract are:

- Residents, families, students;
- Local workers;
- Tourists;
- Boaters; and
- County-area residents.

Market research is needed. Different segments of the market should be interviewed. Segments may change over time.

First determine the use; that will drive design. We offer the following market analysis for consideration:

AUDIENCE	BARRIERS/COMPETITION (and what to do about them)	WHAT ATTRACTS (and what doesn't)
Downtown Residents	Supermarkets Parking (Suggest push carts and use of a market shuttle) City Code Movie theatres	Milk, bread, cheese, eggs, fish Raw bar Beer and wine on premises Performers Plants and flowers (Not T-shirts)
Tourists and Boaters	(Suggest delivery service – partner with water taxi)	Food, milk, provisions Information about where to go

Local Workers		Place to sit Quick, inexpensive sandwiches
County Residents	Marketing is essential. (Suggest an annual marketing budget, in cooperation with merchants)	
Students from the Naval Academy, St. Mary's and St. John's		(Not skate boards)

In conclusion, we offer the following recommendations:

- Create an oversight group composed of residents and business owners to provide a forum and advice. (Needs on this group, it should be noted, will change over time);
- Provide flexible and seasonal space to provide for flowers, produce, and arts & crafts, for example;
- Offer a product mix and prices that will fit the niche we want to attract;
- Use some flexible leases – short-term and low-cost – to test new ideas; and
- Avoid creating a “Vendor Czar,” and utilize local marketing and retail expertise.

Goal #3 – (Group B)

The Market House, in our opinion, should attract and serve a diverse set of clients. That set would include, for example, residents, travelers, and visitors.

Concerning functionality, we suggest reconnecting to what was good. We prefer:

- A good mix of vendors;
- Attractiveness (signage is not needed);
- Good products and services at values that will attract people; and
- An unobstructed view of the outside.

As to implications of the goal, we suggest the need for connections between the vendors and the community. The Market House should:

- Attract tourists;
- Become a social setting for gathering;
- Involve community participation; and
- Be the “healthy heart” of Downtown Annapolis.

General Reactions and Comments

After the group presentations ended, participants engaged in a general discussion by offering comments on what they had heard that impressed them in the round-table discussions and group reports. Single sentence summaries of individual comments follow.

1. The economic viability of the Market House is essential.
2. Having the Market House be “local” is a strong value, but local must also be economically viable.
3. A good mix of interests should be represented on the advisory board to the Market House.
4. Consideration is needed of incentives that result in economic viability; the Market House is the “heart and soul” of Annapolis.
5. The Market House should be appealing “across the board”; effective vendors will provide economic viability, but the Market House should also provide for an attractive gathering place.
6. There needs to be a great group of vendors – business people who have proven to be successful, are highly experienced, and are good entrepreneurs.
7. There is a difference between “local goods and services” vs. who can provide those goods and services.
8. We need a diverse selection of vendors, showcasing the uniqueness of Annapolis.
9. There should be a sense of serving residents first by providing goods and services that are “distinctly Annapolis”; tourists will find those attractive.
10. We need to look beyond the next eight months and consider structures for a long-term plan.
11. Our vision should extend beyond the Market House to include the whole downtown area.
12. We must find the right product mix and the right vendors,
13. The bank now located in the Market House is taking up one of the best commercial spaces.

14. We should remember that sales taxes do not go to the City of Annapolis; visitors are crowding out locals; the Market House needs to be a destination, and tourists will want to experience what is distinctly local to Annapolis.
15. A viable Market House will enhance the vitality of the whole downtown area.
16. City oversight is needed but should reflect the wishes of the Market House advisory board.
17. The reality is, we need to clearly understand the market and employ experts to determine it; market analysis should consider the whole central area of Annapolis and thereby determine the right mix of goods and services to be provided by the Market House.
18. I am concerned that a citizens' advisory committee not go beyond providing advice; we need the advice of marketing and business experts to ensure a successful Market House.
19. Ethnic traditions in Annapolis, as reflected in local foods, should be offered in the Market House as another aspect of "local."
20. As part of a marketing plan, it would be useful to conduct a survey of potential consumers.
21. Whatever we adopt as a plan for the Market House should be generally accepted in the community and relate to existing organizations, such as the Annapolis Business Association, and to current efforts, such as the Maryland Main Street Program for Annapolis, also known as the Downtown Annapolis Partnership.

