

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
by definition, where is the "urban core"?	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	Edit Made	Definition added on p20, callout added on p74, Urban Core boundary added for first two citywide maps in CH4 (74-78).	Email
bond funding \$45M for land acquisition. Does PARD have to pay WPD for strategic acquisition of properties when the land would be better maintained under PARD?	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	No edit needed	PARD Request for Follow up	Email
The heading refers to the Downtown Parks Vision - it's actually the "Downtown Austin Vision"	Melissa Barry, Vice President of Planning, Downtown Austin	Edit Made	Copy editing	Email
a fact sheet? of what?	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	Edit Made	deleted reference, included in engagement summary report	Email
Nature Trails and Natural Areas/Preserves (is WPD aware of these results? They are doing exactly the opposite.) Outdoor recreation/Stewardship services	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	No edit needed	Results have been shared, WPD a partner in implementation	Email
including the area between I-35 and Manchaca (area 16) as Southwest is completely inaccurate and it makes it sound like we have more than we do. If you look at the amenities we have (very minimal) and our neighborhood MFI (\$48k), we are much more similar to Dove Springs than with Circle C and lumping us in that category ensures that we never get any amenities. Staying consistent with 26 planning areas allows you to see a more complete picture over time. It should at least be included in the appendix.	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	No edit needed	No change, this was decided with staff early on and is only for the LRP and statistically valid survey results. Seperate planning areas are commonly used and included in Appendix A.	Email
our District Park (Garrison) does not have major (or any) indoor facilities, as per the definition.	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	No edit needed	This is the goal, current conditions are tracked in the park condition assessments	Email
Data is completely washed for my areas resulting from the use of arbitrarily clumped park planning areas vs the original 26. I would like to see all of the data used on behalf of planning area 16. "Nature Trails"...what constitutes "PARD maintained" and how many miles are you counting for PARD property along Williamson Creek in 78745 and 78744? There is another distinct group...the Southern Belt - South of Ben White along the Bergstrom Spur from E Stassney to Hwy71 @McCarty Lane	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	No edit needed	KM - shared demographics by planning area	Email
I question the accuracy of spending and acreage per person for San Antonio. Have you seen their extensive parks system that follows all of the creek system? They passed a huge parks bond a few years ago but annual spending might be housed under their Watershed department so not showing full picture.	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	Edit Made	TPL provided more info, added clarification on what is included in public spending. May update TPL benchmarking report if needed but Riverwalk is managed by a City of San Antonio Division and should be covered. Pop is higher in San Antonio so maybe that is skewing the per capita numbers	Email
2.3 Correct spelling to "stormwater"	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	Edit Made	Copy editing	Email

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
<p>Section A. 3.4 (Access to Waterways) Add as 3.4.4: Protect and expand future public access to the Colorado River waterfront through land acquisition, parkland dedication, and trail easements. My comments: Riverfront property is a unique treasure, and we should be working towards public access to as much of it as possible -- ideally with a continuous riverside trail.</p>	<p>Nina Rinaldi, Parks and Rec Board, District 1</p>	<p>Edit Made</p>	<p>New Recommendation</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Add as item B.3.3.2: Establish a new designation of "Trailhead" that can be assigned to any existing park type (such as District Park, Neighborhood Park, Pocket Park, etc). <i>The purpose would be to help prioritize investments in smaller parks that also serve as trailheads. Duncan Park is a prime example along the Shoal Creek Trail, and Copperfield Park is another example along the Walnut Creek Trail. We believe parks of this type merit special consideration because of their potential to amplify access to the outdoors beyond the park boundaries -- their dual purpose as both trailhead and park mean that activation of the space attracts people not only to the park but also to the trail. Also, because of their trail access they can serve a broader population not limited to residents of the adjacent neighborhood.</i></p>	<p>Nina Rinaldi, Operations and Development Manager, Shoal Creek Conservancy</p>	<p>Edit Made</p>	<p>New Recommendation</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Add to 8.1: Signage and Wayfinding Master Plan should include an emphasis on trailheads. Consider special signage for trailheads.</p>	<p>Nina Rinaldi, Operations and Development Manager, Shoal Creek Conservancy</p>	<p>Edit Made</p>	<p>New Recommendation</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>lower left green text...sentence doesn't make sense.</p>	<p>Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember</p>	<p>Edit Made</p>	<p>Copy editing</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Same comment (in two different places, the "Downtown Parks Vision" should be the "Downtown Austin Vision." (technically it's the Welcoming Places element of the Downtown Austin Vision)</p>	<p>Melissa Barry, Vice President of Planning, Downtown Austin</p>	<p>Edit Made</p>	<p>Copy editing</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Section C. 3.3.1 Existing text: Find opportunities to reduce barriers to hosting programs in urban spaces. Add: "Create a simplified way to offer programming in partnership with community groups and partner organizations." My comments: I would urge us to recognize that requiring a complicated process for implementing park programming presents an equity issue in and of itself. If the process is burdensome, only well-resourced entities will be able to navigate it. A simplified, accessible process opens the door to a bigger array of potential partners. Another place for this addition could be D.5.5.2 on p 120.</p>	<p>Nina Rinaldi, Parks and Rec Board, District 2</p>	<p>Edit Made</p>	<p>under 3.1, p 109</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>change "cold" to "could" halfway down under Total cost of Ownership section</p>	<p>Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember</p>	<p>Edit Made</p>	<p>Copy editing</p>	<p>Email</p>

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
how does a community get chosen for a Master Planning process? Is it different on AISD shared parks? WPD owned, formerly residential, lots?	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	No edit needed	PARD Request for info. PARD uses a matrix to track and prioritize all projects including master plans.	Email
Section E: Optimize & Improve Efficiency of Operations Add as #7: Make it easier to apply for PARD contracts, friendlier to small businesses <i>RESPONSE- perhaps we can say this differently as the process is somewhat outside of PARD. Perhaps- "Review contracting process and identity ways to streamline."</i> Add as 7.1 Move to an online bid submittal system with e-signature technology	Nina Rinaldi, Parks and Rec Board, District 3	Edit Made	Added instead as #2, following strategies are re-numbered accordingly	Email
far right...change "are" to "is" designed	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	Edit Made	Copy editing	Email
"Typically, Level 1..." sentence doesn't make sense.	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	Edit Made	Copy editing	Email
using both Sub-division and subdivision is confusing.	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	Edit Made	Copy editing	Email
says GAVA was established in 2018 but I've been participating with GAVA as a Park adopter and resident leader since 2013. Last bullet doesn't make sense.	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	Edit Made	Changed to 2015, consistent with website. Copy editing - GAVA self-identified as being established in 2018. I believe this reflects when they gained their 501(c)3 status. They begin initial efforts as far back as 2012, per their website: https://www.goaustinvamosaustin.org/our-beginnings	Email
How can Public Green & Wild be included in the list of partners?	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	No edit needed	No info provided yet	Email
Where are the individual Park Scorecards located?	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	No edit needed	Not yet released	Email
I thought it was Strategic Direction 2023 not 2033 (far right)	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	Edit Made	Copy editing	Email
why use old MFI numbers? They don't show the whole story using 2017 figures.	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	No edit needed	Using most recent data available by Census. Individual park planning area breakdown demographic are available and provided.	Email
Add Duncan Park master plan implementation to the Park Development & Implementation list	Nina Rinaldi, Operations and Development Manager, Shoal Creek Conservancy	Edit Made	New Recommendation	Email
Add "AARC Master Plan" to Park Development & Implementation list	Nina Rinaldi, Parks and Rec Board, District 4	Edit Made	* Need to add in GIS	Email
Add: Explore urban trail connections from Walnut Creek Trail to nearby PARD Facilities such as Gus Garcia Rec Center and AARC	Nina Rinaldi, Parks and Rec Board, District 5	Edit Made	* Need to add in GIS	Email

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
I am opposed to area 16 being included and data washed by including it in SW. We have VERY few parks and park amenities in South Central Austin, planning area 16. With this slide...we will never get any improvements. Our MFI is 48K. Our % of hispanic population is high. Our % of poverty is high. Our risk of displacement is very high.	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	No edit needed	KM - shared demographics by planning area	Email
And Williamson Creek Greenbelt ABSOLUTELY needs to be included under Master Planning. It's the ONLY shot we've got for improving health outcomes, mitigating flooding, protecting the natural environment and wildlife corridor, connectivity (especially under 35, Brodie and MoPac), equity, linear park connecting pocket and button parks, VCT, Dick Nichols, Onion Creek, community gardens and other places for people.	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	Edit Made	Note that Williamson Creek Greenbelt is already included under acquisition and trail development. It is now added under master planning as well.	Email
Under "Partnerships", can we add Public Green & Wild?	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	No edit needed	KM - discussed, not adding at this time	Email
"Work with AISD"...it's St Elmo not ST/MO.	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	Edit Made	Copy editing	Email
looking at revenue streams...have you considered relocating the fee we all pay on our AE bill for the Code department. I don't know of a single soul who agrees with that charge or wants to fund/support that department in any way. However, I think people would be HAPPY to reallocate that funding stream to PARD and probably willing to add another \$1 or \$2 per month. We could also set up a PARD Venmo account coupled with a really cool PSA style marketing campaign so people could just donate effortlessly from their own phone.	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	Edit Made	Under Implementation Guide/Funding Options (page 177), under External Funding, add under private donations: "PARD could also explore opportunities for donations and crowdfunding for special programs and projects."	Email
I would like to have access to the Park Scorecards for every park. It would be beneficial if these were "proofed" by the individual stakeholders.	Kate Mason-Murphy, Parks Board District 3, GAVA Advisory Boardmember	No edit needed	forthcoming	Email
Emphasize greenbelts and open space with limited trails and limited public access to ensure and protect undisturbed areas for wildlife and ecosystems.	David King, Zoning and Platting Cor	No edit needed	See Greenbelt definition on p 56, see also 2.1 and 3.4 (balance trails with water quality and ecosystem preservation where safe)	Email
Emphasize nature-based playscapes and nature-based playgrounds for children and children with disabilities to interact with and learn about nature.	David King, Zoning and Platting Cor	Edit Made	Added nature-play / natural elements under B. 7 describing Universal Access	Email
Ensure all parks, greenbelts, trails, and facilities are affordable to low-income families, equitable to communities of color, and accessible to people protected by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).	David King, Zoning and Platting Cor	No edit needed	See previous updated under B.7.3	Email
Balance the need for additional parks and park facilities with acquisition of trails and greenbelts.	David King, Zoning and Platting Cor	No edit needed	Covered under A & B strategies which include both parkland and connections via trails and greenbelts.	Email
Prohibit micromobility devices (e-scooters) on all parkland and greenbelts.	David King, Zoning and Platting Cor	NO edit needed	See B.5.4. This is an emerging issue and a conclusion has not yet been reached on the best regulatory framework. There is a trial program and limited speed requirements on parkland and in greenbelts.	Email

