

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

July 25, 1974
1:00 P.M.Electric Auditorium
301 West Avenue

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Pro Tem Love presiding.

Roll Call:

Present: Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann,
Mayor Pro Tem Love

Absent: Mayor Butler

The Invocation was delivered by REVEREND CLARENCE WALTON, Trinity United Methodist Church.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council approve the Special Meeting Minutes of July 18, 1974 (11:30 a.m.) and the Regular Meeting Minutes of July 18, 1974 (1:00 p.m.). The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman,
Lebermann

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor Butler

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilman Handcox

HEARING ON AMENDMENT TO AUSTIN DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mayor Pro Tem Love opened the public hearing scheduled for 1:00 p.m. on the passage of a resolution on an amendment to the Austin Development Plan, as follows: (postponed from July 18, 1974)

An area of approximately 25.5 acres requested by Columbia Scientific Industries by R. T. Mayfield for a change in the land use designation from Suburban Residential to Planned Development Area. The request is located on Old U. S. Highway 183 northwest of Austin; it is bounded on the north by Oak Forest Estates Subdivision, on the west by an unnamed road, on the south by Q Ranch Road, and on the east by Old U. S. Highway 183.

Mr. Eugene Haddad, Executive Vice President of Columbia Scientific Industries, reviewed the action that had been taken by the Council on July 18 by stating that a plan had been submitted to the Council; and at the request of Councilman Friedman, it was suggested that the parties involved discuss this and try to reach an agreement on points concerning the area. He noted that this had been done; and as a result of meetings, he submitted a modified plan to the Council along with a letter signed by Dr. Lon Morgan, President of Columbia Scientific Industries, and Mr. Pat Mullen, attorney representing the land owners in the area, in regard to the agreement that had been reached.

Mr. Mullen expressed the residents' deep appreciation for the opportunity the Council provided them to meet with Dr. Morgan to work out an agreement they felt was mutually beneficial to all parties concerned. He reiterated that they had reached an agreement and had no objection to the area as modified.

Councilman Friedman moved that the Council close the public hearing and adopt a resolution amending the Austin Development Plan as afore-mentioned. The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman,
Lebermann

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor Butler

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilman Handcox

APPEAL OF ISSUANCE OF CREEK DEVELOPMENT PERMIT

Mayor Pro Tem Love opened the public hearing scheduled for 1:00 p.m. on an appeal by Mr. and Mrs. Howard L. Long of the decision of the Planning Commission approving the issuance of a Creek Development Permit to Teague-Buda. Mr. Dick Lillie, Planning Department Director, reviewed this by stating that this project had started several years ago dealing with a zoning case, which was approved by the Council; and subsequent to that, there was bulldozing of the property, and the City passed a Creek Development Ordinance. He further stated that since the ordinance, there have been a couple of applications by the owners to satisfy not only the City's requirements but the wishes of the immediate neighborhood. He indicated that the Council had before it several months ago an application which was recommended by the Planning Commission, and the Council denied the permit to develop this particular property. He noted that this previous application had been reviewed by the staff of various departments and the neighborhood and felt at that time that it was one that they could all agree on. He further stated that since the denial of that permit, this was the second permit which has been through the various boards and commissions and through meetings with the neighborhood and that it was recommended by the Planning Commission. Mr. Lillie noted that this permit dealt with the creek

ordinance and that Mr. Charles Graves, Director of Engineering, could comment on this with respect to what the ordinance required insofar as the development of this property. In conclusion, he stated that after approval by the Planning Commission, this was approved by the Engineering Department; and the appeal was based on that approval.

MRS. GLADYS LONG, 1510 Betty Jo Drive, appeared as the appellant and stated that she also represented the South River City Citizens. She noted that they had been trying to maintain the beauty of this area for five years and in 1969 they protested a zoning change from "A" Residential to "LR" Local Retail by John Roberts, Inc., which was approved by the Council; and the property was sold. She further noted that in 1973 the entire property on both sides of Reagan Terrace was bulldozed. She reiterated that the reason for their appeal of this was to try once again to preserve Harper Creek, the neighborhood, and the natural beauty surrounding it.

MS. DIANE DONOVAN, representing Travis Audubon Society, felt that the language of the creek ordinance needed clarification and was concerned with what the Council's decision would be as it would serve as a precedent of the future of this ordinance. She presented copies of a letter from MRS. J. H. ARNOLD, President of the Audubon Society, in which she listed the Society's concern about this application:

1. Hopeful that the ordinance would be interpreted in such a manner that sufficient vegetation along and near creek banks would be preserved to retain the visual character of the waterways; promote wildlife habitat; and ensure erosion control, air purification, and air cooling.
2. Hopeful that the Council would find some design modifications feasible and necessary within the stated intent of the ordinance so that the remaining trees along Harper's Creek would remain and the natural character of this waterway supported.

MR. DAVID GRAEBER, Brooks, Barr, Graeber & White, the architectural firm for Teague-Buda, reviewed the history of this project from the time his firm had been requested to work on this beginning in October, 1973. He noted that many hours had been spent in discussion of all aspects of this particular project and that they had only been asked to prepare conceptual plans; and after denial of the permit on February 14, 1974, they were authorized to proceed with the complete design drawings on March 4, which dealt with the exact size and location of the building. He noted that they had met with the staff to discuss the procedures required by the creek ordinance and added that he would not be before the Council if they did not have the basic approval of all City departments and agencies involved.

He reviewed the design of this project, stating that they had done everything they could in regard to sensitivity. He noted that the total piece of land was 4.055 acres and out of the 400 or 500 trees in the area, the vast majority would be retained. He felt that the creek would be handled in such a way that it would enhance the design of the building, which would be three stories high. He further noted that in order to ease people's minds, they had submitted their development book to the City and were in total agreement of building as outlined in the book. He also noted that they met all requirements

of the flood plain, and the flow line would be moved about three feet to enhance the creek. He stated that the building would be 74,000 square feet with the required parking facilities for 248 cars on the property.

In response to Councilman Dryden's question, Mr. Graeber stated that in every instance they were in accordance with the creek ordinance. Councilman Dryden wondered if the trees adjacent to the building would be preserved. Mr. Graeber indicated that they would and that additional trees would be planted. In response to Councilman Dryden's question, Mrs. Arnold stated this was what they were interested in and also wondered about the future interpretation of the creek ordinance and felt that this would set a precedent.

In response to Councilman Handcox's question, Mr. Graeber stated that the additional acreage was across the street from the proposed project and that nothing had been planned for this.

MS. HARRIET BUXKEMPER, 1504 Betty Jo Drive, stated that in working for the preservation of the area they had two major concerns:

1. The protection of Harper's Branch and the abutting land which had provided a well-known scenic gateway to the State Capitol.
2. The safeguarding of the adjacent residential area called Parkenson Estates.

She indicated that for five years residents had been concerned relative to the possibility of having to look into a tall building in their front or back yards. She reviewed a map of the street level, using the Long's home as an example. She stated that the building would be 34 feet higher than the Long's floor level and believed that this effect of the building would be lessened if the building were set back further from the property line and would allow for the planting of a more significant green buffer, which they felt was necessary for the beauty of their area. She suggested a 25-foot setback with a 15-foot planted buffer would enhance their chances for the retention of the neighborhood.

She reviewed a more recent concern as being the proposed entrance to the Teague-Buda property from Reagan Terrace. It was her belief that the most appropriate entrance would be from the access road on I. H. 35 and that allowing the drive to be cut through on Reagan Terrace would only encourage people going to and from the building to seek a short cut through the neighborhood. They felt that this extra traffic in the neighborhood would present a risk to the children living on Reagan Terrace and that the 90-degree curve at the junction of Betty Jo Drive and Reagan Terrace would make it difficult for anyone to make a left-hand turn into the Teague-Buda property.