Common Themes

After the retreat, the facilitator, Philip Favero, prepared a set of eight common themes, which he viewed as having emerged from the group reports and the general comments. As Favero said during the charrette, his reflections are presented as draft ideas with a request to readers of the proceedings: please provide your reactions, comments, and suggestions for improvements as a means to promote consensus about the future of the Market House.

The themes follow:

1. The value of a "local" Annapolis Market House can be viewed as having several facets. Local can refer to:
 - a. The geographic sources of products for sale;
 - b. Goods and products uniquely representative of Annapolis culture, including the city's history and ethnic diversity;
 - c. The advisory board; and/or

- d. The vendors.
2. There is a need for expert advice in developing a good marketing plan, which would consider consumer preferences, the right mix of products, location of vendors, and complementarity to nearby businesses and attractions. A Market House Advisory Board comprised of common citizens does not substitute for expert advice.
 3. Although there are segments to the market – for example, residential and tourist consumers – it should not be assumed that the market is “segmented.” That is to say, segments of the market may be complementary. Tourists, for example, may demand products because they are “uniquely Annapolis.”
 4. The Market House should promote community-building and be economically viable. Neither the building of community nor economic viability should be promoted to the exclusion of the other.
 5. While the mission needs to be framed, currently, by the existing ordinance, the law can be rewritten, over time, and the mission redirected. There is a need to look beyond the next year.
 6. To manage the Market House well means considering the overall marketing plan, vendor experience and record of entrepreneurial success, the complementarity of Market House businesses, and the products of other downtown establishments. The Market House should not be a common food court.
 7. The Market House mission should relate to other initiatives currently underway for Annapolis, for example, to the Maryland Main Street (Downtown Annapolis Partnership) effort, which is currently underway.
 8. The Market House should be viewed in the context of the “community green” of downtown Annapolis, a place where people can gather for commerce, conversation, education, and recreation. The whole area should be envisioned as an integral whole and designed or redesigned as such.

The themes suggest a consensus mission statement for the Market House would state its role to “preserve and develop the spirit of community,” while, at the same time, state the need for the Market House to be economically viable. As for goals, the themes suggest:

- The value of “local” with its many facets;
- The opportunity to consider the complementarity of market segments; and
- The need to consider the function and role of the Market House in the context of Annapolis’ “community green,” surrounded by economically interrelated firms.

Participants commonly agreed on the strong need for expert consultation, moving forward, but differences among participants exist over the role and authority to be vested in a Market House advisory group.

Conclusion

Mayor Moyer provided a brief reflection on the day and expressed her appreciation for the time and contributions of the participants. The mayor emphasized the need to create a marketing plan that emphasizes what is unique to Annapolis. The short-term interest, she said, is to find vendors for the summer and fall, and, during the winter, to redesign the interior of the building. In the long term, she added, the Market House should not become a fast-food court.

Following the mayor's concluding remarks, participants wrote evaluations, which were later summarized and are shown in Appendix E. The charrette adjourned at 2:00 P.M.

APPENDIX A
Participants List

Margaret Abel	Andrew Fox	George Nassif
Terri Annis	Chris Fox	Precilla Palmiter
Jon Arason	Martin Gardner	Jessica Jordan Paret
Ross Arnett	Beth Garraway	Vic Pascoe
John Baer	Grover Gedney	Sandi Patty
Roland Banscher	Mike Gerace	Frederick Paone
Jeff Bauckman	George Gorayeb	Eugene Peterson
Steve Beardmore	Bill Grovermann	Judith Dodge Petrinis
Adriana Bevis	Devon Heritage	Zina C. Pierre
Hank Berliner	Janna Howley	Harvey Poe
Patricia Blick	Classie Hoyle	L. Harvey Poe
Michael Blonder	Chuck Harken	Gary Reiner
Sherren Bowan	Richard Israel	Gilbert Renaut
Maria Broadbent	Robert Jarret	Paul Rensted
Bevin Buckheister	Karen Jennings	Steve Samaras
Joe Budge	Colleen Joseph-Artini	Rob Schuetz
Bob Burdon	Bill Kardash	Bridget Shea
Joe Cecere	Arthur Knight	Wes Sherman
Brad Cogar	Harold Kumer	Sam Shropshire
Josh Cohen	Dick Lahn	Doug Smith
Sandy Cohen	Don Lamb-Minor	Karen Smith
Steward Cohen	Bob Lawinger	Richard Snow
Dennis Conti	Marcelle Lee	Tony Spencer
Karen Cunyningham	Jim Martin	Wanda Stansbury
Cliff Dean	Tracy McGranaghan	Josh Stewart
Cathy Durkan	Ann M. McGovern	James R. Stilwell
Barbara Duvall	Linda McGreen	Greg Stiverson
Philip Dykes	Valerie Miller	Sveinu Storm
Geoff Elliott	Bryan Miller	Glenn Strachan
Karen Engelke	Hollis Minor	Cathy Strayhorne
Tony Evans	Mike Miron	Peggy Summers
Philip Favero	Amy Morris	Bill Taylor
Sheila Finlayson	Jim Morris	Rhonda Wardlaw
Carl Fiorentino	Ellen Moyer	Raychiel Webb

