

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

September 15, 1966
10:00 A.M.

Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Palmer presiding.

Roll call:

Present: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Absent: None

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 JOHN BARCLAY, Central Christian Church.

Mayor Palmer read the following resolution:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, from time to time our Generous Creator has given the people of Austin many great and good men with broad insights, willing hands, and compassionate hearts to remind succeeding generations of His example that true happiness is found more in giving than in receiving; and,

WHEREAS, as the beneficiaries of the long and untiring service of one of those servants, it is fitting that public appreciation, so seldom expressed, be made known upon appropriate occasions; Now, Therefore,

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

That the affection and gratitude of the people of Austin be publicly expressed upon the occasion of the Silver Anniversary of his service as pastor of Central Christian Church, for the distinguished community service rendered by Dr. John Barclay far beyond his ordinary calls of duty: as an organizer and President of the Austin Council of Churches; Chaplain of Travis County Jail; Chairman of the Citizen's Committee of the Juvenile Board of Austin; Chairman of the Board of Trustees of Brackenridge Hospital for a decade; Chairman of the Austin Equal Citizenship Corporation; and as guardian for numerous indigent citizens, to name only a few of the remarkable threads along which the life of

September 15, 1966

the beloved John Barclay has been woven into the very fabric of his community.

WITNESS Our hands and the official seal of the City of Austin hereunto affixed this 15th day of September, A. D. 1966.

Councilman Long moved that the resolution be adopted by standing vote. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

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

Councilman Long moved the bid opening schedule be recessed to hear MR. JAMES R. HOLMES, father-in-law of Officer Speed. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

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

MR. HUB BECHTOL presented MR. HOLMES, MRS. BILLY SPEED'S father. Mr. Holmes read a letter his daughter had written to the Council, as follows:

"Austin, Texas
September 13, 1966

"Honorable Lester Palmer
Mayor, City of Austin
Municipal Building
Austin, Texas

"Dear Mayor Palmer:

"Your position as the elected leader of the citizens of Austin points you out as the person who I must ask for one more favor. Please act as my emissary and convey my thanks to all of the very thoughtful people who have contributed funds in memory of my husband, Bill.

"All of the contributions are being placed in a trust, along with the benefits of our insurance policies, and will be used in the best interests of our daughter for as long as possible. Rebecca Lynn and I will never forget your kindness.

"Please express our special appreciation to those individuals, groups, and business concerns who took it upon themselves to carry out the chore of collecting from those who wished to help. I speak for Billy Speed in saying thank you, Mr. Mayor, and the citizens of Austin, for being so kind to his wife and daughter.

"Sincerely yours,
s/ Jeannie Speed
Jeanie Speed"

Mayor Palmer said the Council had publicly announced on several occasions the gratitude of the community for the wonderful way the Police Officers performed in this tragedy, and expressed sympathy again to Mrs. Speed and her family.

Mayor Palmer announced it was 10:30 A.M. and the hearing on annexing 0.18 of one acre out of the George W. Davis Survey - Portion of Highway 183 immediately west of Fairfield was opened. No one appeared to be heard. Councilman White moved that the hearing be closed. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

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

Mayor Palmer brought up the following ordinance for its first reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF 0.18 OF ONE ACRE OF LAND, SAME BEING OUT OF AND A PART OF THE GEORGE W. DAVIS SURVEY IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE. (Portion of Highway 183 immediately west of Fairfield)

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 Long, carried by the following vote:

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

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 Long, carried by the following vote:

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

The Council continued with the bid opening. Bids were opened on equipment for the Decker Creek Power Plant.

Bids were opened on CONTRACT NO. 117 - PLANT ELEVATOR

BIDDER	BID BOND	BIDDING UNIT NO. I PLANT ELEVATOR	BIDDING UNIT NO. II PER DIEM	ESCALATION
Hunter Hayes Elev. Co.	\$10,000	\$38,438.00	\$135	Firm
Otis Elev. Co.	\$10,000	35,806.00	7.21	Firm
Westinghouse Elev. Corp.	\$10,000	35,638.00*	91.15	Firm

*Exceptions

The bids were referred to the Consulting Engineer for evaluation, recommendation and report back to the Council.

