MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL<br>CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS<br>Regular Meeting<br>March 16, 1967<br>10:00 A.M.<br>Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Palmer presiding.
Roll call:
Present: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Absent: Councilman Shanks
Present also: W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager; Doren R. Eskew, City Attorney; Reuben Rountree, Jr., Director of Public Works; Robert A. Miles, Chief of Police

Invocation was delivered by REVEREND THOMAS P. LOVETT, University Presbyterian Church.

Councilman Shanks absent as he was in the hospital.

Councilman Long moved that REVEREND DAVIS be heard. The motion was seconded by Councilman White. Roll call showed a unanimous vote.

REVEREND DAVIS, owner of 4.03 acres on Heflin Lane, a portion of which is in the city limits, explained an inability to get sewer connections, although he had given an easement across his property. He was adding to the present building, making an apartment house which was about $90^{\circ}$ from the sewer line. Mayor Palmer stated this appeared to be an administration problem, and asked that the City Manager check on this and that Reverend Davis contact the Director of Water Utilities, MR. VIC SCHMIDI.

Councilman Long moved that the Minutes of February 23, 1967 be approved. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

The City Manager submitted the following:
"March 14, 1967
"TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council.
SUBJECT: Bids for furnishing and installing Chain Link Fence at McNeil Substation.
"Sealed bids were opened in the office of the Purchasing Agent at 2:00 P.M. March 13, 1967 for furnishing and installing Chain Link Fence at McNeil Substation for the Electric Department.
"The bids received are as follows:

| Bidder | Net Total |
| :--- | ---: |
| U.S. Steel Corporation | $\$ 6,868.00$ |
| Evans Metal Products | $7,000.60$ |
| Alamo Fence Co. of Austin | $\underline{5,679.10}$ |

"This tabulation is submitted with the apparent low bid meeting the City of Austin specifications and conditions underscored."

Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

## (RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on March 13, 1967 for the furnishing and installing of Chain Link Fence at McNeil Substation for the Electric Department; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of Alamo Fence Co. of Austin in the sum of $\$ 5,679.10$, was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such bid has been recommended by the Purchasing Agent of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:
That the bid of Alamo Fence Co. of Austin, in the sum of $\$ 5,679.10$, be and the same is hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute a contract, on behalf of the City, with Alamo Fence Co. of Austin.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

The City Manager submitted the following:
"March 13, 1967
"Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr.
City Manager
Austin, Texas.
"Dear Mr. Williams:
"Sealed bids were received until 11:00 A.M., Friday, March 10, 1967, at the Office of the Director of the Water and Sewer Department for the INSTALTATION OF approximately 1,850 feet of 8 -inch CAST IRON WATER MAINS AND approximately 1,140 feet of 15-inch and 4,350 feet of 8 -inch CONCRETE SEWER PIPE IN TRACOR INDUSTRIAL AREA. This project will provide water and sewer service to the Tracor Industrial Area. The bids were publicly opened and read in the Council Room in the Municipal Building.
"The following is a tabulation of bids received:

| FIRM | AMOUNT | WORKING DAYS |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Austin Engineering Company | $\$ 62,679.50$ | 65 |
| Ford-Wehmeyer, Inc. | $69,998.25$ | 85 |
| Walter Schmidt Construction Company | $74,293.75$ | 90 |
| Bland Construction Company | $80,349.50$ | 100 |
| City of Austin (Estimate) | $\$ 58,915.00$ |  |

"It is our recommendation that the contract be awarded to the Austin Engineering Company on their low bid of $\$ 62,679.50$ with 65 working days.
"Yours truly,
s/ Victor R. Schmidt, Jr.
Victor R. Schmidt, Jr., Director Water and Sewer Department"

Councilman Long asked about this contract for Tracor Industrial Area. The City Manager stated this was a cash settlement in lieu of a refund contract, Tracor paying $18 \%$ of the cost of installation. Instead of the City's paying back the total amount over a period of years, Tracor is contributing $18 \%$ of the cost now. These lines will serve property besides Tracor, west of Ed Bluestein Boulevard. Councilman white offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

## (RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on March 10, 1967 for the installation of approximately 1,850 feet of 8 -inch cast iron water mains and approximately 1,140 feet of 15 -inch and 4,350 feet of 8 -inch concrete sewer pipe in Tracor Industrial Area; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of Austin Engineering Company in the sum of $\$ 62,679.50$, was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such bid has been recommended by the Director of Water and Sewer Department of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTTN:

That the bid of Austin Engineering Company, in the sum of $\$ 62,679.50$ be, and the same is hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute a contract, on behalf of the City, with Austin Engineering Company.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

The Council had before it for consideration 2 contracts for the installation of approximately $1643^{\prime}$ of $20^{\prime \prime}$ steel sewer siphon pipe from South of West list Street and East of South lst Street across the Colorado River to South 1st Street at Riverside Drive and for installation of approximately 584 linear feet of 30 " steel sanitary sewer force main and approximately 109 linear feet of $30^{\prime \prime}$ steel inverted sewer siphon along West lst Street across Shoal Creek. The City Manager reported these two contracts are sewer siphons one crossing the river, and the other crossing Shoal Creek, giving flexibility to the outfall system. The line across the river was two small, and the river, now being excavated, is at the level where the proper size pipe can be installed. Councilman LaRue asked about the designation of the Water Treatment Plants. The City Manager explained Water Treatment Plant No. I is on West lst Street by the Power Plant; No. 2 is near Mount Bonnell and No. 3 is the new plant in southwest Austin.

The City Manager submitted the following:
"March 13, 1967
"Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr.
City Manager
Austin, Texas
"Dear Mr. Williams:
"Sealed bids for the SOUTH 1ST. STREET SANITARY SEWER SIPHON were received until 11:00 A.M., Friday, March 10, 1967, at the Office of the Director of the Water and Sewer Department for the installation of approximately 1643 feet of 20 -inch steel sewer siphon pipe from South of West First Street and East of South First Street across the Colorado River to South First Street at Riverside Drive. This 20-inch siphon will divert a portion of the sewerage flow to the South Austin outfall, thereby utilizing more of the facilities of the South Austin System. The bids were publicly opened and read in the City Council Room of the Municipal Build ing.
"The following is a tabulation of bids received:

FIRM
Bland Construction Company Austin Engineering Company Ford-Wehmeyer, Incorporated

City of Austin (Estimate)

AMOUNT
$\$ 89,919.90 \quad 100$
119,646.00 135
$120,573.00150$
"It is our recommendation that the contract be awarded to the Bland Construction Co. on their low bid of $\$ 89,919.90$ with 100 working days.
"Yours truly,
s/ Victor R. Schmidt, Jr. Victor R. Schmidt, Jr., Director Water and Sewer Department:

Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

## (RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on March 10, 1967, for the installation of approximately 1643 feet of $2 \theta$-inch steel sewer siphon pipe from South of West First Street and East of South First Street across the Colorado River to South First Street at Riverside Drive; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of Bland Construction Company in the sum of $\$ 89,919.90$, was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such bid has been recommended by the Director of Water and Sewer Department of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:
That the bid of Bland Construction Company, in the sum of $\$ 89,919.90$, be and the same is hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute a contract, on behalf of the City, with Bland Construction Company.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carred by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

The City Manager submitted the following:
'March 13, 1967
"Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr.
City Manager
Austin, Texas
"Dear Mr. Williams:
"Sealed Bids for the $30-\mathrm{INCH}$ SANITARY SEWER FORCE MAIN AND 30-TNCH SIPHON AT SHOAL CREEK were received until 11:00 A.M., Friday, March 10, 1967, at the Office of the Director of the Water and Sewer Department for the installation of approximately 584 linear feet of 30 -inch steel sanitary sewer force main and approximately 109 linear feet of 30 -inch steel inverted sewer siphon along West First Street across Shoal Creek. The force main will provide an increase in the discharge capacity of the existing Sanitary Sewer Lift Station and the Sewer Siphon will lower the existing sanitary sewer line presently in Shoal Creek Channel. The bids were publicly opened and read in the City Council Room of the Municipal Building, Austin, Texas.
"The following is a tabulation of bids received:

FIRM
Bland Construction Company Ford-Wehmeyer, Inc. Austin Engineering Company

City of Austin (Estimate)

AMOUNT

$$
\$ 63,324.00
$$

70,889.00125
77,168.00 ..... 120
"It is our recommendation that the contract be awarded to the Bland Construction Company on their low bid of $\$ 63,324.00$ with 60 working days.
"Yours truly,
s/ Victor R. Schmidt, Jr.
Victor R. Schmidt, Jr., Director
Water and Sewer Department"

Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

## (RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on March 10, 1967, for the installation of approximately 584 linear feet of 30 -inch steel sanitary sewer force main and approximately 109 linear feet of 30 -inch steel inverted sewer siphon along West First Street across Shoal Creek; and,

WHFREAS, the bid of Bland Construction Company in the sum of $\$ 63,324.00$, was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such bid has been recommended by the Director of Water and Sewer Department of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:
That the bid of Bland Construction Company, in the sum of $\$ 63,324.00$, be and the same is hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute a contract, on behalf of the City, with Bland Construction Company.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

The City Manager submitted the following:
"March 15, 1967
'MEMORANDUM TO: Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr. City Manager
"FROM:
A. H. Ullrich, Director Water and Sewage Treatment
"SUBJECT: Bids received at 10:00 A.M., Tuesday, February 14, 1967, in the City Council Room for Contract No. 3; Section I for Horizontal Pumping Units and Section II for Vertical Pumping Units; same being part of the Water Treatment Plant No. 3 project and part of the Department of Housing and Urban Development Project No. WS-5-44-0043.
"BID TABULATION:
"Attached hereto is the Bid Tabulation and Evaluation for bids taken for Contract No. 3 of the above referenced project. The Bid Tabulation was made by Bryant-Curington, Inc., Consulting Engineer.
"Also attached hereto are the recommendations of Bryant-Curington, Inc. relative to the bids received. I concur in these recommendations, which are as follows:
"RECOMMENDATIONS:
"(a) It is my recommendation that Section I, Horizontal Pumping Units, Contract No. 3, City of Austin Water Treatment Plant No. 3, DHUD Project WS-5-44-0043 be awarded, subject to concurrence or approval by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, to AllisChalmers Manufacturing Company in the bid dollar amount of \$130,160.00.
"(b) It is my reconmendation that Section II, Vertical Pumping Units, Contract No. 3, City of Austin Water Treatment Plant No. 3, DHUD project WS-5-44-0043 be awarded, subject to concurrence or approval by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, to Layne Texas Company on the basis of their telegramed bid in the bid dollar amount of $\$ 110,492.00$.
"Respectfully submitted,
s/ A. H. Ullrich
A. H. Ullrich

## "SUPPIKMENTARY DATA AND INFORMATION

"The subject Contract No. 3 (Sections I and II) is part of the Water Treatment Plant No. 3 project, for which the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has approved a grant in the amount of $\$ 1,500,000$.
"The subject Contract No. 3 covers pumping equipment to be furnished by the City for installation by the construction contractor under Contract No. 1.
"Funds for meeting the anticipated 1966-1967 Fiscal Year project costs are included in this year's Capital Improvements Budget.
"The Consulting Engineers' estimate for the subject Contract No. 3, Sections I and II, was $\$ 260,000$. The combined costs of the bids, acceptance of which is recommended, is $\$ 240,652$.
"The completion time specified for the subject Contract No. 3, Sections I and II, is 300 consecutive calendar days after Notice to Proceed.
"Respectfully,
s/ A. H. Ulirich
A. H. Ullrich
"March 10, 1967
"Mr. A. H. Ullrich
Director Water and Waste Water Treatment
P.O. Box 1088