APPENDIX B
AGENDA
Annapolis Market Place Charrette
May 30, 2009

Conflict is a creative opportunity.
(Unknown)

Our duty to be civil toward others does not depend on whether we like them or not. Civility assumes we will disagree; it requires us not to mask our differences but to resolve them respectfully.
(Stephen L. Carter)

The presumption of innocence is not just a legal concept. In commonplace terms it rests on that generosity of spirit which assumes the best, not the worst, of the stranger.
(Kingman Brewster)

10:00 – 10:20 Welcome, Goals, and Stage Setting

Participants will, in regards the Annapolis Market House:

1. Share information;
2. Discuss a draft mission statement and three draft goals to consider their meaning, value, adequacy, and implications for action;
3. Arrive at a consensus of mission and goals.

Round-table groups will discuss the meaning, value, adequacy of, and decide what actions are suggested by, the following statements:

1. “It is the mission of the Annapolis Market House to preserve and develop the spirit of community, which is historically associated with markets that promote local, small business enterprises.”
2. “A goal of the Market House is to create a special public place within the community that is inviting, safe, and lively.”

3. “A goal of the Market House is to provide space for locally-owned businesses operated by their owners.”
4. “A goal of the Market House is to attract shoppers to the downtown area of Annapolis.”

10:20 – 10:50

Overview Presentations

- The History of Public Markets (Ellen Moyer, Mayor of Annapolis)
- Central Service Processes and Legal Considerations (Rob Schuetz, Director, Central Services, City of Annapolis)

(Break and Transition into Discussion Groups)

11:00 – 12:15

Round-Table Discussions and Consensus Building

(Break)

12:30 – 1:00

(Lunch)

1:00 – 2:00

Round-Table Reports followed by General Discussion on the Mission and Goals of the Market House

2:00

Complete an Evaluation and Adjourn

APPENDIX C
ANNAPOLIS MARKET HOUSE ... SOME OF ITS HISTORY
A LOOK BACK AS WE MOVE FORWARD

Ellen Moyer, Mayor of the City of Annapolis
May 30, 2009

Public Markets are one of the oldest and most widespread forms of retail trade. They are found in every culture. Some for the daily distribution of food. Some for special festivals. Some in small outdoor plazas. Others in 50 acre sites with a variety of stalls.

While markets were first located on the periphery of settlements in Ancient Greece, they eventually moved to central locations for commodity and price oversight by city leaders – a pattern that continued through the Middle Ages.

In England the Crown maintained the right to grant market charters. The colonies followed the European public markets' traditions with indoor halls and outdoor markets in town squares. Nearly every city in America had at least one public market – hence a “Market Street” in most downtowns.

Annapolis' first market in 1695 was – you guessed it – across the street at Market and Duke of Gloucester Streets.

A citizen complained to the Maryland General Assembly about the Market House depriving of his view, and three years later the Market House was moved to State Circle and Maryland Avenue. Complaints of noise and smells moved it to yet another location.

After moving several times, the market House finally found a permanent home at the head of the City Dock in 1784. It has been in the same location for 225 years, managed by the City for most of that time.

