

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS
Special Called Council Meeting

July 23, 1980
7:00 P.M.

Porter Junior High School Cafetorium
2206 Prather Lane

The meeting was called to order with Mayor McClellan presiding.

Roll Call:

Present: Mayor McClellan, Councilmembers Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau,
Mullen, Trevino,

Absent: Councilmember Snell

Mayor McClellan stated that this was a Special Called Meeting for the purpose of conducting a public hearing on the Proposed 1980-1985 Capital Improvements Program. The Mayor then introduced Ms. Lee Thomson, Budget Director, who presented a brief overview of the proposed five-year program.

Ms. Thomson said that the Planning Commission and the City Manager had reviewed the 1980-85 Capital Improvements Program and recommended it to the Council based upon the following criteria: 1) compliance with the Comprehensive Plan and established Council goals and policies; 2) commitment to investment-oriented projects to minimize the impact on the operating budget, and 3) size of the program in relation to bonding authority and to the City's ability to finance future capital costs.

A five-year CIP totalling \$591.3 million was recommended by both the Planning Commission and the City Manager. The primary difference between the two recommendations was in timing and funding. The City Manager had recommended a one-year program requiring new bond authority of \$16.9 million for GO bonds for general government projects and \$35.1 million for utility projects. The Planning Commission had recommended a three-year program totalling \$72.6 million for general government projects and \$97.3 million for utility projects. Some of the highlights of the two recommended programs were as follows:

1. Public Works - Emphasizes street and drainage improvements to meet present and future needs in the rapidly growing periphery of the City and uses developer cost participation to a greater extent than in previous CIP's.
2. Airport - Improvements to be covered by revenues from airlines and air passenger users which would be transferred to repay GO bonds so that the GO bonds would be backed by airport users rather than by the tax base.
3. Parks and Recreation - Funds were included to implement program needs, including \$9 million authorized by voters for 1980-81 additional projects which would reflect the new Parks Master Plan which would be available early next year.
4. Transportation - Busses, bus stops and other transit system improvements and an accelerated traffic signalization program.
6. Electric Department - Improvements for conventional, non-nuclear projects recommended primarily to maintain the electric system capacity and current reliability level for electric customers.
7. Water and Wastewater - Contains funds for a new Water and Wastewater Master Plan and for an environmental impact analysis of development in the Upper Williamson Creek Watershed.

Ms. Thomson next referred to projects dealing directly with South Austin as follows:

1. Clarksville Public Health Center
2. Renovation of Fire Station No. 4
3. South Austin Sports Center improvements
4. A number of public works projects
5. EMS Station No. 12
6. Far South Austin Public Health Center
7. Southwest Austin Fire Station No. 29
8. Southeast Austin Branch Library
9. Mabel Davis Recreation Center
10. Wilderness Park
11. South Austin Police Patrol Center

In addition, the following Citywide projects would effect South Austin:

1. Swimming pool improvements at Deep Eddy, St. Elmo, Stacy and others.
2. Flood control bank stabilization at Mabel Davis District Park
3. Greenbelt acquisition - Williamson Creek, Onion Creek and others
4. Irrigation - Tennis Center, South Austin Sports Center, Mabel Davis District Park
5. Lighting - Fiesta Gardens and other parks
6. Additional park acquisition for neighborhood parks
7. Parking and Roads - Numerous South Austin recreational facilities
8. Outdoor gym facilities at South First and Slaughter Creek District Park
9. A number of other parks and recreation improvements in South Austin

Mayor McClellan then opened the hearing to discussion from the audience.

Mr. BUCK WOOD, representing the Walsh Tarleton Neighborhood Association, stated that Bee Cave Road will be connected with Loop 360. There will be two major shopping centers in the area with the largest located on Loop 360 and another on Bee Cave Road. Those two shopping centers will be connected by what is now a two-lane paved black top road. He asked the Council to either not open up both ends of Walsh Tarleton Road now or build a needed bridge over a creek first. He was concerned that opening the street now would create safety problems for the area, which contained two schools below high school.

Ms. Cindy Hutchinson, member, Walsh Tarleton Neighborhood Association, speaking for improvements to Walsh Tarleton Road, made the following points:

1. Suggested that a higher priority than 1981-82 be assigned to the Walsh Tarleton Road project.
2. Move the project to 1980-81 and include it in the City Manager's CIP proposal.
3. There had been a verbal commitment from various entities to share in improvements costs for the project.
4. Proposed an alternate sidewalk project along the east side of Walsh Tarleton Road abutting both schools whereby vehicular and nonvehicular traffic would be separated by a six-foot median.

Mr. Hector De Leon, president, Walsh Tarleton Neighborhood Association, asked that building of the bridge be moved up in the CIP so that increased traffic could be handled adequately. He also asked for proper sidewalks for the area.

Mayor McClellan asked Mr. Ridings of the Public Works Department to comment on the Walsh Tarleton Road project.

Mr. Ridings said that staff members had been meeting with the neighborhood to look at sidewalk alternatives and priority of funding. In terms of conflict with traffic and development of the subdivision, if funds were appropriated in the one-year program for both engineering and construction, it was quite possible that the bridge construction could be well underway by the time that both ends of Walsh Tarleton were well-developed and fully open. \$540,000 would be required for the engineering and construction. Some areas would have to be adjusted if the program went from five years to one year.

MS. ANNABELLE LINSOMB, representing the Austin Natural Science Association, spoke in support of the Austin Nature Center and asked for its continued funding.

MR. BOB LARSON, president, Barton Hills/Horseshoe Bend Neighborhood Association, requested that a preliminary engineering feasibility study be done on South Lamar Boulevard transportation improvements. The area to be considered ran from Bluebonnet Lane to Sixth Street on the north. Areas to be studied covered 1) possibility of reversible lanes, 2) intersection improvements and 3) systems management improvements, such as prohibition of turning movements.