Austin, Texas 78767

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { "Re: } & \text { Bids for Pumping Units } \\
\text { City of Austin Contract No. } 3 \\
\text { DHUD Project WS 5-44-0043 }
\end{array}
$$

"Dear Mr. Ullrich:
"Attached hereto is the Tabulation of Bids received, opened and read publicly at 10:00 A.M. on February 14, 1967 in the City Council Room for Horizontal Pumping Units referred to as Section I, Contract No 3 and for the Vertical Pumping Units referred to as Section II, Contract No. 3, subject project.
"The pumping units bid under Section I consist of five (5) horizontal pumps with electric drives which are needed for the High Service Pump Station to be constructed for the Water Treatment Plant No. 3. Four bids were received for these units as follows:

Peerless Pump Company
Southern Engine Pump Company
Allis Chalmers Manf. Company
De Laval Turbine, Inc.

$$
\$ 120,671
$$

133,750
130,160
141,670
"The Engineer's Estimate for the horizontal pumping units submitted to your office in August 1966 was $\$ 130,000$.
"The bid documents require that the acceptance of a bid and the award of a Contract for the horizontal pumping units be based upon equipment meeting all the specification requirements and upon an evaluation of guaranteed efficiencies made in accordance with Paragraph 1-10, Page 68 of the Bid Documents, copy attached.
"The bid prices as evaluated in accordance with the foregoing are as follows:

Peerless Pump Company
Southern Engine Pump Company Allis-ChaImers Manf. Company De-Laval Turbine, Inc.
\$140, 899
143,518
131,040
160,468
"The evaluated bid as submitted by the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Company is the lowest. This bid also responds to all specification requirements.
"The pumping units bid under Section II consists of three (3) vertical pumps with electric drives which are needed for the Raw Water Pumping Station to be constructed for Water Treatment Plant No. 3. Nine bids were received for these units as follows:
"Peerless Pump Company
U. S. Pumps, Inc.

Alliger and Sears Company
Layne Texas Company
Delta Machine Company
Southern Engine Pump Company
Allis-Chalmers Manf. Company
J. B. Bradshaw

Crane Supply Company
\$123,839
96,990
108,841
108,392
103,900
117,200
130,610
138,363
141,567
"The Layne Texas Company also made a proposal by wire confirmed before bid opening in the amount of $\$ 110,492$ offering electric drives having better operating efficiencies for the two (2) $14,000 \mathrm{gpm}$ pumping units.
"The Engineer's Estimate for the vertical pumping units submitted to your office in August 1966 was $\$ 130,000$.
"The bid documents require that the acceptance of a bid and the award of a Contract for the vertical pumping units be based upon equipment meeting all the specification requirements and upon an evaluation of guaranteed efficiencies made in accordance with Paragraph 2-10, Page 81 of the Bid Documents, copy attached.
"The bid prices as evaluated in accordance with the foregoing are as follows:

Peerless Pump Company
U. S. Pumps, Inc.

Alliger and Sears Company
Layne Texas Company
Layne Texas Company (by wire)
Delta Machine Company
Southern Engine Pump Company
Allis-Chalmers Manf. Company
J. B. Bradshaw

Crane Supply Company

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\$ 130,364 \\
103,965 \\
147,023 \\
112,577 \\
110,717 \\
111,797 \\
118,500 \\
136,707 \\
142,683 \\
146,067
\end{array}
$$

"The evaluated bid as submitted by U. S. Pumps, Inc. is the lowest, however the data accompanying the bid submitted by the Bidder which was required of all bidders does not support the specification requirement on page 77 of the Bid Documents which states that "Each Motor shall have a continuous horsepower name plate rating which is not less than the maximum horsepower required by the pump at any point above the specified minimum head for continuous operation". The minimum head for continuous operation of two $14,000 \mathrm{gpm}$ pumps as stated on page 72 of the Bid Specifications is 225 feet. Using data submitted by U. S. Pumps, Inc. as part of the bid, the horsepower required to drive each of the two (2) 14,000 gpm pumping units between minimum head specified for continuous operation and rated head will exceed the horsepower of the 1000 HP electric drive proposed by the Bidder by about one percent.
"Another question concerning the bid as submitted by U. S. Pumps, Inc. would be the interpretation and extension of the bid price on Item 3 for the Services of an Erection Supervisor. The bidder stated the unit written price for this item as follows: "FIRST CLASS AIR FAIR plus $+\$ 25.00$ Day Subsistence". The Unit Price in figures was stated as $\$ 75.00$. The total bid in figures (for 10 days) was stated as $\$ 1000.00$. In arriving at the total price for evaluation purposes, we used the total bid price in figures which apparently was the intent of the Bidder. However, the Bid Proposal plainly stated "In case of discrepancy,
"the amount shown in words will govern". Obviously, the price as stated by the bidder in written words and in figures for Item 3 are inconflict and technically it would be impossible to extend the unit price as stated in written words on the Proposal to arrive at a total bid price for Item 3.
"In view of the foregoing comments relating to the bid submittal made by U. S. Pumps, Inc., we do not see how this bid can be considered and, therefore, we recommend it be rejected.
"The next lowest evaluated bid submitted for the vertical pumps was that of the Layne Texas Company by telegram. This bid responds to the specification requirements.
"In summary, it is our recommendations that the awards be made to the lowest evaluated bids which meet specification requirements. These are as follows:
"(a) Section I, Horizontal Pumping Units to Allis-Chalmers Manf. Company in the bid dollar amount of $\$ 130,160$;
"(b) Section II, Vertical Pumping Units to Layne Texas Company in the bid dollar amount of $\$ 110,492$.
"Yours very truly, BRYANT-CURINGTON INC. s/ J. A. Framzetti "
(Tabulation of bids on file under Water Treatment Plant No. 3)
Councilman Long noted these prices were above the contract price, and asked if this were machinery to be purchased separate from the contract. It was stated this was a separate item.

Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

## (RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on February 14, 1967, for Contract No. 3; Section I for Horizontal Pumping Units and Section II for Vertical Pumping Units for the Water Treatment Plant No. 3; and,

WHEREAS, the bid Allis-Chalmers Mamufacturing Company in the sum of $\$ 130,160.00$, for Section I, Horizontal Pumping Units, Contract No. 3; and the bid of Layne Texas Company, in the sum of $\$ 110,492.00$, for section II, Vertical Pumping Units, Contract No. 3, were the lowest and best bids therefor, and the acceptance of such bids have been recommended by the Director of Water and Sewage Treatment of the City of Austin, and by the City Manager subject to approval by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:
That the bid of Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Company, in the sum of $\$ 130,160.00$; and the bid of Layne Texas Company, in the sum of $\$ 110,492.00$, be and the same are hereby accepted, and that W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin, be and he is hereby authorized to execute contracts on behalf of the City, with Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Company and Layne Texas

Company, subject to approval by the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

## PRECINCT BOUNDARIES

The City Attorney displayed a precinct boundary map showing the new precincts created in 1966 by the Commissioners Court, and pointing out recently annexed properties added to the precincts. After discussion, Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 650311-B CONFORMING ITHE BOUNDARIES OF VOIING PRECINCTS IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN TO THE BOUNDARIES OF THOSE VOTING PRECINCTS OF TRAVIS COUNIY WHICH ARE WITHIN THE CITY; REPEALING ORDINANCES OR PARTS OF ORDINANCES IN CONFLICT HERENITH; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman LaRue moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

At 10:30 A.M. the Mayor opened the hearing on a ordinance annexing portions of Interstate 35 and unplatted land. No one appeared to be heard. Councilman White moved the hearing be closed. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent:Councilman Shanks
Mayor Palmer brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

> AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THHE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTTN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 18.3 ACRES OF LAND OUT OF THE JAMES P. WAILACE SURVEY NO. 57, AND 69.1 ACRES OF LAND OUT OF THE JOHN APPLEGAIT AND J. C. HARRELSON SURVEYS IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDI TIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE. (Portions of Interstate 35 and unplatted land)

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent:Councilman Shanks
The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman White moved that the ordinance be passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent:Councilman Shanks

## PROPERTY TO BE DEEDED TO STATE FOR HIGHWAY 290

The City Manager said there was a contract with the Highway Department whereby the City purchased right of way, and the Highway Department participated $50 \%$ upon the City's deeding the property to the State. Mayor Palmer inquired about Highway 290, noting it was valuable property and asking if funds were still available to purchase this right of way. The City Manager reported the commitments would exhaust the funds. The City Attorney said the Highway Department was making two contracts--one on the west side, and one on the east. The City Manager reported two pieces of right of way on Highway 290 on the West Loop (Fredericksburg Road) were to be required.

Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

## (RESOUT TION)

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:

That W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager, be and he is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the State of Texas, the hereinafter described tract of land conveyed to City by Lemuel Scarbrough by Warranty Deed dated May 15, 1965, of record in Volume 2966 at Pages $775-777$ of the Deed Records of Travis County, Texas.

Such conveyance to be for and in consideration of the payment by the State of Texas of one-half of the cost of such tract in accordance with the terms of that certain contract entered into by and between the City of Austin and the State of Texas on the 9th day of December, 1963, for the acquisition of right-of-way for U.S. Highway 290 East from Interstate Highway 35 to Mira Loma Drive, in the City of Austin; said tract of land being more particularly described as follows, to-wit:
1.799 acres of land, more or less, same being out of and a portion of the James P. Wallace Survey in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, which was conveyed to Lemuel Scarbrough by deed dated July 27, 1943 of recora in Volume 728, Page 111 of the Deed Records of Travis County, Texas, and is described as Tract Two, said 1.799 acre tract of land, being more particularly described by metes and bounds as follows:

BEGINNING at pin set in the East line of the above mentioned 3.93 acre tract, said pin also being in the West line of Cameron Road, and bears $\mathrm{N} 44^{\circ} 52^{\prime}$ E, 185.20 feet from the Southeasterly cormer of said 3.93 acre tract;

THENCE, N $15^{\circ} 41^{\prime} \mathrm{W}, 238.88$ feet along the proposed Southwest right of way line at the Cameron Road and U.S. 290 intersection to an iron pin; said pin being 180 feet to the right of and at right angles to U.S. 290 centerline station 48+50;

THENCE, along the proposed South right of way line $\mathrm{N} 75^{\circ} 36^{\circ} \mathrm{W}, 262.54$ feet to an iron pin set in the West line of said 3.93 acre tract;

THENCE, N $6^{\circ} 22^{\prime} \mathrm{E}, 83.21$ feet along the West line of the said 3.93 acre tract, same being the East line of the 21.5 acre tract owned by M. H. Crockett, $J r .$, to an iron pin found in the existing South right of way line;

THENCE, $S 83^{\circ} 38^{\prime} \mathrm{E}, 425.11$ feet along the existing South right of way of U.S. 290 and the North property line of the said 3.93 acre tract to an iron pin;

THENCE, S $19^{\circ} 20^{\prime} \mathrm{E}, 170.30$ feet along the existing Northeast property line of said 3.93 acre tract to an iron pin found; said pin being in the West line of Cameron Road;

THENCE, S $44^{\circ} 52^{\prime} \mathrm{W}, 240.00$ feet along the West line of Cameron Road and the East property line of the said 3.93 acre tract to the point of beginning.

