

# Zilker Park WG Meeting Agenda Notes

Oct 1, 2018 12n - 2p

Temporary Secretary: Jimmy McArthur

Decisions/votes are highlighted and noted by **#Decision** below

## Welcome and Introductions

- Members went around room and introduced name, organization

## Report on Organizational Recommendations

Referencing the document formed after prior meeting:

<https://docs.google.com/document/d/110BnZkwDsjKLefWClytGmFpgykTtJ-gUH5FL8DbPQY/edit>

Breaking down the discussion by Org Recommendation topic, with notes on discussion below

### **Each Organization, Business, Board or Commission, and Council District will have a single vote on Working Group decisions**

- Currently requesting a rep from each District, but not all Council members have not all selected a rep
  - Some discussion around District reps (from Council Member) vs reps that happen to live in a particular district, but are actually representing different constituencies.
  - General consensus is that there should be one vote per org/council/etc...
  - It is possible that one single person could represent both a District and an organizational body, but their duty is to properly represent those separately if needed.
- Some concerns that the voting body could be too large to come to a reasonable consensus
- Each group only receives one vote, regardless of # of group members that show up (e.g. if FoZ has 3 people show up, only one vote)
- Some discussion to ensure we are properly representing all members relevant to Zilker Park (e.g. Science and Nature Center)

**Working Group recommendations to Council and PARD will be determined by a consensus approach. If a consensus cannot be achieved on a particular subject, alternative recommendations will be provided**

- No objections would be considered a consensus
  - If there are objections, the role of the group is to recommend alternate approaches to help find solutions that would satisfy one or more groups within the WG.
    - Would need to note what the vote was in the case of a dissension (how many support each approach)
    - These would all be conveyed to council

**Working Group operational decisions can be made by majority vote**

- This would be straight up or down based on quorum (TBD later, pending total # of members)
- What would we consider quorum?
  - City bylaws say 6 is enough to be quorum
  - Larger the group gets the more difficult it is
  - Suggestion by Clark to have a majority of orgs (12) for quorum
    - Council reps would not be part of this
    - We have 22 orgs w/o council (32 with)

○ **#Decision - Consensus agreed that quorum is 12**

**The Working Group will select a Chair, Vice-Chair, and Secretary to provide meeting facilitation and record keeping.**

- We are an independent entity from City Staff.
- Notes vis Secretary is an important position as that will be primary means of comms b/w WG and City Staff
- Chair recommendations
  - James Russell (nominated and accepted via consensus)
- Vice Chair
  - Clark Hancock (nominated and accepted via consensus)
- Secretary
  - Mike Cannatti (prefers not to)
  - Jimmy McArthur (myself agreed to be permanent sub)
    - Sign in sheet for attendance and votes to be recorded

**The Working Group will establish subject area Sub-groups to investigate specific areas of interest. Each Sub-group will select a Chair and Secretary to facilitate their activities. Each Sub-group will provide the Working Group proposals to consider for final recommendation**

- These groups would be created based on sub-mission of the Zilker Park Working Group

**The Working Group Chair, Vice Chair, Secretary, and Sub-group Chairs will constitute a Steering Committee for the Working Group to ensure effective coordination and communication**

- No notes for this section

**As a focus for its initial activity, the Working Group might consider the following based on the charge from the Council resolution:**

- Council has already laid out our first set of sub-groups that our Working Group should consider our mandate
  - a) Determine the viability of proposed improvement plans to fortify the Butler Landfill cap and propose operational guidelines for that site;
  - b) Evaluate immediate options and opportunities for parking outside of the Zilker Metropolitan Park area and related strategies for reducing traffic in the Park
  - c) Develop recommendations to establish a plan to permanently remove parking on the Polo Fields
  - Master Plan Scoping (added by Chairman)
    - Could be fed by the previous three
  - Submit a report re: all of the above to CoA
- These areas should be our primary focus as a Working Group.

## Discussion of Recommendations

### Discussion on Scope of Work Group / Discussion possible Sub-groups

#### General questions

- Q from Chair: Is the idea that our recommendations on the above would be included within the Master Plan?
  - Ideally yes, but the full scope of Master Plan is not totally known
  - These would be items to be included in a feasibility study
  - Goal should be stay focused and try to come up with a reasonable, viable plan for these three items (plus a report)
- Q: Looking back at resolution (listed as 7b in recommendations) - Resolution seems like it should be larger to include a holistic parking/transportation study, not just intra-park
  - A (Clark): He reduced the resolution a bit in order to help clarify what our WG responsibility is.
  - A: Recommend to both try to solve the specific resolution, but we can also consider additional recommendations for Council review, assuming they are relevant to the larger task.
  - A: Important to note that we are tasked with both addressing the short term issues of this WG, but additionally long term we might be able to assist in recommending for the Master Plan. Essentially Council is listening when they attempt to develop the scope of the Master Plan
- Q: Can we have access to the consultant that is managing the landfill cap?
  - A: If that information is available, we can make that available to the WG. However, if there is a budget requirement to bring in these experts, it might prevent CoA from providing them (b/c WG have no budget)