Market trading was done primarily by those traders who grew, raised or made the foods. “Fair-days” established in the City Charter 1708 for May 1 and September 29 were also set aside as Market days. The Charter defined strict guidelines for city officials on tolls charged for “goods,” cattle, merchandise, and commodities to be sold.

In 1795, William Faris noted in this diary “Rained very hard last night and blow'd a Harrican---the tide was so high this morning that one could not get to the Market House with out a boat.” His notes made it clear that going to market was also more than shopping, it was going to a social center to meet and greet, exchange ideas and gossip.

St. Clair Wright described the Market House thus “The Market House is an exceptional example of a people's landmark. Because it has always been a meeting place where all income groups communicate, its presence inspires a sense of community and the harmonious relationships so needed today...”

This was in 1969 when the city by popular vote elected to establish an historic district. The effort to tear down the Market House voted by the City Council in 1968 was thus thwarted. Razing the Market House had been a 25 year effort by Elmer Jackson, Jr., Editor of The Capital Newspaper.

He thought the Market House was a poor investment. The tenants paid \$.96 per square foot and visually it was unattractive, its interior infrastructure in a state of deterioration. One of his front page Editor's Reports titled “Keeping City Market House Foolish Idea” on July 29, 1968, accused St. Clair Wright of being inconsistent and a “militant leader.” The Washington Post in that year reported that Jackson's campaign to

raze the Market House began as a personal conflict (surprise) between himself and Mrs. Wright who had opposed the building of the Annapolis Hilton (now Marriott). On August 12 the Council voted 6 to 2 to raze the Market. The tenants to be out by December 31st. That was 41 years ago.

Immediately a "Save the Market Committee" was formed. Letters flooded the newspaper, including one by a young Stephen Carr, who wrote "Sir: I am 14 years old and I know my opinion on the demolition of the Market won't make a bit of difference but I decided to express myself anyway. I have enjoyed the Market area in many ways thought my life and would find it a real crime to rip it down..."

After a Spring election, a new Council emerged. Mayor Roger Moyer called a special Council meeting. A motion was made to rescind the decision to destroy the Market and to make recommendations for making the Market a "real asset to the community." The motion passed unanimously. The building was renovated and opened 3 years later in 1972.

In 1969 Talbot Spear sold the Capital-Gazette Press to Philip Merrill and Elmer Jackson left the newspaper. The fight on the existence of the Market House was over.

Twenty-five years later the restored Market was beginning to show its age. In 1995 the City listed the Market House roof in need of repair in its Capital Improvement Program.

In 2003 when Hurricane Isabel flooded the dock, additional damage to the Market House added to the need for repair. Leases for the Market House tenants were to expire on December 31, 2004, and could not be renewed until the Market House, long overdue for repairs, was fixed. This would involve, according the City Administrator Daily as early as 2000, closing the Market to accomplish this.

In 2002, I appointed a market House Transition Team. They recommended:

- Help for the tenants in promotion
- Pay for cosmetic repairs
- Hire a part-time manager to oversee advertising
- Hold a farmers market on site
- Permit outdoor kiosks to operate on market Square
- Completely remodel the market in the long term and
- Form an advisory panel to see that the team's ideas are carried out

The recommendations were addressed. A farmers market opened on site to operate 5 days a week from 11-2 in May, 2002. It was not successful.

In 2003 a citizens Task Force was appointed to consider Code requirements and policy changes, the terms and duration of leases, design standards, parking and transportation issues. The Task Force visited markets in Baltimore, Lancaster, Pennsylvania, and Dean & DeLuca's in Georgetown. Bids for design solutions and construction documents for renovations were accepted. Mr. Holland and Mr. Blonder offered to lease space to merchants in the Market House during the time of renovation. None accepted.

Ward 1 urged the private management of the market and recommended a master lease as an accepted mode.

In 2005 the City advertised for a management entity to Master Lease the Market House. Two companies responded: Dean & DeLuca and Site Reality Corporation. An evaluation Committee selected Dean & DeLuca.

The lease negotiation took 6 months and was presented on February 14, 2005 and referred to the Economic Matters Committee – Aldermen Fox, Hammond and Kelly. They offered 10 amendments which were accepted by the Council on May 23 and it was forwarded to Dean & DeLuca to sign. The company, in March, had already announced it was joining force with Annapolis Seafood to store, supply and deliver fresh produce to the building. Renovation on the building stopped when Dean & DeLuca, who had proposed spending \$1 Million on the interior of the building, hadn't signed the lease. On July 27, Dean & DeLuca, facing other difficulties in New York City, bowed out as the Market's lead merchant. Instead, they recommended its local partner to manage the building and sell Dean & DeLuca Products.