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

## (RESOLUTION)

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:
That W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager, be and he is hereby authorized and directed to convey to the state of Texas, the hereinafter described tract of land conveyed to City by Elizabeth Paterson by Warranty Deed dated April 17, 1965, of record in Volume 2944 at Pages 2274-2277 of the Deed Records of Travis County, Texas.

Such conveyance to be for and in consideration of the payment by the State of Texas of one-half of the cost of such tract in accordance with the terms of that certain contract entered into by and between the City of Austin and the State of Texas on the 9th day of December, 1963, for the acquisition of right-ofway for U.S. Highway 290 East from Interstate Highway 35 to Mira Loma Drive, in the City of Austin; said tract of land being more particularly described as follows, to-wit:
1.101 acre tract of land, mor e or less, same being out of and a portion of the James P. Wallace Survey in the City of Austin, Travis County, Texas, which was conveyed to Elizabeth Paterson by the following three deeds: Vol. 1263, Pages 534 dated May 28, 1952, Vol. 830, Page 601 dated June 19, 1947, and Vol. 1219, Page 452 dated October 13, 1951, all in the Deed Records of Travis County, Texas; said 1.101 acre tract of land, more or less, being more particularly described by metes and bounds as follows:

BEGINNING at a point at the intersection of the proposed South right of way line and said East property line, said beginning point being $\mathbb{N} 31^{\circ} 01^{\prime} \mathrm{E}, 148.08$ feet from the Southeast corner of a portion of the Paterson Tract recorded in Vol. 1219, Page 452 of the Travis County Deed Records;

THENCE, along the proposed South right of way line of U.S. Highway 290, S $88^{\circ} 34^{\prime} \mathrm{W}, 49.94$ feet to a point; said point being 80 feet to the right of and at right angles to the P.C. of a curve at centerline station 62+60.1;

THENCE, continuing along the proposed South right of way line of U.S. Highway 290, N $86^{\circ} 17^{\prime} \mathrm{W}, 165.55$ feet to a point;

THENCE, along the proposed Southeast right of way line of U.S. Highway 290, s $80^{\circ} 24^{\prime} \mathrm{W}, 351.31$ feet to a point; said point being 183.78 feet to the right of and at right angles to U.S. Highway 290 centerline station 57+57;

THENCE, along the proposed East right of way line of U.S. Highway 290, S $06^{\circ} 22^{\prime} \mathrm{W}, 41.95$ feet to a point in grantor's Southwest property line;

THENCE, along grantor's said Southwest property line, the same being the North right of way line of Wheless Lane, N $59^{\circ} 25^{\prime} \mathrm{W}, 153.37$ feet to grantor's Southwest property corner;

THENCE, along grantor's West property line the same being the Southeast right of way line of the intersection of U.S. Highway 290 and Cameron Road, $\mathbb{N}$ $20^{\circ} 48^{\prime} \mathrm{E}, 106.64$ feet to a point;

THENCE, $S 83^{\circ} 38^{\prime} \mathrm{E}, 616.53$ feet along the existing South right of way
line of U.S. 290 to a concrete marker, said South right of way line also being the North property line of all three of the said Paterson tracts;

THENCE, along the existing South right of way line along a curb to the left, having a radius of 5789.65 feet, the chord bears $583^{\circ} 55^{\prime} \mathrm{E}, 55.70$ feet, with an arc distance of 55.70 feet to a point in said South right of way line at the intersection with the East property line of Paterson Tract recorded in Volume 1219, Page 452;

THENCE, along the East property line $S 31^{\circ} 01{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{W}, 14.93$ feet to the point of beginning.

The motion, æconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

> CONIRACT WITH HIGHWAY DEPARTMENT FOR CONSIRUCTING MISSOURI PACIFIC BOULEVARD

The Council had before it for consideration an ordinance authorizing construction and maintenance of Missouri-Pacific Boulevard in cooperation with the State Highway Department. The City Manager said this ordinance formally authorizes the execution of the former contract as worked out with Highway District 14, and contains the provisions in the Minute order.

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:
AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND
MAINTIENANCE OF THE PORTION OF MO-PAC BOULEVARD,
A CONTROLLED ACCESS HIGHWAY IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN,
BEIWEEN THE FOLIOWING LIMITS, TO-WIT: FROM U.S.
HIGHWAY 183 IN NORTH AUSTIN TO THE SOUTH CITY LIMITS
OF AUSTIN. AS A CONIROLIED ACCESS HIGHWAY HEREINAFTER
REFERRED TO AS "THE PROJECT" AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY
MANAGER OF THE CITY TO EXECUTE AND THE CITY CLERK TO
AFFIX THE CORPORAIT SEAL AND ATTEST THE SAME, A CER-
TAIN CONTRACT BEIWEEN THE CITY AND THE STATE OF TEXAS
PROVIDIING FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE, EXISTENCE
AND USE OF SAID PROJECT AS A CONTROLLED ACCESS HIGHWAY
AND DEIERMINING THE LIABILIITIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES
OF THE CITY AND THE STATE OF TEXAS WITH REFERENCE THERE-
TO; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY AND PROVIDING THAT THE
ORDINANCE SHALL BE EFFECTIVE FROM AND AFTER ITS PASSAGE.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent:Councilman Shanks

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilnan Shanks
The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman White moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

## EXPRESSWAY AND MAJOR ARTERIAL PLAN

Mayor Palmer read the resolution formally adopting the Expressway and Major Arterial Plan approved last week. The City Attorney read the statement appearing on the map as follows:
"This map shows in general form, the planned routes for expressways and major arterials intended to be effected by the Austin Development Plan. The actual location of eny particular expressway or major arterial and development thereof to adopted standards will be determined by the City as the community develops and the need warrants.

"The 'Central Expressway' south of 38th Street, and the 'First Street Expressway' east of Missouri Pacific Boulevard, are shown as proposals subject to further study and evaluation of possible routes and preliminary design, and approval by the Planning Commission and the City Council, prior to acquisition of right-of-way development."

Councilman Long inquired about the Interchange on the City Parkway in Zilker Park noting it is not established on this map. The City Manager explained the map does not show any interchanges, and that is a detail that would come into being as the design work is done. Councilman Long said the map shows that the road comes through the park as a general route, and even the route is not tied down. The City Manager said the route is still subject to further study and design. Councilman Long stated assurance that the route through Zilker Park was not tied down is necessary.

Councilman LaRue offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:
(RESOLUTION)
WHEREAS, the Planning Commission of the City of Austin has held public hearings attended by interested citizens and after intense study and careful consideration has recommended that the Expressway and Major Arterial Plan and Standards be adopted in lieu of the existing Thoroughfare Plan and Standards in the Master Plan, in order to keep such Master Plan current with the needs and conditions which have arisen; and,

WHEREAS, a copy of such plan has been forwarded to the City Manager who has submitted the same to the City Council with his recommendation thereon; and,

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Austin has duly held public hearings on the proposed action, and having carefully considered such Expressway and Major Arterial Plan and Standards has duly found that it should constitute a portion of the Master Plan of the City of Austin; Now, Therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CIITY CONVCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:
That the document consisting of text, map, tables and charts, entitled "Expressway and Major Arterial Plan" dated March 16, 1967, a copy of which is attached hereto, is hereby adopted as part of the Master Plan of the City of Austin in lieu of the Thoroughfare Plan and Standards of the Master Plan of the City of Austin adopted June 8, 1961; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:
That the Resolution of the City Council adopting the Master Plan on June 8, 1961, be amended by substituting the expression "Expressway and Major Arterial Plan" in lieu of the expression "Thoroughfare Plan", and that except as herein amended, said Resolution of June 8, 1961 is hereby confirmed and reenacted.
(Document attached)
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EXPRESSWAV AND major amuerial plan

Adopted by City Council, City of Austin March 16, 1967
st 01901
RECOMMENDED EXPRESSWAY SYSTEM

| FACILITY | LIMITS | TYPICAL SECTION | INTERCHANGES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ben White Blvd. | at South lat Street at Manchaca Rd. | ------ | Separation. <br> Separation. |
| Camp Mabry Expressway | Central Expressway to Lamar Blvd. | TYPE B | Directional interchange at Central Expressway. Separation at Lamar Blvd. |
|  | Lamar Blvd. to Shoal Creek | TYPE 3B | Shoal Creek Bridge to provide for 35th Street to 34th Street Connection. |
|  | Shoal Creek to Mo Pac Expressway | TYPE B | Separation at Jefferson Street. Partial directional interchange at Mo Pac Expressway. |
| Central <br> Expressway | Crosstown Expressway to 29th Street | TYPE 2A | Directional interchange at Crosstown Expressway. |
|  | 29th Street to Central Expressway Spur | TYPE A with the omission of the east frontage road from 40th.Street to 45th Street. | Directional interchange at Camp Mabry Expressway. Separations at 38th, 41st, 45th, 5lat \& North Loop Streets. |
|  |  |  | Directional interchange at Central Expressway Spur. |

Table 45 Continued

| FACILITY | LIMITS | TYPICAL SECTION | INTERCHANGES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Central <br> Expressway Continued | Central Expressway Spur to I. H. 35 | TYPE C with the omission of the north frontage road from the Central Expressway Spur to the Southern Pacific Railroad. | Separations at Guadalupe St., Avenue F, S. P. R. R. \& Airport Blvd. <br> Directional interchange at I. H. 35. |
| Central Expressway Spur | Central Expressway to U.S. 183 | TYPE 3C | Directional interchange at Central Expressway. <br> Separations at Koenig, Mayfield \& Justin Lanes, Airport Blvd. \& St. John's Ave. Partial directional interchange at U.S. 183. |
| Crosstown Expressway | Mo Pac Expressway to Central Expressway | TYPE B | Directional interchanges at Mo Pac \& Central Expressways. <br> Separations at West Lynn \& 12th Sts., Enfield Rd., Lamar Blvd., West Ave. \& Rio Grande St. |
|  | Central Expressway to Brazos St. <br> Brazos St. to I.H. 35 | TYPE 3A TYPE A | Separations at Guadalupe St., Lavaca St. \& Congress Ave. <br> Directional interchanges at San Jacinto St., Trinity St. \& I. H. 35. <br> Separation at Red River St. |
|  | I. H. 35 to Airport Blvd. | TYPE C | Separations at Comal, Chicon \& Chestnut Sts., S. P. R. R. Harvey St. \& Airport Blvd. |

Table 45 Continued

Table 45 Continued

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & M_{1} \\ & \alpha_{1} \\ & \text { H- } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { H } & g \\ 0 & 0 \\ \text { d } \\ 0 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & U \\ & N \\ & \text { M } \\ & \mu_{1} \\ & H \end{aligned}$ |
| ${\underset{\sim}{n}}_{\substack{n \\ \\ \hline \\ \hline}}$ |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Academy Dr. to } \\ & \text { Pleasant Valley Rd. } \end{aligned}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