Bids were opened on CONTRACT X-116 SLUICE GATES

BIDDER	BID BOND	BIDDING UNIT NO. I SLUICE GATES	BIDDING UNIT NO. II PER DIEM	ESCALATION
Armco Steel Metal Products, Div.	\$10,000	\$83,195	No chg.	Firm
Chapman Div. Crane Co.*	\$10,000	183,000	see schedule	5%
Rodney-Hunt Co.	\$10,000	87,659	125	Firm

*Exceptions

The bids were referred to the Consulting Engineer for evaluation, recommendation and report back to the Council.

Bids were opened on CONTRACT X-127 ISOLATED PHASE BUS

BIDDER	BID BOND	BIDDING UNIT NO. I ISOLATED PHASE BUS	BIDDING UNIT NO. II 11000 AMP PER FT. ADD OR SUBT.	BIDDING UNIT NO. III 1500 AMP PER FT. ADD OR SUBT.	BIDDING UNIT NO. IV PER DIEM	ES- CA- LA- TION
ITE CIRCUIT Brkr Cr.*	\$20,000	\$104,864	\$637	\$200	\$135	20%
Westinghouse Elec. Corp.*	\$20,000	91,104	556	249	137	10%

*Exceptions

The bids were referred to the Consulting Engineer for evaluation, recommendation and report back to the Council September 22, 1966.

Bids were opened on CONTRACT X-130 138 KV SWITCHYARD

BIDDER	BID BOND	BIDDING UNIT NO. I CIRCUIT BREAKERS	BIDDING UNIT NO. II SWITCHYARD STRUCTURE	BIDDING UNIT NO. III LUMP SUM UNITS I & II	BIDDING UNIT NO. IV PER DIEM	ES- CA- LA- TION
Allis Chalmers Mfg. Co.*	\$50,000	No Bid	No Bid	\$535,700	\$120	5%
ITE Circuit Brkr Co.*	50,000	\$350,074	\$253,697	\$603,771	\$115	20%
Westinghouse Elec. Corp.*	50,000	313,544	240,790	No Bid	137	Firm

*Exceptions

The bids were referred to the Consulting Engineer for evaluation,

recommendation and report back to the Council September 22, 1966.

Bids were opened on CONTRACT X-125 AUXILIARY SWITCHGEAR

BIDDER	BID BOND	BIDDING UNIT NO. I 4160 VOLT AUX. SWITCHGEAR	BIDDING UNIT NO. II 480 VOLT AUX. POWER CENTER	BIDDING UNIT NO. III LUMP SUM I & II	BIDDING UNIT NO. IV PER DIEM	ES-CA-IA-TION
Allis-Chalmers	\$30,000	\$84,000*	\$63,077*	\$147,077*	\$130	8%
Federal Pacific Elect. Co.	30,000	86,100	53,100	139,200	115	Firm
General Electric Co.	30,000	77,260*	58,293*	135,553*	137	3%
ITE Circuit Brkr Co.	30,000	80,540*	63,050*	143,590*	135	20%
Pennsylvania Transformer	30,000	82,060*	No Bid	No Bid	135	5%
Westinghouse Elec. Corp.	30,000	76,324*	57,331*	No Bid	137	5%

*Exceptions

The bids were referred to the Consulting Engineer for evaluation, recommendation and report back to the Council September 22, 1966.

Bids were opened on CONTRACT X-133 UTILITY PUMPS

BIDDER	Lapp Insulator Co. Inc.*	Alligear & Sears Co.	Byron Jackson	DeLaval Turbine Inc.*	Light-bourne Equip. Co.*	Warren Pump Co.
BID BOND	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	\$10,000	No	-
BIDDING UNIT NO. I CONDENSATE MAKE-UP PUMPS	No Bid	2,728	No Bid	2,092	2,400	No Bid
BIDDING UNIT NO. II POTABLE WATER PUMPS	No Bid	622	No Bid	No Bid	655	No Bid
BIDDING UNIT NO. III CONDENSATE DRAIN TANK PUMP	No Bid	640	1,080	No Bid	760	No Bid
BIDDING UNIT NO. IV SCREEN WASH TRASH PUMP	No Bid	5,862	No Bid	No Bid	5,870	No Bid