The City chose to pursue its contract with Annapolis Seafood and Dean & DeLuca products. Mr. Bassford presented his plan to the Economic Matters Committee. Acrimony erupted and 3 days later Mr. Bassford withdrew. His attorney, Mr. Hyatt, wrote "The decision was made that it was best not to go forward...there's too much animosity for a smart businessman to participate in...and the potential to become involved in a (largely politically motivated) controversy would not be commercially expedient."

One week later, the City put the Market House up for bid. Site Realty was back. So why did it fail? – And what lessons have we learned to avoid in the future?

Franpoint, a firm that nurtures restaurant franchises, studied the current Market House operations. This is their finding.

- The tenants were largely unproven in the risky business of the restaurant industry (which has a notoriously high failure rate).
- The Market House space is situated in the middle of a tourist driven trade area.
- The site is handicapped by limited signage and parking and surrounded by competition from other well-entrenched food options. It is not as compelling a location as one might believe.
- The market House offering lacked charm and personality and historical reference and was unimaginative in its design.
- The concept of a Market House was largely ignored in favor of a fast food court, used in malls, which does not translate well in this location.
- Market House Ventures was negligent in its duties to maintain and market the premises.
- Tourism is the key driver of revenues at the Market House location. There are only 36,000 residents in Annapolis, 4.5 million visitors, with a peak season between May and October.
- Rents to tenants were very high -- \$60 or more per square foot.
- Market House Ventures did not create an overall concept for the Market House:
 - No message
 - No branding
 - No evidence of a marketing plan
 - No evidence they thought about marketing of the entire concept.

- Market House Ventures ignored the advice of the architect with respect to lighting, lavatory design, and forgoing the “old farmers market” for a food court flawed concept
- Space was laid out poorly with no attempt to leverage the rare and all important waterfront view
- Not inviting – no seating, no outside vendors “critical to success because they will signal to potential customers that there is activity inside”
- No evidence by landlord of studies of the competitive landscape essential to wise selection of tenants
- Air conditioning as an issue was brought up by Vacarro’s at first tenant meeting before opening was ignored by landlord who did not review tenant plans or employ industry standard, 300 square feet or 175 square feet per 1 ton in the recommendation to architect.

Today’s program is designed to discuss those actions that will insure avoiding the mistakes of the past and set the stage for a lively Market House, offering unique and special cuisine.

The principles of success include a distinct concept, focus, professionalism and marketing. These principles have insured the success of public markets for thousands of years and will ensure the success of our Market for future generations.

