



Friends of Barton Springs Pool

MAILING

P.O. Box 685286
Austin, Texas 78768-5286

PHONE

512-236-9655

FAX

512-236-1258

EMAIL

president
@friendsofbartonspringspool.org

WEB

www.friendsofbartonspringspool.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

OFFICERS

President: Robin Cravey
Vice President: Gary Beyer
Treasurer: Maria Ines Weber
Secretary: Mary Yarrington

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

Advocacy: Tom Weber,
Communications: Chasity Keen Larios,
Fun: Clarke Hammond,
Fundraising: Mike Cannatti
Membership: Karl Detjen
Service: Jonathan Beall

January 11, 2010

To: Tom Nelson, Parks & Recreation Dept.
From: Tom Weber & Robin Cravey, FBSP
Subject: Comments on PARD Initial Draft of Project Review Process

The Friends of Barton Springs Pool (FBSP) appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments on the initial proposal by PARD of a review process for BSP Master Plan short-term projects. We understand that PARD would like to use a consistent process that would result in implementing each project. On this subject, we offer both some general comments and specific comments on the initial flow chart we were provided in December, 2009.

General Comments

The FBSP supports establishing a process that would expedite the review of the projects approved in the Master Plan. An established process serves to give notice to all interested parties of how and when input will be considered. It would improve transparency and eliminate arguments that organizations or the public were either kept in the dark or not offered an opportunity to give input.

We urge PARD to establish a process that complements a goal of completing the review and design phases of all Short-Term Projects by August, 2010 and to have all necessary contracts executed by the end of calendar year 2010. Of course, not all short-term projects require an entire year of further review because they have been vetted already, and some short-term projects can readily be implemented in an even shorter time.

We understand that resources of the city staff, volunteer organizations, and the public are limited, and any process developed should be efficient of everyone's time. Therefore, the FBSP recommends that PARD group multiple projects together and create a small number of review tracks. In this manner, a given group of projects would be considered together at each step of the established process. Projects could be grouped together based upon similarity, relatedness, similar approval steps, who with the city is involved, or complexity.

Once reasonable schedules are determined, process delays should be avoided whenever possible. Stakeholder meetings and Joint Committee meetings and city staff technical reviews should stay on schedule. The FBSP encourages a



focus on project management in 2010 and hope an established review process will prevent delays in Short-Term Master Plan projects like we experienced in 2009.

Specific Comments

Project Initiation – We suggest that a step be added. At this step, the city would communicate that staff or project leads have been assigned and from whom further project information could be obtained or questions directed.

Rough Design/Concept/Ideas – This step should be eliminated since the City Council has already approved and funded the BSP Short-Term Master Plan projects as a result of an extensive rough design and conceptual phase. Unless the City Council was to disapprove of the projects, the PARD process should not repeat this step.

Design/Concept with Stakeholders Group – We recommend that this be titled “Stakeholder Meeting 1”. At an initial presentation, the city should present its design concept and communicate the project review time line. Public input would be solicited at that meeting and for a 30-day period.

Meeting with Stakeholders Group – We recommend that this be titled “Stakeholder Meeting 2”. This second meeting would be held 30 days after the first meeting. City staff would summarize comments received to date and design changes since the previous presentation. Public input would again be solicited at that meeting. City staff would then develop a 30% design proposal in consideration of this input.

Meeting with Joint Committee – The 30% and 90% design proposals each would be presented at a formal meeting that allowed public input. The Joint Committee would either approve the design proposal or approve it with modifications. The Joint Committee could choose to remand the proposal to city staff if serious flaws were apparent. The 60% design proposal should be eliminated as a specific process step.

Presentations to Commissions and Council– The initial proposal by PARD includes four steps in series for review of the projects by the Design Commission, Historical Landmark Commission, Park Commission, Environmental Board, Planning Commission, and City Council. We recommend these steps be replaced with one generic step titled “Board and Commission Review”. This step of the process may not



be applicable to some of the projects. Footnotes could describe what type matters must go to one or more of the Commissions or Council.

Bid Process for Construction Contracts – The major milestone steps and timeline for the bid process should be shown as process steps, for transparency and to help communicate how well the project is staying on track. The steps and the period to advertise for bids/bid opening, departmental review, and the request for council action should be shown.

The table below shows a revised process flow chart that illustrates our suggested changes. Enclosed with these comments is a proposed timeline for implementing all the short-term projects this year.

Thank you for considering these comments. Together we hope to achieve a shared goal to get all the BSP Master Plan short-term projects underway and completed.

PROPOSED REVISED PROJECT REVIEW PROCESS				
Day 1	Day 20	Day 50	Day 70	Day 100
Project start	Stakeholder 1	Stakeholder 2	Joint Comm 30	Joint Comm 90
Day 120				
City Reviews				
Day 150	Day 180	Day 210	Day 240	Day 270
Bidding	Dept. Reviews	Council action	Contract	Action