

APPENDIX F

MEETING MINUTES

Appendix F: Meeting Minutes

Appendix F1: Austin Parks Foundation - October 15, 2013

Appendix F2: Pease Park Conservancy & PARD – October 15, 2013

Appendix F3: Shoal Creek Conservancy – October 15, 2013

Appendix F4: Technical Advisory Group – October 15, 2013

Appendix F5: Jill Nokes – October 15, 2013

Appendix F6: Carolyn Long – October 15, 2013

Appendix F7: Pease Park Conservancy & PARD Re-Cap – October 15, 2013

Appendix F8: Urban Design – November 21, 2013

Appendix F9: Technical Advisory Group – November 22, 2013

Appendix F10: Technical Advisory Group – February 28, 2014

Appendix F11: Pease Park Conservancy & PARD Public Meeting #3 Debrief and Next Steps – June 6, 2014

Other meetings, discussions, dialogues that the Design Team had throughout the course of the master planning process:

Jill Nokes, Nokes Landscape Design

Carolyn Long, Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center

Danielle Pieranunzi, SITES Director

John Hart Asher, Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center

Ted Eubanks, Joanna Wolaver & Ted Siff, Shoal Creek Conservancy

Sonny Poole, Austin Energy

Sinclair Black, Black + Vernooy

Betty Trent, Architecture + Plus

Matthew F. Kreisle III FAIA, Page; Texas Historical Commission

APPENDIX F1

AUSTIN PARKS FOUNDATION

OCTOBER 15, 2013

DATE & TIME: October 15, 2013, 8:45 AM

LOCATION: Austin Java

PREPARED BY: Charlie Neer (WRT)

ATTENDEES:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Email</u>
Colin Wallis	Austin Parks Foundation	colin@austinparks.org
Richard Craig	Pease Park Conservancy	richardcraig2004@yahoo.com
Eric Tamulonis	WRT	etamulonis@ph.wrtdesign.com
Charlie Neer	WRT	cneer@ph.wrtdesign.com

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1.0	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - After introductions, a brief discussion followed about the planning process, public input, public meetings and deadlines. WRT also wanted to understand the separate roles of Pease Park Conservancy (PPC) and Austin Parks Foundation (APF). 	
1.1	<p>Initial Thoughts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A focus of the Master Plan will be to enhance the water quality and recreation potential of the park – enhance ecological and recreational functions. - A general consensus that people want a better park with better trails. - Past planning efforts have shown Pease Park and Shoal Creek on the seams or edge of the planning efforts. - Is Pease Park what people think it should be? If not what should it be? In general it seems like people like it as it is but recognized needs for enhancements. - Shoal Creek from Lady Bird Lake to 38th St is a logical transportation corridor with increased development in the south. Pease Park is in the middle and is surrounded by neighborhoods willing to make it better. Time is right for transportation connectivity. - Pease Park and Shoal Creek will not be Waller Creek. 	
1.2	<p>City-Wide Planning Efforts & Conservancies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Current megaparks and large developments throughout the country can suck resources from their cities. - Currently a lot of similar trail efforts going on throughout the City. WRT to study current trail efforts through Austin. 	WRT

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Getting in a car and driving around the City is not the answer. - Pease Park is a district park – more than just a neighborhood park. - Concerns that there are a lot of overlapping planning efforts going on. WRT needs a diagram showing how the Pease Park Master Plan fits into other ongoing planning efforts. Similarly there are a lot of conservancies that have similar agendas. Need to make clear how the Pease Park Master Plan fits into the work that the Shoal Creek Conservancy is doing. - Many of the conservancies and non-profits are coming together to maximize resources. Many of these groups are communicating to the same groups who now feel tapped out – “how do I choose who I want to support?” 	WRT
1.3	<p>APF ‘s Concluding Thoughts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Parks & Recreation Department (PARD) has limited financial resources which prevent them from being able to implement all of their visions for Austin parks. - APF is a relatively small organization with \$1 million annual budget which wants to support anyway that they can. No one has enough money for all the things that people want to do to improve the City’s parks. - WRT is trying to figure out how ambitious the master planning efforts should be – APF recommends that the efforts be ambitious due to Pease Park’s prominence, however all recommendations in the master plan must be realistic. - The master plan should find a way to phase the park recommendations in a suite of options. - The master plan should emphasize long term maintenance. 	

ISSUE DATE: October 22, 2013

DISTRIBUTION: All Present, Kim McKnight & Shawn Cooper (PARD)

Attachments: none

The minutes as presented herein are not in sequence with the discussion and constitute the author’s understanding of the results of the meeting. Any discrepancies or omissions should be brought to the author’s attention in writing within three working days, upon receipt of which the author will revise and re-circulate these minutes. In the absence of such notice, these minutes will be deemed correct.

APPENDIX F2

PEASE PARK CONSERVANCY & PARD
OCTOBER 15, 2013

DATE & TIME: October 15, 2013, 9:30 AM
LOCATION: PARD Annex
PREPARED BY: Charlie Neer (WRT)

ATTENDEES:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Email</u>
Richard Craig	Pease Park Conservancy	richardcraig2004@yahoo.com
Kim McKnight	PARD	kim.mcknight@austintexas.gov
Shawn Cooper	PARD	shawn.cooper@austintexas.gov
Richard Soliz	PARD	richardo.soliz@austintexas.gov
Jonathan Ogren	Siglo	jogren@siglogroup.com
Emily Little	Clayton&Little	emily@clayton&little.com
Nathan Quiring	Clayton&Little	Nathan@clayton&little.com
Eric Tamulonis	WRT	etamulonis@ph.wrtdesign.com
Charlie Neer	WRT	cneer@ph.wrtdesign.com

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1.0	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The master plan is the culmination of the work that Pease Park Conservancy (PPC) has done to date. - The master plan will serve the park for the next 20 – 30 years and hopefully longer. - The master plan needs to honor the Pease Family and Janet Long legacies. - Pease Pak is a critical part of the Austin Park system. It is prime for rediscovery. - PARD and PPC are committed to working together in order to ensure a successful master planning process. 	
1.1	<p>Communications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Design Team has already discussed internal team protocols. WRT will need to be cc'ed on all emails. - Emails to the client should include Richard Craig, Kim McKnight and Shawn Cooper. 	

