

**Joint Committee
Meeting Comments
10-17-2011**

- 01.** Consider not developing “J” and “K” indicated on the rendering for the “South Entry Option” provided by the design consultants. Some individuals with disabilities do not currently use south side because of accessibility issues. J & K area does not meet federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility criteria as it is currently (support ADA “green” natural option keeping beauty of space); no limestone blocks in “K” area.

Response: Based upon citizen comment, a compromise is under consideration. Area “K” will not include the seating as originally illustrated. Area J will have an ADA accessible path and is considered to be “developed” in the sense that it will have an ADA accessible viewing area. Material options and associated costs are being researched, with the goal of using the most natural and pervious materials feasible.

- 02.** Start entrance closer to parking lot and eliminate switchbacks (look at options).

Response: The south trail cannot begin slope at parking lot because of the elevation of the Hike/Bike trail which it intersects. Consultants are evaluating an alternate route for ADA accessible trail from south gate, but due to slope requirements, switchbacks cannot be totally eliminated.

- 03.** Two paths versus one path; One walkway would be preferable (are there options?).

Response: The option of creating only one path was considered; however, it was decided that the two path approach was still the more viable. Due to slope constraints, the ADA accessible path will be routed through the “south woods.” If only one path were to be installed, able-bodied patrons would continue to use the current rutted pathway since it is a more direct route. Erosion would remain an issue there. However, if the accessible pathway is designed to begin near the ticket booth, the rutted trail will not need to be as accessible so a more “natural” look can be utilized for improving it (i.e. stepping stones instead of a concrete path between the intersection with the ADA accessible trail and the proposed limestone steps.)

- 04.** No asphalt or caliche in parking lot, please; explore parking lot material options.

Response: Alternative paving materials are under consideration. Currently, concrete is the material most likely to be used and the costs associated with concrete are being explored.

- 05.** Try not to use concrete for entire south side path. “More natural” look is desired. Consider “green” along paths.

Response: ADA accessible “natural” trail and path building materials and associated costs are being researched.

06. Increase and be consistent with meeting notifications. Consider press release.

Response: Joint Committee Meetings will continue to be posted in the following manner:

- 1) The Barton Springs Pool Master Plan website
(www.austintexas.gov/parks/bartonspringsmp.htm)
- 2) Austin News and Notes
- 3) Notices at Barton Springs Pool
- 4) Via a Yahoo group meeting notice
- 5) The City’s Boards and Commissions Information Center

07. Can ramp end more west of diving board?

Response: Unfortunately, the ramp cannot end more west of the diving board because the cross-slope of the deck in that area exceeds ADA accessibility standards.

08. A few expressed they “liked” the “South gate” plan since it moved the gate.

Response: The Department is pleased the Joint Committee voted in support of locating the Barton Springs “south gate” in a location close to the current gate location instead of the alternate “East Entry Concept.”

09. Are non-profits available to help support “green”?

Response: The Friends of Barton Springs Pool have expressed interest in supporting “green” efforts and Department staff is currently exploring other partner options.

10. Consider parking extended to Robert E. Lee.

Response: The parking design displayed at the October Joint Committee meeting maximized the available area of parking. The Department is pleased the Joint Committee voted to pursue the design that would provide optimum parking. The final parking layout, however, will be dependent upon budget constraints.

11. Larger parking lot favorable – start SOS amendment quickly; City look at phased approach regarding amendment.

Response: The Parks and Recreation Department, Watershed Protection Department and Larson Burns & Smith are working to expedite completion of this process. Watershed has committed to assisting the Department in expediting approvals when possible. Permitting and work schedules will be created in a manner that allows the project work to be completed as efficiently as possible,

12. Examine trail through “disturbed area”; Inside fence “jungle like” on West.

Response: The current design incorporates the “south woods” area for an ADA accessible trail and interpretive opportunities.

13. Early on the suggestion for “International” competition.

Response: The Department is pleased to have Larson Burns and Smith on board to design and manage the Barton Springs Grounds Improvement Project. Through the City’s Request for Qualifications (RFQ) process, Larson Burns and Smith – along with two other firms - was selected based on qualifications for the Parks Improvements Rotation List, which was approved by City Council. The General Grounds project is a subsequent assignment from the rotation list. Utilizing the rotation list resulted in lower administrative costs and a substantially shorter assignment process versus going through a similar RFQ process specifically for the project.

14. Current lighting design is excessive; consider less light and no lights in trees.

Response: It is important to appropriately illuminate Barton Springs in order to ensure the safety of nighttime swimmers. With that in mind, the direction of lighting, the options for mounting lights, the type of lighting and the minimum illumination standards are being researched to ensure appropriate illumination for safety and security while minimizing “light pollution.”

15. AIPP Art project

a. When was the artist opportunity advertised?

Response: The Request for Qualifications was released on March 17, 2011. A Process Summary with details on the artwork opportunity, Call to Artists, and artist selection/approvals is attached.

b. Who decided what the criteria would be for the artist selection?

Response: A selection panel appointed by the Art in Public Places Panel reviews and discusses artist applications with a group of advisors and makes a recommendation to the Art in Public Places Panel and Arts Commission. The individual goals for the project as well as goals set forth by the Art in Public Places Program provide the review criteria used to guide artist selection. General programmatic criteria are listed here: <http://www.ci.austin.tx.us/aipp/selectioncriteria.htm>, and project goals are listed in the attached Process Summary.

c. Is reconsideration possible?

Response: An artist has been selected and approved by the Art in Public Places Panel and Arts Commission, and is under contract to design, fabricate and install the artwork. To deviate from this process at this point could involve legal issues and would have a negative impact on the funding for the artwork. This could compromise the ability for an artist to design in concert with the project's construction schedule.

16. What are the cost figures for the ravine banks?

Response: The design consultants are compiling the cost data, which will be presented at the November meeting of the Joint Committee.

17. Avoid narrow walkways.

Response: Walkways will be created to meet ADA accessibility standards and in a width appropriate to accommodate the estimated traffic.

18. Art around perimeter

Response: The Department met with Arts in Public Places (AIPP) coordinators and the selected artist to discuss art project options. The artist's contract limits the artwork to the design and fabrication of "seating strategies." The location of the artwork will be determined with input from Barton Springs stakeholders.