- Q (for staff): Master Plan sure to go through robust community engagement process. How do we ensure the work this group is doing isn't going to be replicated by the Master Plan? Basically, how do we avoid doing what the Master Plan is meant to do.
  - A: Staff will try to review things and help us scope if it seems we'll be reaching too far into Master Plan. There is information that the Master Plan will have, that this WG won't.
- Q: So some of our recommendations might be "This should be looked into in the Master Plan"
  - A: Yes. Possible that our recommendations can't be complete without more info
- Q: We should not divide into sub-groups without the relevant information from the City. If we don't have that, it's likely we can't come to a recommendation. Basically "why are we here" if the Master Plan will be covering this.
  - A: There are "short term" and "long term" solutions. This group should be focused on the short term items. We should consider breaking some things up to ensure we are pushing recommendations that solve the immediate needs.
  - A: It's difficult to make recommendations without understanding what the Master Plan is. For instance, how do you make landfill recommendations w/o understanding what's happening with the Polo Fields? That said, if we can tackle some of the most immediate needs to get some carefully crafted to-do list on how to approach it, because it's a huge undertaking, that would be a success
  - A: Master Plan process should start soon (relative to City time) - A lot of what's happening in the park is Summer has very high usage / demanding period of the park. Given that, the relief a Master Plan might bring in the long run, there are opportunities to attempt to relieve these more immediate issues (e.g. Are we encouraging public transportation? Are there enough bike racks?) Whatever recommendations occur, Staff would need time to help publicize and coordinate in order to enact them.
  - A: We don't see this as duplication, but as a head start for the Master Plan
  - A by Clark: We aren't necessarily looking at permanent solutions, we're looking for direction. How do we change the way people interact with Zilker Park? We should consider our purpose to find short-term directions that we can start moving in, by next summer, to help people think about how they access and use the park.
- Q: During the first meeting there was a mention of a feasibility study? Is that relevant here?
  - A: The bath house feasibility study is the only one available. Staff can provide that. There are also some park attendance numbers that we can make available.
- Q: Can we have a motion to ask the City to say that Master Plan work needs to start ASAP?
  - A: Yes
- Q: Can we have a motion to get all of the information relevant to each sub-group to those people as soon as possible?
  - A: Yes
- Q: Is there a schedule for the Master Plan and scope of work?

- A: Not yet. What we do for a scoping process (Phase I of Master Plan) is engage w/ community to get thoughts, look at other comparable parks, etc...
- Q: Can someone sit on more than one sub-group?
  - A: **#Decision - No problem if someone sits on more than one sub-group**
- Q: Can anyone attend a sub-group?
  - A: Yes
- Q: Sub-groups are just meant to make recommendations, not meant to make the decisions?
  - A: Yes, but there should be some deference about the work put into them.
- Q: Is there going to be a delay before Sub-Groups are formed?
  - A: It's recommended we do
  - A (Clark): Sub-Group A should start immediately (Butler), but B & C start before next meeting.

## Additional Discussion

- Clark recommends we go ahead and split into sub-groups and start working (no motion)
- Mark Gentle - Maybe as a group we need to hear everything there is to know from the City side about transportation and what we see as the current problems that we're trying to address. And see how those logically flow into the sub-categories. If we don't have a common understanding, then we are jumping ahead.
- James - Do we have resources from the city?
  - Yes, but they aren't here today.
  - They can provide contextual information on circulation patterns, road types, etc... but they can't provide "new" observations
  - Can provide challenges from their experiences
- Aside from transportation, we need knowledge about general operations and demand. This can help us to create data points for what we're dealing with.
  - Barton Springs visitors
  - Parking meters
  - Polo fields
- Staff - WG needs to clearly articulate exactly what data we want and formalize it as a request to the city
- Clark - For the purposes of this group, we'd like to hear from each relevant department within Zilker Park, what their problems and pain points are. Along with data to support. And a list of all of the special events in the park (large and small)
- James - To provide in Google Drive a document from PARD that would provide details on all parks, stats, etc...

## Selection of Officers (appended from above)

- Chair nominations

- James Russell (nominated and accepted via consensus) **#Decision**
- Vice Chair nominations
  - Clark Hancock (nominated and accepted via consensus) **#Decision**
- Secretary
  - Mike Cannatti (prefers not to)
  - Jimmy McArthur (myself agreed to be permanent sub)

## Housekeeping

- Notes to be added to Google Drive
- Steering Committee will distill to specific questions and passed on to Staff
- Can staff set up a Doodle Poll / sign up for various sub-groups?

## Meeting Schedule

- For meeting schedules
  - Suggestion to establish a regular meeting
  - First Monday of the month, 12-2pm **#Decision**
    - **\*Meeting location might be different each time\***

## Communications to Staff (gathered from notes)

Per Staff: WG needs to clearly articulate exactly what data we want and formalize it as a request to the city

- For the purposes of this group, we'd like to hear from each relevant department within Zilker Park, what their problems and pain points are. Along with data to support.
- A list of all of the special events in the park (large and small)
- Aside from transportation, we need knowledge about general operations and demand. This can help us to create data points for what we're dealing with.
  - Barton Springs visitors
  - Parking meters
  - Polo fields
- Potential time frame for Master Plan
- List of District Reps (or a note if they decline)
- Can we have access to the consultant that is managing the landfill cap?
- Request extension to council b/c of almost certain to miss deadline of October 18
- We would like to see the Butler engineering studies (Will be provided by COA and added to Google Drive)

## To Do

- James - To provide in Google Drive a document from PARD that would provide details on all parks, stats, etc...

## Agenda items for next meeting

- Intros + challenges faced in park
- Brief report from SubGroup A