<p>1.2</p>	<p>Media Communications & Public Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PARD will need as much lead time as possible to advertise for public meetings. - PARD has already set up a project website: (http://austintexas.gov/department/pease-district-park-master-plan). - The master plan process will work to properly engage citizens and stakeholder groups. - PARD and WRT agreed that the Senior Activity Center will be the public meeting location. - The first Public Meeting is scheduled for Nov 21, 2013. - PPC and PARD will jointly introduce the Pease Park Master Planning process and schedule to the Parks Board Meeting so that the public at large can find out about the master plan. Ricardo will work to put it on the Parks Board agenda. - Announcements for the project can also be made in the neighborhood newsletters & list serves. - WRT will provide a Survey Monkey to solicit public input. The survey can be put on the project website and other outlets. - Holly Shores used a direct mailing which is something that PARD can think about. - Signs can be placed in the park as well as along Lamar Blvd. - PARD will also reach out to the neighborhood associations of which there are at least eight and will send neighborhood plans to WRT. - Base on the tactics above, WRT understands that the project is employing the appropriate range of media communications and public engagement methods. 	<p>Richard & Ricardo</p> <p>WRT</p> <p>PARD</p>
<p>1.3</p>	<p>Project Schedule and Public Meeting Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The master planning process will take about one year. - The first Public Meeting will be Nov 21st. The purpose of this meeting is to solicit public input for the master plan. The goal is to receive as much feedback as possible. The Design Team will also go over some of the inventory and analysis work which is currently ongoing. - The second Public Meeting will be in late February. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the alternatives being considered based on the feedback we have been hearing from the kick-off meetings and first public meeting. - The third Public Meeting will be in June. The purpose of this meeting will be to go over the draft master plan and get any last comments that can be incorporated into the final plan. - From the end of June until the end of September, the report document will be finalized. 	

ISSUE DATE: **October 22, 2013**

DISTRIBUTION: All Present

Attachments: None

The minutes as presented herein are not in sequence with the discussion and constitute the author's understanding of the results of the meeting. Any discrepancies or omissions should be brought to the author's attention in writing within three working days, upon receipt of which the author will revise and re-circulate these minutes. In the absence of such notice, these minutes will be deemed correct.

APPENDIX F3

SHOAL CREEK CONSERVANCY

OCTOBER 15, 2013

DATE & TIME: October 15, 2013, 10:00 AM
LOCATION: PARD Annex
PREPARED BY: Charlie Neer (WRT)
ATTENDEES:

11/11/13 Revisions in red

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Email</u>
Ted Siff	Shoal Creek Conservancy	ted@parkplacepubs.com
Joanna Wolaver	Shoal Creek Conservancy	joanna@shoalcreekconservancy.org
Ted Eubanks	Shoal Creek Conservancy	tedleeeubanks@fermatainc.com
Kim McKnight	PARD	kim.mcknight@austintexas.gov
Shawn Cooper	PARD	shawn.cooper@austintexas.gov
Jonathan Ogren	Siglo	jogren@siglogroup.com
Eric Tamulonis	WRT	etamulonis@ph.wrtdesign.com
Charlie Neer	WRT	cneer@ph.wrtdesign.com

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1.0	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WRT introduced their past working experience in Austin as well as introducing Clayton&Little and Siglo Group. - The Design Team wants to hear the goals and aspirations of the Shoal Creek Conservancy (SCC) for the Pease Park Master Plan. 	
1.1	<p>Project Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The master planning process will take about one year. - The first Public Meeting will be Nov 21st. The purpose of this meeting is to solicit public input for the master plan. - The second Public Meeting will be in late February. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the alternatives being considered based on the feedback we have been hearing from the kick-off meetings and first public meeting. - The third Public Meeting will be in June. The purpose of this meeting will be to go over the draft master plan and get any last 	

	<p>comments that can be incorporated into the final plan. From the end of June until the end of September, the report document will be finalized.</p>	
1.2	<p>Project Geographic Scope</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The geographic scope of the master plan is from 15th to 31st streets. - The SCC pointed out that Pease Park proper is from 15th to 24th streets. The Area north of 24th is part of the Shoal Creek Greenway corridor – it has never been considered to be a part of Pease Park. North of 24th and Pease Park have different histories. From an ecological and recreational point of view, Pease Park and north of 24th are viewed as the same, but from an interpretive point of view they are different. SCC wants to make it clear that the boundaries of Pease Park have not grown. - SCC notes that Pease Park is a district park, not just a neighborhood park. - SCC acknowledges that master plan’s geographic scope extends beyond Pease Park proper to 31st Street. - If SCC had a choice, they would prefer not to include north of 24th in the Master Plan as they feel it is two distinct projects. - The master plan should make recommendations for historical interpretation in the park. Pease Park is “the most historical park” in Texas, but the public knows remarkably little, therefore interpretation is essential. 	
1.3	<p>Shoal Creek Conservancy Background & Vision</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The SCC was launched on October 1, 2013. - It has grown out of a 15 month feasibility plan which asked what were the needs on Shoal Creek and is there a need for another non-profit? - The scope of the SCC is the entire Shoal Creek watershed. Its goal is to address flood risk and improve water quality. - See attachments for SCC: Purpose – Cost - Benefits 	
1.4	<p>Pease Park Master Plan & Shoal Creek Conservancy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PPC and SCC share a similar vision and many of the same goals for their conservancies. - How can this master plan realize SCC efforts and what does SCC want to see? - 1. The Park is not the biggest concern, the Shoal Creek is different as SCC is looking at the entire watershed. Some of the solutions for the entire Shoal Creek are in Pease Park. - 2. Do no harm – SCC does not want a plan that they would fight against. - 3. A wayfinding system and a complete trail system are critical. Pease Park is a part of something bigger than itself. - Austin Watershed Protection is currently spending \$5 million on the 	

	Shoal Creek Restoration from 15 th to 28 th Streets.	
1.5	<p>Pease Park as “Beta Test” for Shoal Creek Conservancy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SCC agreed that this master planning effort could serve as a “pilot” or “beta test” for the goals and aspirations for the SCC in conjunction with PPC. - Development along the Shoal Creek south of 15th will bring more people into the area and put more pressure on the creek and the park. The stormwater will be exasperated. - The master plan will build on the Shoal Creek Restoration work. Pease Park will need to do a better job of stormwater infiltration as there is no water to waste. - Pease Park will have to be a fully, functional multi-purpose space – no longer can it be a “passive park.” - The park will be a riparian, ecological, visual, stormwater, transportation and, recreation corridor. - The master plan will look beyond the park borders. There are opportunities to reach out to the Watershed Protection Department, Public Works and the neighborhoods. 	
1.6	<p>Shoal Creek Valley</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The SCC prefers interactive planning for Shoal Creek. In 1998 Ted Siff was responsible for the Shoal Creek Greenway Action Plan by Greenways, Inc. SCC is interested in being advocates for the creek and for improving water quality and public access. They would like an interpretive plan for the creek. - The Shoal Creek Valley represents a significant landform north of 24th. The watershed extends further than the valley. SCC thought that perhaps the name of the master plan should be Pease Park and the Shoal Creek Valley. - Siglo will be contacting SCC for further discussions on habitat management. 	
1.7	<p>Post Meeting Note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The approach in this master plan reinforces and supports the 1998 Shoal Creek Action Plan by characterizing the area from 15th to 29th Streets as a “Parkland Character.” The area from Lady Bird Lake to 15th St is characterized as an “Urban Character.” The area from 29th to 45th Streets is characterized as a “Suburban Character.” - PPC and SCC have agreed that the name for the master plan be called “Pease Park Master Plan.” 	