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
Consistently enforce speed limits on all trails and greenbelts.	David King, Zoning and Platting Cor	No edit needed	See B.5.4. This is an emerging issue and a conclusion has not yet been reached on the best regulatory framework. There is a trial program and limited speed requirements on parkland and in greenbelts.	Email
Provide recycling containers at all greenbelts, parks, trails, and facilities.	David King, Zoning and Platting Cor	No edit needed	Covered under E7 - facilities and recycling goals, carry-in and carry-out signage	Email
Require all events at parks and facilities to meet City goals regarding net-zero greenhouse gas emissions, net-zero water use, zero waste, and 100% recycling.	David King, Zoning and Platting Cor	No edit needed	The citywide event ordinance requires events tiers 2-4 to prepare a waste management plan, which minimally requires trash and recycling. The ordinance does not mandate composting when it comes to waste. It does not mandate items such as composting, percentages, or similar. It establishes floors for events - but not mandated ceilings. The net zero water use has not been addressed, but the topic could also include quite a bit of discussion on water use, and other items such as waste water reduction. It would likely be more complex than issuing of a mandate and would require additional engagement and feedback.	Email
Prohibit styrofoam and fossil fuels at all events at all parks and facilities.	David King, Zoning and Platting Cor	No edit needed	Styrofoam has been prohibited by policy for 10 or more years, and now is included for park in the citywide event ordinance. Fossil fuel mandates are not included.	Email
Minimize commercialization of and franchise agreements on parkland.	David King, Zoning and Platting Cor	No edit needed	See recommendation for vending under C.5.4, working with EDD	Email
Reduce and eliminate single-occupancy vehicle parking lots on parkland and emphasize mass transit access at all parks and facilities.	David King, Zoning and Platting Cor	No edit needed	Covered under B 10 - reviewed with ATD, strategies to reduce parking and better connect transit access	Email
<p>As I recall from your presentation last night, the Long Range Plan includes an employment program to help homeless people transition from camps on parkland to permanent supportive housing.</p> <p>Homeless people in camps on parkland should not be "evicted" from parkland, they should be treated with dignity, respect, and compassion and provided with permanent housing with services (health care, food, etc), resources, and job training.</p> <p>Homeless people utilizing parkland should receive the same public safety protections afforded park users. Homeless people are among the most vulnerable members of our communities and have no safety net.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this input regarding the Long Range Plan.</p>	David King, Zoning and Platting Cor	No edit needed	See E. 2 & 3, highlighted opportunities to expand the Workforce First program, park ambassador roles, and partner with other organizations	Email

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
<p>I regrettably had to leave early last night, but thank you so much for presenting to ZAP! To echo Commissioner King's point, I would love to know more about PARD's position on ending homelessness in Austin. I am both a Commissioner and an employee at the Ending Community Homelessness Coalition, so I think it is fantastic that PARD is partnering with workforce initiatives to engage our neighbors experiencing homelessness. That said, I think it would be beneficial to capitalize on the interactions that PARD staff are having with individuals experiencing homelessness, since they are likely having regular and intimate interactions with folks. Since the data indicates that 'Housing First' is the most effective way to get individuals back into housing, it would be great to have PARD's support on that. I would love to know if you think there is interest in supporting this and would be happy to discuss it further with you.</p>	<p>Abby Tatkow, Zoning and Platting Commission, District 4</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. We did provide the following city-wide recommendation: Engage with and provide work opportunities in parks to help people experiencing homelessness. Austin's Ending Homelessness Coalition estimates there are 2,147 homeless individuals in Austin, a five percent increase from 2017. Many individuals expressed a general feeling that urban public spaces are not being taken advantage of and are pass through spaces for individuals experiencing homelessness, which is only amplified by maintenance concerns. 2.1. Strengthen and expand the Workforce First program. Work with partners to secure additional funding and support to expand the Workforce First program, which currently pays individuals experiencing homelessness to help remove trash in public parks. Expansion could include full-time park ambassador roles or a workforce</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Please also find ways to enforce off leash areas. It seems like all of austin is off leash, and if you ask anyone to leash their dog, they lose their minds. This makes using spaces intended for sports very difficult and it makes parks hard to use for people who are afraid of dogs. (I am a current dog owner and former dog fearer after an attack)</p>	<p>Matt</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>Addressed under 6, p 92</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>Businesses within the city limits are being held accountable for not complying to the Universal Recycling Ordinance and are required to have a diversion plan. What is PARD's diversion plan? Does the Long-Range Plan incorporate the City's efforts related to Zero Waste? How can the city's compostable waste beused in parks? Can parks have an more active role in Zero Waste initiatives?</p>	<p>Jennifer</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>See D6.4, p129</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>I hope that the spaces set aside for dogs will be thoroughly vetted.Red Bud Isle has been over loved and is not the tranquil, pleasant smelling place in once was.</p>		<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>Addressed under 6, p 92</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>Since our lakes are not safe for dogs during the summer due to blue green algae please consider adding a pool or water feature so that our dogs can exercise safely.</p>	<p>Sheila Medford</p>	<p>Edit Made</p>	<p>Added under 6.3 Standards for Off Leash Areas</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>Park spaces need to have more recycling and composting options and containers. I've had to carry my recycling from a park to the nearest library to dispose of it. Most residents and visitors will not do this.</p>	<p>Jennifer</p>	<p>Edit Made</p>	<p>Added under E.7.4, E.7.5</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
<p>Dogs are not tax paying members of this city. They poop wherever is convenient to them, frequently their owners don't notice or fail to pick up after them, which then creates a breeding ground for pests, bacteria, & disease, which then gets stepped on by innocent tax paying citizens and/or washes into the water table a degrades our environment even faster than is already occurring as a result of the City Council's short-sighted, ill-thought policies. If we want to protect land and water we should discourage people from letting dogs run around on parkland. Don't take away public property from the general public that would essentially reserve VIP areas for dogs as well as reward their owners for perpetuating these problems.</p>	<p>Kris Williams</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>See 92-93, under 6</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>My dog may not pay taxes, but I sure as heck do — a LOT of taxes. One of the reasons I moved to Austin because of the dog parks but little by little they have been taken away or shrunken (Bull Creek, Auditorium Shores). Bad owners let their dogs poop wherever they want, but most owners are responsible people who pick up after their dogs. I am hoping that Austin provides more areas for dogs to play off-leash</p>	<p>Kristen Remeza</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>See 92-93, under 6</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>Yes, please! More access to water. Can we create a swimming beach on Lady Bird Lake?</p>	<p>Eve Chenu</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>See 3.4.1, p 89</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>I have noticed that the City of Austin is listed as the owner of two substantial plots of land, Property Identification Number 128486 and 128485, between the ends of Las Colinas and Jorge Drives and 2222. These plots are not only one of the last vestiges of untouched Hill County in north central Austin, they are in proximity to the Bright Leaf Preserve and Oak Ridge Reservoir Park and could easily be connected to them by hiking trails. These plots provide important wildlife habitat and during spring migration, huge flocks of cedar waxwings and robins, as well as other migrants such as yellow-rumped warblers, orange-crowned warblers, and black and white warblers, use this land and the nearby greenbelt running along Las Colinas Drive to roost, rest, and feed (I have seen a golden-cheeked warbler in the area). Has the City of Austin given any consideration to preserving these two plots as parks? This land is not only beautiful, with wooded areas, wildflowers, and wonderful views, it is important wildlife habitat, especially as continued development in the area displaces many animals and birds.</p>	<p>Sharon Weintraub</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>Great idea. This is too specific to add into the plan document but will be considered by the Park Acquisition and Development teams at PARD.</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>Wow, nice to see there is concern for over-development and the need to preserve existing parks (esp. after hearing about the Ford Commons issue) and add to greenbelts to protect wildlife, water quality, clean air (trees help), beauty, quiet.</p>	<p>Carol Philipson</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>no change</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>Good to hear! clearly after the flood and great algae bloom of 2019, we need green transitional spaces to filter water as it finds its way to our waterways!</p>	<p>Matt</p>	<p>Edit Made</p>	<p>Added language under A2.3 "...continue building green stromwater infrastructure projects that filter water, improve water quality and improve environmental and public health."</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
<p>It's nice that more parkland is planned for the Austin area. But the current parks are a mess. How are all the parks going to be maintained? The only truly nice parks in Austin now are Zilker and Butler and even those need a lot of work. There are trees with bagworms. Ant beds. And big mudholes caused by who-knows-what. There has been no rain for months, yet Zilker has large muddy water holes. And the hole at the Butler/Auditorium Shores dog park by the drinking fountain (NOT caused by the fountain!) is a huge mess and has been since the park was supposedly built out by C3, or whatever that production company is called. When will that mudhole be remedied? It's been five years, at least! Other parks, like Stacy and Gillis, are a crusty, dry disaster. Sprinkler systems or at least water trucks are needed during the hot, dry months. And Gillis Park has been taken over by homeless camps along the periphery and in the pavilion, directly adjacent to the children's playground. Police have been told not to do anything unless they get a call for a crime.</p>	<p>Suzie</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>Our interpretation: concern that maintenance and enforcement should be prioritized, that the quality standards are not high enough and should be addressed more so than acquisition. The plan acknowledges this, but does not see these two as mutually exclusive - it instead aspires to pursue both.</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>Repair is needed for the pond at Beverly S. Sheffield Northwest Park!</p>	<p>Amy Wright</p>	<p>Edit Made</p>		<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>I wonder if this acreage is high enough and fast enough based on the growth of our population. If land is not acquired fast enough, it will be out of reach in future years.</p>	<p>Sarah Jenkins</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>		<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>Walsh Landing: Build a system of docks and piers and T-Heads configured to better handle the variety of watercraft and boat sizes. Consider commercial public/private partnerships to better manage the park. Expand the No-Wake Zone from Walsh Landing to Tom Miller Dam.</p>	<p>Gene Smith</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>This is too detailed of a recommendation to include in the LRP, but is a great idea. A more general version of this is included on p154 of the LRP under "Park Development & Implementation"</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>Aside from accessible spaces, parking should not be free in the park system. Small parking fees add up to help fund and support park maintenance and also encourage people to carpool, walk, bike or bus to parks - which allows for cleaner air in our parks and also reduces pressure to increase impervious cover in the park system.</p>	<p>sarah</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>The LRP does not suggest that parking spots at PARD facilities should be free, only that the fee structure should be evaluated.</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>Please do not identify environmentally sensitive features online.</p>	<p>Sarah Jenkins</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>The web-based information will help provide information on recreation features, to help people find recreation resources. This information will not put environmentally sensitive features in danger</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>Current and foreseeable access to parks requires the use of autos so the available parking for them is vital. Curtailment of parking is essentially making the parks exclusive and not available to all. Considering our environment for several months a year, it requires the parking of autos close to the use areas to bring the shade, chairs and coolers.</p>	<p>Scott Smiley</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>We are sensitive to this issue - which is why p105 recommendation B10 suggests that the parking fee structure needs to take this into consideration. However, cars are only one way people get to parks and so it must be balanced with the full range of users.</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>
<p>We should substantially improve existing parks as a priority before adding more. Many are not maintained on a regular basis, so weeds take over open spaces and soil washes away. An example is Reed Park. While Pease Park has a group supporting substantial renovation, the green belt along Shoal Creek, especially north of the park, is in poor shape. In addition to the issues caused by the landslide, topsoil constantly washes away, exposing recently installed irrigation.</p>	<p>Brian Greig</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>Maintenance is a critical aspect of this plan, but acquisition cannot be delayed until all current parks are in peak condition. We therefore suggest pursuing them simultaneously as a way of making sure residents don't only have access to parkland but rather have access to QUALITY parkland.</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
There should not be a fee to park at neighborhood parks. Many are not served by public transportation.	Brian Greig	No edit needed	The LRP does not suggest that parking spots at PARD facilities should have a fee associated with them, only that the fee structure should be evaluated.	Virtual Meeting Konveio
Totally agree - the PARD website is very difficult to navigate and just not clear. It needs to be simplified big time.	Jennifer Orr	No edit needed		Virtual Meeting Konveio
I hope large enough spaces will be reserved in each park for people who want a quiet, immersive experience.	Sarah Jenkins	No edit needed	The LRP prioritizes this through the strategies listed under "A: Ensure Parks Act as a Relief from Urban Life" - unstructured, natural spaces are a critical aspect of the park system and will remain so.	Virtual Meeting Konveio
As small as Joslin Park is, over the years no one has try to make it ADA Compliance. Why do you spend so much money on all other Parks and just skip pass these small Parks like Joslin Park that are in Residentialneighborhoods ? We are in District# 5. We would like to see at least 2 Handicap Ramps on the Cimarron Trail side of the Park because there is no entrance to get in the Park on the Redd street side for the Handicap at all. Unless your NOT in a wheel chair. There should be two Parking spaces for Handicap people to be able to park as well on Cimarron Trail for them. Can you explain.	Gil Jenkins	Edit Made	Added on p170 under Park Development and Implementation	Virtual Meeting Konveio
If providing "equitable access" for Austin citizens is a goal here, then please begin with Zilker, our crown jewel park.It is ridiculous and aggravating that a music festival that lasts two weekends, SIX DAYS, manages to get our best park closed to the public for more than a month.And the most beautiful time of year, to boot.Thousands and thousands of people literally destroy the park, which has to be re-sodded in many places every year, and takes months to recuperate. This year the park FINALLY looks good just in time for another two weekends of destruction by the ACL Fest.It should be moved to the racetrack outside town.And give the park back to Austin taxpayers.	Suzie	No edit needed	This came up consistently throught the LRP engagement process and is included for further evaluation under strategy C4 on p110	Virtual Meeting Konveio
This is a great idea and can be implemented today. The land around the upper end of the Southern Walnut Trail bike path is owned by the city (formerly "farmer Dave"). The city should not allow the development of this tract. It could be used now for farming, demonstration gardening, etc. There could be a homeless component as well. Maybe add a new Mobil Loaves and Fishes neighborhood that maintained the farm and sold the produce as well as provided water and snacks for trail users. There is a lot of opportunity here but the city MUST NOT DEVELOP the property.	Andy Jones	No edit needed	This is great input and will be considered when planning takes place for that parkland. This is, however, too detailed to include in the LRP document for the city as a whole - it is better dealt with through a local community process with detailed information on the site.	Virtual Meeting Konveio
Preservation (and enhancement) should include Hancock Recreation Center AND Hancock Golf Course. This is an incredible green space in central Austin that should remain as it has been.Pressure from development minded sources that only look at the profitability of a space should be recognized as such. Parks aren't for profit.The entire community uses this space, including special events such as cross country track and disc golf.It's historic, and important and should be not only protected but also supported.	William Biggs	No edit needed	Both are included in preservation/enhancement. This LRP suggests on p154 that PARD "study feasibility of golf and other recreational opportunities that can enhance sustainability of course" - this is with the intent of preserving the important role of this asset for Austin.	Virtual Meeting Konveio
Any added lighting should meet International Dark Sky standards.	Andy Jones	Edit Made	See addition on p. 109 - C.2.5	Virtual Meeting Konveio