APPENDIX D
MUNICIPAL CODE OF THE CITY OF ANNAPOLIS
7.28.020 MARKETHOUSE POLICY

- A. The policies set forth in this section shall serve as a guide for the selection of tenants, management and operation of the markethouse located at the City dock.
- B. The operation of the markethouse shall not be subsidized by the general funds of the City. The revenues and expenditures related to the operation of the markethouse shall be budgeted in the annual operating budget of the City according to generally accepted accounting principles customarily employed for enterprise funds.
- C. The markethouse shall be operated as a mercantile enterprise in a clean, safe and visually attractive environment.
- D. The markethouse shall be managed and operated to attract and serve the needs of a diverse clientele consisting of:
1. Residents;
 2. Workers employed in the vicinity of the City;
 3. Day visitors;
 4. Extended visitors;
 5. Special-events visitors; and
 6. Transient boaters.
- E. A similarity in types of merchants and types of merchandise offered for sale shall be avoided in the consideration of tenant selection for the markethouse so that patrons may be offered a variety of products. During the tenant selection process, consideration also shall be given to a prospective tenant's ability and willingness to comply with the policies set forth in subsection F of this section.
- F. Foods and products offered for sale in the markethouse generally shall be of the highest quality and shall be displayed and offered for sale in a manner that will not interfere with the movement of shoppers or the right of other tenants nor create unnecessary visual clutter. For prepared foods, an emphasis should be placed upon those types of items which are generally too difficult or time-consuming for personal preparation, and an undue concentration on food prepared on the premises for immediate consumption shall be avoided.
- G. The Central Services Officer shall manage the markethouse property and administer all markethouse leases according to their terms.
- H. The Boards of Appeals shall have jurisdiction to hear and decide disputes arising under the terms of a markethouse lease as provided by the terms of the lease.
- I. If the markethouse tenants create a tenant association, the association may place tables and chairs ("furniture") on the sidewalks adjacent to the markethouse, exclusive of the sidewalk located on the northeastern side of the markethouse, subject to the following standards:
1. The furniture shall be placed upon the sidewalk so as to occupy not more than three feet of the width of the sidewalk directly adjacent to the markethouse;
 2. In no case may the furniture be placed within six feet of the outward edge of the curb of any street;
 3. All such furniture shall comply with any standards lawfully adopted by the Historic District Commission regulating sidewalk cafe furniture;
 4. The tenant association shall insure, indemnify, defend and hold harmless the City, its officers and employees against any and all claims and demands arising out of (or alleged to arise out of) the use, placement or condition of the furniture;
 5. The furniture shall be removed from the sidewalk whenever the markethouse is closed;
 6. The markethouse tenants shall at all times, maintain the furniture in a clean and attractive condition;
 7. The furniture shall be for the use of carry-out customers only and no markethouse tenant shall conduct any transaction with customers at any furniture; and
 8. The placement, use and maintenance of all such furniture shall be subject to the further regulation of the Central Services Officer not inconsistent with the enumerated standards set forth above. (Ord. O-27-96 § 1; Ord. O-79-94 § 1; prior code § 15-3)

APPENDIX E EVALUATIONS OF THE CHARRETTE

A total of 30 participants provided answers to the four questions posed in the evaluation instrument. Their answers, listed in random order after each question, follow.

What was particularly constructive for you about this charrette? (n = 30)

- The format/structure was good. It provided for input from all persons who participated, as well as covering many subject areas.
- Open-honest dialogue; variation of opinions with a common thread to see similarities of the “Old” Market House.
- Small groups at round table; consensus was great.
- We agree to serve residents & visitors. We want the MH to constantly evolve, to constantly draw interest.
- Round-table facilitated discussion.
- Good cross section of participants.
- Consensus and team building. The compassion and zeal from the participants. The common thread that ran throughout all of the presentations. Interests: buy local, grow local, sustainability, connecting the diversity and culture.
- Good staff. Need more meetings like this.
- Inclusion, ability of citizens to give specific input.
- Good discussion. Quite a bit of agreement on purpose.
- Good forum for getting many ideas on the table.
- Nothing.
- Very well done, real input permitted, good framework.
- The interaction of the residents and the free flow of ideas.
- Opportunity to hear from residents with long-term knowledge. Vested interests in a good outcome.
- The overall process was very constructive and interesting. Great to hear all sides, even when I don’t necessarily agree with them. But that’s democracy.
- Opportunity for broad spectrum of opinions and comments to share.
- Conversation.
- Openness and collaboration.
- Giving the people who have interest in living here a voice on a non-working day.
- Good dialogue. Surprising amount of similarity among discussion group comments/conclusions.
- Open exchange of opinion, done in a respectful fashion.
- The opportunity to provide inputs to the mission statement and goals for Market House. Breaking people into smaller groups.
- I appreciated the random assignment to tables. We had a good mix of backgrounds and opinions at our table.
- Open-minded atmosphere of meeting tone was welcoming and encouraging. The pre-designation of facilitators was also helpful.
- Opportunity to hear a variety of views.
- Having a forum for constructive discussion with such a large number of residents about this issue.

- Civility, respect, and creative exchange of ideas.
- Heard different groups and ideas.
- Listening to various ideas and possible solutions to make our Market House successful; the mayor's opening remarks.