ISSUE DATE: October 22, 2013

DISTRIBUTION: All Present, Richard Craig

Attachments: SCC: Purpose – Cost - Benefits

The minutes as presented herein are not in sequence with the discussion and constitute the author's understanding of the results of the meeting. Any discrepancies or omissions should be brought to the author's attention in writing within three working days, upon receipt of which the author will revise and re-circulate these minutes. In the absence of such notice, these minutes will be deemed correct.

APPENDIX F4

TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP

OCTOBER 15, 2013



11/8/13 Revisions in red

DATE & TIME: October 15, 2013, 2:00 PM
LOCATION: PARD Annex
PREPARED BY: Charlie Neer (WRT)

ATTENDEES:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Email</u>
Kim McKnight	PARD	kim.mcknight@austintexas.gov
Shawn Cooper	PARD	shawn.cooper@austintexas.gov
Chad Crager	Public Works /Neighborhood Connectivity	chad.crager@austintexas.gov
Regina Ramos	Forestry	regina.ramos@austintexas.gov
Morgan Byars	Watershed Protection	morgan.byars@austintexas.gov
Todd Hemingson	Capital Metro	todd.hemingson@capmetro.org
Peter Marsh	Transportation	peter.marsh@austintexas.gov
Jonathan Ogren	Siglo	jogren@siglogroup.com
Eric Tamulonis	WRT	etamulonis@ph.wrtdesign.com
Charlie Neer	WRT	cneer@ph.wrtdesign.com

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1.0	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Technical Advisory Group (TAG) is made up of various City Departments in order to coordinate the Pease Park Master Planning activities among the city agencies. - The Pease Park Master Plan will cover the Pease Park proper and the Shoal Creek Greenway from 24th to 31st. - The Master Plan will focus on natural resources, cultural resources, transportation and recreation. - The Design Team will also need to meet with PARD Maintenance and C.I.P. 	PARD



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Master Plan seeks to get buy in from all groups. - Urban Design should be asked to join the TAG 	
1.1	<p>Project Schedule and Public Meeting Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The master planning process will take about one year. - The first Public Meeting will be Nov 21st. The purpose of this meeting is to solicit public input for the master plan. The goal is to receive as much feedback as possible. The Design Team will also go over some of the inventory and analysis work which is currently ongoing in order to get better, more informed feedback. - The second Public Meeting will be in late February. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the alternatives being considered based on the feedback we have been hearing from the kick-off meetings and first public meeting. - The third Public Meeting will be in June. The purpose of this meeting will be to go over the draft master plan and get any last comments that can be incorporated into the final plan. - From the end of June until the end of September, the report document will be finalized. 	
1.2	<p>Neighborhood Connectivity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The goal of the neighborhood connectivity is to have a continuous bike route from Lady Bird Lake to 31st by turning the sidewalk into a 2-lane 12' wide trail. - Pease Park is one area with two paths – the sidewalk along Lamar and the pervious trail west of Shoal Creek. - The Shoal Creek Restoration project will fund the pervious trail from 24th to the Shoal Creek Blvd on the west side of Shoal Creek and a new impervious trail under 24th on the east side of Shoal Creek. - The west side of Shoal Creek should be more recreational and it would be preferred to keep bike traffic on the west side and away from Lamar. - Holly Shores plan is recommending separating pedestrians from bikes. Copenhagen uses a system of decomposed granite for pedestrians and asphalt for bikes, parallel to one another to separate bicycles and pedestrians. - Bike Austin (Tom Wald) and Bicycle Advisory Council are two bicycle advocacy groups in Austin that the Design Team should reach out to solicit input. - The Design Team needs to receive from PARD the neighborhood plans for the adjacent neighborhoods of Pease Park. 	WRT & PARD



1.3	<p>Forestry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A healthy forest canopy in Pease Park is critical for the entire Austin urban forestry. - The master plan will need to balance often competing needs for increased riparian corridors, reforestation and open space recreation. - The Design Team believes it has the most current tree survey information that has been given to them by PARD and Watershed Protection. - The Forestry Department encourages the reduction in urban heat island affect. - Viewsheds can be crested and preserved through the Park. - Trees along Lamar are possible but will need to be coordinated with the utility lines. - Forestry supports more proactive stewardship. - Regina will contact Emily King (Environmental Coordinator) for more background information and on the Future Forest Project. 	
1.4	<p>Watershed Protection</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Design Team has no civil engineer on board – WRT will work with Morgan and his group at Watershed Protection to fill in any gaps in the Master Plan. - The Shoal Creek Restoration project seeks to capture any drop of water that can be used in the park. - The Design Team will follow up with Watershed Protection to see if there is anything else that they wish could have been in the Restoration project. This could include identifying retrofit opportunities. - Watershed and Forestry are working together on the planting plans and details for the Shoal Creek Restoration. - Morgan cited that the plans that the Design Team has for the Shoal Creek Restoration project needs some minor revisions. Siglo will follow up with Morgan and Darcy. - The Design Team will get 100% construction documentation from Watershed. 	<p>Siglo</p> <p>Siglo</p>
1.5	<p>Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lamar is a transportation corridor. Pedestrian improvements along Lamar could focus on each intersection. - Connectivity happens along north / south routes, not east / west. 24th Street is one of the few east / west connections through the site. 	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A Lamar crossing by PARD’s office would be difficult given the travel speeds and street curvature. - Bus stop shelters are determined by ridership. Funding for standard bus shelters are covered by Capital Improvements and then any shelter desired above the standard shelter will require additional funding. - Topography and density preclude any major transit beyond Lamar in our study area. - The medians in Lamar are aging. The Design Team should get the plans from Public Works to convert the concrete medians to gardens. - Curb cuts and crosswalks are standard pedestrian improvements but bulbouts are more difficult to implement as they require more land. - Parkway can turn into a Park Road. - Peter Marsh will send along the traffic calming plans for Old Enfield. - Kingsbury is a dead end and is the clear entry and gateway to the park. The Design Team plans on looking at the parking and arrival sequence to determine appropriate gateway designs. - The bridges crossing Shoal Creek in the study area are historic and fall under the Public Works. Special Lighting may want to be considered. 	WRT
1.6	<p>Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is a possibility of sinking the overhead utility lines along Lamar since they are distribution lines, not transmission lines. Cost is an obvious challenge. 	
1.7	<p>Post Meeting Note</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rob Borowski, the Sustainability Officer and a planner from Capital Metro, will serve as the point person of contact for this project. 	

ISSUE DATE: October 22, 2013

DISTRIBUTION: All Present, Richard Craig, Rob Borowski

Attachments: None

The minutes as presented herein are not in sequence with the discussion and constitute the author’s understanding of the results of the meeting. Any discrepancies or omissions should be brought to the author’s attention in writing within three working days, upon receipt of which the author will revise and re-circulate these minutes. In the absence of such notice, these minutes will be deemed correct.