	Lapp Insulator Co. Inc.*	Alligear & Sears Co.	Byron Jackson	DeLaval Turbine Inc.*	Light- bourne Equip. Co.*	Warren Pump Co.
BIDDING UNIT NO. V INTAKE STRUCTURE SUMP PUMP	No Bid	\$ 661	\$ 815	No Bid	\$ 980	No Bid
BIDDING UNIT NO. VI TURBINE LUBE OIL TRANSFER PUMP	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	980	850	\$2,032
BIDDING UNIT NO. VII FUEL SERVICE PUMP	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	\$8,088	No Bid	\$19,628
BIDDING UNIT NO. VIII TURBINE LUBE OIL SUMP PUMP	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	No Bid	490	794
BIDDING UNIT NO. IX CHEMICAL FEED PUMPS	\$ 2,148	\$2,378	No Bid	No Bid	\$2,685	No Bid
BIDDING UNIT NO. X ACID REGENERATING PUMPS	\$ 4,092	\$3,604	No Bid	No Bid	\$5,115	No Bid
BIDDING UNIT NO. XI CAUSTIC REGENERATION PUMP	\$ 3,780	\$3,488	No Bid	No Bid	\$4,725	No Bid
BIDDING UNIT NO. XII BIDDING UNIT NUMBERS	IX,X,XI		III & V		I-VI & VIII-XI Incl.	
LUMP SUM	\$10,020	No Bid	\$1,895	No Bid	\$24,530	No Bid
BIDDING UNIT NO. XIII PER DIEM	\$125 / travel	No quote	100	100 / travel	130	See sched.
ESCALATION	Firm	?	Firm	Firm	?	5%

The bids were referred to the Consulting Engineer for evaluation, recommendation and report back to the Council.

Later in the afternoon meeting the Council received reports from the Consulting Engineers on equipment for the Decker Creek Power Plant.

The City Manager read the following recommendation:

"September 15, 1966

"Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr., City Mgr.
City of Austin
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas, 78767

September 15, 1966

"SLUICE GATES
 CONTRACT NO. X-116
 DECKER CREEK POWER STATION
 UNIT NUMBER ONE
 OUR JOB CA-0003

Dear Mr. Williams:

"Brown & Root, Inc., has examined the bids opened by you at 10:00 A.M., September 15, 1966, in open Council meeting for the Decker Creek Power Station, Unit Number One, Sluice Gates, Contract No. X-116.

Bids were submitted by:

"Armco Steel Corporation
 Chapman Division Crane Co.
 Rodney-Hunt Machine Co.

"All bids were found to be in accordance with the Engineering Specifications. A bid tabulation follows:

<u>Bidder</u>	<u>Bid Bond</u>	<u>BIDDING UNIT NO. I Gates, Thimbles & Operator</u>	<u>BIDDING UNIT NO. II Per Diem</u>	<u>Price Escalation</u>
Armco Steel	Yes	\$ 83,195.00	No Charge	Firm
Chapman Valve	Yes	\$183,000.00	Attached Schedule	5%*
Rodney-Hunt	Yes	\$ 87,659.00	\$125.00	Firm

*Exceptions taken in attached letter.

"On the basis of our review, the lowest and best bid, no exceptions to the specifications, firm price, and satisfactory delivery, it is recommended that a contract be awarded to Metal Products Division, Armco Steel Corporation for Contract No. X-116, Sluice Gates, Bidding Unit No. I, for the lump sum of \$83,195.00.

"Yours very truly,
 BROWN & ROOT, INC.
 s/ D. V. Boyd, P.E.
 D. V. Boyd, P.E.

"APPROVED:
 s/ D. C. Kinney
 D. C. Kinney, Dir. Elect. Utility
 City of Austin, Texas"

The City Manager stated both he and the Director of Electric Utilities concurred in the recommendation.

Councilman LaRue moved that the contract be awarded as recommended by the Director of Electric Utilities, the City Manager, and the Consulting Engineers, Brown & Root, Inc., to METAL PRODUCTS DIVISION, ARMCO STEEL CORPORATION for Contract No. X-116, Sluice Gates, Unit No. I for the lump sum of \$83,195. The

motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

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

The City Manager read the following recommendation:

"September 15, 1966

"Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr.
City Manager
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas, 78767

"PLANT ELEVATOR
CONTRACT NO. X-117
DECKER CREEK POWER STATION
UNIT NUMBER ONE
OUR JOB CA-0003

"Dear Mr. Williams:

"Brown & Root, Inc., has examined the bids opened by you at 10:00 A.M., September 15, 1966, in open Council meeting for the Decker Creek Power Station, Unit Number One, Plant Elevator, Contract X-117.