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
Being in touch with the natural environment is good for our physical and mental health. Dense use can conflict with this and may not be the highest use of parkland.	Sarah Jenkins	No edit needed	This sentiment is captured under strategy A	Virtual Meeting Konveio
What does this even mean?!	Suzie	No edit needed	the public realm is a way of referring to spaces used by the public - such as streets, parks, plazas, bus stops, sidewalks, plazas - that may or may not be owned by the City but that are part of the public's experience of the place. Enhancing/elevating the public realm is both visual (making it more beautiful and engaging) but also about ensuring that it facilitates the activities and programs that will make the space lively, vibrant, interesting and fun. Strategy C1 is about integrating the downtown PARD parkland into a network of open spaces and streetscapes that together offer a high-quality, varied experience.	Virtual Meeting Konveio
Yes, lighting is sorely needed at the park that used to be called Auditorium Shores!	Suzie	Edit Made	Added under Central Park Development & Implementation for "Auditorium Shores at Town Lake Metro Park", Park Planning Area 17 (p. 154)	Virtual Meeting Konveio
Commercializing our public parks for beer gardens, a private/public ferris wheel is not good for the general population. Parks must free, maximizing engagement with nature for healing from a busy, crowded life in Austin. Avoid putting a carnival atmosphere and fees between people and the protected natural environment. Let's keep our parks as natural resources avoiding anything which approaches the Roman arenas which were programmed to "appease the masses" and appeal to humanities baser instincts.	Megan Meisenbach	No edit needed	This sentiment is captured under strategy A	Virtual Meeting Konveio
Can a soccer park be built and set aside for just that purpose? Zilker is over-run most week nights with multiple soccer games, which take up a lot of room, forcing picnickers and people with pups who just want to relax in a nature environment to sit on the hill, unable to use the vast expanse of the park itself.	Suzie	No edit needed	original comment was in response to D.6 (p.121). This is too detailed to incorporate into the LRP - this is best addressed through a more local park planning process with local input on tradeoffs and desired balance of uses, rather than at the citywide scale of the LRP.	Virtual Meeting Konveio
We need more publicly available tennis courts! The demand has completely outstripped supply — making it impossible to find courts in Central Austin. And we need the park courts we do have to be resurfaced so they are playable. Shipe is always full of people, but those courts are pathetic. And yes, I know Pharr will get resurfaced, but while that is happening we'll lose even more courts. And ATC is a windy out-of-the-way joke.	Kristen Remeza	Edit Made	Although tennis courts are not specifically mentioned, this is included under B6 on p103 - tennis courts are an example of PARD's commitment to "achieve a more even distribution of facilities that have a strong citywide interest" - added tennis courts and disc golf courses as examples of two other facilities with strong citywide interest	Virtual Meeting Konveio
Focus on equity: hire people from the community who represent the community to lead these programs. Fund racial equity focused work where young folks (and others) from the communities get paid to provide their input & do the work.	Kerstin Johansson	Edit Made	Added under D.6.3 (p121)	Virtual Meeting Konveio
Add more tennis courts in the Austin areas.	Fernando Velasco	Edit Made	Although tennis courts are not specifically mentioned, this is included under B6 on p103 - tennis courts are an example of PARD's commitment to "achieve a more even distribution of facilities that have a strong citywide interest" - added tennis courts and disc golf courses as examples of two other facilities with strong citywide interest	Virtual Meeting Konveio

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
Absolutely, Fernando! We don't have nearly enough to meet the need!	Kristen Remeza	Edit Made	Although tennis courts are not specifically mentioned, this is included under B6 on p103 - tennis courts are an example of PARD's commitment to "achieve a more even distribution of facilities that have a strong citywide interest" - added tennis courts and disc golf courses as examples of two other facilities with strong citywide interest	Virtual Meeting Konveio
So while we wait for a "master plan", what can be done to improve the parks we already have? For instance, the "dog park" at Auditorium Shores.... what genius designed that one? The wooden fence is cute, but totally useless when it comes to containing the dogs that use the park. Dogs of all sizes can easily run under the fence, while their owners have to struggle to climb over or through it to rescue runaway dogs from adjacent Riverside Dr.Even chicken wire along the bottom of that long fence would solve the problem. And it is a problem.	Suzie	Edit Made	Added under park development and implementation for the Central Combined Planning Area, p154	Virtual Meeting Konveio
Prioritize meeting with Office of Sustainability to drastically reduce the PARD environmental footprint. Our (PARD's) contributions to greenhouse gases could be drastically reduced. Our department should be a model for sustainability and low impact. We should also be focusing on how we are going to adapt and mitigate climate crisis impacts. Reducing our collective carbon footprint should be immediately put into action.	Kerstin Johansson	No edit needed	Included in detail on p129 of plan under strategy E6	Virtual Meeting Konveio
Who are these partners? Why is it so hard to work with PARD? So far, PARD has not been an easy partner for conservancies. The Public-Private partnerships need to be a given for PARD, council needs to get on board, and PARD needs to provide way more leadership in making these work. They can sometimes be almost anti-conservancy. That seems ridiculous to me. Take citizens volunteers and their donated money and use it!The process is so difficult to work with PARD, I am surprised more citizens have not just given up. Why is this? Who can make this change?Public private partnerships for public land are in no way new....	Jennifer Orr	No edit needed	Partners are listed in the MP p138-149. PARD is committed to enhancing and leveraging public-private partnerships, and this plan will help guide PARD towards that goal.	Virtual Meeting Konveio