APPENDIX F5

JILL NOKES

OCTOBER 15, 2013

DATE & TIME: October 15, 2013, 3:00 PM

LOCATION: PARD Annex

PREPARED BY: Charlie Neer (WRT)

ATTENDEES:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Email</u>
Kim McKnight	PARD	kim.mcknight@austintexas.gov
Shawn Cooper	PARD	shawn.cooper@austintexas.gov
Jill Nokes	Nokes Landscape Design	jill@jillnokes.com
Jonathan Ogren	Siglo	jogren@siglogroup.com
Eric Tamulonis	WRT	etamulonis@ph.wrtdesign.com
Charlie Neer	WRT	cneer@ph.wrtdesign.com

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1.0	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Pease Park Master Plan will cover the Pease Park proper and the Shoal Creek Greenway from 24th to 31st. - The Master Plan will focus on natural resources, cultural resources, transportation and recreation. 	
1.1	<p>Project Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The master planning process will take about one year. - The first Public Meeting will be Nov 21st. The purpose of this meeting is to solicit public input for the master plan. - The second Public Meeting will be in late February. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the alternatives being considered based on the feedback we have been hearing from the kick-off meetings and first public meeting. - The third Public Meeting will be in June. The purpose of this meeting will be to go over the draft master plan and get any last comments that can be incorporated into the final plan. <p>From the end of June until the end of September, the report document will be finalized.</p>	
1.2	<p>Public Engagement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jill recommended that interns and/or PPC volunteers with clipboards could be used in the park to solicit input. This could be tied to the Survey Monkey that WRT will prepare. This is a way of 	WRT, PPC &

	getting boots on the ground input from the users themselves. WRT will coordinate with PPC and PARD	PARD
1.3	<p>Pease Park Conservancy Board Development</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The PPC is a recently founded organization. The master plan should address the organizational aspects of the conservancy, such as mission (conservancy vs friends group), succession, training / development, etc.... 	
1.4	<p>Hopes for Master Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plan should make recommendations the Pease Park Conservancy (PPC) can carry out in 1 to 3 years, 3 to 5 years and 5 to 10 years from now. - The master plan will help PPC by having an overall vision for everyone to see so that a strategic action plan can be established. - The master plan should set a clear annual budget and focus on goals, actions and strategies. - The master plan should focus on ecological <u>resiliency</u> and <u>repair</u>. The drought in Austin could last another 20 – 30 years. - The current irrigation system installed by PPC needs to be identified and analyzed to make sure it is functioning correctly. - Watershed Protection, PARD, Forestry and PPC all need to work together. Coordinated communication is key and PPC currently has no staff. Better partnerships make better parks. - The Master Plan should be a living document and not a static report on a shelf. - Pease Park’s needs will grow and so will the needs within PPC. PPC needs achievable goals. - PPC could use a fundraising consultant. - The master plan will need to make recommendations that will help people “read the landscape” and gain greater understanding of the natural processes. 	

ISSUE DATE: October 22, 2013

DISTRIBUTION: All Present, Richard Craig

Attachments: None

The minutes as presented herein are not in sequence with the discussion and constitute the author’s understanding of the results of the meeting. Any discrepancies or omissions should be brought to the author’s attention in writing within three working days, upon receipt of which the author will revise and re-circulate these minutes. In the absence of such notice, these minutes will be deemed correct.

APPENDIX F6

CAROLYN LONG

OCTOBER 15, 2013

DATE & TIME: October 15, 2013, 3:30 PM

LOCATION: PARD Annex

PREPARED BY: Charlie Neer (WRT)

ATTENDEES:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Email</u>
Kim McKnight	PARD	kim.mcknight@austintexas.gov
Shawn Cooper	PARD	shawn.cooper@austintexas.gov
Carolyn Long	Lady Bird Johnson Wildflower Center Volunteer	clong@austin.rr.com
Jonathan Ogren	Siglo	jogren@siglogroup.com
Eric Tamulonis	WRT	etamulonis@ph.wrtdesign.com
Charlie Neer	WRT	cneer@ph.wrtdesign.com

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1.0	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Pease Park Master Plan will cover the Pease Park proper and the Shoal Creek Greenway from 24th to 31st. - The Master Plan will focus on natural resources, cultural resources, transportation and recreation. 	
1.1	<p>Project Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The master planning process will take about one year. - The first Public Meeting will be Nov 21st. The purpose of this meeting is to solicit public input for the master plan. - The second Public Meeting will be in late February. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss the alternatives being considered based on the feedback we have been hearing from the kick-off meetings and first public meeting. - The third Public Meeting will be in June. The purpose of this meeting will be to go over the draft master plan and get any last comments that can be incorporated into the final plan. From the end of June until the end of September, the report document will be finalized. 	
1.2	<p>Hopes for Master Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The master plan should focus of a deep communication with the 	

	<p>land. If Pease Park is turned into a space with too much structure than we will lose the ability to commune with the land. The master plan should encourage children to say yes to the landscape and explore nature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plan should take advantage of the floodplain and design for the flows of water and people. The landscape will be dynamic as part of the floodplain. - The Park needs a reliable trail system for bikes. - Transportation funding is necessary as the neighborhoods can't fund all the needs of the Park. - Pease Park can be a "beta test" or "pilot project" for the some of the goals and visions of the Shoal Creek Conservancy. - The Master Plan has to be <u>simple</u>, <u>sustainable</u> and <u>practical</u>. - If you build it they will come and currently there is no staff and little money for maintenance. The Master Plan recommendations need to account for this. - Invasive species are a major concern and need to be dealt with both short term and long term. This will need to be coordinated with the Shoal Creek Conservancy. - The Park should be open and fun. - The adjacent neighborhoods see the area from 15th to 31st as one area. The neighborhoods do not have or use back passages to the park (i.e. stormwater easements that are steep and rocky) as they are perceived to be security risks. 	
--	---	--

ISSUE DATE: October 22, 2013

DISTRIBUTION: All Present, Richard Craig

Attachments: None

The minutes as presented herein are not in sequence with the discussion and constitute the author's understanding of the results of the meeting. Any discrepancies or omissions should be brought to the author's attention in writing within three working days, upon receipt of which the author will revise and re-circulate these minutes. In the absence of such notice, these minutes will be deemed correct.