She thanked the Council for the work it had done relative to the creek ordinance and thanked them for hearing the residents as many times as they had.

Councilman Dryden understood their concerns about the traffic problems but wondered how congested traffic could become if an apartment complex were to be built instead. He felt that regardless of what was built there would be an increase of traffic.

MR. DON COX, 1315 Alta Vista Avenue, appeared as President of the South River City Citizens and stated that the ordinance was designed to preserve the natural character of Austin's waterways and that this was one of the first cases to be considered since its passage and, therefore, would set a precedent. They questioned whether trying to fit a building of this size on this site was compatible with preserving the natural character of the creek. He reviewed the site on a map, noting that much of the green space was already owned by other people. He felt that the creek's natural beauty was effected by the cut and fill along both sides and added that it was his understanding that the largest tree would have to be cut, which was more than 30 inches in diameter. He also noted that because of the auto and pedestrian bridges, more than 180 feet of the creek would be covered and that over 70% of this property was either paved or in concrete. He referred to Section 29-2 of the ordinance which addressed the problem of paved surfaces as adding "quantity and intensity of run-off and surface flow." It was their interpretation that the quantity and intensity of run-off and surface flow was to be considered in the creek ordinance. He felt that the increased flow of water because of the paving could lead to the potential flooding and erosion of either side of the property. They felt that this was a matter of important consideration, and every factor contributing to increased run-off should be weighed carefully.

He noted that the building size had increased in that the original plan had called for 68,000 square feet and that the increase in size would require an additional 7,000 square feet in parking. He further noted that Teague-Buda's argument for increasing the size was that delays caused by community opposition had required expansion of its plans to better realize an economic return.

In response to Councilman Handcox's question, Mr. Cox stated that he had submitted a proposal to the Council for possible approval. In response to Councilman Dryden's question with regard to whether or not Mr. Cox felt this proposal was in agreement with the ordinance, Mr. Cox quoted from Page 9 of the City's Guidelines for Interpretation of the Creek Ordinance: "Development should be avoided which extends out over a creek bank or spans the creek." This would obviously be a drastic change from the natural character of the creek. Councilman Dryden did not believe the economics or the benefit to the firm was the Council's concern.

At this point, Mr. Richard Tulk, Assistant City Attorney, pointed out that this was not like a zoning change in that the Council could only vote to uphold the Planning Commission or vote to set this aside; and it would have to go back to the Commission to be drafted again.

MR. JOE RIDDELL appeared to discuss what he considered to be an appropriate interpretation of the creek ordinance in regard to the development. He prefaced his remarks by noting that the Council could turn down the permit and recite various conditions under which it would be the sense of the Council that they would at a later date upon a new application approve the permit. He quoted from Section 29-2 of the ordinance, which states the purpose: "It is the intention of the City Council of the City of Austin to prevent, consistent with sound drainage practices, the unnecessary destruction of the natural and traditional character of the waterways." He did not believe the permit met the requirements of the ordinance in that it did not preserve the natural and traditional character of the land and waterway to the greatest extent feasible. His concern was that various sections of the creek were being covered by a bridge and building and that the land was being built right up to the creek bank. He

felt that the reason was because of the size of the building and the parking required. He also felt that the real question dealt with the justification for putting a 74,000 square foot building on this 4-acre tract of land. He did not believe the necessity had been demonstrated for this size building.

In response to Mr. Riddell's comments, Mayor Pro Tem Love indicated it was the Council's responsibility to reach the decision as to what it thought was preserving the natural quality of the creek and that the size of the building had nothing to do with the hearing. He added that the Engineering Department had reviewed this in detail and felt that Teague-Buda complied with the ordinance in every respect in that it did not interfere with the creek's flow and did not permit erosion. Mr. Riddell suggested that it would be more appropriate to have two separate buildings on either side of the creek with a setback from the center line of the creek.

In response to Councilman Binder's questions, it was determined that the nature of Mr. Cox's proposal was:

1. Reduce the building size to 68,000 square feet.
2. Require building setback of 25 feet from the west property line.
3. Eliminate entrance to north parking lot on Reagan Terrace.
4. Require that Teague-Buda land north of Reagan Terrace be subject to special permits.
5. Limit the amount of creek which can be spanned by the structure.
6. Limit the height of any building on the south tract.
7. Consider the need to preserve the remaining trees with diameters of 8 inches or more.

In response to Mayor Pro Tem Love's comment that this was a hearing regarding the appeal of the creek permit, Mr. Cox hoped that the Council would turn it down and give them a chance to work on this proposal. In response to Councilman Friedman's question, Mr. Cox indicated they had not had an opportunity to meet with Teague-Buda on these proposals. In response to Councilman Binder's question with regard to a one-week postponement to work out remaining differences, Mr. Cox felt this would be a good idea in that it had been his intention that Council approve this subject to other considerations. In connection with this, Mr. Graeber stated that they had met many times in relation to the first application and thought that things had been worked out, but at the Council meeting the residents had indicated their opposition. He did not believe any agreement could be reached in one week. He noted that he had not received a copy of the proposals.

At this point, Mr. Cox presented Mr. Graeber with the proposals; and Mr. Graeber stated their position in relation to the requests:

1. It would be impossible to reduce the size of the building.
He felt that no one would be able to ascertain the reduction in size.

2. He felt that if there was a building setback of this nature, it would require more building along the creek.
3. He did not believe the entrance off Reagan Terrace was that important to the project and that this could be included as a restriction.
4. He felt that the subjection of the land to special permits was totally impossible.
5. He stated that they could agree to the limitation of the amount of creek which could be spanned by the structure.
6. He stated they could agree to the height limitation of the building.
7. He noted that their proposal called for the cutting of 18 trees over 6 inches in diameter and the planting of more. He did not believe they could assent to this.

In response to Councilman Handcox's question, Mr. Graeber did not believe a week would change his mind in regard to the items to which he could not consent. In response to Councilman Binder's comment that possibly an agreement could be reached, Mr. Cox requested the one-week postponement. Mr. Graeber reiterated that he could not agree to the postponement and added that they needed to get on with the project. Councilman Dryden did not believe one more week would make any difference.

There was further discussion with regard to the postponement of this hearing. MR. RICHARD BAKER, representing Teague-Buda, noted that the residents had known the differences between the proposals and that it had been submitted to the Planning Commission about 30 days ago. He further noted that he did not plan to be present next week and added that in an effort to comply with the requirements, they had redrafted this and that it had been approved by each agency. Mayor Pro Tem Love added that they had received staff's approval and that he felt an undue burden was being placed on this particular issue.

There was further discussion, and Mr. Baker indicated that his clients had advised him that they would agree to a one-week's extension. Therefore, Councilman Dryden moved that the Council recess the hearing until August 1, 1974, at 1:00 p.m. The motion, seconded by Councilman Binder, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann
Noes: Mayor Pro Tem Love
Absent: Mayor Butler

At this point, Mayor Pro Tem Love announced that Councilman Dryden had to leave the Chambers to assist a patient in the emergency room.

The Council recessed at 2:50 p.m.

Mayor Pro Tem Love called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

HEARING ON 23RD STREET VENDING PROPOSAL.