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
<p>The City Parks and Recreation Department needs rules for private agencies developing parks - Agencies such as the Austin Parks Foundation. These rules are needed to protect the city from potential lawsuit for health and safety, to ensure efficient use of funds, and ensure best practices are used.</p> <p>These rules need to include postings at the parks being worked on for transparency to the public. This also should be done because of the potentiality of fraud being committed. And the actual fact that FRAUD is being committed in our parks.</p> <p>Rules need to include; public disclosure about what is to be done, what is going to be changed or removed, public meetings and postings, amounts of money spent - similar to a highway project. Also the amounts of money being invoiced for donated materials - Such as mulch given by the city for free but invoiced as a material that is paid for. The amount of volunteer time given to projects should also be transparently displayed at the end of a project and maybe even if the volunteers are park attendees. Rules also should include contact points for other city agencies such as fire/rescue, flood control, building code and police among others, in order that these agencies to approve of changes to our parks that may effect them or the city. ie; illegally mulching in flood control areas (being done repeatedly in order to make money, yet eroding and impacting Colorado river or our creeks adversely), illegally spraying herbicide in our parks (having been done illegally by e-corps unskilled at risk youth in order to make money and unfortunately endangering the at risk youth and other park attendees to CANCER causing herbicides, not to mention being done in an ill conceived effort to eliminate poison ivy in an area park and their not knowing how it is propagated or it's life cycle and how the two tallest trees in the park were poisoned and died, there is still poison ivy in the park, they have taken out much of the other ground cover in order to spray herbicides more effectively, and poison ivy grows faster than the other ground cover – poor best practices), limiting access to first responder lake access (converting ramps for first responders motor boats into impassable stairs), limiting parking access, building structures according to city building code (stairs that are dangerous and prevent access).</p> <p>In the past the PARD director has limited the number of parks an individual may adopt (one person had 8 – If \$35,000 in work is invoiced at each park this is \$250,000 per year in income. Money that should go to our parks not into the pockets of an organizer). But overall the access of the Parks Foundation to PARD and other city agencies is unfettered. This is a private group that is funded by the rent for use of Zilker park by Austin City Limits for the music festival. This money goes directly to the Parks Foundation to be invoiced by a very few people. The Parks Foundations federal tax disclosure forms (1-9) have discrepancies on the amount of money being reported not conforming to the amounts that were given by ACL. I had a discussion with the accountant for the Parks Foundation and she was confident that there would be no problems with the invoicing and accounting “because she had a friend who was a forensic accountant and no one would find out where funds went.”</p> <p>PARD should have it's own organization for creating volunteer work projects by citizens. It could access the money that is coming from ACL directly to help make our parks better. Instead PARD chooses to let an intermediary siphon off funds with NO ACCOUNTABILITY, decisions being made for personal monetary purposes instead of what</p>	<p>phil burns</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>PARD addresses many of the issues raised in C.4 and E.4 and E.5.</p>	<p>Virtual Meeting Konveio</p>

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
Make all PARD events zero waste (recycle and composting on site of the events). I have been to many events where we are still not recycling.	Kerstin Johansson	Edit Made	Added under E6.4, which now reads "Implement comprehensive recycling and composting standards to meet zero waste goals. Ensure that all PARD facilities and events adhere to recycling standards and provide 'organic diversion' / composting opportunities and community education."	Virtual Meeting Konveio
I am a member of the board of the Shoal Creek Conservancy, and I am glad to work to coordinate discussions and activities between PARD and the Conservancy to the extent such does not already take place.	Brian Greig	No edit needed		Virtual Meeting Konveio
I want to activate Beverly S Sheffield Northwest District Park. This park needs a master plan to become a vibrant part of our neighborhood and community. I will work with the city on this plan and work hard to bring value to this park.	Steven R Johnson	No edit needed	Park Master Plan and level 2-3 development already included in recommendations, see p 154	Virtual Meeting Konveio
I would like to help in the master planning and implementation processes for redevelopment of Beverly S. Sheffield Northwest District Park.	Amy Wright	No edit needed	Park Master Plan and level 2-3 development already included in recommendations, see p 154	Virtual Meeting Konveio
I would be quite interested in seeing those courts resurfaced so they are playable. Such a resource that is being squandered. I can help with that process if necessary!	Kristen Remeza	Edit Made	Park Master Plan and level 2-3 development already included Beverly S. Sheffield Northwest District Park in recommendations, see p 154. Added "determine if there is a need for court resurfacing" under this existing Master Planning recommendation	Virtual Meeting Konveio
I'm interested in this strategic goal of the LRP.	Amy Wright	No edit needed		Virtual Meeting Konveio
Where is the funding going to come from to retain muny?		No Edit Needed	Funding for each project is explored on a case-by case basis, and could include: bonds, grants, general funds, public-private partnerships. Funding options for exploration by PARD are included starting on p 178 (Chapter 5)	In-Person Community Meeting
How does Beverly Sheffield NW Park move from planning to implementation?		No edit needed	Master Planning is the first step towards implementation - it is the roadmap for what needs to get done and in what order. PARD moves from planning to implentation on all parks master plans via the park development levels (described on page 136-137) and the specific phasing established by the master planning process.	In-Person Community Meeting
Lighting on trails where there are none		No edit needed	Addressed on p109 under C.2	In-Person Community Meeting
Extend off leash area in Pease by the Janet Fish water area		No edit needed	Too detailed for the LRP, and would be covered under Pease Park Master Plan Implementation	In-Person Community Meeting
Get rid of the construction staging area off Stratfoed Drive by Garden Center & Nature Center. Unsightly and should be attractive park		No edit needed	PARD has addressed this area through clean-up and removal of staging material.	In-Person Community Meeting
Treat urban trail corridors as greenbelts (priority)		no edit needed	These are already a priority and will continue to be priorities as described in the LRP Strategies A and B.	In-Person Community Meeting
Emphasis on connectivity accross i-35 as key linkage need.		No edit needed	See the Austin Strategic Mobilty Plan	In-Person Community Meeting
Doris Miller - Resume the following all over city; fly football, baseball, softball		Edit Made	PARD addresses the need to assess commnuty feedback for programming shifts in D.6 however, perhaps we can add additional point: Develop strategies to assess community response or feedback to the addition and/or removal of programming.	In-Person Community Meeting
Add Millenium to LRP		No Edit Needed	Complex is owned by the City of Austin and managed by ASM Global. Consider if there is an oppotunity to explore specific building needs through discussion with management.	In-Person Community Meeting

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
Add Rosewood		No Edit Needed	Recommendation for PARD facility SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis to identify small scale improvements to parking, access, lighting, surrounding recreational amenities and features. The intent is to identify quick, easy to fix solutions and changes that can be put in place at each PARD Facility.	In-Person Community Meeting
Better Transition for community when leadership changes- new rec center community feels like they're starting over ever change impacts KIDS		Edit Made	Recommendation for PARD facility SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis to identify small scale improvements to parking, access, lighting, surrounding recreational amenities and features. The intent is to identify quick, easy to fix solutions and changes that can be put in place at each PARD Facility.	In-Person Community Meeting
Add the Carver masterplan to the recommendations		Edit Made	Master Plan to start very soon and funding for enhancement or expansion was included in 2018 bond. Added on p. 164 under Park Development & Implementation	In-Person Community Meeting
Holly Power consistent with & enhance master plan reconnection opportunity		Edit Made	Under recommendations in East: Park Development: Change Holly Power Plant to Holly Shores Master Plan	In-Person Community Meeting
Let's target a park in each region to build 4 bocce courts for robust league play and interaction.		Edit Made	Added "bocce courts" under examples of facilities with strong citywide interest in B.6. on p103.	In-Person Community Meeting
Please continue to develop trail access along Colorado River waterfront, so we have a longer continuous trail		No edit needed	Although not specifically named, this is already goal of the plan, stated more generally in B.4 on p101	In-Person Community Meeting
Update for connecting Southern Walnut Creek Greenbelt to Northern so you can ride west under I-35, 183, Mopac		No edit needed	See p 158	In-Person Community Meeting
Let's target a park to build bocce courts we can help raise funds		No edit needed	This is best addressed at a local level rather than in the citywide LRP. More public feedback is needed to determine where a bocce court would be best used.	In-Person Community Meeting
Continue to develop Shoal Creek Trail northward and improve E-W connections to the Shoal Creek Corridor.		No edit needed	Although not specifically named, this is already goal of the plan, stated more generally in B.4 on p101	In-Person Community Meeting
Bolm Park What are the plans to develop Bolm Park?		Edit Made	THIS WAS AN OVERSIGHT. Added under: East Recommendations Master Planning including Level 1 development	In-Person Community Meeting
Music Events in Guerro Park?		No edit needed	This is best addressed at a local level rather than in the citywide LRP.	In-Person Community Meeting
A bridge in between I-35 and Pleasant Valley Road (at new fishing pier at trailhead for boardwalk is ideal...We need this		NO edit needed	This comment may be referring to Onion Creek Metro Park, in which case, this is an improvement that is underway.	In-Person Community Meeting
With the growth that this area will experience in the next 20 years there should be more trails connecting the community to parks and more community centers (maybe tell the city that a \$200 million library makes more sense in this area	Dante	No edit needed	See B.4 on p101	In-Person Community Meeting
I have been reading about the Onion Creek greenway for years. I know it was partially washed out a few years ago but I love this idea and look forward to its completion.		No edit needed		In-Person Community Meeting
Highlight need to embrace exploring alternative revenue sources opportunities citywide? Add as goal!		No edit needed	See Implementation Guide Funding Options, p176-181	In-Person Community Meeting