APPENDIX F7

PEASE PARK CONSERVANCY &
PARD RE-CAP
OCTOBER 15, 2013



DATE & TIME: October 15, 2013, 4:00 PM
LOCATION: PARD Annex
PREPARED BY: Charlie Neer (WRT)

ATTENDEES:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Email</u>
Steve Davis	Pease Park Conservancy	asdavis@austin.rr.com
Kim McKnight	PARD	kim.mcknight@austintexas.gov
Shawn Cooper	PARD	shawn.cooper@austintexas.gov
Jonathan Ogren	Siglo	jogren@siglogroup.com
Nathan Quiring	Clayton&Little	Nathan@clayton&little.com
Eric Tamulonis	WRT	etamulonis@ph.wrtdesign.com
Charlie Neer	WRT	cneer@ph.wrtdesign.com

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1.0	<p>Historic Resources in the Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are pylons along Lamar up by the bluffs. These should be added to the base map. Kim has many of these mapped and will share with Clayton&Little and Siglo. - The Design Team has the cultural resources report that was done for the Shoal Creek Restoration. Kim has the USACE report in her office. - The bridges are historic and we will need to determine which ones are proposed to be on the National Registry of Historic Places. . - Public Works is responsible for the graffiti abatement on the bridges. The handling of graffiti in Austin is inconsistent among the various agencies. 	<p>PARD</p> <p>Clayton & Little</p>
1.1	<p>Site Furnishings and Lighting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Many of the old concrete benches and picnic tables are nicer than what PARD is currently using. - Kim will send to WRT the standard site furnishings that PARD uses. - Memorial benches in Pease Park are on concrete slabs and are laid out by PARD landscape architects. There are separate policies for 	



	<p>donations and memorials that PARD will provide to WRT.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is an ongoing effort in Austin parks to take out lighting as they represent a maintenance concern. Many park users would like more lighting, but police and park rangers think that it encourages unwanted late night uses of the parks. - City Council does not want the trails lit and they currently are not. - If the trails are lit, then they need to be patrolled by the police which create a funding concern. - Lighting is preferred by the users but not the neighbors. 	PARD
1.2	<p>Windsor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The open space parcels along Windsor could be used for birding or other light, passive activities. - Pedestrian access up Kingsbury is possible. - This area needs invasive species removal and management. 	
1.3	<p>Project Naming</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What should the area north of 24th be called? Northern Shoal Creek Valley? - The project area could use a branding exercise for both large scale and specific areas. - The naming should be linked to the history of the site. - The master plan can include interpretive recommendations to help people understand what they are seeing in the historical and ecological contexts. 	

ISSUE DATE: October 22, 2013

DISTRIBUTION: All Present, Richard Craig

Attachments: None

The minutes as presented herein are not in sequence with the discussion and constitute the author's understanding of the results of the meeting. Any discrepancies or omissions should be brought to the author's attention in writing within three working days, upon receipt of which the author will revise and re-circulate these minutes. In the absence of such notice, these minutes will be deemed correct.

APPENDIX F8

URBAN DESIGN

NOVEMBER 21, 2013



DATE & TIME: November 21, 2013, 10:30 AM

LOCATION: PARD Annex

PREPARED BY: Charlie Neer (WRT)

ATTENDEES:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Email</u>
Tonya Swartzendruber	Planning & Development Review Department - Urban Design Division	tonya.swartzendruber@austintexas.gov
Kim McKnight	PARD	kim.mcknight@austintexas.gov
Shawn Cooper	PARD	shawn.cooper@austintexas.gov
Eric Tamulonis	WRT	etamulonis@ph.wrtdesign.com
Charlie Neer	WRT	cneer@ph.wrtdesign.com

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1.0	<p>Introductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - After introductions, a brief discussion followed about the planning process, public input, public meetings and deadlines. - It was agreed that Tonya should join the Technical Advisory Group. - The Planning & Development Review Department – Urban Design Division uses the <i>Imagine Austin</i> report as their main document for planning. - WRT quickly shared the Power Point presentation that would be shown to the public later that night in the first Public Meeting on Pease Park. - WRT discussed how Pease Park is always just to the edge of major planning efforts – whether they be centrally focused on the downtown core or focused on the neighborhoods – Pease Park always seems to be on the edge. - WRT noted that there has never been a plan for Pease Park. Development has always occurred organically with no plan or vision. 	
1.1	<p>Parks Without Borders</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - WRT explained the concept of parks without borders by explaining how parks can influence or inform the neighboring developments, neighborhoods and streets and how these can then have an influence on or inform the parks. - On the east side, Lamar Blvd. is the primary influence on Pease Park. On the west side, Parkway/Kingsbury and the private 	



	<p>residences are the primary influences on the park.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Growth of the University of Texas will add pressure on Pease Park as will development south of 15th Street in the Lower Shoal Creek. - Opportunities for change along Lamar Blvd. exist and could consist of: 1) utility burial to improve viewsheds into and along the park 2) pedestrian crossing improvements to make it easier to enter into Pease Park 3) green infrastructure to treat urban stormwater management 4) improved bus shelters at 29th, 24th and MLK which could help lend an identity to the Park and 5) street trees 	
1.2	<p>Wayfinding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Urban Design Division has been working on a wayfinding plan for the downtown, following the same boundary of the Downtown Plan. The goal is to make it more expandable so that it can be applied to the rest of the City- not solely focused on Downtown. The process applied an urban design approach to wayfinding. The plan identified 20 important vehicular, pedestrian / bike gateways for wayfinding and then focused in depth on 6 gateways – one of which was 15th Street at Lamar. Tonya will send this plan to Kim who will then send to the Design Team. - This wayfinding plan is not for public use yet. - Urban Design has meet with the Shoal Creek Conservancy on trail signage and is looking into a potential pilot project. 	PARD
1.3	<p>Pease Park Identity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The appearance of the landscape along Lamar Blvd. should say “this is a public park”, not “this is a drainage easement.” - Pease Park is about both neighborhood connectivity and about a district park. - Pease Park’s identity is somewhat non-descript. - Pease Park is a great resource for downtown users and the master plan needs to make sure that the park is accessible to them. Many may not even realize the proximity of the park to the downtown. 	

ISSUE DATE: December 05, 2013

DISTRIBUTION: All Present, Richard Craig, Jonathan Ogren and Nathan Quiring

Attachments: none

The minutes as presented herein are not in sequence with the discussion and constitute the author’s understanding of the results of the meeting. Any discrepancies or omissions should be brought to the author’s attention in writing within three working days, upon receipt of which the author will revise and re-circulate these minutes. In the absence of such notice, these minutes will be deemed correct.

APPENDIX F9

TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP

NOVEMBER 22, 2013



DATE & TIME: November 22, 2013, 8:30 AM
LOCATION: PARD Annex
PREPARED BY: Charlie Neer (WRT)

ATTENDEES:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Email</u>
Kim McKnight	PARD	kim.mcknight@austintexas.gov
Shawn Cooper	PARD	shawn.cooper@austintexas.gov
Gregory Montes	PARD	gregory.montes@austintexas.gov
Richard Craig	PPC	richardcraig2004@yahoo.com
Rob Borowski	Capital Metropolitan Transit Authority	robert.borowski@capmetro.org
Chad Crager	Public Works /Neighborhood Connectivity	chad.crager@austintexas.gov
Nathan Quiring	Clayton&Little	NQuiring@claytonandlittle.com
Eric Tamulonis	WRT	etamulonis@ph.wrtdesign.com
Charlie Neer	WRT	cneer@ph.wrtdesign.com