"Bids were submitted by:

Hunter-Hayes Elevator Co.
Otis Elevator Co.
Westinghouse Electric Corp.
Elevator Division

"All bids except Westinghouse were found to be in accordance with the Engineering Specifications. A bid tabulation follows:

Bidder	Bid Bond	Addendum Acknowledged	BIDDING UNIT NO. I Plant Elevator	BIDDING UNIT NO. II Per Diem	Price Escalation
Hunter-Hayes	Yes	Yes	\$38,438.00	\$135.00	Firm
Otis Elevator	Yes	Yes	\$35,806.00	\$ 7.21	Firm
Westinghouse	Yes	No	\$35,638.00	\$ 91.15	Firm*

*Exceptions taken in letter attached to proposal.

"On the basis of our review, the lowest and best bid, in exact compliance with the specifications, firm price, and satisfactory delivery, it is recommended that contract be awarded to Otis Elevator Company for Contract No. X-117, Plant Elevator, Bidding Unit No. I, for the lump sum of \$35,806.00.

"Yours very truly,
BROWN & ROOT, INC.
s/ D. V. Boyd, P.E.
D. V. Boyd, P.E.

"APPROVED:

s/ D. C. Kinney
D. C. Kinney, Dir. Elec. Utility
City of Austin"

The City Manager stated both he and the Director of Electric Utilities concurred in the recommendation.

Councilman White moved the contract be awarded as recommended by the Director of Electric Utilities, the City Manager, and the Consulting Engineers, Brown & Root, Inc., to OTIS ELEVATOR COMPANY for Contract No. X-117, Plant Elevator for the lump sum of \$35,806.00. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

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

The City Manager read the following recommendation:

"September 15, 1966

"Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr.
City Manager
P. O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas, 78767

"UTILITY PUMPS, CONTRACT NO. X-133
DECKER CREEK POWER STATION, UNIT NO. I
OUR JOB CA-0003

"Dear Mr. Williams:

"Brown & Root, Inc., has examined the bids opened by you at 10:00 A.M., September 15, 1966, in open Council meeting for the Decker Creek Power Station, Unit No. One, Utility Pumps, Contract No. X-133.

"Bids were submitted by:

Alliger & Sears Co.
Byron-Jackson Pumps, Inc.
DeLaval Turbine, Inc.
Iapp Insulator Co.
Lightbourn Equipment Co.
Warren Pumps, Inc.

"A bid tabulation for the various proposals is attached. (see beginning of meeting)

"While some exceptions were taken, bids were found to be in accordance with the intent of the specifications.

"In reference to the proposals of the Lightbourn Equipment Company and Warren Pumps, Inc., which were submitted without a Bid Bond, it is recommended that these offerings be deleted from further consideration.

"It is recommended that on the basis of the lowest and best bid in accordance

September 15, 1966

with the specifications, that contracts be awarded as follows:

"DeLaval Turbine, Inc.

Bidding Unit No. I - Condensate Make-Up Pumps
For the Lump Sum of - - - - - \$2,092.00

Bidding Unit No. VII - Fuel Oil Service Pumps
For the Lump Sum of - - - - - \$3,088.00

Bidding Unit No. VI - Turbine Lube Oil Transfer Pump
For the Lump Sum of - - - - - \$ 980.00

"Alliger & Sears Co., Inc.

Bidding Unit No. II - Potable Water Pumps
For the Lump Sum of - - - - - \$ 622.00

Bidding Unit No. III - Condensate Drn. Tank Pumps
For the Lump Sum of - - - - - \$ 640.00

Bidding Unit No. IV - Screen Wash Trash Pumps
For the Lump Sum of - - - - - \$5,862.00

Bidding Unit No. V - Intake Struct. Sump. Pump
For the Lump Sum of - - - - - \$ 661.00

Bidding Unit No. X - Acid Regenerating Pumps
For the Lump Sum of - - - - - \$3,604.00

Bidding Unit No. XI - Caustic Regenerating Pumps
For the Lump Sum of - - - - - \$3,488.00

"Lapp Insulator Co.,

Bidding Unit No. IX - Chemical Feed Pumps
For the Lump Sum of - - - - - \$2,148.00

"TOTAL - ALL CONTRACTS - - - - - \$28,185.00

"Bidding Unit No. VIII was not awarded since an offering meeting the intent of the specifications was not received. It is suggested that this item be purchased at a later date.