What was not beneficial about the charrette? (n = 28)

- Goal and mission statement formation wasn't quite clear.
- Large/disparate groups require "getting acquainted" first before meaningful comments are derived.
- Comment period at end seemed a little long.
- Irrelevant comments.
- It was difficult to limit ourselves to one goal, although we certainly wouldn't have had time to address all of them. Having city staff available to answer questions was helpful, and I was glad people did not accept limitations (i.e., what's in the code) suggested by them.
- Don't be so wedded to the literal written document that we started out with.
- Being limited to a topic of discussion that was different than what some other tables were discussion (i.e., not have same topic for all tables).
- I would not call it a charrette – working session.
- Was there any record made for information and/or questions during the Q&A period? Did this have any value in the overall process?
- All was beneficial!
- I feel the microphone was not used equitably among the group.
- Too many personal views. MH must operate with economic viability.
- Limited framework that defined mission and goals. Let us create and discuss Market House.
- Length of charrette. Too long.
- Nothing N/A.
- Task seems daunting.
- Lack of focus on critical issues: merchant limitations; local ownership vs. open ownership; not enough debate – pros/cons; discussion of the remaining process.
- Need to explain the next steps. Who is making decisions? Form a plan for short term. Pull in DAP to help select short-term vendors.
- Terrible forum for any "out of box" thinking to be heard.
- Everything.
- Sounds as if AC already designed and can't do (?) until after you've decided what's going in.
- It appeared to many people the intentions of the city were already made.
- Starting with preset mission/goal statements.
- The time limitations made it difficult to really dig down.
- Try to keep discussion on target.
- People remaining entrenched in their pre-conceived positions.
- City person kept advocating the status quo.
- No cost data presented by the mayor as to cost to date as well as budgeted during the repositioning of the facilities (including lost revenue to the City); No clear path as to what happens to our recommendations and comments.

What suggestions do you have for improving the process and content of possible future meetings about the Market House? (n = 26)

- Have more of these sessions.
- Is there any way to make it a more creative process so that new ideas can emerge?
- This first charrette was more exploratory in nature. The tough part will come in the future as we try to mesh our goals with the constraints inherent in the property and management.
- Narrowing down the ideas. Making them more clear for the next step. Give information as it comes out – so we are aware of what is coming next.
- Get as much general community input as possible. Spread the word as broadly as can be done (Internet, newspapers, posters, etc.)
- Well, just have more of these for this subject. As suggested, have more for other topics.
- The microphone should be used more and questions should be repeated by someone with a microphone.
- Keep focus.
- Have one meeting of other groups working on same issue.
- More charrettes.
- Work well.
- Go in specific order to achieve the final goal. More meetings will be needed. Need professional input. More information about basic costs, etc.
- More discussion of pros/cons of multiple operator vs. single operator.
- Process explanation would help.
- Rely on experts rather than amateurs; don't list the Mission & Goals then ask audience to define the Mission and Goals – it ends up in little more than word-smithing.
- None.
- Same type of forum.
- Work with existing focus groups.
- Tourism \$ stats; Resident \$ stats; Focus group results; data about economic multiplier effects in communities.
- More specifics to put in an (unfinished...).
- Pick a cloudy day.
- Keep openness and facilitation.
- Please do something similar for businesses who may have an interest in being a part of Market House.
- Pre-registration with a limited number of participants.
- Keeping people focused on task at hand.
- Discuss financials – e.g., construction budget, pro-forma. Who are the players who control the Market House's outcome? Need names, addresses and fax numbers.

What additional comments, if any, do you have? (n = 16)

- Great turnout!
- Just be careful in statements not to tie our hands.

- We need innovative product mix, not more of what we already have so much of.
- Fine job, great opportunity.
- City ownership forever of market space. Community management and operation; Eliminate parking by Market House, making area workable.
- City should publish results in newspaper. E-mails, mailings; include those who couldn't attend.
- Market House should be viewed as a "doorway" through which residents/tourists enter into the downtown business area.
- Turned out well!
- Continue to allow resident participation in this process.
- Annapolis City Staff was great (Annapolis Taxpayer).
- Thanks for having this! It's a wonderful opportunity!
- Make it unique with character for the locals, and the tourists will come. Make it uniquely Annapolis – not a food court that can be found anywhere in America;
- Do follow-ups with summaries of Pluses & Deltas.
- Great charrette! Good mix of residents and business owners.
- Hypothetically, I want to open a raw bar and serve onsite beer & wine. When and how is that prohibited in the Market House policy?
- Need a full "letting" of why sufficient AC not installed per lease prior to occupancy by site's vendors. Prepare schedule – design, bid out, select vendors, bid out, open for business.