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1.1	<p>Introduction / Review of Previous Night’s Public Meeting #1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The general consensus was that the meeting went well. The meeting was well attended with over 60 participants. The feedback that the Design Team received was substantial. - One comment was that the meeting time was not well suited for families. 	
1.2	<p>Children’s Charrette</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In order to get input from the children, it was discussed that a Charrette or meeting specifically tailored to the children would be helpful. Many techniques were discussed to get the children involved or engaged including visual preference surveys. - PARD would attend this meeting. The Design Team would not need to be there. - PARD would like to have the neighborhoods set up the meeting, 	PARD



	<p>perhaps at a local elementary school, and PARD would then attend.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This children’s Charrette would have to take place before February in order for their input to be included in the development of the conceptual alternatives. 	
1.3	<p>TAG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rob Borowski – a sustainability officer from Capital Metro Transit Authority – will be joining the TAG in place of Todd Hemingson. - Tonya Swartzendruber from the Urban Design Division of the Planning & Development Review Department will also be joining the TAG. WRT and PARD met with Tonya the day of the public meeting. Tonya mentioned that the Urban Design Wayfinding Plan makes specific recommendations for 15th Street at Lamar and she will send to the Design Team. - The TAG would like to review the conceptual alternatives for the master plan a few weeks before the next public meeting on Feb 27th. This will give time for review and comment. A GoTo meeting or other type of video conference between the TAG and the Design Team will be set up to review the conceptual alternatives. 	Urban Design
2.1	<p>Bus Transit</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A new Rapid Route will be coming down Lamar Blvd. Rob will send this information to Kim who will send to the Design Team. - The MLK / Lamar Blvd intersection has a bus stop but no shelter. It is often very hot at this bus stop. It is possible to make a place making identity piece at this bus stop and possibly at 29th and 24th. - The bus stops are controlled by Capital Metro. There are opportunities for innovative bus shelters. East Austin has a green roof bus shelter and public art could also be included. 	Cap Metro & PARD
2.2	<p>Lamar / Great Streets</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lamar Blvd is on the edge of the Great Streets projects which are focused on downtown streets. North of 15th Streets isn’t in Great Streets, but there was question among the group as to what, if anything could be done on Lamar? Is there money for utility burial along Lamar as part of the Greta Streets program? - There are no current development projects in the pipeline for Lamar Blvd. - A new designation for Lamar could be “Great Parkway”. - The eastern sidewalk along Lamar and the medians are in bad shape. 	
2.4	<p>Windsor Hillside</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The closed portion Kingsbury St does not work for many of the 	



	<p>neighbors who use the park from the south as a pedestrian connection. The topography is such that for many, it is easier to cut down the hillside than to go uphill on the pavement and then go downhill on Kingsbury St.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is an opportunity to improve this area into a neighborhood gateway – improved pedestrian access while still preventing vehicular access. - There is an opportunity for more natural wilderness trails along the hillside for birding. 	
2.5	<p>PARD Annex Site</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This site has the opportunity to be a model of green design and sustainability. There is a story to tell about this site in relation to Pease Park. - Kim will check with Morgan Byars to see if there are any plans by the Watershed Department for the PARD Annex site. - Many neighbors have complained that the asphalt parking lot at the intersection of San Gabriel and 28th Half Street is visually unappealing. This intersection is a gateway to the neighborhood and they want this property to add to the visual quality of the neighborhood. - The building next to PARD will become part of PARD in the near future. - Shawn will determine if any green building measures have been already been completed or planned to be completed for this site. 	<p>PARD & Watershed</p> <p>PARD</p>
2.6	<p>East Bank</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Christmas Tree Site is a “sacred tradition”, but a question arises as to what should be the program here the rest of the year? Petanque and bocce were discussed as possibilities here. This lot has access to on street parking. - A pedestrian crossing at grade along the curve in Lamar Blvd is not safe. A grade separation is one possible opportunity which would include a tunnel under Lamar for pedestrians. - The hillside along East Bank has many seeps and springs and the sidewalk below is full of runoff from the hillside. There are many erosion issues along this hillside. - The lawn at 25th and Lamar Blvd. is owned and maintained by Lumberman’s Investment. - There are two private land parcels which are open and green. Should they be included as part of the master plan? Can it become a contributing element to the Lamar Parkway idea? - WRT requests that PARD provide the names of the business along the east side of Lamar. 	<p>PARD</p>
2.7	<p>Caswell Tennis Courts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is believed that the current drainage from the Caswell Tennis 	



	<p>Courts drains into a stormwater pipe which then outlets in the Shoal Creek inside Pease Park. There is an opportunity to see if this drainage can be daylighted or treated prior to entering the Creek.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The cedar elms along Lamar at Caswell Tennis Courts enhance a boulevard feel. New plantings along this area may be necessary. 	
2.9	<p>29th & Lamar Blvd</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This intersection is an accident corner. There is a lot of traffic coming from the university. The topography effect the ability to stop in time to avoid the on-coming traffic. The utility poles are often damaged in accidents at this intersection. - WRT requests that Capital Metro or Transportation send to the Design Team the traffic ratings for the intersections at 29th, 24th and MLK 	Capital Metro & Transportation
2.10	<p>Polecat Hollow</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strong desire to bury the overhead utilities that block the views of downtown. - There is an opportunity to make this area a placemaking civic public space. - An amphitheater in the mesquite grove by the bank in the Shoal Creek is a possibility which could double as a storm water detention. - There are possibilities for public art opportunities in this area. - Water lines, restrooms and water fountains were also discussed as a need for this area in the public meeting. - There was a discussion about bringing “whimsy” to Pease Park as part of a city wide initiative to add Austin specific character, but the goals of the project are not to make Pease Park something it isn’t. Pease Park will not be Waller Creek. 	
2.11	<p>Task Force for Families and Children</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Kim will resend the link to this report to the Design Team. - Kids gravitate to water. The master plan should locate specific play areas for children in the banks of the Shoal Creek. The limestone bank by the North Ramble / Custer’s Meadow would be a good place to let children play in the creek. - Natural play for children would work well in Pease Park. - E. coli concerns may be an issue, especially along the off-leash areas. 	PARD
2.12	<p>Lamar Terrace</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Senior Activity Center is directly across from the Park and could become a targeted user group. Lamar Terrace is an un-programmed space that could be used for senior fitness activities and children’s activities. The pedestrian connection along Lamar at 29th Street must be improved if seniors from the Center are going 	



	<p>to use this part of the Shoal Creek Greenbelt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Petanque and bocce could also go here. This is a very social activity and the users would like to be in the middle of the Park. - Lamar Terrace could be enhanced as a playfield for children from Brykerwoods. - Lamar Terrace contains a wastewater interceptor. Shawn will check to see if PARD and Wastewater have an agreement about this area. 	PARD
2.13	<p>The Bluffs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The current path will need to be expanded to accommodate the bicycle activity. This will most likely need to include a deck, railing and boardwalk. - Connectivity along the Shoal Creek trail is a huge need. Perhaps the Shoal Creek Conservancy can help obtain the easements needed to fill the gap from north of 31st Street to 34th Street. - The Bluffs are one of the few areas in the city where someone has a unique environment of the outdoor wilderness in the heart of the city. It has the feel that “the Comanches just left.” 	
2.14	<p>Pease Park Identity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pease Park needs entry markers at the main intersections along Lamar Blvd. A possible theme could be to use the stone walls that are currently found in the Park and Greenbelt. These markers could be tied into the bus shelters. The markers would help announce that “this is a park”. 	