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
Why is hispanic highlighted on all sheets?		No edit needed	Hispanic residents make up a significant portion of the population of Austin and the proportion of Hispanic residents is an important aspect of park planning because it may effect the languages needed for signage and programming to effectively serve the community nearby. Its also related to how the Census reports percentage of population rthat is Hispanic, which is pulled out seperately from the other categories shown.	In-Person Community Meeting
CommonsFord: mainatin roads, excellent job turing into back to wild, enforcement dogs off leash bank stabilization similar to Emms		Edit Made	Off-leash dog enforcement is included under strategy A.6 for the city as a whole, which applies to all PARD parks including this one. Added road maintenance.	In-Person Community Meeting
Rebuild concrete dam on Bull Creek This will allow for more swimming like it was in the 1960's, 70's & 80's		No edit needed	PARD will share comment with Watershed Protection Dept and evaluate the feasibility of this recommendation. No revision at this time.	In-Person Community Meeting
Educate bike riders, pedestrians on "pass on left", "walk on right" this is key bicycling area for young & old		no edit needed	Highlight for signage and park ambassadors	In-Person Community Meeting
Partner with bike shops to distribute and install bicycle bells on select dates		no edit needed		In-Person Community Meeting
Consider partnership w trravis Ardubon for birding education center at Commons Ford		Edit Made		In-Person Community Meeting
Target Metropolitan district parks for affordable housing "missing middle" market vote & permanently affordable. More people deserve to live next door to Zilker, etc. Not just wealthy families		no edit needed	Parkland cannot be developed for housing	In-Person Community Meeting
Red Bud Isle water sports park longer than off leash- improve bridge & work with LCRA to park & walk safely to Red Bud		Edit Made		In-Person Community Meeting
Move commons Ford Metropolitan Park to Park Dev		Edit Made		In-Person Community Meeting
Good presentation. Like the improving on the update old park.	Apolinar Garza	No edit needed		In-Person Community Meeting
The parks around Palmer Center have a shade tree need. The ones the that died were not replaced. The area at the large "hump" has no tree shade whatsoever and need it. Also Quiet-zones for seniors with no scooters, babies, does, noise, etc. SHADE. Inequality of funding for babies & children & noise forgetting sessions & quiet shade. Also, keeping clean & respecting our home for people who don't. A sign "Please leave this area as you would like to find it."	Margarget Wells	NO edit needed	Summary: desire for shade trees and quiet zones, no-scooter zones. We are working on integrating a recommendation for increased shade cover in parks. See B.5.4 for scooter recommendations. See E.7.4 for cleanliness recommendations. Regarding "quiet zones" - I don't think we can zone out diffenent users from a park. Maybe the idea of "quiet" could be explored through the Score Cards in the future. I.e., qualifying if a park has generally more quiet areas.	In-Person Community Meeting
Easier canoe & kayak access to Barton Creek & Town Lake	Greg Ormisto	No Edit needed	This falls under connecting with water recommendations	In-Person Community Meeting
Self cleaning restrooms for public use, Like the ones in Paris.	Greg Ormisto	Edit Made	Restrooms: Added B.6.2: Evaluate the equitable distribution and quantity of restrooms throughout the park system and determine if access and sustainability can be increased through technology and innovation.	In-Person Community Meeting
Open greenbelt trails to electric bikes. Owner rides ebikes as safely as regular bikes. I think they were lumped in with scooters by mistake. Trails are frequently the only option to get around town safely (Lamar, Guadalupe).	Greg Ormisto	No Edit needed	See B.5.4. This is an emerging issue and a conclusion has not yet been reached on the best regulatory framework. There is a trial program and limited speed requirements on parkland and in greenbelts.	In-Person Community Meeting

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
Commons Ford Park: Please continue to take care of and monitor Commons Ford Park in western Travis County. - Roads need repair - Safety issues with parking on weekends - lots of swimming in the lake by dark - dogs off leash lots. Commons Ford prairie is beautiful. Many beautiful wildflowers and birds. Great partnership with Trails Foundation currently. New split fence is very nice. Great trails and signage. Many people love & use the park. Over 100 year old log cabin. Historic barn	Janice Sturrock	Edit Made		In-Person Community Meeting
More of a dining/ tea house or culinary destinaton options within the parks. options within the parks.	Natalie Kirchner	No Edit needed	See C.3 and C.5 for dining/culinary activation in parks.	In-Person Community Meeting
Theatre venues in addition to free zilker theatre (which is awesome)	Natalie Kirchner	no edit needed	Discussed with arts and culture programming expansion	In-Person Community Meeting
Expand train, Zucker Zephyr is fantastic.	Natalie Kirchner	no edit needed	Expansion of the Zilker Zephyr will be explored the Zilker Master Plan.	In-Person Community Meeting
Movies under the stars.	Natalie Kirchner	No edit needed		In-Person Community Meeting
Dog friendly off leash options.	Natalie Kirchner	No edit needed		In-Person Community Meeting
We love austin parks we dont like the increased pay for parking	Natalie Kirchner	no edit needed		In-Person Community Meeting
Outdoor ballromm dancing, swing events and bringing these to south austin too	Natalie Kirchner	no edit needed	Discussed with arts and culture programming expansion	In-Person Community Meeting
I would like to see more skateparks, multiuse parks, MTB trails in Austin's parks. The community is hungry for this space and is willing to build it with the permission from the city. Underdeveloped park space would be great for this application. Micro spots or micro skate parks are another great option in exisiting facilities that can't dedicare large ares of square footage. We are really asking for "permission to build" areas/ Places where we can put our time, labor and materials without fear of losing everythign created. All of these spaces would be built for everyone to enjoy.	Brent Thompson	NO edit needed	See C.3 and D.5 for park activation through pop-up installations and program partnerships (which could certainly include skateparks, multiuse parks, MTB trails and micro-skateparks); See E.5 for commitment to developing a stronger framework for PARD to engage in partnerships like the idea you propose. This is a great idea and you should continue to reach out to PARD as they begin to evaluate how to act on the facility and amenity priorities documented on p154-177; specifically for the combined planning areas where there was a documented desire for skate parks, BMX parks and multi-use/nature trails.	In-Person Community Meeting
I believe in the importance of developing a vision and a plan, but there is tension between the need for progress on updating and maintaining our parks while substantial resources are devoted to planning. It can be a course of frustration to watch a park continue downfall toward disrepair while so much effort is spent articulating and presenting consensus statemetns around the uses of pir parkland. A beautiful park is a source of joy and pride for its neighborhood/ commuity, and the current state of disrepair of many parks in our city creates the opposite experience for the citizens who visit these parks. Q: How could this planning process happen more EFFICIENTLY so that we can turn our efforts to IMPLEMENTATION?	Amy Wright	No edit needed	See Chapter 4 strategies under partnerships, and Chapter 5 impleentation. Table to be added	In-Person Community Meeting

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
Pay attention to the Grove development (on the former TxDOT land along Bull Creek/45th) and ensuring that the developers do, indeed, provide the parkland they are supposed to. As the city looks to acquire more parkland, it seems like one good strategy is making certain developers set aside the land they're supposed to set aside for parks.	Robyn Ross	Edit made	Detail added to the Combined Planning Area and Park Planning Area #2 Tables: added: in compliance with the Grove at Shoal Creek PUD	In-Person Community Meeting
Poster A 1) Why add 4-8,000 acres of new parkland when there is parkland that has not been developed or programmed. 3) Consider "night skies" so folks who live in the city can see the stars @ night are?? Can't see them in the city.	D Houston	Edit Made	A1: acquisition and maintenance/enhancement of existing parks are not mutually exclusive and must be pursued at the same time; A3: we have incorporated this edit in C2.6	In-Person Community Meeting
Poster B 1) Amen to that 2) ...Areas that have been underserved/ under resourced 3) Require sidewalks where they are none. 8) Put accurate names on signage Davis-White is named for a police officer & a fireman. 8) Use of solar over parking spaces to reduce electric bills.	D Houston	Edit Made	B2: we consider under-resourced parkland and facilities to be a sub-category of underserved; B3: see p102, B5; B8: added solar recommendation under E7, signage recommendation is too specific to include in the citywide LRP	In-Person Community Meeting
Poster C 6) Especially in historic East Austin Poster D 5) Traveling programming	D Houston	No edit needed	C6 includes historic East Austin even though it is not specifically called out. D5 "pop-up" programming can also be referred to as traveling programming	In-Person Community Meeting
Dorris Miller- resume the following: flag football, baseball, softball-> all over city		Edit Made	PARD addresses the need to assess community feedback for programming shifts in D.6 however, perhaps we can add additional point: Develop strategies to assess community response or feedback to the addition and/or removal of programming.	Pop-Up
Add Millennium to LRP		No Edit Needed	Complex is owned by the City of Austin and managed by ASM Global. Consider if there is an opportunity to explore specific building needs through discussion with management.	Pop-Up
More areas for autistic children		Edit Made	See B.7 on p 103. Also added under D 6.5 on p121 for programmatic aspect.	Pop-Up
Add Rosewood		No edit needed	PARD will do a facility SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis to identify small scale improvements to parking, access, lighting, surrounding recreational amenities and features. Rosewood will be included in this small-scale improvement facility SWOT, but will not be incorporated into the LRP.	Pop-Up
Restrooms and more shade		no edit needed	Previously added shade trees, restrooms are identified through individual park master plans	Pop-Up
Ball Moss Mitigation Improve more eastside parks to upgrade		no edit needed	Assuming this is ball moss on oak trees; Urban Forestry currently maintains trees and ball moss removal is not a major priority.	Pop-Up
We like the free pools		no edit needed		Pop-Up
More restrooms		Edit Made	Added B.6.2: Evaluate the equitable distribution and quantity of restrooms throughout the park system and determine if access and sustainability can be increased through technology and innovation.	Pop-Up
More shaded areas, benches		Edit Made	Added new shade/tree canopy recommendation under A.2.7	Pop-Up
Need more parks like Emma Long		no edit needed		Pop-Up
Better transition for community when leadership changes- new rec center staff		no edit needed	Keep this as a note for recreation center staff	Pop-Up
Community feels like they are starting over, every staff change impacts kids		no edit needed	Keep this as a note for recreation center staff	Pop-Up