Figure 36


Figure 37


Figure 39


Figure 40
Table 6
MAJOR ARTERIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Table 6 Continued

| NAME | LIMITS | MI. | EXISTING \# |  | RECOMMENDED |  | SECTION TYPE** | OTHER <br> RECOMMENDATIONS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | STREET | R.O.W. | STREET | R.O.W. |  |  |
| Braker Lane | U.S. 183-Lamar Blvd. <br> Lamar Blvd. $-1800^{\prime}$ east of I.H. 35 <br> 1800'east of I.H. 35Dessau Rd. | $\begin{aligned} & 3.75 \\ & 0.97 \\ & 0.45 \end{aligned}$ | 20 $20$ | $\begin{gathered} - \\ 60-70 \\ 40 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 @ 24 \\ & 2 @ 24 \\ & 2 @ 24 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 120 \\ & 120 \\ & 120 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | M-4 <br> M-4 <br> M-4 |  |
| Bull Creek Rd. | Hancock-Jefferson | 1.61 | 40 | 60 | OK | 70 | H-2 |  |
| Burnet Rd. | ```45th-Koenig Koenig-Burnet Lane Burnet Lane-U.S. 185 U.S. 183-Cordon``` | $\begin{aligned} & 1.37 \\ & 0.27 \\ & 1.81 \\ & 2.87 \end{aligned}$ | 42 51 34 $44-48$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 60 \\ 120 \\ 120 \\ 2001,20^{\prime} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \\ & 60 \\ & 60 \\ & \text { OK } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 90 \\ \text { OK } \\ \text { OK } \\ 120 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\mathrm{K}-2$ $\mathrm{M}-1$ $\mathrm{M}-1$ $\mathrm{M}-2$ | Prohibit parking. Turn lanes at Koenig. |
| Cameron Rd. | 5lst-Ridgemont Ridgemont-U.S. 290 U.S. 290-Braker Lane | $\begin{aligned} & 0.57 \\ & 0.69 \\ & 6.06 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & 20 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 60 \\ & 50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \circledast 24 \\ & 2 \circledast 24 \\ & 2 \circledast 24 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90 \\ & 90 \\ & 90 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{K}-6 \\ & \mathrm{~K}-6 \\ & \mathrm{~K}-6 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Prohibit parking. <br> Prohibit parking. <br> Revision at 5lst \& I.H. 35. |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { Cherrywood Rd. \& } \\ \text { Wilshire Blvd. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Manor Kd.-38th St. } \\ & \text { 38th St.-Airport Blvd. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.55 \\ & 0.59 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 40 \\ \times \quad 30 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \\ & 60 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 70 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{H}-1 \\ & \mathrm{H}-1 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Chestnut Ave. | Manor Rd...Rosewood Rosewood-E. 7th | $\begin{aligned} & 1.00 \\ & 0.87 \end{aligned}$ | $40$ | $\begin{array}{r} 50-60 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 44 \\ 2 \cdot 24 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90 \\ & 90 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{K}-\mathbf{3} \\ & \mathbf{K}-6 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Chicon St. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Holly-7th } \\ & \text { 7th-1lth } \\ & \text { 1lth-Manor Rd. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.66 \\ & 0.27 \\ & 1.25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 36 \\ 28 \\ 38-40 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \\ & 60 \\ & 60 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 70 \\ & 70 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{H}-1$ $\mathrm{H}-1$ $\mathrm{H}-1$ |  |
| Congress Ave. | 11th St.-So. Cordon | 4.89 | 48-94 | 100-120 | OK | OK | N |  |
| Decker Lane ${ }^{\&}$ Blue Goose Rd. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { F.M. 969-U.S. } 290 \\ & \text { U.S. 290-Sprinkle Cutoff } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4.70 \\ & 3.20 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \\ & 15 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 50 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2 @ 24 \\ & 2 @ 24 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 120 \\ & 120 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{M}-4 \\ & \mathrm{M}-4 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Duval St. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { San Jacinto-38th } \\ & \text { 38th-43rd } \\ & \text { 43rd-48th } \\ & 48 \mathrm{th}-51 \mathrm{st} \\ & 51 \mathrm{st-56th} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.60 \\ & 0.49 \\ & 0.49 \\ & 0.27 \\ & 0.44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38 \\ & 36 \\ & 40 \\ & 27 \\ & 40 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \\ & 60 \\ & 60 \\ & 60 \\ & 60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 70 \\ & 70 \\ & 70 \\ & 70 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{H}-1$ $\mathrm{H}-1$ $\mathrm{H}-1$ $\mathrm{H}-1$ $\mathrm{H}-1$ | $\qquad$ |
| East Loop | Alipport Blvd.-1.H. 35 | 8.14 | 2 @ 24 | 200 | OK | OK | N |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Elgin Hwy. (U.S. } \\ & 290 \text { ) } \end{aligned}$ | I.H. 35 to East Loop East Loop-Cordon | $\begin{aligned} & 2.05 \\ & 5.55 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 120 \\ & 120 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 € 36 \\ & 2 @ 24 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 200 \\ & 200 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{p} \\ & \mathbf{p} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Enfield Rd. \& Parkway | Lk. Austin-Robinhood Robinhood-Park St. <br> Park St.-Hopi Trail <br> Hopi Trail-Windsor <br> Windsor-Parkway <br> Along Parkway to Lamar | $\begin{aligned} & 0.26 \\ & 0.05 \\ & 0.26 \\ & 1.55 \\ & 0.15 \\ & 0.09 \end{aligned}$ | 37 33 $33-40$ 40 40 40 | 39 <br> 60 <br> 45 <br> 70 <br> 100 <br> 70 | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90 \\ & 90 \\ & 90 \\ & \text { OK } \\ & \text { OK } \\ & \text { OK } \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{K}-3$ <br> $\mathrm{~K}-3$ <br> $\mathrm{~K}-3$ <br> $\mathrm{H}-1$ <br> $\mathrm{~L}-2$ <br> $\mathrm{H}-1$ |  |
| Exposition Blvd. | Lk. Austin Blvd.-Enfield Enfield-35th St. | $\begin{aligned} & 0.58 \\ & 1.50 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 46 \\ & 40 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 60 \\ 60-70 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{OK} \\ & 44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 70 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{H}-3 \\ & \mathrm{H}-1 \end{aligned}$ | Rebuild Windsor to Enfield. |
| Guadalupe St. | $\begin{aligned} & 34 t h-19 t h \\ & 19 t h-13 t h \\ & 13 t h-12 t h \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1.31 \\ & 0.41 \\ & 0.09 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40-63 \\ 40 \\ 50 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 57 \frac{1}{2}-120 \\ 80 \\ 80 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OK } \\ & 60 \\ & 60 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \mathrm{~J}-1 \\ & \mathrm{~J}-1 \end{aligned}$ | Prohibit peak parking. |


Table 6 Continued

Toble 6 Continued


| NAME | LIMITS | MI. | EXISTING \# |  | RECOMMENDED |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SECTION } \\ & \text { TYPE*** } \end{aligned}$ | OIHER <br> RECCMNENDATIONS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | STREET | R.O.W. | STREET | R.O.W. |  |  |
| St. Johns Ave. (Cont'd.) | I.H. 35-Blessing <br> Blessing-Cameron | $\begin{aligned} & 0.61 \\ & 0.22 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Unpaved } \\ 44 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 50 \\ 70 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & \text { OK } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & \text { OK } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{H}-1 \\ & \mathrm{~N} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Todd Lane | Riveraide Dr.-Burleson Burleson-St. Elmo <br> St. Elmo-Stassney | $\begin{aligned} & 1.27 \\ & 0.85 \\ & 0.77 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\overline{20}$ | $\overline{50}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r} 120 \\ 90 \\ .90 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{K}-4 \\ & \mathrm{~K}-6 \\ & \mathrm{~K}-6 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Trinity St. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 1st-3rd } \\ & \text { 3rd-7th } \\ & \text { 7th-15th } \\ & \text { 15th-19th } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.14 \\ & 0.27 \\ & 0.56 \\ & 0.27 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \\ & 60 \\ & 40 \\ & 60 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 80 \\ & 80 \\ & 80 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \\ & \text { aK } \\ & 60 \\ & \text { OK } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OK } \\ & \text { OK } \\ & \text { OK } \\ & \text { OK } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{J}-1 \\ & \mathrm{~N} \\ & \mathrm{~J}-1 \\ & \mathrm{~N} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\underset{\infty}{\text { Prohibit peak parking. }}$ |
| Vinson Dr. | Cordon-S. City Limit S. City Limit-St. Elmo St. Elmo-Oltorf | $\begin{aligned} & 0.85 \\ & 0.53 \\ & 1.65 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Unpaved } \\ \text { U } \end{gathered}$ | $24-70$ | $2 \times 24$ 2 2 | $\begin{aligned} & 90 \\ & 90 \\ & 90 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{K}-6 \\ & \mathrm{~K}-6 \\ & \mathrm{~K}-6 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Walah Tarlton Ln. | R.M. 2244-So. for 2000 There to Stoneridge Stoneridge-W. Loop | $\begin{aligned} & 0.38 \\ & 0.38 \\ & 0.45 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Unpaved | 40 - | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 90 90 90 | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{K}-3 \\ & \mathrm{~K}-3 \\ & \mathrm{~K}-3 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Webberville Rd. 8 Ridgeway Dr. | Chestnut-Bedford Bedford-Oaksprings Oaksprings-Wilaon Wilson-Crosstown | $\begin{aligned} & 0.36 \\ & 0.19 \\ & 0.19 \\ & 0.04 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20-32 \\ 40 \\ 30 \\ - \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 60 \\ & 60 \\ & 50 \\ & - \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & 44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70 \\ & 70 \\ & 70 \\ & 70 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{H}-1 \\ & \mathrm{H}-1 \\ & \mathrm{H}-1 \\ & \mathrm{H}-1 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| West Ave. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sth-12th } \\ & \text { 12th-Crosstown } \\ & \text { Crosstown-19th } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.48 \\ & 0.23 \\ & 0.23 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \\ & 40 \\ & 40 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80 \\ & 80 \\ & 80 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OK } \\ & 60 \\ & \text { OK } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { OK } \\ & \text { OK } \\ & \text { OK } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \mathrm{~J}-1 \\ & \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ | Make oneway south. $\cdots \quad \cdots$ " $\quad$ N $\quad$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { West Lake Dr. }{ }^{\&} \\ \text { Red Bud Trail } \end{gathered}$ | Lk.Austin Blvd.wW. Lk. Dr. Red Bud Tr.-R.M. 2244 R.M. 2244-W. Loop | $\begin{aligned} & 1.10 \\ & 1.06 \\ & 1.14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 100 \\ 50 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0 K \\ & 44 \\ & 44 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 02 \\ 90 \\ 70 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{L}-2 \\ & \mathrm{~K}-3 \\ & \mathrm{~K}-1 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| West Loop | U.S. 183-U.S. 290 | 14.09 | $\cdots$ | -- | 2 (1) 24 | 200 | P |  |
| Windsor Rd. \& 24th St. | Mat thews-Pecos <br> Pecos-Moffett <br> Moffett-Exposition <br> Exposition-Woodlawn <br> Woodlawn-Lamar | $\begin{aligned} & 0.38 \\ & 0.33 \\ & 0.06 \\ & 0.72 \\ & 0.30 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 30 30 40 40 40 | $50-60$ <br> 50 <br> 50 <br> 60 <br> 70 | $\begin{aligned} & 44 \\ & 44 \\ & \text { OK } \\ & \text { OK } \\ & \text { OK } \end{aligned}$ | 70 <br> -70 <br> 70 <br> 90 <br> 90 | $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{H}-1 & \\ \mathrm{H}-1 & \\ \mathrm{H}-2 \\ \mathrm{~K}-4 \\ \mathrm{~K}-4 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Prohibit peak parking. Prohibit peak parking. |
| Woodland Ave. |  |  | See Annie Street. |  |  |  |  |  |
| Woodrow Âve. | Burnet Rd.-Anderson Ln. | 2.55 | 40 | 50-80 | OK | 80 | J-3 | Prohibit peak parking. |
| Woodward St. |  |  | See Barton Skyway. |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1st St. | Town Lk. Expr.-I.H. 35 <br> I.H. 35-Pleasant Valley <br> Pleasant Valley-Linden Linden-E. 7th St. | $\begin{aligned} & 0.23 \\ & 1.53 \\ & 0.12 \\ & 1.00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40 \\ & 36 \\ & 30 \\ & 40 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 80 60 100 100 | 66 44 44 44 | 90 90 OK OK | $\mathrm{K}-1$ $\mathrm{~K}-4$ $\mathrm{~L}-2$ $\mathrm{~L}-2$ | ```Rebuild & prohibit peak parking. Rebuild & prohibit peak parking. Rebuild.``` |
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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | as． |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\int_{1}^{*}$ |  |
| 㑒荌 | \％ | A 4 为 4 为 8 \％ | O | 으못ํ |  | ¢ 2 | 요） |  |  |
|  |  | $8: 804 y$ |  | \％ 4 |  | － |  | $\pm+$ |  |
|  | 웅융 | ¢ 90.0 |  | 응 1 | － |  |  | $\left\|\begin{array}{ccc} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{array}\right\|$ | 으웅 18 |
| 昫荀 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & 0 \\ & \mathbf{N} \\ & \mathbf{N} \end{aligned}$ | 융ㅇㅇㅇㅇ |  | －8： 1 | －2918980． | $\pm$ |  | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 10 & 9 \\ 1 & 9 \\ \infty & 0 \\ m \end{array}\right.$ | ずッジ 1 |
| 安 |  |  －00000 |  | $\begin{array}{lll} 1 & \text { No } \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{array}$ | N～우N N $0^{\circ} 0^{\circ} 0^{\circ} 0^{\circ} 0^{\circ}$ |  |  <br>  | － |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \dot{4} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \dot{4} \\ & \stackrel{4}{4} \end{aligned}$ |  |