Mayor Pro Tem Love opened the public hearing scheduled for 1:00 p.m. on the 23rd Street Vending Proposal. City Manager Davidson stated that the vendors operating at the 23rd Street area appeared before the Council on June 20, 1974, and described a number of problems; and the Council directed the Manager's office to examine the problems described and to come back with a proposal as a solution to some of the problems. Mr. Randy Turner, Administrative Assistant, reviewed the staff's recommendations:

1. Amend the present ordinance to include as allowable market area on Saturdays only the north side of 23rd Street between Guadalupe and the mid-block alley.
2. Beginning October 1, 1974, permits should be sold on a quarterly basis at the rate of \$5.00 per quarter, with no automatic renewals and all permits simultaneously expiring at the end of the regular calendar year quarter in which they were purchased.
3. Restrict the total number of permits sold in any one quarter to 200, being sold on a first-come, first-served-basis.

Mr. Davidson pointed out that these recommendations were arrived at after discussions with not only members of the Police Department but with the vendors as well. He felt this was a reasonable approach and recommended the proposal as described. In response to Councilman Handcox's question, Mr. Turner stated that the \$5.00 per quarter rate was not for revenue making purposes but merely to process the paper work.

MR. MARTIN MAYFIELD noted that he was the first drag vendor in 1968 and felt that it was appalling for such a proposal to come forth with so little consideration of the vendors. He stated that he was no spokesman for the vendors and was well aware of the problems on the Drag but felt that if a poll were taken, the vendors would agree that these problems could be handled among themselves. He did agree that there was need for additional space.

MR. DALE NAPIER, Chairperson of the University City Lobby Committee and member of the West Campus Committee, indicated that he had been in contact with some of the vendors. He felt that the problem of panhandling was a result of the vendors' being removed from the Drag and that the reduction of the number of licenses demonstrated "tunnel vision" in that this would be limiting free enterprise. He also felt that this was a tourist attraction, and he did not believe the vendors were competing with the merchants.

MR. CECIL HENNINGER felt that there had been a lot of accusations made against the panhandlers and stated that there were a lot of things he had never seen. He quoted various scriptures from the Bible and urged that we go back and seek peace and justice among all men.

Councilman Dryden entered the Chambers at this point.

MR. BOB WALLACE, a sidewalk vendor, did not think the number of permits should be restricted in any way because it would limit the amount of business a vendor could do. He also felt that 23rd Street from Guadalupe Street to San Antonio should be closed on Saturday and should be divided into three lines of vending spaces and should be closed every day from Thanksgiving until Christmas. He felt this additional space would be very beneficial.

MR. VINCENT RICCIUDI, sidewalk vendor, indicated that there were about 60 vendors on the Drag who were trying to form a cooperative, and he presented City Manager Davidson with their names and addresses so that they could be notified of any proposals under consideration. He did not feel that there should be any limitation of the number of permits but was not prepared to make any alternate proposal. He requested that if an alternate proposal were desired, they be allowed the opportunity to obtain representatives from their organization to meet with the City Manager's office. He further requested that they be allowed to use the north side of the street in front of Hal's Bootery because of the lack of space.

In response to Councilman Friedman's question, Mr. Ricciudi did not believe the quarterly renewal aspect of the permits was acceptable. In response to Councilman Handcox's question as to whether or not a week or so would be helpful to discuss the pros and cons with the City Manager and his staff, Mr. Ricciudi stated that he was only prepared to ask for non-limitation of permits and for the north side of the street when it would be needed. He indicated that he would ask the vendors present at this time whether or not they wanted the additional time, but he noted that they could not accept a limitation because this would be limiting free enterprise. Councilman Dryden felt that the City should be concerned about the vendors from Austin and not the ones that were "fly by night."

MR. WALTER JENKINS, sidewalk vendor, felt that a limitation of permits would be an attempt on the City's part to ensure that there would be enough space but also that this would be possibly hurting the chances of someone new coming in and effecting the quality of merchandise and the flux of people. He stated that the reason for forming the cooperative was to provide for themselves and added that he wanted this to remain a free market.

Councilman Dryden remarked that he did not believe the City could plan and provide for any business on an unlimited basis. Mayor Pro Tem Love felt that by "making the sky the limit" on the number of permits, there would be additional requests for space. Councilman Friedman stated that there really had never been a limit on the number of businessmen allowed to operate in the state and found it hard to conceive licensing someone to do business in this community when there was a limitation on the number of licenses issued. Mayor Pro Tem Love clarified his earlier remarks by stating that there were physical constraints in the 23rd Street neighborhood and that there were other people involved, such as property owners and people in the immediate neighborhood. Councilman Binder felt that there might be a blackmarket problem on permits with the limitation.

In reference to Councilman Handcox's earlier question in regard to a postponement, Mr. Riccioudi stated that he had talked to the vendors who were present; and they were in agreement to delay to draw up an alternate proposal with the cooperation of the City Manager's office, which would involve the vendors and the private property owners.

Mr. Riccioudi asked what the basis was for determining who would get the 200 permits. Mr. Davidson indicated people holding an active permit would be able to renew those on that basis, but Mr. Turner stated it would be on a first-come, first-served basis each quarter. Mr. Davidson felt that it could be done the other way; and Mr. Turner noted it would be the Council's decision, but he added that it had been his recommendation to do this because the City would be giving preferential treatment.

There was further discussion, and Councilman Lebermann noted that he had met with Mr. Jenkins and had been told that what they had in mind was the development of some of their own rules and regulations and the dissemination of those rules and regulations to the new people as they came along; and Councilman Lebermann wanted to give them that opportunity.

MR. JOE CROW, real estate agent representing the owners of the building at 23rd and Guadalupe on the north side of the street, felt that the vendors had improved their operation but also felt that the increase of that business was going to keep bringing on problems. He suggested that the block of ground across from the old hospital be utilized for this additional space. He thought this might be developed and made attractive and would be right in the same area and would provide plenty of space.

In response to Mayor Pro Tem Love's question, Mr. Crow indicated that he would be willing to take part in the discussions with the vendors and the City Manager's office. On behalf of the owners of the afore-referenced property, Mr. Crow stated their opposition to any ordinance which would change the present status of their ownership and rights in the sidewalks along the area. In response to Councilman Friedman's question, Mr. Crow indicated that they owned the property to the center of the street. In connection with this, Mr. Richard Tulk, Assistant City Attorney, noted this was a public right-of-way easement and regardless of where the ownership of the property was, it was the Council's decision as to the use.

Mr. Crow reviewed complaints made by his clients in connection with defacing the property and suggested that the owner be protected in some fashion against damage to his property. He also reviewed the parking situation. In conclusion, he reiterated that the rights of the owners should be protected.

MR. ROLAND DeNOIE, sidewalk vendor, requested that the previously discussed meeting be scheduled on a Friday evening and felt that the University "Y" would offer their auditorium as a facility. He noted that he would support the postponement to have a meeting of the vendors and the City in some community-located place like the University "Y".

Councilman Handcox moved that the Council recess the hearing until August 8, 1974, at 1:00 p.m. The motion, seconded by Councilman Binder, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor
Pro Tem Love, Councilman Binder
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler

HEARING ON VACATION OF STREETS

Mayor Pro Tem Love opened the public hearing scheduled for 1:00 p.m.
on vacating the following streets and the passage of ordinances:

Mariposa Drive from Interstate Highway No. 35 easterly
398 feet, more or less. (Requested by Mr. Adon Sitra,
representing Mrs. Edna Duffy, Mr. John F. Thomas, and
Mr. E. R. Youngblood, owners of all the properties
adjoining said portion of Mariposa Drive.)

In response to Councilman Dryden's questions, Mr. Reuben Rountree, Public Works
Director, reviewed this, stating that there was a requirement for a \$30,000
letter of credit to cover the cost of drainage improvements necessary to
properly drain the property south of Mariposa Drive; and in addition, there was
a Cashier's Check for \$10,863.45 for the street area requested to be vacated.