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
Recently garbage cans were removed and recycling cans were added. Patrons (some) don't know how to use. Need knowledge to use		no edit needed	Covered under E 7	Pop-Up
We love movies in the park, we need more safety		no edit needed	Keep this as note for programming staff	Pop-Up
Please offer Travis County residents discounted prices for parking! Please!		no edit needed	Discussion of parking costs with ATD, the intent is to encourage residents to bike, walk, or take transit where feasible to parks. See recommendations under B	Pop-Up
Keep sewage out of creeks		no edit needed	multiple	Pop-Up
Bull Creek 78731 entrance under 360 needs works		no edit needed	This is too detailed to include in the LRP, but this will be taken into consideration for ongoing operations and maintenance	Pop-Up
More lighting		no edit needed	Lighting is covered under:	Pop-Up
Mas limpios mejor iluminacion y que haiga mas areas de juego		no edit needed	Lighting is covered under:	Pop-Up
Nolie Superviciou de policia		Insufficient Info to Respond	Unable to translate exactly, likely transcribed inaccurately. Safety is included in the plan in several areas: crime prevention through environmental design, involvement through Park Rangers, community partnerships	Pop-Up
More restrooms and exercise areas also splash park for kids		Edit Made	Splash Pads: see A3, Aquatics Master Plan. Exercise Areas: see B.6. Restrooms: Added B.6.2: Evaluate the equitable distribution and quantity of restrooms throughout the park system and determine if access and sustainability can be increased through technology and innovation.	Pop-Up
Seria ana buena idea de poner tela alrededor de la escesa		Insufficient Info to Respond	Unable to translate, possibly transcribed inaccurately	Pop-Up
More splash pads and restrooms		Edit Made	Splash Pads: see A3, Aquatics Master Plan. Exercise Areas: see B.6. Restrooms: Added B.6.2: Evaluate the equitable distribution and quantity of restrooms throughout the park system and determine if access and sustainability can be increased through technology and innovation.	Pop-Up
Onion Creek Forest 78744- needs lighting		Insufficient Info to Respond	Need more detail in order to respond.	Pop-Up
Longview- needs lighting/sidewalks along highway		No edit needed	See p170	Pop-Up
More gym space at ZRC		No edit needed	Assume this is referring to the Danny G. McBeth Recreation Center & Annex Building in Zilker Metro Park. This is too detailed to be included in the citywide LRP, but will be addressed in detail through the Zilker Metro Park Master Plan (see p156)	Pop-Up
Richard Moore- needs more playgrounds		Insufficient Info to Respond	Assuming this is in reference to Richard Moya, which is a county park. PARD can share this with the county.	Pop-Up
Parks SE- Needs more lighting, not safe at night		No edit needed	This is addressed at the city-wide level because this issue is shared by many parks throughout the city. See C.2.	Pop-Up
Dove Springs- needs more playgrounds, water pods/splash pad, pool for the summer, more lighting and safety, water fountains and splash pad		NO edit needed	Dove Springs has received a great deal of investment and the rec center is currently being expanded. Suggest that working through Community Parknerships is best option for further enhancements.	Pop-Up
Across from Longford Elem- needs splash pads and restrooms		No edit needed	Splash Pads: See A.3, Aquatics Master Plan. Restrooms: dded B.6.2: Evaluate the equitable distribution and quantity of restrooms throughout the park system and determine if access and sustainability can be increased through technology and innovation.	Pop-Up

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
McKinney Falls- needs playgrounds		No edit needed	McKinney Falls is a state park, not PARD	Pop-Up
Little Walnut Creek- not accessible, people don't know it's there (signage)		Edit Made	See p162	Pop-Up
Worried improvement to parks- displacements, gentrification (multiple people)		No edit needed	See p98 B1	Pop-Up
Walter Creek Greenbelt needs more light		no edit needed	Lighting is covered under: C2, p 111. Lighting is a community concern and identified as a reason why people may not use a park, but it has been balanced with protection of dark skies	Pop-Up
Onion creek metro park- grass is very tall attracting snakes but I understand y'all are working very hard so I'll be very patient! Thank you for all you do!		no edit needed		Pop-Up
More venues for live performances covered, raised stage 200 or so places!		No edit needed	See p66 for distribution of existing performance areas in parks, See strategy A5 on p92 for multi-purpose/flexible spaces that could accommodate performances, See strategy C3 on p110, see B6 for commitment to more even facility distribution. Construction of new live performance venues will be addressed at a local level as opportunities arise and when there is a strong community interest.	Pop-Up
Community is important and parks speak to the community! They are one of the first things I look for in a home. Big support		no edit needed		Pop-Up
Develop the park land that is already in use instead of buying or acquiring more area		no edit needed	Plan includes a balance between parkland development and land acquisition	Pop-Up
McKinney- solar lights? Can light pollution. Perhaps reflective lights. Franklin Park (452) needs money and support.		no edit needed	Covered under dark skies recommendations	Pop-Up
More mountain bike trails and mixed use hiking		No edit needed	See B.4	Pop-Up
Ancient Oak- Needs wildflower management plan like church across street; Needs an oriental planting plan for unused stripped land butting up to an apartment complex, create methyl's, red buds and winter berries		Insufficient Info to Respond	Need more detail in order to respond.	Pop-Up
I absolutely love to many trash and dog bag stations are available all over! Thank you!		no edit needed		Pop-Up
Rosewood would be a lot more user friendly for about \$100. A bench and some hooks on the wall would be nice. Having to throw your clothes on the floor or in the sink is annoying. A bench to sit on would be nice rather than having to sit on the toilet to put your shoes on.		No edit needed	PARD will do a facility SWOT (strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats) analysis to identify small scale improvements to parking, access, lighting, surrounding recreational amenities and features. Rosewood will be included in this small-scale improvement facility SWOT, but will not be incorporated into the LRP.	Pop-Up
Patterson, would be a lot more user friendly for about \$100. A bench and some hooks on the wall would be nice. Having to throw your clothes on the floor or in the sink is annoying. A bench to sit on would be nice rather than having to sit on the toilet to put your shoes on.		No edit needed	See p 162	Pop-Up
We really need a dog park in the Mueller area that is fenced in and has a small and large dog area. Agility equipment would be great. In addition, the Riverside Dog Park needs A LOT OF WORK!		NO edit needed	PARD can share the recommendation for the Mueller Development. Assuming this is referring to the Riverside Dog Park aka Norwood Dog Park. See general recommendations for off leash areas.	Pop-Up

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
Beautiful salt water pool at BARTHOLMELO ON 5TH ST, wish the Muller area, and Austin in general had more dog parks.		no edit needed	Dog parks are a need that is highlighted in Chapter 4, A	Pop-Up
Pecan Springs shows a playground w/ COA. It is always open to the Public, which could present a safety threat to the campus during school hours		No edit needed	This should be addressed at an individual level between PARD and AISD - this is too specific to include in the LRP	Pop-Up
Gravel Pathways: Upkeep of Bauerle Ranch Park!		no edit needed		Pop-Up
More Splashpads, community pool in Del Valle, Parks & general, Formal bike Path.		no edit needed	Splash Pads: see A3, Aquatics Master Plan.	Pop-Up
We need more parkland in West Oak Hill, more ballfields (baseball/softball) are also needed as well as multipurpose fields. SH 71 & US 290 W of the Y would be good areas.		No edit needed	See p174 - acquire parkland in park deficient areas	
Also look at flood prone areas that could be used for regular development - like the freescale property along William Cannon north of Williamson Creek.		No edit needed	Flood prone areas are not appropriate sites for development. Even if the flooding makes them less attractive as recreational sites, flood management is one of the roles of the park system in protecting and supporting the City of Austin and its residents.	Pop-Up
Enforce Leash Laws! PARD could make money maintenance if they started fining people who don't leash their dogs. Add leash free areas designated to accommodate dog owners.		No edit needed	See A.6.5 - this is already under consideration, starting with issuing warnings.	Pop-Up
We need trail connections along greenbelts & between parks.		No edit needed	See B.2.4 - already a priority	Pop-Up
My only concern is that we continue to keep these amazing parks & grow the parks in relation to the growth in Austin to accommodate the people that need to use the parks. Also, the off leash parks are incredibly important to these communities in the south. The park here is often filled with 50+ people at night at any given hour after 5:00 and on.		No edit needed	PARD shares your concerns and has incorporated both these ideas into the LRP - the need for parks to keep pace with population growth and the need to increase access to off-leash dog areas.	Pop-Up
Yes expand parks!		No edit needed		Pop-Up
I've lived here 5 years now and take my dog into Steveson Nature Preserve 2x/day everyday. As of late, we can no longer go to certain areas of the preserve because of the homeless population. Pill bottles, So Much Trash. It's taking over this beautiful preserve that we've loved for so long.		No edit needed	See recommendations E.3 and C.2 for how the LRP addresses your concerns about people experiencing homelessness and public safety	Pop-Up
Climbing Dome - Fire Pole - Sand Pit - Shade near play area for infants		No edit needed	Many residents and stakeholders have highlighted the need for increased shade in parkland, and we are working this into the plan as an additional recommendation. Your other play structure ideas - climbing dome, fire pole and sand pit - are great ideas but are a bit too specific for a citywide plan - they are best incorporated as part of a local park master planning process!	Pop-Up
More off leash dog parks		No edit needed	this is addressed under A.6	Pop-Up
Page 12 correction - The Parks and Playground Commission was created on June 14, 1928. The \$700,000 parks bond was passed in May 1928. Email me if you need the backup materials. Also, clarify on the other projects if the year represents when they were opened or construction began.	bc-richard.depalma	Edit Made	<p>Confirmed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The parks and playgrounds bond for \$700,000 passed on 5/18/1928. The Parks and Public Playgrounds Commission was established 6/14/1928 through ordinance 19280614-002. <p>Clarification: the dates of establishment for parks are deed dates – we don't have records of park openings/and or development</p>	Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
Save Palm School for good use as low cost housing for the best teachers.	bcbers	No edit needed	Not park-specific	Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio
It's frustrating to see that there is nothing about enforcing park rules in Barton Creek Greenbelt. The current free-for-all atmosphere that has been allowed to flourish when the creek is flowing has a lot of careless visitors leaving behind cigarette butts, beer cans and dog poop, and is driving away people who who want to be able to spend time with their families in the park.The city already has this amazing asset that I've not found in any other city --- a wilderness park pretty much in the urban center that is almost completely secluded city itself --- and it does so little to protect it.	beskrowni	No edit needed	Summary: enforce park rules in Barton Creek Greenbelt, especially leave no trace and dog ettiquite. Please see strategies A.6 on p92 and strategy E. 7.5 on p 129 for where this is addressed in the LRP	Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio
OMG we cannot go to the Gillis Park anymore because it is overrun with drug deals, weapons, and seedy people. It's quite scary. PLEASE STOP THE HOMELESS FROM TAKING OVER.The bathrooms are inaccessible because the homeless have set up camps. It's very disappointing.	Patricia Potyka	No edit needed	Summary: desire for policing and enforcement at Gillis Park. See recommendations E.3 and C.2 for how the LRP addresses your concerns about people experiencing homelessness and public safety	Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio
I concur with the goals that have resulted. I believe acquisition of park space is essential. The loss ofthe green space on Shoal Creek along Bull Creek Blvd and 45th Street has been devastating for wild life. Hundreds of monarchs came through there every spring and fall; thousands of birds. Where do they go now? If Camp Mabry becomes available, it must not also end up in developers' hands. If humans are to thrive in Austin, there must be wildlife as well. We cannot continue causing mass extinctions.	leilal	No edit needed	Summary: supports conservation/maintenance of habitat and natural areas	Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio
I'm amazed that our City Council approved spending \$25M+ to build a new Dougherty Arts Center at S. Lamar / Riverside when there are several schools being closed that could be re-purposed. Re-purposing the schools would cost taxpayers significantly less, it recycles existing structures AND would be aligned with stated goals such as: - A1 – Adding Parkland - B6 – Achieving better geographic distribution of facilities - D3 – Increase the number, diversity and equitable distribution of Arts and Culture programs - D4 – Partnership strategies to increase low-income access to PARD programming.	kristinm	No edit needed	Summary: consider repurposing schools being closed as arts/cultural centers. See p 125 E.1.5.4: "Work with AISD to understand long-term population shifts and where schools may be reused or repurposed. If a school is no longer viable, or will be repurposed, PARD should have the opportunity to evaluate the property for park or recreation use, including cultural, arts and community centers."	Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
<p>Look at Pg 15...EVERYONE gets love but Williamson Creek! The greenbelt was acquired by PARD in 1971 and we are the ONLY creek on that timeline that hasn't been improved, except for (white) Oak Hill and (white) Sunset Valley. Glaring example of "codified racial segregation", something Austin is still struggling with in lower income areas.</p> <p>I spent hours reading the LRP cover to cover, digesting the maps and I am compelled to stand up for my community. We are not accurately represented in this document that is intended to guide PARD for the next decade. We are Southwood neighborhood and we are split among 3 City Council districts (3, 5 and 2), where Williamson Creek and the main UP rail meet.</p> <p>Pg 54...including the area between I-35 and Manchaca (area 16) as Southwest is completely inaccurate and it makes it sound like our neighborhood is affluent. It is not. Our two elementary schools are both Title I. If you look at the lack of parks, sidewalks, trails and other basic amenities, our neighborhood MFI (\$48k), and our high % of poverty and risk of displacement, we are much more similar to Dove Springs than with Circle C. Lumping us in that category ensures that we never get any amenities. Staying consistent with 26 planning areas allows PARD to see a more complete picture over time, especially with regard to equity. It should at least be included in the appendix.</p> <p>Page 56...our District Park (Garrison) does not have major (or any) indoor facilities, as per the definition.</p> <p>All in all...I applaud PARD staff for their hard work and willingness to engage the community!</p>	<p>Kate Mason-Murphy</p>	<p>Edit Made</p>	<p>Addressed previously</p>	<p>Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio</p>
<p>Please get the dogs in parks under control. Dog feces and dogs off leash. Start punishing those breaking the rules. I love taking my dogs and kid don't eat me wrong. I also love the off leash areas. But, it's getting gross and out of control those who don't abide and litter the trails. Throwing bags or not using them at all. Also letting dog run wild up and down the trails. Monitor it. Do something.</p>	<p>Pawinston</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>This concern came up repeatedly throughout the process and is addressed in the LRP under strategy A.6 on p92</p>	<p>Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio</p>
<p>Please enforce leash laws. PARD could solve any budget problems on a few weekends going to popular parks and fining people with off leash dogs or those who don't pick up their dog's poop. Consider additional dog parks, but balance that with strict enforcement of the current laws.</p>	<p>Tom Thayer</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>See p92 Strategy A6</p>	<p>Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio</p>
<p>It breaks my heart to see all of the cars parked on the grass at Zilker Park. Yes, there is limited parking at the park, but using green areas for parking is not a solution. There are other ways to get to the park - even driving, there are places to park vehicles outside of the park where one just needs to walk a little bit. Existing parking should be first come-first served, and after it's full, people need to find other ways to get there.</p>	<p>Tom Thayer</p>	<p>No edit needed</p>	<p>Vehicles parking on the grass is largely about enforcement and event management. See B.10 on p105 about parking management and B.5 on p 102 about supporting non-car modes of transit to get to parks.</p>	<p>Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio</p>