Councilmember Cooke commented that last year in the final deliberations of the Austin Transportation Study the issue was addressed and entered into the objectives of the Austin Transportation Study to see how traffic flow could be improved in the South Lamar facility.

Dr. Jim Benson, Director of the Urban Transportation Department, stated that the Southwest Quadrant Study would address portions of the area being discussed. There was some money in the CIP for transportation system management improvements. The Southwest Quadrant Study was being reviewed by the task force and should be available within several weeks.

Councilmember Cooke asked Dr. Benson to get an update on the South Lamar facility, which was brought up last year before the Austin Transportation Study under the Unified Work Plan.

MS. ELSIE ALTHENN, representing the Far South Austin Community Association, referred to CIP 78/62-31 (Paving - Eberhart-Cooper Lane/Congress Avenue-City Limits) and asked if the project included Cooper Lane near Eberhart for drainage improvements. Flooding in the area was a problem. She also was concerned that opening of a nearby street (Milford Way) would cause more flooding problems.

Mr. Ridings of Public Works stated that the Department had met with members of the neighborhood association and changes had been made to reduce a 44-foot wide street to a substandard one which would be upgraded to provide for street reconstruction, drainage and sidewalk improvements with a major emphasis on drainage improvements. Some large trees in the area would be worked around to save them.

MR. JOHN PICKWELL, vice president, Whispering Oaks/Cherry Creek Area Neighborhood Association, spoke with regard to the following projects:

1. CIP 76/62-12 (Paving - William Cannon Drive/Brodie Lane - US 290)
Felt that the project should be dropped and money used elsewhere.
2. CIP 81/86-03 (Neighborhood Park Acquisition)
Supported parkland acquisition for the area.
3. 81/87-03 (South Austin Patrol Center)
Supported a Police Center in South Austin.

MR. PICKWELL also thought that general aviation improvements at Municipal Airport were very good.

MS. PAM GREY, president, Southwest Austin Neighborhood Association, spoke on the following projects:

1. CIP 76/62-12 (Paving - William Cannon Drive/Brodie Lane-US 290)
Opposed project because it would increase traffic.
2. CIP 79/60-04 (Drainage - Cherry Creek Improvements)
Supported the project because of flooding problems.
Also supported a storm water detention facility for the Westgate Boulevard area of South Austin.
3. CIP 81/87-03 (South Austin Patrol Center)

Felt that the project would be a great asset for the neighborhood and would help relations between the Police Department.
4. CIP 81/86-03 (Neighborhood Park Acquisition)
Supported the need for a park in the Whispering Oaks area.

MR. PAT SILVERWISE, representing the Cooper Lane Neighborhood Association, spoke in support of CIP 78/62-31 (Paving - Eberhart-Cooper Lane/Congress Avenue-City Limits). The Association asked that the proposed improvements not reroute or straighten the roadway in such a manner to endanger or eliminate existing trees and that the existing two-lane road on Eberhart-Cooper Lane be upgraded to a two-lane City-approved street with drainage and sidewalk improvements. They asked that the street width be in the lower 30's foot range and a combination sidewalk/bike lanes to keep children out of the street.

MS. GLADYS BAXTER asked and was told that the City owned the lot adjacent to the Kinney Avenue Fire Station and that it was large enough to accommodate two pumper trucks and an Emergency Medical Services Station.

MR. JERRY LOBDILL, representing the McCarty Lane Neighborhood Association, spoke in opposition to CIP 76/62-12 (Paving - William Cannon Drive/Brodie-US 290). He asked that the project be deleted.

Regarding CIP 79/62-14 (Paving - Brodie Lane-William Cannon - Davis Lane), Mr. Lobdill stated that four lanes would be excessive. He also asked that strip development by means of developer participation be avoided.

Mayor McClellan asked Dr. Benson of the Urban Transportation Department to get a report on the projects and report back to Council as well as share it with the neighborhood association.

MR. ROBERT FINLEY, a member of the Environmental Board, stated that in a letter to the Planning Commission dated May 16, 1980, the Environmental Board recommended that the William Cannon projects be deleted.

MS. SHUDDE FATH spoke in support of keeping the Kinney Avenue Fire Station where it was.

MS. CONNIE MOORE spoke in opposition to the following projects:

1. CIP 73/22-23 (Southwest Austin Transmission Main)
2. CIP 80/22-02 (Davis Lane Pump Station)
3. CIP 76/22-27 (Martin Hill Reservoir)
4. CIP 79/80-04 (Civic Center)

Ms. Moore also requested that saunas for Barton Springs be placed in the CIP, particularly for winter time swimmers.

Mayor McClellan pointed out that the first three items were not included in the one-year bond program recommended by the City Manager.

Bill Bulloch, Water and Wastewater Director, commented as follows:

"...we have asked Council to consider a study...environmental impact study on that area, since many of the issues that precede extension of water and wastewater deal with density, the aquifer recharge zones, and that type of policy should be set that would dictate the sizing and the alignment of that line, so we are talking about whether or not that line would serve existing utility customers, or it would provide additional capacity for additional homes and so forth in appropriate areas, and we don't have those answers yet. Certainly agree that those issues be addressed before that type of major policy decision on extension of water service is made."

Mr. Bucky Couch, representing the West Creek Neighborhood association, stated that his area was in the southwest area of the City and that water pressure was very low. The Neighborhood had voted against the project in the last bond election, but now felt that it was a mistake. He asked that the Southwest Distribution Main project not be pushed back too far into the future.

ADJOURNMENT

The Council adjourned its meeting at 8.18 p.m.

APPROVED


Mayor

ATTEST:



City Clerk