Mayor Pro Tem Love introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE VACATING AND PERPETUALLY CLOSING THAT CERTAIN PORTION OF
MARIPOSA DRIVE, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; RETAINING AN
EASEMENT IN THE CITY FOR DRAINAGE AND PUBLIC UTILITIES PURPOSES; SUSPENDING
THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF AN ORDINANCE ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND
DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council waive the requirement for
three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective
immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilman Handcox, carried by the follow-
ing vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love,
Councilmen Binder, Dryden
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler

The Mayor Pro Tem announced the ordinance had been finally passed.

Three (3) portions of Dittmar Road along its north property
line westerly 150 feet, more or less, from the west property
line of Lunar Drive, and from the east property line of
said Lunar Drive to the west property line of proposed
Loganberry Drive, and easterly 110 feet, more or less, from
the east property line of said proposed Loganberry Drive.
(Requested by Mr. B. F. Priest, Registered Public Surveyor,
representing Mr. Glenn H. Koons and the Provident Development
Co., Inc., owners of the properties adjacent to portions
to be vacated.)

Mayor Pro Tem Love introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE VACATING AND PERPETUALLY CLOSING THOSE CERTAIN PORTIONS OF DITTMAR ROAD, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; RETAINING AN EASEMENT IN THE CITY FOR PUBLIC UTILITIES PURPOSES; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF AN ORDINANCE ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council waive the requirement for three readings, declare an emergency and finally pass the ordinance effective immediately. The motion, seconded by Councilman Handcox, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor Butler

The Mayor Pro Tem announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

The West 14th Street Alley twenty (20.00) feet in width in Block 174 of the original City of Austin from the west property line of Colorado Street in a westerly direction 172.00 feet. (Requested by the State Bar of Texas and the State Building Commission of the State of Texas, joined in the request by Mr. Ford Smith, owners of all the properties adjacent to said portion of the alley to be vacated.)

Mayor Pro Tem Love brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE VACATING AND PERPETUALLY CLOSING THAT PORTION OF WEST 14TH STREET ALLEY, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF AN ORDINANCE ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

The ordinance was read the first time, and Councilman Lebermann moved the ordinance be passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Handcox, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilman Dryden

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor Butler

Abstain: Councilmen Friedman, Binder

LICENSE AGREEMENTS

Councilman Dryden moved that the Council adopt a resolution granting the following license agreements:

STATE BAR OF TEXAS - Permitting encroachment by underground parking facilities proposed by the State Bar of Texas in a portion of the West 14th Street Alley in Block 174 of the Original City of Austin, between Colorado and Lavaca Streets and between West 14th and West 15th Streets. (Requested by State Bar of Texas.)

STATE BAR OF TEXAS - Permitting encroachment by underground parking facilities proposed by the State Bar of Texas into the rights of way (sidewalk areas) of West 15th and Colorado Streets, 7 feet of the 12 feet West 15th Street sidewalk area, and 11 feet, 6 inches of the 20 feet Colorado Street sidewalk area.

City Manager Davidson noted that the staff recommended approval of both these to enable the State to properly construct parking facilities in connection with their proposed building.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Handcox, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love,
Councilman Dryden
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Abstain: Councilman Binder
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilman Friedman

The Council had before it a resolution granting the following license agreement:

MRS. LOTTIE CAROLINE HARDY - Permitting encroachment by a house standing over a sanitary sewer easement ten (10.00) feet in width in Lot 8-B, Hardy Resubdivision, at 6702 Mesa Drive. (Requested by Mr. Elbert Hooper, Attorney for Mrs. Lottie C. Hardy, owner.)

City Manager Davidson reviewed this, noting that this had existed for many years; and because it was a cash deal, there was no title requirement that this easement be clarified at the time the house was built. He added that the house was being sold, and it must be clarified; and adequate provisions had been made to protect what the City needed.

Councilman Dryden moved that the Council adopt a resolution granting the afore-mentioned license agreement. The motion, seconded by Councilman Handcox, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love,
Councilman Dryden
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Abstain: Councilman Binder
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilman Friedman

RELEASE OF EASEMENT

Councilman Handcox moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing release of the following easement:

The public utilities easement five (5.00) feet in width in Lot 8-B, HARDY RESUBDIVISION, at 6702 Mesa Drive. (Requested by Elbert Hooper, Attorney for Mrs. Lottie Caroline Hardy, owner)

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Handcox
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilman Friedman

CONTRACTS AWARDED

Councilman Handcox moved that the Council adopt a resolution awarding the following contract:

POWELL ELECTRICAL MANUFACTURING COMPANY 8550 Mosley Houston, Texas	- Station Service Electric Equipment for Decker Unit #2 - \$709,990.00 (subject to escalation)
---	--

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler

Councilman Handcox moved that the Council adopt a resolution awarding the following contract:

UTILITY STEEL COMPANY 4035 West 49th Street Tulsa, Oklahoma	- Galvanized Steel Structures for Electric Utility Department Item 1-6 - \$8,262.00
---	---

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler

Councilman Handcox moved that the Council adopt a resolution awarding the following contracts:

Bid Award	- Audio Communication System for Holly Power Plant, Electric Utility Department
-----------	---

BROWNE-DAVIES
ELECTRONIC COMPANY
10600 Fallstone Road
Houston, Texas

- Items 1-5 and 7-10 - \$10,965.10

TECHNICAL EDUCATIONAL
SERVICES, INC.
6615 Burnet Lane
Austin, Texas

- Item 6 - \$1,489.86

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman,
Handcox, Lebermann

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor Butler

Councilman Handcox moved that the Council adopt a resolution awarding the following contract:

LONGHORN WIPING MATERIALS COMPANY
5120 East 5th Street
Austin, Texas

- Wiping Rags, Central Stores Division
3-month supply agreement, 15,750 lbs.
@ \$.37/lb. - Total - \$5,827.50

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman,
Handcox, Lebermann

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor Butler

Councilman Handcox moved that the Council adopt a resolution awarding the following contract:

ALLIS-CHALMERS CORPORATION
310 South St. Mary's Street
San Antonio, Texas

- Power Transformers, Electric Department
for Brackenridge Substation
2 ea. @ \$276,000.00
Total - \$552,000.00 (subject to
escalation)

The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman,
Handcox, Lebermann

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor Butler

City Manager Davidson indicated that this was the second low bid in that the low bidder could not meet the delivery date because they could not meet delivery for 110 weeks as opposed to 52 weeks for the second low bidder. In response to Mr. Davidson's question, Mr. H. L. Peterson, Superintendent of Engineering Design, stated there was a difference of \$34,000 between the two bids. In response to Councilman Dryden's comment that this was a project

scheduled for 1976, Mr. Peterson noted that the City had asked for delivery in March, 1976. In response to Councilman Dryden's further concern, it was noted that in case of delays, the bid price of Allis-Chalmers would be reduced monthly beginning 60 days after the promised delivery date so that this would equal the low bid by the required delivery date.

PROFESSIONAL SERVICES

Councilman Handcox moved that the Council select Tracor, Inc., for professional services for making an environmental analysis and report in connection with the following project for the Water and Wastewater Department:

Barton Creek Wastewater Interceptor from existing west end westerly to Lost Creek Country Club. (Capital Improvements Program Project No. 5032 0.)

The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman,
Handcox, Lebermann
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler

CONTRACT FOR RAILROAD CROSSING PROTECTION DEVICES

Councilman Dryden moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to enter into a contract with the Southern Pacific Transportation Company for installation of railroad crossing protection devices at Morrow Street. The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann,
Mayor Pro Tem Love
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler

ACTION TAKEN ON BIDS FOR SALE OF SURPLUS REAL PROPERTY

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council adopt a resolution approving the following bid for the sale of surplus real property:

Parcel No. S-127 for \$8,030.00 (1111D-1115D Springdale Road, also referred to as 1155 Springdale Road).