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
It is especially appalling that scooters and eBikes are prohibited from parks, yet vehicles can just park on the grass. I would rather see people "scooting" and riding eBikes to the parks than polluting vehicles. Also, many of the trails in our parks, such as Town Lake Hike/Bike Trail and Shoal Creek Trail are used as transportation - prohibiting electric devices from these trails discriminates against those who are unable to ride a regular bike or walk long distances, such as the elderly and disabled. Regular bikes can go about as fast as eBikes and scooters anyway - if there are problems, it is the users, not the mode.	Tom Thayer	No edit needed	See p102 strategy B.5.4 for scooter and eBike enhancements and regulation updates. Vehicles parking on the grass is a separate issue that is largely about enforcement and event management - see response to other comment re: cars parking on grass.	Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio
PARD should partner with Austin Watershed to utilize Water Quality Lands for low impact recreation, like is allowed at Slaughter Creek Wildlands. There are huge amounts of open space that could be utilized for hiking, mountain biking, and enjoying nature without degrading water quality (just ban dogs).	Tom Thayer	No edit needed	PARD regularly works with other departments and agencies to explore partnerships and opportunities to increase recreational access, but does not have jurisdiction over non-PARD maintained land. PARD will share this recommendation with Austin Water. No revision at this time.	Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio
Williamson Creek should be connected from SW to SE with greenbelts and natural trails. Much of the land is already public - it would not be too difficult to acquire the remaining tracts (which will be flood prone) or negotiate easements. Many of the neighborhoods along Williamson Creek (especially in south central Austin) don't have a whole lot of public parks nearby. This would also be a safe corridor across south Austin for locals to travel.	Tom Thayer	No edit needed	See p166	Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio
Overall, PARD need to work with other public entities (inside and outside the city) such as Transportation, Watershed, and AISD to improve access to parkland for all Austinites. PARD is not an island unto itself in city government - it needs to be integrated with the plans from other city departments and needs to work with other departments/entities to accomplish the City's goals.	Tom Thayer	No edit needed	The LRP includes this - see p24-25 for overview of key related plans from other departments and organizations, see recommendations p84-129, 152-175 for examples of partnerships, coordination and collaboration encouraged by the plan	Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio
Given limited land, growing park needs, and long-term uncertainty about water availability, the City's large stock of municipal golf courses makes little sense to retain. The sport is waning in popularity and use, and the courses run losses regularly. The Jimmy Clay-Roy Kizer Municipal Golf Courses could be turned into full parks integrated with McKinney Falls State Park. With this and better ties to Onion Creek Metro, southeast Austin could have its own Zilker scale and quality park, with little additional cost.	gjannene	No edit needed		Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio
Golf courses like Hancock and Morris Williams should be turned into affordable housing and multiuse parks for the whole community	jacobaronowitz	No edit needed	Many aspects of the park system are only used by a sub-set of the community, but are still an asset to the city. At this time, golf continues to have interest and users within the city - see p165, p173 - the repurposing of golf courses is best addressed at a local level with community input rather than at a citywide scale. See D6 on p121 - PARD will continually monitor whether golf is still a community need/desire.	Speak-Up Draft Plan Konveio
re: Other City of Austin Open Space - is this accessible? Or what?	Katie Coyne, PARD Board	Edit Made	Some are / some are not - the intent is to show the large network of open spaces that expands well beyond PARD parks. Access is mentioned for each of the categories. Intro text revised	Email

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
Key City Initiatives Callout: Impressed that this is included but I want more specifics on how it will be used? I think the equity component could come through more in terms of the direct application to the rec's.	Katie Coyne, PARB	No edit needed	Added the consideration of housing needs and displacement in the strategies	Email
Distance Diagram: is this as the crow flies? or using network analyst?	Katie Coyne, PARB	No edit needed	Using Network analyst as described in the text. Diagram is just for context.	Email
"what we learned" section: I'd like to see a panel here on what the existing conditions/data told the "experts"/consultants and PARB staff on this that informed some of these strategies... not just engagement?	Katie Coyne, PARB	Edit Made	Added to the method description to describe what factors were considered and studied	Email
A.1: This recommendation is wishy washy... are we maintaining with growth or are we achieving more?	Katie Coyne, PARB	No edit needed	This was discussed at length with PARB staff, the intent is to maintain the current standard but strive to achieve higher standards. Range gives some flexibility and provides a baseline for where we shouldn't dip below.	Email
A.2: So glad to see multifunctional parks design as front and center as this one is. I do think this mostly focuses on parks and stormwater... one step in the right direction - but I think there needs to be more in this recommendation about climate resilience generally - mitigating urban heat, air quality, storing carbon, also habitat, etc.	Katie Coyne, PARB	no edit needed	this has been added	Email
A.2.3: What are our standards for this kind of work? In what contexts are we doing this? Is this a standard for every park in some way? How will this be applied? LATER ON I SEE MULTIPLE REC'S THAT STATE "CREATE A SET OF STANDARDS..." - THAT SHOULD BE HERE TOO.	Katie Coyne, PARB	Edit Made	Added uniform set of standards in partnership with WPD and others	Email
GSI Callout: porous "pavers" >> "paving"	Katie Coyne, PARB	Edit Made		Email
A.3.2: I'd like to see something about equity here.	Katie Coyne, PARB	Edit Made	Added: potential need to decommission or redevelop the site considering community need	Email
A.3.4: Can we include something here about balancing water access in some places with better and more functional management of eroding shorelines in other places?	Katie Coyne, PARB	no edit needed	this has been added	Email
A.4.3.2: cool	Katie Coyne, PARB	no edit needed		Email
A.4.3.3: I think there should be something here about working with watershed and sustainability on leveraging floodplain buyout land toward greenbelt development and also urban agriculture/community gardens! They are attempting to pilot something on Onion/Williamson... reach out if you need more info.	Katie Coyne, PARB	No edit needed	PARB regularly works with other departments and agencies to explore partnerships and opportunities to increase recreational access, but does not have jurisdiction over non-PARB maintained land. PARB will share this recommendation with Watershed Protection Dept.No revision at this time.	Email
Community Gardens Callout: Is there staff bandwidth for this? Ah, I see above... seems great but is it feasible?	Katie Coyne, PARB	no edit needed		Email
B.1: Great that this says prior to	Katie Coyne, PARB	No edit needed		Email
B.1.1: to what end?	Katie Coyne, PARB	No edit needed	Intent is to inform the community outreach and master planning that PARB engages in with the community.	Email
B.2.3: Need to call out balance of environmental protection here as well - how can the designation of greenbelts/riparian areas as parks actually provide more protection to natural systems? Many will see this as opening the door to users being able to degrade sensitive areas.	Katie Coyne, PARB	no edit needed	this has been added	Email