Toble 6 Continued

| NAME | LIMITS | MI. | EXISTING \# |  | RECCMMENDED |  | $\underset{\text { SYPE** }}{\substack{\text { SECTION }}}$ | OTHERRECOMMENDATIONS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | STREET | R.o.w. | STREET | R.O.W. |  |  |
| 825-857 | U.S. 183-Cordon | 3.30 | -- | - | $2 @ 24$ | 90 | K-6 |  |
| 670-1068 | U.S. 290-Springdale | 2.43 | - | -- | 2@ 24 | 90 | K-6 |  |
| 855-861 | Lamar-Cordon | 1.14 | -- | -- | 2@ 24 | 90 | K-6 |  |
| 920-921 | Rundberg-Braker | 1.52 | -- | - | 44 | 70 | H-1 |  |
| 1050-1102 | Stassney-Lk. Shore Dr. | 3.60 | - | - | 2@ 24 | 90 | ${ }^{\text {K-6 }}$ |  |
| 1245-1097 | U.S. 183-Braker Ln. | 0.83 | - | - | 2 @ 24 | 90 | K-6 |  |

[^0]| NAME | LIMITS | RECOMMENDED |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | STREET | R. O. W. |
| Anderson Lane \& Spicewood Springs Road | West Loop - west | 44 | 80 |
| Barton Skyway | Mo Pac - R.M. 2244 | 44 | 90 |
| Cameron Road | Braker Lane - north | 2 @ 24 | 90 |
| Chunn Lane, Nuckles Crossing Road, F.M. 812, F.M. 973, \& Parmer Lane | $\begin{aligned} & \text { U. S. } 290-\text { S.H. } 71 \\ & \text { S. H. } 71 \text { - U. S. } 183 \end{aligned}$ | 44 2 @ 24 | 120 200 |
| Congress Avenue | Stassney Lane - South | 44 | 120 |
| Dalton Lane | Ed. Bluestein Blvd. - S. H. 71 | 2 @ 24 | 200 |
| Darran Gin Road | U. S. 290 - Decker Lane | 44 | 90 |
| Hogeye Road | Ed. Bluestein Blvd. - F.M. 973 | 44 | 90 |
| Mesa Drive | Far West Blvd. - Old U.S. 183 | 44 | 90 |
| North Lakeshore Drive | E. Avenue - E. 1st at Canadian | 44 | 70 |
| Nuckles Crossing Road | Nuckles Crossing Road - south | 44 | 90 |
| 01d Dessau Road | Yager Lane - north | 44 | 90 |
| 01d Lockhart Road | Chunn Lane - south | 44 | 90 |
| 01d U. S. 183 | Mo Pac Blvd. - west loop | 44 | 100 |
| Robert E. Lee Road | Lamar Blvd. - Barton Springs Road | 44 | 70 |
|  | Barton Springs Rd. - R. M. 2244 | 44 | 90 |
| Slaughter Lane | U. S. 290 - U. S. 183 | 44 | 90 |
| Todd Lane | Stassney Lane - south | 44 | 90 |
| Upper Lockhart Road | Chunn Lane - south | 44 | 90 |


| NAME | LIMITS | ReC REC | NDED |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | STREET | R. O. W. |
| West Lake Drive \& Red Bud Trail | R. M. 2244 - southwest | 44 | 90 |
| E. 1st Street | I. H. 35 - E. 1st Street | 44 | 70 |
| E. 2nd Street | I. H. $35-\mathrm{E}$ - 1st Street | 44 | 70 |
| S. 1st Street | Stassney Lane - south | 44 | 80 |
| E. 51st Street | Springdale Road - Ed Bluestein Blvd. | 44 | 90 |
| 1050-1102 | 1050 - south | 2 @ 24 | 90 |
| Decker Lane Loop | F. M. 969 - Decker Lane | 44 | 70 |

The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:
an ordinance vacating and perperually closing for PUBLIC USE A PORTION OF ANGELINA STREET, IN THE CITY OF AUSTITN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; RETAINING AN EASEMENT FOR PUBLIC UTILITY PURPOSES: SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF AN ORDINANCE ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS; AND DECLARING AN ENERGENCY.

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

Ayes: Councilmen IaRue, Long, Mayor Palmer
Noes: Councilman White
Absent: Councilman Shanks
The City Manager pointed out this was in accordance with the Kealing Plan.

## ANNEXATION

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:
AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTIENSION OF CERTAIN bOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 7.04 ACRES OF LAND, SAME BETNG OUT OF AND A PART OF THE JAMES P. WALLACE SURVEY NUMBER 57 IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSIIIN IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE. (Proposed Cameron Park, Section 3)

Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be published in accordance with Article 1, Section 6 of the Charter of the City of Austin and be set for public hearing on March 30, 1967 at 10:30 A.M. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:
AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTHENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITTY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXAMION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTTING OF 1.44 ACRES OF LAND OUT OF AND A PART OF THE JOHN APPLEGAIT SURVEY, IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT 10 AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSITIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE. (Proposed Patton's Addition and Patton's Addition, Section 3)

Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be published in accordance with Article 1, Section 6 of the Charter of the City of Austin and be set for public hearing on March 30, 1967 at 10:30 A.M. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following: vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

Mayor Palmex introduced the following ordinance:
AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN
BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXA-
TIION OF CERTATN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF
22.20 ACRES OF LAND OUT OF THE WILIJAM WILKS SURVEY,
THE JOHN APPLEGAIT SURVEY, THE J.A.G. BROOKE SURVEY
AND THE PAIRICK LUSK SURVEY, IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS;
WHICH SAID ADDIIIONAL TERRITORY ITES ADJACENT TO AND
ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF
AIJSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE.
(Proposed University Hills, Section 4, Phases 1 \& 2.)

Councilman LaRue moved that the ordinance be published in accordance with Article 1, Section 6 of the Charter of the City of Austin be set for public hearing on March 30, 1967 at 10:30 A.M. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

## SHORELINE IMPROVEMENTS

The Council had before it requests for shoreline improvements for the following:
a. FRANCIS E. BENOIT - Lot 3, Windy Cove Addition (retaining wall).
b. CARL WOOTTEN - Lot 23, Lakeshore Addition (reconsideration of location of retaining wall).

Councilman White and the Director of Public Works had made on site inspections of these two sites. It was reported Mr. Benoit's sketch showed the area to be narrower than he had agreed upon, and he had been asked to set his improvement over $23^{\prime}$ instead of $20^{\frac{1}{2}}$ ' as shown on the sketch, from and parallel to the wall along Mr. Fritzgerald's property, and Mr. Benoit is to cut off 5' of the lot. They were agreeable to these revisions. Councilman LaRue moved that the Council approve the shoreline improvement as requested by FRANCIS E. BENOIT - Lot 3, Windy Cove Addition. (Retaining wall) The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

> Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
> Noes: None
> Absent: Councilman Shanks

The Director of Public Works reported that CARL WOOTTEN has a request for shoreline improvement and for a boat dock. The Council last September granted MR. WOOTIEN permission to build a retaining wall along his property line out to the end of the peninsula. Part of the wall has been constructed, and Mr. Wootten want $\$$ to build the upper wall back where he will have a $10^{\prime}$ setback and build two or three docks in a little cove that had been developed. He will be $10^{\prime}$ from the property line. He has a request for a boat dock which also will be $10^{\prime}$ back. Fill will need to be removed from the lake and placed on the peninsula. MR. IESTER PROCTOR drew a sketch of the area under consideration, and of the property and channels of MR. JOHN BRADFIELD and his boat docks extending into the lake. At the time the permit was obtained, he said a survey was made to assure that $10^{\prime}$ of water existed all the way up the channel. He pointed out the land purchased by Mr. Wootten stating it was their understanding the former permit granted Mr. Wootten was to square up the property, setting back about $18^{\prime \prime}$ and constructing a wall, and the area where his boat docks are was to be filled in. The foundation was made for a wall, a permit granted, and then Mr. Wootten changed his mind and decided to keep the boat docks and run the wall at the back end of the lot; and from the boat dock area on out. Councilman Long asked how Mr. Wootten's construction would affect Mr. Bradfield's property. Mr. Proctor explained had the construction taken place under the eirst permit, Mr. Wootten would have had to cross Mr. Bradfield's property line on the water. Work done under the first permit prevents Mr. Bradfield from bringing a large boat around the turn to service off of his land. Mr. Proctor said Mr. Wootten had not squared the property, but was encroaching upon the $10^{\prime}$ line, which is the equivalent of constructing a dock, and that Mr. Wootten wants the Council to rescind previous action and close the waterway at the rear. If he closes this waterway, he wowld be denying Mr. Bradfield the use of the water, as Mr. Bradfield cannot turn the corner with large craft. Councilman LaRue asked if the first phase of the well had been constructed Within the 18" of the property line; and if it were within the legal remifications, Mr. Proctor said it was contrary to the Council's policy which requires lo' setback; and he saw no difference in filling in with dirt or building a dock. The Mayor explained the Council did not say a retaining wall could not be constructed on a property line, but did say $1 f$ a boat dock were built, it must be $10^{\prime}$ back. Mr. Wootten was not encroaching on anything by being within $18^{\prime \prime}$ of the property line for a retaining wall. The City Manager stated there were two separate rules. The dock ordinance requires a $10^{\prime}$ set back; and permission to fill the lake must be by special permit from the Council. Mr. Proctor stated Mr. Wootten proposed to keep the back part of his property as it is with the retaining wall, and then build the retaining wall from the cove on out to the point, although he would be using Mr. Bradfield's entry water and denying Mr. Bradfield the use of the back water. He stated there may be some legal rights. Mr. Proctor emphasized his main
point is that Mr . Wootten originally asked to square up the property but abandoned that idea and is going to continue to use the water and an earthern dock leaving Mr. Bradfield unable to turn the corner with large craft; that Mr. Wootten is not 10' from the side lot. The City Attorney stated the ordinance governing the $10^{\prime}$ set back from a side lot line pertains to piers, docks, wharves, float, island, piling or other structures. This rule applies only to side lot lines.