The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor
Pro Tem Love, Councilman Binder
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council approve recommendations as follows concerning certain bids for the sale of surplus real property:

1. Reject bid on Parcel No. S-96 (8830-8836 North Lamar and 801-825 Peyton Gin Road).
2. Reject bids on Parcel No. S-27 and authorize removal of structure and combine the land with adjacent park (2516 Hartford Road).

The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor
Pro Tem Love, Councilman Binder
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler

COMPENSATION FOR LAND

It was noted that the establishment of just compensation for seven parcels of land required for the Barton Creek District Park and Greenbelt was before the Council for consideration. Mr. Joe Morahan, Property Management Director, reviewed this, stating that the government required that the Council establish by formal procedure the fair market value before negotiations. He added that the resolution would authorize that if these offers were made and acceptable in these amounts by these owners, the City would have the authority to close the purchase and that if something was different, it would have to come back to the Council.

City Manager Davidson further noted that the Council approved the expansion and acquisition of additional green space and park lands for Austin under the Capital Improvements Program. He felt that this purchase constituted one of the largest land purchases for Parks and Recreation in the history of Austin and also that this was one of the most significant parks project. It was noted that the project would entail \$1,286,140 for the land acquisition.

Councilman Handcox moved that the Council adopt a resolution establishing just compensation for each of the seven parcels of land required for the Barton Creek District Park and Greenbelt. The motion, seconded by Councilman Lebermann, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem
Love, Councilman Dryden
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilman Binder

GRANT FOR CONTINUATION OF COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

Councilman Friedman moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to accept a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity for \$109,137.00 for continuation of the Community Action Program from September 1, 1974, to November 30, 1974. The motion, seconded by Councilman Handcox, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love,
Councilmen Dryden, Friedman
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilman Binder

COST DIFFERENCE PAYMENTS

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing payment to W. W. PATTERSON, for the cost difference of 12"/8" water mains in Loyola Center in the amount of \$6,148.54. The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen
Dryden, Friedman, Handcox
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilman Binder

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing payment to JAGGER ASSOCIATES, INC., for the cost difference of 12"/8" water mains in Oak Hollow Subdivision in the amount of \$10,397.16. The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen
Dryden, Friedman, Handcox
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilman Binder

CASH SETTLEMENT

Councilman Handcox moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing cash settlement as follows:

NELSON INVESTMENT COMPANY - For 60%/40% cash settlement for water-main extension for L & H Addition. Total cost will be \$5,917.50. City's share at 60% will be \$3,550.50; owner's share at 40% will be \$2,367.00.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Dryden, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Dryden, Handcox, Lebermann
Noes: Councilman Friedman
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilman Binder

CONTRACT TO SECURE STAFF TRAINING

It was noted that the Council had before it for consideration a contract with Arthur Young & Associates, Austin, consulting firm in the amount of \$35,000.00 in order to secure staff training and also the development of a Management Information System. In response to Mayor Pro Tem Love's question, City Manager Davidson indicated that the \$35,000.00 would be paid by the Department of Labor and that they were recommending a firm that had worked with the Department of Labor in designing this concept. He felt that the City would save a great deal of money as compared with using a firm not familiar with the project.

Mayor Pro Tem Love wondered if there would be increasing usage by municipalities for various consulting firms. Mr. Davidson felt that there would be and that this was a very wise approach instead of deflating the City budget with personnel on just a temporary basis.

Councilman Handcox moved that the Council adopt a resolution authorizing the City Manager to enter into a contract with Arthur Young & Associates, Austin, consulting firm, in the amount of \$35,000.00 in order to secure staff training and also the development of a Management Information System. The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Dryden, Friedman, Handcox,
Lebermann

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor Butler

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilman Binder

PLAN FOR ONE-WAY STREET SYSTEM

Councilman Handcox moved that the Council postpone until August 1, 1974, the review of the plan establishing the approved one-way street system for 16th, 17th, and 18th Streets. The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann, Mayor
Pro Tem Love

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor Butler

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilman Binder

REQUEST TO INCLUDE SER IN CAPITAL AREA MANPOWER PLAN

MISS ANNABELLE VALLE, Project Director of SER, addressed the Council regarding the funding of SER under the Capital Area Manpower Plan. She was followed by several individuals who presented various facets of the SER program to the Council.

MISS MARTA COTERA asked that \$218,000 be made available to underwrite SER, the funding to come entirely from the Federal government. She asked that the Council act now on a previously adopted resolution as well as the favorable resolution adopted by the Manpower Executive Committee and recommend to the City's manpower staff that they immediately modify the manpower plan to include SER.

MR. VICTOR GONZALEZ presented to the Council statistics on SER's past operations. He made the following points:

1. SER exceeded its placement obligation by 44%.
2. SER operates at 32% above capacity.
3. SER manages its budget within 1%.
4. SER places 1 out of every 2.3 people who come in.
5. SER places 88 out of every 100 people it serves.
6. SER retains 99% of its placements 1 month later.
7. SER places people at \$2.93 per hour.
8. SER places people at high skill level.
9. SER places and trains people at a low cost of \$641/per person.
10. SER returns \$3.49 for every dollar spent.

Through charts, he compared favorably SER's performance to other related programs in the community. He also presented a breakdown of the \$218,143.00 requested by SER.

MR. MATT GARCIA, representing International Business Machines (IBM), spoke to the Council regarding the Amigos de SER Program in which IBM was participating both locally and nationally. He felt that more and more large corporations would be taking the initiative to make the program work and perhaps for that reason the Federal government was continuing to decentralize control of the program. He stated that Revised Order 4 of 1971, a Federal law, identified SER as a viable organization, one with which cities, states and private industries could work. He felt that the SER organization was concentrated in an area where minorities would respond. He noted how carefully SER was being scrutinized and wondered how well other organizations would do under such careful examination.

MRS. SUSIE AYALA, a SER ex-enrollee now employed by the Mexican-American Council for Economic Progress and serving on the SER Board of Directors, addressed the Council. She spoke of how the SER program had benefited her and asked the Council to approve the funding so that others might be helped.

DR. RUDOLFO ARREVALO of the University of Texas at Austin, speaking for the Chicano Faculty Association of The University of Texas at Austin, the Chicano Law Students Association, the Chicano Graduate Students Association, the Mexican-American Youth Organization, Trabajadores Sociales de la Raza of the University of Texas at Austin and the National Association of Social Scientists, stressed the need for a good manpower program in Austin during a period of rising inflation. He asked the Council to reconsider including SER in the Austin manpower program, and in so doing to measure the cost-effectiveness of SER during the coming year against other manpower organizations in Austin.

MISS LYDIA ESPINOSA, speaking for the Mexican-American Business and Professional Women, Chicano Research and Learning Center, Mujeres por Raza Unida, Brown Beret Women, LUTAC, LULAC Ladies Council 650, American GI Forum Ladies Auxiliary, read a joint statement for the groups, expressing their support for the SER program and requesting that the City Council approve funding of the program.

MR. DAVE DOBBS, Publicity Director for the American GI Forum, Austin Chapter No. 2, asked for clarification regarding who had the power to fund the SER program and exercise the will of the people through the elected officials who are in place.