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
B.2.4: Is there more to this? This is great for both ecology and people.	Katie Coyne, PARB	No edit needed	Shade trees were added with previous reviews, greenbelts along stream corridors discussed in 2.3 above	Email
B.7: This language is vague... aspire to? what does that mean?	Katie Coyne, PARB	No edit needed	More specifics in the strategies below, provides some flexibility, rather than burdening where not feasible.	Email
B: There needs to be something in this chapter, somewhere, about intergenerational access...	Katie Coyne, PARB	Edit Made	Intergenerational programs discussed under D. Added age distribution under 6 in this section.	Email
C.1: YAAAASSSSSS, but also, isn't this really more about supporting the vision... not really implementing or building on?	Katie Coyne, PARB	No edit needed	Intent is to partner with and support	Email
C.2: Need to call out dark skies and should include language to create standards around where this will be applied (preserves vs. urban parks... on a spectrum)	Katie Coyne, PARB	Edit Made	See revised 2.6	Email
C.4: Should there be something here about Austin Parks Foundation and how revenue is distributed from large events? There is a perception that funding is not allocated fairly.	Katie Coyne, PARB	no edit needed	this has been added	Email
C.6: I'd love to see a recommendation here about how heritage and nature-based tourism "stories" can be interwoven for visitors and residents alike. There is so much that is complementary between these and I don't want to see them siloed.	Katie Coyne, PARB	Edit Made	Added under 6.4	Email
D.1: There should be a recommendation here about how "nature" is in urban places too... I don't want to see nature-based programs only in the places that are further out, have preserve designation, etc. I'd love to see programming in downtown's parks on "urban nature."	Katie Coyne, PARB	Edit Made	Refined D1 1.1 1.2 to clearly include urban areas	Email
D.1.5: How's this for an idea - Create an urban nature center in downtown or east Austin - brand it that way... or better leverage Austin Nature and Science Center, the public library, and other assets to urban nature education and stewardship. Also - why not directly call out the nature center that was just proposed at Walter E. Long? This plan could use some carefully selected specificity in a few places.	Katie Coyne, PARB	Edit Made	See D.1.5 which is about a second nature center and programming across the city. Added " facilities or on parkland in urban and heavily used parks" to indicate the desire to provide this in an urban area where it will have maximum impact. However, the LRP needs to leave this recommendation open enough to allow for a more complete evaluation of the benefits and challenges of different ways (and locations) that could achieve this goal.	Email
D.2: Glad to see this here but the intergenerational goal should be included in the way infrastructure is planned/ designed in earlier chapters... not just in programming.	Katie Coyne, PARB	Edit Made	Added age under B6	Email
E.1.5.2: I don't think we should be calling out stormwater specifically - this could be more holistic - green infrastructure.. and include habitat, air pollution mitigation, heat mitigation... and other ecosystem services. Watershed Protection needs to be included as a partner here and in the rec's later about climate. Also - There should absolutely be a recommendation about how PARD cost-shares with other departments to implement cross-departmental goals!!!	Katie Coyne, PARD Board	no edit needed	this has been added	Email
E.4: This absolutely needs to be paired with more FTEs to support PARD partnerships!	Katie Coyne, PARB	no edit needed	Agree	Email
E.5: This needs some sub-recommendations... it certainly needs more specificity.	Katie Coyne, PARB	no edit needed	We feel this pretty specific, intent to to develop the partnership agreements and models	Email
E.6.1: THIS. This could be included throughout as an opportunity. Especially in how parks are designed - this should make its way into this document in more places.	Katie Coyne, PARB	no edit needed	Now referring to E7, we thought it made sense to put it all together in one place, with the GI recommendations earlier in the chapter	Email

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
E.6.2: AGAIN, why is this here and not also in the first section? It seems backburnered here when it could have been in both places (efficiency... and in places where we call out green infrastructure).	Katie Coyne, PARB	no edit needed	Now referring to E7, we thought it made sense to put it all together in one place, added GI standards in earlier section per Katie's recommendation	Email
E.6.5: Some of this is redundant with some of the rec's above. I think this is more about parks as resilience hubs? Needs to be more clear.	Katie Coyne, PARB	Edit Made	Add more detail on resiliency hubs in emergencies here	Email
Parkland Acquisition: Equity needs to come through here...	Katie Coyne, PARB	Edit Made	Added equity to need description	Email
Program Design and Development: This seems to further silo... How can Museum and Cultural Programs overlap with Nature Based, etc.? How can Community recreation centers be satellite nature centers amplifying the visibility of urban nature? There should be a section on the overlap.	Katie Coyne, PARB	No edit needed	The need for greater integration is discussed in strategies,	Email
The Score Card Tool: I wish this was bigger so I could see it...BIGGER ISSUE - there is nothing on this score card about the multifunctional goals that are outlined throughout the recommendations about both green infrastructure or climate resilience. This needs to be better updated to reflect the more holistic view on what well-functioning parks do.	Katie Coyne, PARB	no edit needed	Score Card is a pilot tool and may be revised in the future. It is intended to be used with partnerships.	Email
Implementation Matrix: Environmental Commission would like to review this as it pertains to meeting environmental goals. This will be vital to ensuring action on rec's related to enviro and climate goals.	Katie Coyne, PARB	No Edit Needed	Matrix is now included in the revised draft plan	Email

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
<p>I have a few questions in preparation for the draft PARD Long Range plan presentation to the Bicycle Advisory Council next Tuesday, Sept. 17th.</p> <p>There is a lot of good in the plan. My questions are regarding the approach and sources for a few things.</p> <p>1. On various pages, especially p. 68: How did PARD choose the five peer cities?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Why not a comparison to Minneapolis or St. Paul, which consistently rank near the top for U.S. park systems, per the Trust for Public Land ParkScore®? o Why not comparisons to any cities in the northeast quadrant of the country? o Why not international comparisons? (CoA departments usually don't do this, but they should.) <p>2. On p. 70: How did PARD calculate miles of bikeway? Does this include on-street routes or is this only paved PARD trails? Does this include 6' trails or only 10'+ trails?</p> <p>3. On p. 71: How did PARD calculate miles of trails? Is this all trails or only paved trails?</p> <p>Thank you, Kim, for your responses.</p> <p>1. Regarding peer cities, I appreciate the methodology spelled out. I do think it would be best (for future plans) to include cities in the NE quadrant in the U.S. and at least one city from Europe and one city from Southeast Asia.</p> <p>2. Bikeway miles: I cannot picture that there are 166 miles of bikeways maintained by PARD. I'm not sure where the discrepancy is coming from. I suspect this figure (as in the TPL report) includes all single-track dirt trails that are legally available for mountain bike use. If that's the case, then I don't think it is appropriate to carry on the term "bikeway" to refer to all such trails in public-facing documents. Sure, in a very generic sense these are bikeways, but then so are the shoulders of all Austin-area highways and freeways and essentially 100% of Austin street and sidewalks. Is there a map of the 166 miles of bikeways as counted by TPL?</p> <p>3. Trails miles: I think for this plan, whose audience includes laypersons and decision-makers, it would be best to clarify on the same page that "trails" includes the full range of trails from dirt track to wide paved trails (i.e. "urban trails" as used by PWD). Austin does have many unpaved hiking trails (which is great!), but very few paved trails. I think they can be lumped together in this graph, but that it's important to state what "trails" encapsulates.</p>	<p>Tom Wald, Cicycle Advisory Council Alternate</p>	<p>Edit Made</p>	<p>Thank for your questions, which relate to the benchmarking that we did as part of the long range plan process. We worked with our prime consultant, WRT, and a sub-consultant, The Trust for Public Land. Attached is the full report, which our Long Range Plan document summarizes. This is also available as a link on our website. I've done my best to respond below, but know that there are some metrics that were difficult or didn't work as well. Not every city tracks things the same way so we know that there are some weaknesses in the comparative approach. The miles of trails for example are only counting bikeway miles as maintained by parks and recreation departments in TPL's city parks surveying. So it's likely that its undercounting bikeways for all the cities listed. I would say that it is more "directional" than scientific given the limitations with how other cities track and report their metrics. Having said that, I will ask that we add a note to explain this in the long range plan document. Happy to discuss further.</p>	<p>Email</p>

Change Proposed [be as specific as possible and provide exact desired language]	Proposed by [name, title, division, department]	Edit Tracking	LRP team response	Format Comments Received
SHADE (LRP TEAM SUMMARY OF MANY COMMENTS): a general comment we are seeing a lot of is a request for increasing shade – whether through added tree canopy or shade structures. For some this is related to universal design with respect to the comfort and safety of children and seniors. For others this is an environmental and ecosystem benefits management idea.		Edit Made	Added as A.2.7: Implement strategies to increase shade and Austin's urban tree canopy as recommended in Austin's Comprehensive Urban Forest Master Plan.	
PUBLIC RESTROOMS (LRP TEAM SUMMARY OF MANY COMMENTS) - many public comments mentioned a desire for more. One suggestion was Self cleaning restrooms for public use, Like the ones in Paris.		Edit Made	Added B.6.2: Evaluate the equitable distribution and quantity of restrooms throughout the park system and determine if access and sustainability can be increased through technology and innovation.	
SPLASH PADS (LRP TEAM SUMMARY OF MANY COMMENTS) - there were a few public comments requesting these, especially for kids		No edit needed	See Aquatics Master Plan	
Use school grounds aside of school hours for parkland - allow public to use school field / tracks		No edit needed	See E.1.7.1 - you make a great point, and this is already being considered as a way to meet the needs of more residents with existing parkland assets, especially in park-deficient areas of the city. The LRP specifically calls out schools under AISD that can function as school parks.	Pop-Up