The Building Official said the original request was to erect a retaining wall and walkway on the lake side-not necessarily to straighten up the property line. Mr. Wootten had poured for the wall from the land on the west up to the area where the boat docks are. He came back for a change, and constructed a retaining wall 8' from the property line, and came back for approval for another change. The Building Official requested him to move the wall back $10^{\prime}$ all the way to the docks the Council had granted permission to erect. Mr. Wootten was asked to move the docks inward, so that they too would be 10 from the property line.

MR. CULLEN, the contractor, said Mr. Wootten was trying to build a maintenance service, and pointed out the area where the boats would be brought in for maintenance. The City Attorney stated the ordinance required a 10 ' set back. The Building Official said the retaining wall had complied initially; but when the wall was changed, he had asked the contractor to stop work. Councilman Long asked if the permit was to build on through in a straight line without a $10^{\prime}$ set back. The Building Official stated this was correct. Mayor Palmer asked where the next plan would adversely affect the property owner, other than giving the applicant the opportunity to build a boat dock, as it would seem more water way is being provided all the way down except one little site. Mr. Proctor stated that was true, but a large craft could not turn the corner on the west end, and that Mr. Bradfield had explained this problem to Mr. Wootten, stating businesswise he would be frozen out. Mr. Proctor believed people were entitled to their property rights. Councilman LaRue asked if it were Mr. Proctor's contention that the retaining wall be removed. Mr. Proctor had hoped Mr. Wootten would be able to move the wall back; and had they left everything alone, the question of crossing over Mr. Bradfield's property probably would not have been brought up.

Councilman Long stated the permit had been granted and since the wall has been built as far as it has been, it should be left; and then the $10^{\prime}$ set back on the other portion be required. She inquired how many common property lines or walks are on the lake now, and if the common consent of both property owners was always obtained before the Council granted these permits. She asked if the problem were recognized at the time. The Building Official said they saw no problem, and they were of the opinion this work was an improvement of the shoreline. When the docks came into the question, and the wall was set back only 8', they asked Mr . Wootten to set back $10^{\prime}$ to give egress and ingress back to these docks. The Mayor asked Mr. Proctor if he were asking that the back portion be moved out stating a retaining wall would not have to be set back $10^{\prime}$ from the line, but could be on the line.

After further discussion, Councilman Long moved that the Council stand by its original decision, and that the City Manager be instructed to see that the 10' set back is observed, and that every part of this plan as presented to the Council is adhered to in completing it, and that the boat docks be cut back two feet or whatever the line is. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

Mayor Palmer stated this would not require taking out the retaining wall.
Councilman Long offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

## (RESOLUTION)

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:
THAT the City Council of the City of Austin hereby approve the repair of a boat dock on the property owned by MR. CARL WOOTMEN as described in the Travis County Deed Records and known as Lot 23, Lakeshore Addition as described on the attached plot plan and hereby authorizes the said CARL WOOTTEN to repair, maintain and operate this boat dock to same being constructed in compliance with all the ordinances relating thereto and further subject to the foregoing attached recommendations; and the Building Official is hereby authorized to issue an occupancy permit for the repair of this boat dock after full compliance with all the provisions of this resolution. Said permission shall be held to be granted and accepted subject to all necessary, reasonable, and proper, present and future regulations and ordinances of the City of Austin, Texas, in the enforcement of the propeq police, fire and health regulations and the right of revocation is retained if, after hearing, it is found by the City Council that the said CARL WOOTEN has failed and refused and will contime to fail and refuse to perform any such conditions, regulations and ordinances.
(Recommendations attached)
"Austin, Texas
March 15, 1967
"Memorandum To: Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager Subject: RESOLNTION, BOAT DOCK (Private)
"I, the undersigned, have reviewed the plans and have considered the application of Mr. Carl Wootten, owner of the property abutting on that part of Lake Austin lying downstream from the westerly extension of the south line of Windsor Road and known as Lot 23, Lakeshore Addition as described on the attached plans recorded in the Travis County Deed Records, for permission to repair and maintain a boat dock. The construction details meeting all requirements, I recommend that if Mr . Wootten is granted his request by the City Council, that it be subject to the following conditions:
"(1) That nothing but creosoted piles, cedar piles or concrete piles, substantially braced and bolted to withstand wind and water pressure, be used in the construction and that no structure shall extend more than one-third the distance from shore to shore at the point where structure is located, or be nearer than ten feet to any side property line of the owner or applicant.
"(2) That no business, such as a restaurant, dance hall, concession stand, or any other enterprise for the sale of goods, wares and merchandise, except marine supplies and tackle, and no living quarters of any character shall be erected on any pier, dock, wharf, float, island, piling, or other structure extending into or above Lake Austin.
"(3) That every structure shall be equipped with proper lights which shall show all around the horizon for night use and shall be equipped with flags or other warnings for daylight use.
"(4) That all structures extending out into the lake be constantly kept in a state of good repair and that the premises be kept reasonable clean at all times.
"Respectfully submitted,
s/ Dick T. Jordan
Dick T. Jordan
Building Official"
The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
Councilman Long stated if the Council were wrong, Mr. Proctor has recourse to the courts. She asked if he could not have gotten a restraining order on this, when it first came to his attention. Mr. Proctor stated he knew about this only a week ago, and he understood this was the policy of the City. They had assumed the matter was lawful and consistent with the policy; but they may have a legal property right. Councilman Long stated the set back policy, and what is a side line and front line should be made clear. She stated the Council was not looking at the lake front themselves as they passed on these matters, but passed on recommendations, and she did not know how many permits were granted where the walls come up to the property line, but she was of the opinion they were permitting this

## BOAT DOCKS

The Council had before it for consideration a boat dock for FRANCIS E. BENOIT, Lot 3, Windy Cove Addition. The Building Official drew a sketch of the proposed location of the dock, and stated it was his recommendation it be relocated $10^{\prime}$ from the point right on the cove, or $10^{\prime}$ from the property line, whichever Mr. Benoit prefers, to keep from obstrucing the slough. Councilman LaRue moved that the request be granted under the conditions as laid down by Mr. Jordan, Building official and offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:
(RESOLUTIION)
BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:
THAT the City Council of the City of Austin hereby approve the erection of a boat dock on the property owned by FRANCIS E. BENOIT as described in the Travis County Deed Records and known as Lot 3 in the Windy Cove Addition as described on the attached plot plan and hereby authorizes the said FRANCIS E. BFNOIT to construct, maintain and operate this boat dock to same being constructed in compliance with all the ordinances relating thereto and further subject to the foregoing attached recomendations; and the Building Official is hereby authorized to issue an occupancy permit for the erection of this boat dock after full compliance with all the provisions of this resolution. Said permission shall be held to be granted and accepted subject to all necessary, reasonable, and proper, present and future regulations and ordinances of the City of Austin, Texas, in the enforcement of the proper police, fire and health regulations and the right of revocation is retained if, after hearing, it is found by the City Council that the said FRANCIS E. BENOIT has failed and refused and will continue to fail and refuse to perform any such conditions, regulations and ordinances.
(Recommendation attached)
"Austin, Texas
March 14, 1967
"Memorandum To: Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager Subject: RESOLUPION, BOAT DOCK (Private)
"I, the undersigned, have reviewed the plans and have considered the application of Mr. Francis E. Benoit, owner of the property abutting on that part of Lake Austin lying upstream from the westerly extension of the south line of Windsor Road and known as Lot 3 in the Windy Cove Addition as described on the attached plans recorded in the Travis County Deed Records, for permission to construct and maintain a boat dock projecting out into the lake approximately twenty (20) feet beyond the normal high water level. The construction details meeting all requirements, I recommend that the boat dock not be approved at the present location, it must be moved ten (10') feet from the point of curve, and if this is approved I recommend that if Mr . Benoit is granted his request by the City Council, that it be subject to the following conditions:
"(1) That nothing but creosoted piles, cedar piles or concrete piles, substantially braced and bolted to withstand wind and water pressure, be used in the construction and that no structure shall extend more than one-third the distance from shore to shore at the point where structure is located, or be nearer than ten feet to any side property line of the owner or applicant.
"(2) That no business, such as a restaurant, dance hall, concession stand, or any other enterprise for the sale of goods, wares and merchandise, except marine supplies and tackle, and no living quarters of any character shall be erected on any pier, dock, wharf, float, island, piling, or other structure extending into or above Lake Austin.
"(3) That every structure shall be equipped with proper lights which shall show all around the horizon for night use and shall be equipped with flags or other warnings for daylight use.
"(4) That all structures extending out into the lake be constantly kept in a state of good repair and that the premises be kept reasonable clean at all times.
"Respectfully submitted,
s/ Dick T. Jordan
Dick T. Jordan
Building Official"
The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

The Council had before it for consideration a boat dock for MRS. WINSTON KINSER, Lot 6, Aqua Monte Subdivision. Councilman White recommended approving this request with the condition that the Building Official be authorized to have the owner to move the dock back as it is about two feet over the line. The Building Official stated the dock was already built, but it was only eight feet from the line. Councilman Long moved to follow the recommendations of the Building Official that the dock be set back two and a half feet farther and offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

## (RESOIUTION)

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:
THAT the City Council of the City of Austin hereby approve the erection of a boat dock on the property owned by MRS. WINSTON KINSER as described in the Travis County Deed Records and known as Lot 6, Aqua Monte Subdivision as described on the attached plot plan and hereby authorizes the said MRS. WINSTON KINSER to construct, maintain and operate this boat dock subject to same being constructed in compliance with all the ordinances relating thereto and further subject to the foregoing attached recomendations; and the Building Official is hereby authorized to issue an occupancy permit for the erection of this boat dock after full compliance with all the provisions of this resolution. Said permission shall be held to be granted and accepted subject to all necessary, reasonable and proper, present and future regulations and ordinances of the City of Austin, Texas, in the enforcement of the proper police, fire and health regulations and the right of revocation is retained if, after hearing, it is found by the City Council that the said MRS. WINSTON KINSER has failed and refused and will continue to fail and refuse to perform any such conditions, regulations and ordinances.
(Recommendations attached)
"Austin, Texas
March 14, 1967
"Memorandum To: Subject:

Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager
RESOLUTION, BOAT DOCK (Private)
"I, the undersigned, have reviewed the plans, and have considered the application of Mrs. Winston Kinser, owner of the property abutting on that part of lake Austin lying upstream from the westerly extension of the south line of Windsor Road and known as Lot 6, Aqua Monte Subdivision as described on the attached plans recorded in the Travis County Deed Records, for permission to construct and maintain a boat dock projecting out into the lake approximately eighteen (18') feet beyond the normal high water level. The construction details meeting all requirements, I recomend that if Mrs. Kinser is granted her request by the City Council, that it be subject to the following conditions.
"(1) That nothing but creosoted piles, cedar piles, or concrete piles, substantially braced and bolted to withstand wind and water pressure, be used in the construction and thet no structure shall extend more than one-third the distance from shore to shore at the point where structure is located, or be nearer than ten feet to any side property line of the owner or applicant.
"(2) That no business, such as a restaurant, dance hall, concession stand, or any other enterprise for the sale of goods, wares and merchandise, except marine supplies and tackle, and no living quarters of any character shall be erected on any pier, dock, wharf, float, island, piling, or other structure extending into or above Lake Austin.
"(3) That every structure shall be equipped with proper lights which shall show all around the horizon for night use and shall be equipped with flags or other warnings for daylight use.
"(4) That all structures extending out into the lake be constantly kept in a state of good repair and that the premises be kept reasonable clean at all times.
"Respectfully submitted

> s/ Dick T. Jordan, By S. R. R. Jr. Dick T. Jordan Building Official"

The motion, seconded by Councilman IaRue, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
Not in Council Room when roll was called: Mayor Palmer

The Council had before it for consideration a boat dock for Henry Wendlandt, Jr., 1740 Channel Road. Councilman White made an on site inspection of this site and recommended its approval. Councilman Long moved to accept the recommendation of Councilman White, and the City Manager on this request for a boat dock and offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:
(RESOLUTION)
BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:
THAT the City Council of the City of Austin hereby approve the erection of a boat dock on the property owned by MR. HENRY WENDLANDT, JR. as described in the Travis County Deed Records and known as 1740 Channel Road as described on the attached plot plan and hereby authorizes the said HENRY WENDLANDT, Jr. to construct, maintain and operate this boat dock subject to same being constructed in compliance with all the ordinances relating thereto and further subject to the foregoing attached recommendations; and the Building Official is hereby authorized to issue an occupancy permit for the erection of this boat dock after full compliance with all the provisions of this resolution. Said permission shall be held to be granted and accepted subject to all necessary, reasonable and proper; present and future regulations and ordinances of the City of Austin, Texas, in the enforcement of the proper police, fire and health regulations and the right of revocation is retained if, after hearing, it is found by the City Council that the said HENRY WENDLANDT, JR. has failed and refused and will continue to fail and refuse to perform any such conditions, regulations and ordinances.
(Recomendetions attached)
"Austin, Texas
March 13, 1967

```
"Memorandum To: Mr.W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager
Subject: RESOLUTION, BOAT DOCK (Private)
```

"I, the undersigned, have reviewed the plans and have considered the application of Mr. Henry Wendlandt, Jr., owner of the property abutting on that part of Lake Austin lying upstream from the westerly extension of the south line of Windsor Road and known as 1740 Channel Road as described on the attached plans recorded in the Travis County Deed Records, for permission to construct and maintain a boat dock projecting out into the lake approximately twenty (20') feet beyond the normal high water level. The construction details meeting all requirements, I recammend that if Mr. Wendlandt is granted his request by the City Council, that it be subject to the following conditions.
"(1) That nothing but creosoted piles, cedar piles or concrete piles, substantially braced and bolted to withstand wind and water pressure, be used in the construction and that no structure shall extend more than one-third the distance from shore to shore at the point where structure is located, or be nearer than ten feet to any side property line of the owner or applicant.
"(2) That no business, subh as a restaurant, dance hall, concession stand, or any other enterprise for the sale of goods, wares and merchandise, except maring supplies and tackle, and no living quarters of any character shall be erected on any pier, dock, wharf, float, island, piling, or other structure extending into or above Lake Austin.
"(3) That every structure shall be equipped with proper lights which shall show all around the horizon for night use and shall be equipped with flags or other warnings for daylight use.
"(4) That all structures extending out into the lake be constantly kept in a state of good repair and that the premises be kept reasonable clean at all times.
"Respectfully submitted
s/ Dick T. Jordan
Dick T. Jordan
Building official"
The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
Not in Council Room when roll was called: Mayor Palmer

The Council had before it for consideration a boat dock for John M. Wyatt, Jr., 1746 Channel Road. Councilman White made an on site inspection of this site and reconmended its approval. Councilman Long moved to accept the recommendation of Councilman White, and the City Manager on this request for a boat dock and offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:
(RESOLUTION)
BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTTN:
THAT the City Council of the City of Austin hereby approve the erection of a boat dock on the property owned by MR. \& MRS. JOHN M. WYATT, JR. as described
in the Travis County Deed Records and known as 1746 Channel Road as described on the attached plot plan and hereby authorizes the said MR. \& MRS. JOHN M. WYATT, JR. to construct, maintain and operate this boat dock to same being constructed in compliance with all the ordinances relating thereto and further subject to the foregoing attached recommendations; and the Building Official is hereby authorized to issue an occupancy permit for the erection of this boat dock after full compliance with all the provisions of this resolution. Said permission shall be held to be granted and accepted subject to all necessary, reasonable, and proper, present and future regulations and ordinances of the City of Austin, Texas, in the enforcement of the proper police, fire and health regulations and the right of revocation is retained if, after hearing, it is found by the City Council that the said MR. \& MRS. JOHN M. WYATT, JR. has failed and refused and will continue to fail and refuse to perform any such conditions, regulations and ordinances.
(Recommendations attached)
"Austin, Texas
March 15, 1967
"Memorandum To: Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager
Subject:
RESOLUTION, BOAT DOCK (Private)
"I, the undersigned, have reviewed the plans and have considered the application of Mr. and Mrs. John M. Wyatt, Jr., owners of the property abutting on that part of Lake Austin lying upstream from the westerly extension of the south line of Windsor Road and known as 1746 Channel Road as described on the attached plans recorded in the Travis County Deed Records, for permission to construct and maintain a boat dock projecting out into the lake approximately twenty-two (22') feet beyond the normal high water level. The construction details meeting all requirements, I recomend that if Mr. and Mrs. John M. Wyatt, Jr. are granted their request by the City Council, that it be subject to the following conditions:
"(1) That nothing but creosoted piles, cedar piles or concrete piles, substantially braced and bolted to withstand wind and water pressure, be used in the construction and that no structure shall extend more than one-third the distance from shore to shore at the point where structure is located, or be nearer than ten feet to any side property line of the owner or applicant.
"(2) That no business, such as a restaurant, dance hall, concession stand, or any other enterprise for the sale of goods, wares and merchandise, except marine supplies and tackle, and no living quarters of any character shall be erected on any pier, dock, wharf, float, island, piling, or other structure extending into or above Lake Austin.
"(3) That every structure shall be equipped with proper lights which shall show all around the horizon for night use and shall be equipped with flags or other warnings for daylight use.
"(4) That all structures extending out into the lake be constantly kept in a state of good repair and that the premises be kept reasonable clean at all times.
"Respectfully submitted,
s/ Dick T. Jordan
Dick T. Jordan
Building Official"

The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
Not in Council Room when roll was called: Mayor Palmer

The City Manager submitted a request for rebuilding a dock, making a major repair. The Building Official said this is known as "The Pier" across from Lake Austin Park, and the request is for replacing rotten timber and five poles. It is strictly a repair job. Councilman LaRue moved that the request be approved. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
Not in Council Room when roll was called: Mayor Palmer

The Council recessed until 2:30 P.M.

RECESSED MEETTNG 2:30 P.M.

At 2:30 P.M. the Council resumed its business.

The Council considered the request for 28 off street parking requirements at 2101 Oldham Street for an apartment hotel. The Building Official reported 28 spaces are required and that many are being provided and he recommended approval. Councilman Long asked if this were in the Urban Renewal area in which the University was concerned. The Building Official explained these cases are referred to the Urban Renewal Board. This was explained to the developer and the Urban Renewal Board had reported back that if the developer wanted to pursue the development, to go ahead. At this time the Urban Renewal Agency has no funds available for purchasing this. The Mayor explained this might be in the area that the University would need dormitory structures. Councilman Long believed this area was so close in, that it would not be dedicated as dormitory use. The City Manager stated on a long range plan, it may be years before the land would be needed for classrooms; but in the meantime the University might use it for dormitory purposes. Councilman LaRue offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

## (RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, there has been submitted to the Building Inspector, the application of H. H. ROTHELL, JR., \& E. T. MCGREGOR for a building permit together with a site plan dated March 14, 1967 meeting the requirements of section 10-B, 3 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City, for certain building establishment at 2101 Oldham Street, more particularly described in said application; and,

WHEREAS, it has been found and determined by the City Council of the City of Austin that, based upon the use of the premises for the purpose of erection of an apartment-hotel the maximum number of parking spaces which will probably be used by employees and customers of such establishment, taking into account the loading facilities on the site, the public parking areas and street space available for parking in the vicinity, public safety, and free circulation of traffic
both on and off the site, is twenty-eight (28) parking spaces; Now, Therefore,
BE IT RESOLVED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN:
That twenty-eight (28) spaces is an adequate number of parking spaces for the establishment shown on the site plan of H. H. ROTHELI, JR. \& E. T. MC GREGOR dated March 14, 1967, for use of the premises for the purpose of erection of an apartment-hotel.