MR. MARCEL ROCHA, representing the Mexican-American Chamber of Commerce of Travis County and a member of the Capital Area Executive Committee which recommended the funding of SER, spoke to the Council and made the following requests:

1. Asked for clarification of who had the power to fund SER.
2. Expressed confusion as to whether the Executive Committee was worth existing.
3. Urged the Council to tell the City Manpower people to take the necessary steps to fund SER by Friday.
4. Appealed strongly to the Council that SER be funded again.

MR. HOMER REED, Deputy City Manager, in attempting to place the matter in historical perspective, made the following statement:

1. For over three years, the Department of Labor had been trying to eliminate or minimize the many specialized or categorical manpower programs which they had funded previously.
2. Mayor Butler had been appointed as coordinator of manpower programs for Austin and the surrounding counties, and he, in turn, had appointed a manpower planning group. That group included representatives of area governmental units and the administrators of categorical programs being funded by the Department of Labor.
3. Following Department of Labor guidelines, two years ago the planning group prepared a comprehensive manpower program for the last year which anticipated new Federal legislation requiring one comprehensive manpower program to replace the many small ones.
4. SER was contacted at that time as a part of the development process of that program. The initial plan called for the participants in SER's existing program to become part of the comprehensive program. SER then would have ceased to be responsible for that type of activity.
5. After some negotiations, approximately one year ago, SER asked that their consolidation into the joint program be deferred until July 1, 1974, the beginning of the current fiscal year for Federal programs.

6. Since developing the initial plan, the anticipated new Federal legislation has been adopted; and the manpower planning staffs and the manpower representatives of each governmental unit in the ten-county area agreed to form a consortium with one planning, budgeting and administrative structure for all manpower programs.
7. Before the comprehensive manpower plan was developed by the consortium, SER presented its request to the Executive Committee and was given full consideration. The adopted plan provided again for the people getting the training and employment assistance in the SER program to be assumed by the new comprehensive program.
8. There is no City manpower program as such, but the City is the administrator of the joint program for the consortium.
9. New Federal legislation could divide the money on either a geographical or estimated actual cost basis. The consortium chose the latter method because the rural areas would receive more money. (\$722,000 out of \$1,939,000 versus \$620,000.)
10. SER was requesting funding from the consortium through urban funds. Under such a geographical basis, the rural areas would lose \$102,000 in funds.
11. It was highly unlikely that the consortium would change its 6 to 2 vote against including SER regardless of the way the funds were handled.

Councilman Friedman asked Mr. Reed if SER could be funded out of the \$1.2 million allocated to the City of Austin, so that the rural areas would not be effected. Mr. Reed stated that to do so would completely eliminate the basis on which the consortium was founded. Mr. Reed further stated that what Councilman Friedman was suggesting could be used for next year's program and possibly this year with some delay if the consortium were eliminated and the City of Austin or Travis County went directly to the Department of Labor for funding. An extended period of time might be involved in working out the matter.

Councilman Friedman then asked if there were no way to fund SER through money allocated by the consortium to Travis County except as it had been approved.

Mr. Reed called on MR. JAN KUBICEK, Assistant City Attorney, to explain the legal aspects involved. Mr. Kubicek stated the following:

1. The earlier manpower programs were based on the categorical, local unit of government method of grant awards. However, Congress was concerned that the problems of unskilled laborers did not align with with political subdivision jurisdictional areas.
2. To solve the problem, the Comprehensive Employment Training Act (CETA) was passed. The Act provided several methods of eligibility for funds:
 - a. The State could be the prime sponsor (sovereign body for the purpose of distributing funds).
 - b. Units of local government with population base of over 100,000.

- c. Consortium (combination of general units of government having the same labor market problems that are compatible in problem areas) are similar to and in close proximity to each other and have one member with a population base of over 100,000.
3. The City Council had directed the staff to adopt the consortium approach in part because Congress had provided a ten per cent incentive for governmental units which adopted that approach.
4. The consortium is regulated by two areas of law: the CETA legislation and State law. The consortium in which the City of Austin is involved is subordinate to the principles of the CETA legislation and compatible with State law (the Interlocal Cooperation Act, Article 4413, Section 32c). Within those two areas of law minor modifications and major modifications (regarding funding) are broken down by five per cent of the total grant award. With regard to SER, the \$218,000 request exceeds the five per cent rule. To cut down and fund to a portion less than the \$218,000 would still require the approval of the prime sponsor (the consortium). In this case, with ten members, it would require six affirmative votes to approve SER's funding request.
5. The consortium should execute a plan and get on with it, rather than inject new methodology into the matter.

Mr. Reed asked Mr. Kubicek if it were possible under the Federal law regulating the manpower program for the City Council to act unilaterally to add SER to the program out of the \$1.2 million allocated for urban programs without the approval of the other members of the consortium.

Mr. Kubicek stated that in his opinion it would not be legal and it would also be bad administrative practice.

Mr. Reed, continuing his presentation, noted that some allegations had been made that some members of the joint manpower planning staff did not support the direction of the Council to sponsor SER's inclusion in the program before the Executive Committee and the consortium. He stated that he thought he had adequate facts to support the fact that they did support the will of the Council, but he would not elaborate unless the Council requested him to. Councilman Friedman said that unless it would help to find the requested money that it would not be necessary to elaborate.

Mr. Reed then stated that the central manpower staff and the City administrative staff agreed fully with the objectives of SER and had shown it repeatedly. The comprehensive manpower plan provides for language training and other aids to help eliminate employment disabilities of all types. He thought that at this time it would be futile to try to get SER included in the consortium program. He thought that the Council might be able to help SER through a direct funding request to the Department of Labor, since the Secretary of Labor had available a sizable discretionary fund from which such projects could be funded. He thought that SER might want to apply for funding from that source.

COUNCILMAN DRYDEN wondered why the Council had spent so much time on the subject today if any action they took might be illegal.

Mr. Reed stated that the City Council could get out of the consortium but if they did so this year, they ran the risk of shutting down all of the programs being operated for a considerable period of time until things were straightened out. The City could retain the power for next year.

Mr. Dobbs questioned the legality of letting a minority of the population through their representative officials make decisions for the majority of people who live in Travis County and Austin. He also questioned the political wisdom of the decision.

MR. ELI BARRON, Chairman, SER Board of Directors, recalled notes taken during a Department of Labor meeting with Mr. Charles Guinn before the present plan was put together by the City manpower planning group. He stated that Mr. Guinn could be contacted for verification. The reason for going with the counties was the incentive provision. Getting together with the counties could be beautiful if it was done for the right reasons because that was what the plan was meant to do. On the other hand, if people got together with the counties for the wrong reasons an administrative nightmare could be created. Mr. Barron recalled he had attended several meetings with Mr. Kubicek and that Mr. Kubicek had seen then that the plan was unwieldy as it was then even before it was submitted to the Department of Labor.

Mr. Kubicek stated that it was his personal opinion that a smaller organizational base would be better organizationally. He also felt that generally the consortium plan was a good one, and that the preponderant share of the consortium action had been good. He was stating his personal, not legal, view.

Mr. Barron stated that at the time of the subject meeting when Mr. Kubicek was representing the City of Austin, no one was there to discuss personal views. Mr. Barron was concerned about creating an administrative nightmare which was not of SER's doing. He then requested that SER's attorney, Mr. Jose Camacho, address the Council.

MR. CAMACHO stated that the plan could and must be changed at this late date. He cited a similar problem in the San Antonio consortium. Although the City of Austin had agreed that each county must approve the decisions of the Executive Committee, he saw nothing in the law that said it had to be that way, except in reorganizing and refunding. Final decisions should have rested with the Executive Committee. He questioned why the City of Austin had given away so much power unnecessarily.