ISSUE DATE: December 09, 2013

DISTRIBUTION: All Present, Jonathan Ogren, Regina Ramos, Peter Marsh, Tonya Swartzendruber, Morgan Byars

Attachments: 2013-11-22 TAG Map-rev.pdf

The minutes as presented herein are not in sequence with the discussion and constitute the author’s understanding of the results of the meeting. Any discrepancies or omissions should be brought to the author’s attention in writing within three working days, upon receipt of which the author will revise and re-circulate these minutes. In the absence of such notice, these minutes will be deemed correct.

APPENDIX F10

TECHNICAL ADVISORY GROUP

FEBRUARY 28, 2014



DATE & TIME: February 28, 2014, 8:30 AM
LOCATION: PARD Annex
PREPARED BY: Charlie Neer (WRT)

ATTENDEES:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Email</u>
Kim McKnight	PARD	kim.mcknight@austintexas.gov
Richard Craig	PPC	richardcraig2004@yahoo.com
Larry Schooler	Mediator/Facilitator/Community Engagement Consultant, City of Austin	Larry.Schooler@AustinTexas.Gov
Terry Jungman	Capital Improvement Program Project Management	terry.jungman@austintexas.gov
Peter Marsh	Transportation Dept.	peter.marsh@ci.austin.tx.us
Jonathan Ogren	Siglo	jonathanogren@gmail.com
Eric Tamulonis	WRT	etamulonis@ph.wrtdesign.com
Charlie Neer	WRT	cneer@ph.wrtdesign.com

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1.1	<p>Review of Previous Night's Public Meeting #2 With Larry Schooler</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The general consensus was that the meeting went well given the presence of the disc golf community. The meeting was well attended with over 110 participants. - PARD will scan and send the comment notecards gathered at the meeting to PPC and the Design Team. Upon review of the comments, we will determine if they require an immediate response. The comments received at the four breakout stations should also be included into one document of public input. - Comments on the Design Team presentation are that it was full of good content, but that it needs to be more concise and simpler for the next meeting. The presentation should present the general, large scale information with more specific information located at each of the stations. Over the next couple of months, the Design Team will focus on how the next presentation format should be set up to match the design vision. A full dress rehearsal for all speakers is recommended before the next public meeting. 	<p>PARD</p> <p>PARD/ WRT</p> <p>WRT</p>



	<p>Transportation Dept.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Peter will send standards for neighborhood-scaled traffic roundabouts (This approach will be evaluated for the Kingsbury Parkway intersection. Note that minimal safe signage should be recommended, because extensive MUTCD signage could worsen the clutter at this critical location, and make the roundabout a less satisfactory solution.) - All traffic recommendations for all intersections will be reviewed in-house by PPC and PARD prior to deciding on a preferred approach to be presented to the general public. 	<p>Peter</p>
<p>1.3</p>	<p>Natural Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Jonathan commented that most of the feedback he received the night before was almost all affirmative of the proposals we were recommending for natural resources. Trees are very important for everyone and he received many comments about not letting disc golf back into the park. - Over the next month, Siglo will be working on making specific natural resource recommendations and prescriptions for each area that can be shared with the client and the Design team in order to determine the necessary prioritization and phasing. - Pease Park suffers from lack of intentionality and deliberateness which in turn affects the legibility of the landscape and the maintenance of the landscape. - The Master Plan design and maintenance go hand in hand. The master plan will look to reduce maintenance while improving habitat, ecological health and increased aesthetics. If it is a challenge and cost burden to mow, irrigate and restore the current areas of lawn, then we could recommend reducing the area of dedicated lawn so that it can be maintained better, while the rest can be converted to low/no-mow, a meadow or savannah. - Fire safety, usable area and aesthetics must be addressed in the designation of management areas. - Sight lines in the park are important to users. - At the public meeting, Jill Nokes noted that the next presentation should also address the visual/experiential poetic qualities of the landscape – to help the public understand what the future condition will look and feel like. 	<p>Siglo</p>
<p>1.4</p>	<p>Funding</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The City Bond Program for Parks runs for 5 years. The next opportunity for funding will be in 2017. - The next Transportation Bond has already been spoken for, but there may be a way to tap into it since intersections improvements are relatively cheap compared to the cost of other transportation initiatives. 	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Street trees cannot be funded through the Transportation funding – they may be able to be funded by the Forestry Dept. - To organize the review of funding strategy, WRT will prepare a matrix that divides the master plan actions into projects with a rough cost estimate for each, a targeted funding source(s), a first, rough cut at prioritization based on criteria and phasing plan. 	
1.5	<p>Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Our next Public Meeting is tentatively planned for the end of June. - The new City Council will start in January. The Master Plan will need to be accepted/approved/adopted before then. All the necessary steps of Parks Board and Facilities Review need to be reviewed in September so Council can review in October. PARD will confirm this schedule and get back to PPC and the Design Team. - If the schedule above is correct, the Master Plan report will have to be complete by the end of August. - PARD will check to see if there are any Master Plan standards that the Design Team needs to adhere to. 	<p>PARD</p> <p>PARD</p>
1.6	<p>Miscellaneous</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Google will be placing fiber optics along Lamar Blvd. Information as to where and when has been hard to come by. - Many of the neighbors of the Park have mentioned their concern about the possibility of wildfires. PARD will send information on their “Fire Wise” program to PPC to be sent to WRT. - If we add a circular walking path at Lamar Terrace, it will need shade trees. - PPC wants to push to get the Purple Pipes into the Park. 	<p>PARD</p>

ISSUE DATE: March 17, 2014

DISTRIBUTION: All Present, Nathan Quiring, Regina Ramos, Chad Crager, Tonya Swartzendruber, Morgan Byars, Rob Borowski

Attachments: None

The minutes as presented herein are not in sequence with the discussion and constitute the author’s understanding of the results of the meeting. Any discrepancies or omissions should be brought to the author’s attention in writing within three working days, upon receipt of which the author will revise and re-circulate these minutes. In the absence of such notice, these minutes will be deemed correct.