The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:
AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA AND CHANGING THE USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 39 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODEOF 1954 AS FOLLOWS: LOTS 23 AND 24, BLOCK E OR THE RIDGETOP ADDITION, LOCATED AT 5101-5103 DEPEW AVENJE AND 900-902 EAST 51ST STREET, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT AND FIRST HEIGFP AND AREA DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE DISTRICT AND SECOND HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; SAID PROPERTY BEING SITUATED IN AUSTIIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, ITEXAS; AND SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its second reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman White moved that the rule be suspended and the ordinance passed to its third reading. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman white moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

The Council had before it the request of PRINGLE COMPANY to put a bill board on city property. The City Manager stated this site was property which the City had acquired for right of way on the west side of Balcones Drive north of Anderson Lane. Councilman LaRue moved that the Council deny the request. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

## REPORT ON TAXICAB FRANCHISE COMMISSION ON REQUEST GF SABATINO SCONCI FOR TAXICAB FRANCHISE AS ABC CAB COMPANY

The City Attorney explained that the ordinance required that the report be submitted to the City Council, and all the members had received copies of the report as follows:
"February 27, 1967
"MEMORANDUM TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council.
SUBJECT: Application for Taxicab Company Franchise by Sabatino Sconci, dba ABC Cab Company.
"The above captioned application for the issuance of a taxicab franchise was filed with the City Clerk on February 3, 1967. This application was referred to the Taxicab Franchise Commission, andn otice of a public hearing was duly published under Section 31.58 of the Austin City Code.
"Pursuant to such notice, a public hearing was held at 11 A.M., on the 2lst day of February, 1967. Written and oral testimony was presented to the Commission by the applicant and other interested parties at the hearing.
"Upon the evidence presented to the raxicab Franchise Cormission at the public hearing, it is hereby the finding of the Commission that:
"1. Mr. Sconci has been engaged in the taxicab business for approximately fifteen years and is familiar with the procedure necessary in carrying out such an operation, and further, that Mr . Sconci is physically able and willing to perform such operation.
"2. The applicant, Mr. Sconci, does not personally have sufficient funds to finance such an undertaking; however, several persons spoke in his behalf regarding their willingness to underwrite Mr. Sconci's operation.
"3. Several persons spoke in behalf of the applicant and stated a general dissatisfaction with the service now rendered by the six companies presently operating taxicabs in the City of Austin; however, the applicant produced no statistics which would indicate that there is a public convenience or necessity for additional franchises at this time.
"4. Evidence presented to the Commission showed that the outstanding authorized permits for the six companies now in operation stand at 219; however, the number of taxicabs in actual operation is between 100 and 110 . Further evidence indicated that the 110 taxicabs operating within the City conformed favorably with the number of taxicabs authorized in other cities of comparable size.
"After due consideration of the testimony and evidence presented to the Commission and the foregoing findings of the Commission, the Taxicab Franchise Commission finds that the public convenience and necessity do not require the issuance of a franchise to the applicant, Sabatino Sconci, to do business as the ABC Cab Company.
"Therefore, the Taxicab Franchise Conmission recommends to the City Council that the request of Sabatino Sconci for the issuance of a taxicab franchise be denied.
> "TAXICAB FRANCHISE COMMISSION
> s/ George Rogers GEORGE ROGERS
> s/ John A. Basford JOHN A. BASFORD
> s/ Charles E. Johanson
> CHAS. E. JOHANSON"

The City Attorney recommended that the Council direct that copies be sent to all franchise holders and the applicant. The applicant has a right to appeal from the adverse ruling within five days from the date he receives a copy of the report and a copy had not been sent to him. Councilman LaRue moved that the proper distribution be made on the report of the Taxicab Franchise Commission on the request of Sabatino Sconci. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen IaRue, Long, White
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
Not in Council Room when roll was called: Mayor Palmer

## PERNDING ZONING MATTERS

The Chief of Plan Administration reviewed some zoning applications which had been pending.

HERBERT DEASON 1116-1120 East 5lst street From "A" Residence 1115-1125 East 52nd Street To "B" Residence

The Chief of Plan Administration reported this request was granted subject to acquisition of 15' for widening 5lst Street. The alignment now has been shifted to the south side of 5 lst Street. Mayor Palmer stated it had been planned that 5 2nd Street would be opened and the City Manager said there also had been plans that 5lst and 52nd Streets may be a one way pair, and $52 n$ d Street would need widening also. No action was taken by the Council at this time. (Ordinance had been passed through its first reading)

## Zoning Applications Withdrawn

C.B.C. CO.

6812-6820 Hardy Drive
2001 Justin Lane
From "O" Office To "C-I" Commercial

The Chief of Plan Administration reported this application was granted subject to acquiring right of way for widening of Justin Lane. The applicant is no longer interested in the "C-1" Commercial zoning, and has asked that the application be withdrawn. Councilman White moved that the Council permit the applicant to withdraw this application. The motion, seconded by Councilman Lakue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
Not in Council Room when roll was called: Councilman Long

JOE CHARLES JUNG Rear of 1406-1410 South lst Street
604-606 Jewell Street

From "C" Commercial and Height \& Area To "C-1" Comercial 2nd Height \& Area

The Chief of Plan Administration reported this application was from "C" Commercial to "C-1" Commercial and since "C-1" Commercial has been deleted from the ordinance, the applicant had requested withdrawal of this request. Councilman White moved that the Council grant the request of withdrawal of this zoning application. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

WILLIIAM CARTER
Additional Area
$1145 \mathrm{E}-114 \mathrm{TE}$ Springdale Rd. From "A" Residence 1146E-1148E Webberville Ra. To "B" Residence

The Chief of Plan Administration said this was "Additional area" recommended in 1963. Mr. Carter's part of the application was granted, but the intervening lot which had been included in the hearing is what is pending. The owner has not shown any interest in the " B " Residence zoning nor in dedicating any right of way. Councilman Long moved that the additional area inthe William Carter application be withdrawn. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
A. E. COCKE

## Referred back to Planning Commission

4305-4307 Caswell
From "A" Residence To "BB" Residence NOT Recommended by the Planning Commission

The Chief of Plan Administration reported the THEO P. MEYER and A. E. COCKE applications had been pending sometime for an area study. The Theo $P$. Meyer application had been acted upon. MR. RICHARD BAKER, Attorney, representing MR. A. E. COCKE, wants this application to be heard. Councilman Long moved to refer the A. E. COCKE zoning change from "A" Residence to "BB" Residence back to the Plaming Commission for restudy. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

VANCE FOX \& FLOYD
L. RAYMOND

Granted and withdrawn

4403-4405 Red River Street 901-905 Ellingson Lane

From "A" Residence To "O" Office NOT Recommended by the Planning Commission

The Chief of Plan Administration stated right of way was pending from both applicants, and Mr. Raymond had provided right of way. Mr. Fox indicated he could not furnish the right of way, and had asked to withdraw his portion of the application. Councilman LaRue moved that the request of Mr. Floyd Raymond, 4405 Red River and 901-905 Ellingson Lane be changed from " $A$ " Residence to " 0 " Office. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen IaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shaniks
Councilman LaRue moved to grant MR. VANCE FOX'S request to withdraw his zoning application at 4403 Red River Street. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen JaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

The Chief of Plan Administration reported he had contacted many of the applicants whose zoning was pending for restrictive covenants, rights of way , etc., and they had indicated they were still interested, and would get the necessary instruments in. The Mayor statedif those who had been contacted do not meet the conditions, then the Council would be justified in withdrawing the applications. The Director of Planning stated they were sending letters to these on the pending list.

## REVISED PLANS OF WINDSOR PARK BAPTIST CHURCH, 5900 CAMERON ROAD

The Building Official reviewed previous plans submitted on the Windsor Park Baptist Church, 5900 Cameron Road, stating the building was practically on the $80^{\prime}$ right of way. Since that time the Council has adopted the Expressway and Major Arterial Plan and Cameron Road would be 90'. The Architects have revised their plan to set back $12^{\prime}$ from the $80^{\prime}$ right of way, and $2^{\prime}$ from the proposed 90' right of way. The Building Official recommended approval. Councilman Long moved to authorize the Building Official to issue a permit under the revised conditions. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen IaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer<br>Noes: None<br>Absent: Councilman Shanks

## PRESIDENT'S CONFERENCE ON CRIME

MAYOR PALMER read a letter from the United States Attorney General, regarding a conference in Washington D.C., March 28 th and 29th, and asking that a representative of the City of Austin attend. Mayor Palmer said Councilman LaRūe had just made a report on crime, and Mayor Palmer suggested that MR. LaRUE attend this conference. Councilman White moved that the Council authorize MR. TRAVIS IaRUE to represent Austin, Texas, at this President's Commission on Crime. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
Present but not voting: Councilman IaRue

## LEASE

The City Manager reported he had given the Council Members a copy of a letter from MR. MARTIN de STEFANO regarding a new lease from Mr. Barefield. Mr. DeStefano asked that this not be considered today as he would be out of the City. This is a new long term lease which he proposed $\$ 50.00$ per month for 30 years, and an option to renew for 20 years. After discussion, Councilman LaRue moved that the Council hear this on April 6th at 10:00 A.M. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

## PARADES

The City Manager reported a request from the University people for a Round-Up Parade in the University area at noon on April 14 th, the parade crossing Guadalupe at 2lst Street. The Police Department preferred that it be held at any other hour, but the group still asked that they start at 11:45. Councilman Long moved to grant the permit for the parade, with all the usual precautions. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen IaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

Councilman LaRue moved that the Council grant the SHRINERS permission to hold a parade Saturday, April 15th, from 10:00 A.M. to 11:15 A.M. on Congress Avenue between Second Street and llth Street. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

## MERCHANDISE ON SIDEWAIK

The City Manager stated the Council had gone out to see the conditions of the Academy Surplus area. Councilman Long reported the Council did go to the Academy Surplus Store to look at the merchandise on the sidewalk area in front of the store, and the Council talked with the manager, who said they were having an auction and everything would be moved out by tomorrow night, and the Council was happy to have this announcement. The Mayor stated the Manager showed a splendid spirit of cooperation.

## ELECTRIC UTILITIES REPORT

The City Manager called attention to the filing of the Electric Utilities Monthly Progress Report for February, 1967.

## POLLUIION

Councilman Long asked about the Pollution Study in conjunction with the State. The Health Officer reported the State would start the Pollution Study in June.

The Mayor called attention to the notice of the Central Texas Comprehensive Health Planning Meeting Friday, March 17 th at 2:00 P.M. at the Health Department at 1313 Sabine Street.

Councilman Long had a request for a stop sign and a yield sign where new Angelina Street converges into the two streets-one a thoroughfare and the other a street. A yield sign is needed on one street, and a stop sign on the other. The City Manager stated he would have this checked. With the vacation of the street on the north, and the closing of that street, there may be so little traffif it may be that the need may not exist, but he would have it checked out.

The Building Official submitted a request of MR. LES PROCTOR for permission to take out the dirt underneath the boat dock area of Mr. Bradfield. The City Manager stated he wanted to take the dirt from the boat stalls and create a dike so that the boats will be kept afloat when the water is down; when the water is up the dike would be submerged. Councilman Long moved that Mr. Proctor's request for Mr. Bradfield to pull the fill out and put it on the pilings be granted. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks

MAYOR PALMER stated the Council had discussed the possibility of extending that area over which the Council had jurisdiction of determining the number of off street parking and suggested that the Council initiate a request to extend the area from Rio Grande Street over to Lamar and ask the Planning Commission to study this and report back to the Council. Councilman Long moved to ask the City Manager to have the Planning Commission make a study of the area that the Mayor mentioned from 19th Street to 29th Street, and the area from Rio Grande to Lamar with the view of making that a special area for consideration of off street parking. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
The City Attorney stated this would be an amendment to the ordinance.

The Council recessed to go into Executive Session to appoint Election Officials.

The Council returned to open meeting.
There being no further business Councilman LaRue moved that the Council adjourn. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None
Absent: Councilman Shanks
Present but not voting: Councilman Long
The Council adjourned at 4:50 P.M. subject to the call of the Mayor.


ATTEST:



[^0]:    \# Typical and average major sections. In many instances there are variations from these for short distances.

    * As an interim measure the pavement width recomended for 1982 can be constructed or retained on the existing right-of-way. right-of-way widths.
    ** Refer to Typical Sections (Type $N$ and Type P) in Chapter 11.
    General Note: In instances where an existing $40^{\prime}$ street width is recomended to be improved to a $44^{\prime \prime}$ street width, the improvement should be undertaken when it is necessary to rehabilitate the existing street.

