



## **Memo**

**To: Members of Boards and Commissions**

**From: Friends of Barton Springs Pool**

**Date: February 25, 2013**

**Subject: FAQ Re: Grounds Improvement Project at Barton Springs Pool**

### **Why amend the SOS Ordinance?**

The SOS Ordinance does not allow for any construction in watersheds contributing to Barton Springs and for anything to be done to improve the pool, an amendment is required. Because of this, the plans require a site-specific amendment to the SOS Ordinance in order for any of the proposed improvements to be implemented, including installing irrigation for the South Lawn and trees, burying the power lines, building the ADA path down to the pool and the improvements to the Tree Court. None of these projects can go forward without amending the SOS Ordinance, but it is a site-specific amendment applicable only to Barton Springs Pool, and will not affect the City's ability to use the SOS Ordinance to protect the aquifer.

### **Why will the plan increase impervious cover?**

The increase in impervious cover comes entirely from the expansion of the South parking lot. Currently covered in dusty caliche (and considered impervious cover by the City), many swimmers requested that the Master Plan address parking lot improvements during public input, and the Master Plan calls for the lot to be paved. The current parking lot is not to code, and is grandfathered in because it existed when the SOS Ordinance was passed. The City is required to bring the parking lot to code if it makes any improvements to the lot. Because the code requires space for things like turning radius and emergency vehicle access, paving the current lot footprint would result in a reduction of parking spaces. Staff additionally wants to address the current problem of vehicles parking on the grass due to lack of parking spaces, by increasing the number of spaces. Removing the caliche would also eliminate the runoff of dust particles from the parking lot.

### **Can't we improve the parking lot without increasing impervious cover?**

The Environmental Board has approved the project, with the condition that City staff look for ways to offset the increased impervious cover from the parking lot with removal of impervious cover elsewhere in the Barton Springs Zone. There are many options that could make this possible, and FBSP strongly supports this idea.

**Why do we need a path to the historical marker on the South side?**

There are good reasons for providing a crushed granite ADA path to the historical marker on the South side. A site visit by the Environmental Board to the location of the path a couple years ago, with members of the disabled community in attendance, proved to be eye-opening and emotional. Those disabled patrons had never been able to visit the South Lawn before and were struck by its beauty. But the Barton Springs Master Plan calls for the South Lawn to remain in its current state as much as possible. On balance, FBSP does not object to the removal of the crushed granite path from the plan, but also would not object to it being included.

**No one objects to the improvements to the Tree Court. Can't we split the project into North and South?**

For several years, the Grounds Improvements have moved forward as one plan, and have been submitted as one site plan to the City. To split the plan apart would require the architect to submit two completely new site plans, and would start the process over from the very beginning. In addition, some of the projects encompass both sides of the pool (for example the electrical work and the irrigation projects).

**Has there been a sufficient public process?**

The General Grounds Improvements are the result of years of public process – first during the creation of the Barton Springs Pool Master Plan, which was adopted by City Council in 2009, then during the development of the Grounds Improvements plan. All in all, this process resulted in over 40 public meetings over years, starting in 2006, and included the formation of a Joint Subcommittee of the Parks Board and the Environmental Board. Many changes have been made to the plans over the years as a result of stakeholder input.