"Should you have any question on this contract award, please let us know.

"Yours very truly,
BROWN & ROOT, INC.
s/ D. V. Boyd, P.E.
D. V. Boyd, P.E.

APPROVED:
s/ D. C. Kinney
D. C. Kinney, Dir. Electric Utility
City of Austin"

The City Manager stated both he and the Director of Electric Utilities concurred in the recommendation.

Councilman Long moved that Contract No. X - 133 - Utility Pumps be awarded as recommended to the following:

DeLAVAL TURBINE, INC.	- Bidding Unit No. I - Condensate Make-Up Pumps	\$2,092.00
	Bidding Unit No. VII - Fuel Oil Service Pumps	\$3,088.00
	Bidding Unit No. VI - Turbine Lube Oil Transfer Pump	\$ 980.00
ALLIGER & SEARS CO., INC.	- Bidding Unit No. II - Potable Water Pumps	\$ 622.00
	Bidding Unit No. III - Condensate Drn. Tank Pumps	\$ 640.00
	Bidding Unit No. IV - Screen Wash Trash Pumps	\$5,862.00
	Bidding Unit No. V - Intake Struct. Sump Pump	\$ 661.00
	Bidding Unit No. X - Acid Regenerating Pump	\$3,604.00
	Bidding Unit No. XI - Caustic Regenerating Pumps	\$3,488.00
LAPP INSULATOR CO.	- Bidding Unit No. IX - Chemical Feed Pumps	\$2,148.00

TOTAL - ALL CONTRACTS \$28,185.00

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

The Director of Electric Utilities, Mr. Dexter Kinney, stated the Consulting Engineers asked for more time on their review of bids on Contract X-125 - Auxiliary Switchgear, Contract X-127 - Isolated Phase Bus, and Contract X-130 - 138 KV Switchyard, stating they would report back next Thursday.

Pursuant to published notice thereof the Mayor, at 10:35 A.M., opened the Public Hearing on the Budget. MAYOR PALMER welcomed the many who were present in the interest of the Budget hearing. He explained the City Manager prepared and filed a budget to provide the necessary services the people ask for and the Council after several meetings, came up with a few suggestions. In connection with the services the Council was hoping to be provided, it had asked the City Manager to test the market on a wage increase for city employees. This was done; and after a very careful study it was found on comparable basis with the Federal, State, and private enterprise payrolls, the City was 11.6% below the mean average of salaries. To adjust these salaries, they could not quite pick up the entire 11% difference but were able to provide about 8.8 of the differential.

In a brief review, the Mayor said this budget is one of a \$40,000,000 operation; \$13,000,000 in Revenue Bonds to carry on the improvements in the Utility Systems--Decker Lake, Water Treatment Plant No. 3 and sewer facilities in Walnut Creek; \$3,000,000 in General Obligation Bonds, for street improvements, culverts, bridges, hospital expansion, a fire hall and other things desperately

needed. The City Manager added that besides the \$13,000,000 utility revenue bond money to be spent on the utility system next year, \$5,000,000 out of its current earnings would be spent on the utility system totaling about \$18,000,000. The Council had made some amendments to the proposed budget, and the City Manager distributed copies of the revised figures which would give effect to these changes amounting to about \$101,000 increase. Councilman Long asked about the figure for the increase in the number of policemen. The City Manager stated the gross amount was over \$100,000 but the Chief of Police stated the overtime expense would drop \$15,000 by adding the additional patrolmen, leaving a net of about \$85,000.00.

MAYOR PALMER announced the budget must be adopted by September 27th; and at that time the tax rolls would be approved and the tax levy set to produce the revenue. The ad valorem tax on approximately \$703,000,000 assessed valuations, would produce some \$5,376,000. The Fire Department, Police Department, and Hospital take more than the total taxes received for ad valorem purposes. He listed the amounts from franchise taxes, gross receipts, taxes, licenses and permits, fines, use of money, garbage charges, etc., totaling \$12,000,000 while the total operating budget is \$18,000,000 leaving roughly \$6,000,000 short on revenue sources. A transfer from the earnings of the utility system has in the past been made from 50% on down to the present 19.22% of gross earnings. In 1955, the total earnings of the system were \$5,000,000; today \$26,000,000. To balance this budget this year, \$5,995,000 will be transferred. Every dollar spent from current earnings is a savings to the people, since every dollar borrowed means \$2.00 to be paid back.