Councilman Handcox asked if Mr. Camacho had a legal way for the Council to reach an affirmative decision regarding the funding of SER. Mr. Camacho stated that the City of Austin could not unilaterally move today to fund SER. However, the City could move today to recommend to the consortium that SER be funded. The consortium could lose money by approving SER, but Mr. Camacho could not see how.

The other alternative would be to withdraw from the consortium immediately which would delay the plan (for the entire membership), and many people would suffer. SER would incur some delay in resubmitting their application to the Department of Labor for funding but in Mr. Camacho's opinion, probably not over 30 days. He could not understand why the City manpower planning staff had opted to run a comprehensive program, rather than subcontract the work. To his knowledge, the City of Austin was the only city doing so.

Mr. Kubicek stated that under minor plan modification the prime sponsor could make any change in its project operating plan which was not set out in major plan modification without prior approval, but must show any such change in its next quarterly report. A minor modification is \$10,000 or 5 per cent, whichever is greater, of the total grant. Under the current manpower funding for the consortium, the \$218,000 SER funding request would be over the 5 per cent level. Agreement would be required by the majority will of the prime sponsor (the consortium) to make a change. In this instance, approval had to come from the consortium and not the Department of Labor.

Mr. Camacho pointed out that inconvenience would be caused to the consortium, but that the City Council could recommend that the consortium fund SER.

Councilman Friedman asked what the feasibility was of getting direct funds out of discretionary funds from the Department of Labor until a realignment could be worked out.

Mr. Barron stated that SER enrollees had volunteered to continue on a voluntary basis with the trainees and that SER had been advised that no discretionary funds were available from the Department of Labor. He then called on MR. ALFREDO GARCIA to address the Council.

Mr. Garcia stated that he had lived in Austin for 46 years, and at one time had served as a juvenile probation officer, adult parole officer and social worker. He asked that the Council provide leadership necessary for the manpower staff to work up a plan that will ensure an equitable distribution of funds so that the counties will feel that they are getting their fair share and that there be sufficient funds in Austin and Travis County to cover SER.

Councilman Dryden stated that he was quoted correctly by Mr. Tom Barry of the American Statesman in that he was for the program and recommended that the other counties support it, too. If possible, he wanted to correct the mistake and fund the program.

Motion

Councilman Dryden moved that the Council be for the funding of the program and request the group to so help us and work out the legalities for it. Councilman Binder seconded the motion.

Amendment to Motion

Councilman Friedman offered an amendment that the administrative arm of the consortium will prepare a modification of the budget that will fund SER from funds that have been allocated to the City of Austin and Travis County to be used for their program.

Restatement of Councilman Dryden's Motion

Councilman Dryden moved that the Council go on record back to the consortium indicating its support and desire to have SER funded under the current program under consideration and that it should be funded by showing the rural counties that they will not lose any funds that have been designated for their programs at the present time under the consortium program and that the administrative arm of the consortium (City of Austin) develop a program taking the

\$1.2 million that the City of Austin has to expend in manpower services and have that broken up to show that the SER funds will come from that lump sum and no other and that the rural counties will remain intact. The motion, seconded by Councilman Binder, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Binder, Dryden, Friedman, Handcox, Lebermann,
Mayor Pro Tem Love

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor Butler

Mayor Pro Tem Love asked if discretionary funds could be obtained from the Department of Labor. Miss Valle stated that \$30,000 to \$50,000 would be available for SER funding from the Department of Labor if SER were approved in the plan.

After the vote, MR. LOUIS MARTINEZ stated that he felt the Council acted in good faith by voting to support SER, but he was concerned that there was no guarantee that SER would be funded. He had considered resigning as a member of the Human Relations Commission but he would withhold his resignation at this time, because he had faith in the Council.

At this point, Councilmen Dryden and Handcox left the Chambers.

REFUND CONTRACTS

Authorization of the following refund contracts was not considered:

W. W. PATTERSON Trustee	- To purchase the water and wastewater mains installed in Loyola Center - \$27,971.69
JAGGER ASSOCIATES, INC. Sid Jagger, President	- For the purchase of water and waste- water improvements in Timberline Subdivision - \$94,162.15
JAGGER ASSOCIATES, INC. Sid Jagger, President	- For water and wastewater mains in Oak Hollow Subdivision - \$94,495.65

APPROACH MAIN CONTRACT

Authorization of the following approach main contract was not considered:

JAGGER ASSOCIATES, INC. Sid Jagger, President	- For wastewater approach main in Oak Hollow Subdivision - \$27,594.00
--	---

HEARING SET ON APPEAL

Upon the requests of Messrs. Michael Domjan and Joe Riddell, Councilman Friedman moved that the Council set a hearing for August 15, 1974, at 1:00 p.m. on an appeal of the Planning Commission's granting Special Permit C14P-74-26. The motion, seconded by Councilman Binder, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Friedman, Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love,
Councilman Binder
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilmen Handcox, Dryden

REQUEST IN CONNECTION WITH SOLID WASTE COMPACTION

It was noted that Mr. Johnny Voudouris, Travis County Commissioner of Precinct 3, had requested to appear before the Council to request approval for the County to construct and operate a Solid Waste Compaction and Transfer facility. However, this item was forwarded to the Planning Commission for recommendation to the Council.

REQUEST IN CONNECTION WITH SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL SITE

It was noted that Mr. David L. Houston, State Health Department, had requested a formal statement of approval or disapproval by the Council regarding a proposed municipal solid waste disposal site in the extraterritorial jurisdiction of the City of Austin. However, no action was taken on this matter.

ZONING ORDINANCES

Mayor Pro Tem Love brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA AND CHANGING THE USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 45 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1967 AS FOLLOWS:

TRACT 1-A: A 46.1 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, SAVE AND EXCEPT THE EASTERNMOST ONE HUNDRED FEET FRONTING ALONG I. H. 35, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "GR" GENERAL RETAIL, THIRD HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 1-B: THE EASTERNMOST ONE HUNDRED FEET OF A 46.1 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "GR" GENERAL RETAIL, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 1-C: A 5.5 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "A" RESIDENCE, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 2-A: A 22.4 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, SAVE AND EXCEPT THE EASTERNMOST ONE HUNDRED FEET FRONTING ALONG I. H. 35, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "LR" LOCAL RETAIL, THIRD HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 2-B: THE EASTERNMOST ONE HUNDRED FEET OF A 22.4 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "LR" LOCAL RETAIL, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 2-C: AN 8.3 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, SAVE AND EXCEPT ALL THAT AREA SOUTH OF LITTLE TEXAS LANE, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "LR" LOCAL RETAIL, THIRD HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 2-D: ALL THAT AREA SOUTH OF LITTLE TEXAS LANE OUT OF AN 8.3 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "LR" LOCAL RETAIL, SECOND HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 2-E: A 5.9 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "LR" LOCAL RETAIL, SECOND HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 3-A: A 6.0 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE, SECOND HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 3-B: A 4.6 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE, SECOND HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 4-A: A 13.9 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "B" RESIDENCE, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 4-B: A 27 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "B" RESIDENCE, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT;

ALL OF SAID PROPERTY LOCALLY KNOWN AS 5901-6011 SOUTH CONGRESS AVENUE; 101-1111 LITTLE TEXAS LANE; 500-900 LITTLE TEXAS LANE; 1000-1104 LITTLE TEXAS LANE; 5514-5600 SOUTH INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 35; 5610-5712 SOUTH INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 35; AND 5900-6120 SOUTH INTERSTATE HIGHWAY 35; ALL OF SAID PROPERTY BEING LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. (150 Ltd. and Douglas Duwe, C14-74-061)

The ordinance was read the first time, and Councilman Friedman moved the ordinance be passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Binder, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Friedman