APPENDIX F11

PEASE PARK CONSERVANCY & PARD
PUBLIC MEETING #3 DEBRIEF AND
NEXT STEPS
FEBRUARY 28, 2014



DATE & TIME: June 6, 2014, 8:30 AM
LOCATION: PARD Annex
PREPARED BY: Charlie Neer (WRT)

ATTENDEES:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Email</u>
Kim McKnight	PARD	kim.mcknight@austintexas.gov
D'Anne Williams	PARD	D'Anne.Williams@austintexas.gov
Richard Craig	PPC	richardcraig2004@yahoo.com
Andy Gill	PPC	gillandrewr@gmail.com
Eric Tamulonis	WRT	etamulonis@ph.wrtdesign.com
Charlie Neer	WRT	cneer@ph.wrtdesign.com

ITEM	DESCRIPTION	ACTION
1.0	Review of Previous Night's Public Meeting #3	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The general consensus was that the meeting went very well. Overall impressions were that the designs were favorable and represented renewed vision for the future of Pease Park. - Members of the dog community wanted to make sure that the dogs would be able to remain off leash north of 24th St and on leash south of 24th St. WRT will add a slide to the Power Point before it is uploaded to the City Website to clarify this. - There was mention that picnic shelters and dogs off leash may cause a problem. PARD would like the Master Plan Report to incorporate language about educational etiquette for dog owners and non-dog owners. Also the Gaston Green perspective should show dogs off leash – not just all on-leash. - Representatives from the disc community agreed with many of the Master Plan recommendations for the future of the park, but they will oppose the adaptation of the master plan. When this Master Plan goes through Council approval, it is possible that Council may request a recreational study to examine the potential for disc golf in the park. - Some questioned the naming of the various rooms in the park. 	<p>WRT</p> <p>WRT</p>
2.0	Master Plan Document	



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A copy of WRT’s Floyds Fork report was passed around as an example of the layout and size of report (8.5”x14” portrait) that WRT was thinking of using. It was agreed that this was a good layout and size to use since the site is so linear. - The Master Plan document will reference Park Management Best Practices for conflict resolution. The document will not single out any particular cause or issue. - The document will add disc golf as an important part of the park history. It will also explain why the activity had to be removed from the park and explain the current recommendation that it stay out of the park. - The Appendix will list all feedback that this Master Planning process has received. Kim will send to WRT the emails they have received from March until now. WRT already has the feedback from November to February. - The Appendix may be a companion document to the Master Plan Document and will include different chapters which will serves as the repository of the detailed project information that can’t be included in full in the Master Plan Document. Potential chapters in the Appendix include 1) Public Input 2) Detailed land Management Plan 3) Don Gardner’s Report 4) Cost Estimate 5) Implementation Plan. - The Master Plan Document should mention how the public input has been interpreted in the plan. The master planning process is not a vote, but an integration of input, large scale city goals, best management practices that can be brought to the park. The document should also mention <i>Imagine Austin</i> as well as all relevant Neighborhood Plans. - The Master Plan Document will serve as a long term blueprint. It should offer frank assessment of current conditions and help fuel excitement about the future potential vision for the park. - The Master Plan Document should include quotes from Sara Hensley, Richard Craig and other notables like Fritz Steiner and Sinclair Black. PARD and PPC will look into seeing if we can get a letter from the Mayor. - The Master Plan Document will include an executive summary. 	<p>WRT</p> <p>WRT</p> <p>PARD</p> <p>WRT</p> <p>WRT</p> <p>WRT</p> <p>PPC & PARD</p>
3.0	Next Steps – Boards and Commissions	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There are currently four boards and committees on the schedule for July: 1) Land, Facilities and Program Committee of the Parks and Rec Board 2) Environmental Board 3) Planning Commission 4) Design Commission. PARD will look into whether or not this needs to be presented to the Urban Forestry Board as well. These meetings are briefings and are limited to 8 slides in 10 minutes. 	<p>PARD</p>



	<p>Members of the Design Team and TAG could be asked to attend these meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Parks Board will be August 26th and the Presentation to Council will be on September 25th. WRT will attend these two meetings. PARD and PPC will decide if other sub consultants or TAG members need to attend. - To help with these boards and commissions PPC should collect neighborhood letters of support. Letters of support from Fritz Steiner, Sinclair Black and Shoal Creek Conservancy would also benefit the approval process. - PARD will finalize the list of all boards and commissions and send out to PPC and the Design Team. - The Design Team will send to PPC by Tuesday a fee proposal to attend these extra meetings. Once it is decided who will attend which meeting, WRT and PPC will amend the contract to include the change in scope and fee. 	<p>PARD & PPC</p> <p>PPC</p> <p>PARD</p> <p>WRT & PPC</p>
4.0	Miscellaneous	
4.1	<p>Cost Estimate & Implementation Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PARD and PPC will review the draft Cost Estimate and Implementation Plan and return comments / revisions to WRT. - WRT will update the Estimate and Implementation Plan to reflect changes to the design since the draft in April. - PARD will examine what the maintenance impact of the Master Plan recommendation s will have on them. This will need to be factored into the Master Plan Document. 	<p>PARD & PPC</p> <p>PARD & WRT</p>
4.2	<p>Urban Trails Master Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Urban Trails Master Plan does recommend a dedicated bike trail as a separate facility, but this is not that feasible since Pease Park is so linear and narrow. 	
4.3	<p>Hiking Trails in Ramble Scramble and Windsor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Some who attended the Public Meeting voiced concerns that adding hiking trails to Ramble Scramble and Windsor hillsides will actually increase the homeless issue in the park, however studies have shown that adding trails to these types of areas will create enough foot traffic that the area will no longer seem appealing to the homeless. 	
4.4	<p>Shoal Creek Trail Material</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Shoal Creek Trail is recommended to be made out of concrete. Permeable concrete is an acceptable material to use as it aides in stormwater infiltration, but PARD will not be maintaining the open pores in the paving which will eventually clog and act as 	



	impermeable paving. Impermeable paving may hold up better in a floodplain but is not viewed as aiding stormwater infiltration for tree roots. WRT will review with PARD which material has been shown to survive in a floodplain and what the costs for each type of concrete are.	WRT & PARD
4.5	Restrooms <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The Master Plan needs to mention that there are provisions for more restrooms in the future that just the improved restroom at Kingsbury Commons and Lamar Terrace. 	
4.6	Parking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The upper parking lot at the Senior Center could be shown as parking space for the park. - All PARD parking should be listed in the Master Plan – this includes the parking on 19th St. - Caswell Tennis Facility has mostly on-street parking and may not be able to be included as parking space for the park. 	
4.7	East Lamar Landowner Outreach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - PPC will try and organize the landowners on the east side of Lamar to review the master plan recommendations along Lamar which would serve to improve their frontage to the park. PPC will draft a letter to these neighbors explaining the Mater Plan improvements with a link to the City’s website where they can review the Power Point Presentation. - Austin Fit Magazine is one of these neighbors along Lamar and may be a good partner for PPC. - Any articles or marketing outreach done by PPC will be reviewed by Robert Nash to make sure that the message of any outreach is controlled by PPC. 	PPC

ISSUE DATE: June 9, 2014

DISTRIBUTION: All Present, Nathan Quiring, Emily Little, Jonathan Ogren

Attachments: None

The minutes as presented herein are not in sequence with the discussion and constitute the author’s understanding of the results of the meeting. Any discrepancies or omissions should be brought to the author’s attention in writing within three working days, upon receipt of which the author will revise and re-circulate these minutes. In the absence of such notice, these minutes will be deemed correct.