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor Butler

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilmen Handcox, Dryden

Mayor Pro Tem Love brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA AND CHANGING THE USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 45 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1967 AS FOLLOWS:

(1) A 2,898 SQUARE FOOT TRACT OF LAND, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 2021 GUADALUPE STREET AND 309-311 WEST 21ST STREET, FROM "C" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT TO "C-1" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; AND,

(2) A 0.313 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 4014 MEDICAL PARKWAY, FROM "O" OFFICE DISTRICT TO "GR" GENERAL RETAIL DISTRICT; AND,

(3) A 4,800 SQUARE FOOT TRACT OF LAND, LOCALLY KNOWN AS THE REAR OF 5555 NORTH LAMAR BOULEVARD, FROM "C" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT TO "C-2" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; AND,

(4) TRACT 1: A 3.06 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 2: A 2.20 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "BB" RESIDENCE, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; LOCALLY KNOWN AS 4600-5016 BEACON DRIVE, ALSO BOUNDED BY SPRINGDALE ROAD (MANOR ROAD);

ALL OF SAID PROPERTY BEING LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. (Continental Assurance Company, C14-74-065; Richard R. Jenkins, C14-74-066; Hardin Associates, Inc., C14-74-080; J. D. Connolly, C14-74-070)

The ordinance was read the first time, and Councilman Friedman moved the ordinance be passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Binder, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Friedman
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilmen Handcox, Dryden

Mayor Pro Tem Love brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA AND CHANGING THE USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 45 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1967 AS FOLLOWS:

64.5 X 216 FEET OUT OF OUTLOT 4, DIVISION "E," ORIGINAL CITY OF AUSTIN, AND 60 X 76.25 FEET OUT OF OUTLOT 4, DIVISION "E," ORIGINAL CITY OF AUSTIN, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 1002-1004 WEST AVENUE AND 806-808 WEST 10TH STREET, FROM "B" RESIDENCE, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT AND "B" RESIDENCE, SECOND HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE, SECOND HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; SAID PROPERTY BEING LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. (Barry S. Gillingwater and Ernesto Liebrecht, C14-74-072)

The ordinance was read the first time, and Councilman Friedman moved the ordinance be passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Binder, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Friedman
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilmen Handcox, Dryden

Mayor Pro Tem Love brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA AND CHANGING THE USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 45 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1967 AS FOLLOWS:

TRACT 1: A 10.06 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 5313-5411 PLEASANT VALLEY ROAD, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "LR" LOCAL RETAIL, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 2: A 1.88 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 5212-5218 NUCKOLS CROSSING ROAD, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "LR" LOCAL RETAIL, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND,

TRACT 3: AN 8.30 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 4905-5009 STASSNEY LANE, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "BB" RESIDENCE, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT;

ALL OF SAID PROPERTY BEING LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. (Jagger Properties, Inc., C14-74-078)

The ordinance was read the first time, and Councilman Friedman moved the ordinance be passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Binder, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Friedman
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilmen Handcox, Dryden

Mayor Pro Tem Love brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND CHANGING THE USE MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 45 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1967 AS FOLLOWS:
THE SOUTH 62 FEET OF THE WEST 50 FEET OF THE EAST 150 FEET OF THE NORTH 150 FEET OF BLOCK 1, OUTLOT 22, DIVISION "O," ORIGINAL CITY OF AUSTIN, LOCALLY KNOWN AS THE REAR OF 213-215 CHALMERS AVENUE, FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "C" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; SAID PROPERTY BEING LOCATED IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. (P. L. Baker, C14-74-073)

The ordinance was read the first time, and Councilman Friedman moved the ordinance be passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Binder, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Friedman
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilmen Handcox, Dryden

Mayor Pro Tem Love brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA AND CHANGING THE USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 45 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1967 AS FOLLOWS:
LOTS 33 AND 34, ST. ELMO HEIGHTS, SECTION 1, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 301 AND 303 INDUSTRIAL BOULEVARD, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE, INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "D" INDUSTRIAL, FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; SAID PROPERTY BEING LOCATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. (Max W. Stone, C14-70-001)

The ordinance was read the first time, and Councilman Friedman moved the ordinance be passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman Binder, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Friedman
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilmen Handcox, Dryden

Because the field notes had not been received, Mr. Dick Lillie, Planning Department Director, requested that the following zoning ordinance not be considered:

RALPH DANYSH
C14-74-077

2906-2910 San Gabriel
Street, also bounded
by North Lamar
Boulevard

From "A" Residence
1st Height and Area and
"GR" General Retail
5th Height and Area
To "C-2" Commercial
5th Height and Area and
"GR" General Retail
1st Height and Area

AMENDMENT TO HISTORIC ZONING ORDINANCE

Consideration of an amendment to the ordinance establishing the Historic Landmark Commission to reduce the number of members required for a quorum was before the Council. However, upon Mr. Lillie's request, Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council forward this to the Planning Commission. The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilman Lebermann, Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Dryden

Noes: None

Absent: Mayor Butler

Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilmen Handcox, Dryden

AFFIRMATIVE ACTION POLICY STATEMENT

Consideration of the Affirmative Action Policy Statement was postponed until August 1, 1974.

BUS STOP SHELTERS AND BENCHES

Mr. Joe Ternus, Urban Transportation Director, appeared before the Council to present a proposal for a cooperative program with the Austin Independent School District for bus stop shelters and benches. He noted that at the request of the Council and the School Board, the City's administration and the School District administration staff had developed and reviewed the operation of the bus systems and had developed possible criteria and recommended a standard for the implementation of shelters and benches. He also noted that they had reviewed the possibility of a joint program between the City and the School District based on this recommendation. He added that there would be 23 locations where shelters and benches could be installed along common routes. He believed this was an opportunity for two agencies to work together to provide services to the citizens and reduce their costs. He recommended that the Council approve this concept so that the administration's staff could implement the program.

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council approve the concept of this proposal. The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Friedman, Lebermann
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilmen Handcox, Dryden

INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF AD VALOREM TAX EXEMPTION FOR ELDERLY

It was noted that consideration of increasing the amount of ad valorem tax exemption granted for citizen property owners over 65 years of age was before the Council. Councilman Lebermann indicated that this addressed the issue of a need on the part of the senior citizens who were on fixed incomes to enjoy the level of tax relief which the Council had intended a year ago. He indicated that his notion had not been to set aside a limit today but to instruct the staff to bring the Council material for proper adjustment in maximizing this relief in relation to the budget, in relation to tax rolls and in relation to the rate which Council was obligated to set. He felt that this was the soundest and most sensible approach to provide additional ad valorem tax relief.

Councilman Lebermann moved that the Council go on record as approving the concept of extending the ad valorem tax relief for the senior citizens and instruct the City Manager to bring the Council the necessary material. The motion, seconded by Councilman Friedman, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Mayor Pro Tem Love, Councilmen Binder, Friedman, Lebermann
Noes: None
Absent: Mayor Butler
Not in Council Chamber when roll was called: Councilmen Handcox, Dryden


Councilman Friedman pointed out that as they were looking at the budget, they should keep in mind that for each \$1,000 increase to the exemption there would be a \$76,200 decrease in the City's tax revenue.

At this point, Councilman Binder recognized a group of retired City employees; and Mr. Hamner appeared to express the appreciation of the members of the 1208 of A.A.R.P. for the consideration that the Council had given them and indicated that they knew the Council would do all they could for the senior citizens with regard to the tax relief.

ADJOURNMENT

The Council adjourned at 6:30 p.m.

APPROVED


Mayor Pro Tem

ATTEST:


City Clerk