DR. J. J. SEABROOK made observations generally of happenings in other cities. He mentioned the sanitation employees' strike here. He said he hated to see those men lose their jobs. The proposed increase for them was \$.13 an hour. Mayor Palmer pointed out the union scale for a truck driver is \$1.75 and the City's proposed scale is \$1.66 - \$2.09, plus vacation, sick leave and insurance. Many on the \$1.75 scale do not have these extras. He said Austin had always tried to be fair with the employees and pay a good wage.

MR. HUB BECHTOL, on behalf of the Grand Jury Association of Travis County, commended the Council in its proposal of expanding the Police Department, which is one of the finest in the nation and perhaps is not in as critical condition as other law enforcement agencies are due to Austin's alert Council.

MR. HUB BECHTOL stated the City of Austin is extremely fortunate to have two nationally recognized experts on municipal finance, MR. BILL WILLIAMS, the City Manager, and MR. LESTER PALMER the Mayor. He said this was indicated in the bond rating. This was not to say that the other members of the Council were not also interested, but these two men have held the bond rate for the City lower than that of any major City in the United States. Mr. Bechtol said he believed the people wanted and needed the expanded services and they were behind the Council 100%, and he hoped the Council would not be reluctant to give an adequate tax increase to cover these services; also that it not transfer more than the 20% from the utility fund.

COUNCILMAN LONG speaking of the wages in the Sanitation Division, said they were increased approximately 23% in the lower income brackets, and she wanted to assure the people and employees that the Council should keep abreast of the fluctuating prices and try to fix some kind of an index for the lower income people. According to information from the Trades Council, the rate for labor in construction is \$2.00. With the \$.19 per hour fringe benefits and the 23% increase, the wages of these City employees would be almost up to the Trades Council Scale.

DR. D. K. BRACE, Parks and Recreation Board, and DR. O. D. WEEKS and others from the Library Commission commented favorably on the proposed budget as pertained to their respective activities.

COUNCILMAN LaRUE asked if the tax rate would remain at 10¢ increase as originally recommended, or was it to be more than that. The City Manager reported the Council had instructed him to provide for the adjustments in the Budget Expenditures. In addition he was asked to see if additional revenue could be produced to provide for the additional expense. The budget as prepared was based on an estimated \$701,000,000 tax evaluation. The rolls are about completed, and it appears now there will be an increase of \$3,500,000 of tax valuations which will provide approximately \$30,000 above what was originally set out. The only other source would be to provide for a higher tax increase beyond the 10%. The revised figures, based on the \$704 or \$705,000,000 with a \$.91 tax rate (the proposed 10¢ increase) would result in a deficit of \$68,828. Figures based on a \$705,000,000 tax roll and an 11¢ tax increase would leave \$1,912 unexpended at the end of the year out of about \$19,000,000.

COUNCILMAN LaRUE discussed the \$343,000 figure used as anticipated revenue from Medicare. This was based on an estimate prior to the experience during July and August; and during those two months there were "sales" on Medicare of \$151,000. An average of \$75,000 a month would be approximately \$900,000 a year. A half of this would give \$400,000 which would come close to taking care of the \$68,000 deficit shown on a 10¢ tax increase. The City Manager explained it was their estimate that Medicare would improve collections of the year by \$350,000 and they believe that is excessive. It probably will be necessary to increase the rates at the Hospital to meet their estimate for the year. Practically all of the money mentioned would have been paid anyway through insurance, Old Age Assistance, and by the individuals. A check was made of each person whose account was billed to Medicare which went into the figures just read, and it was found that all but \$10,000 would have been paid anyway for July. It would seem it would be \$10,000 per month instead of \$40-\$80,000 or \$120,000 total improvement in collection with the result of Medicare. Probably there would be a shortage of \$250,000 rather than an overage. Councilman LaRue stated that taking half of the \$900,000 indicated would be easily \$345,000 as opposed to the \$65,000 shortage based on the original 10¢ increase. This was the basis for his investigation in trying to locate the \$80,000 needed for the additional law enforcement personnel. Left in the overall personnel accounts was \$650,000; and next year there should be at least the same amount based on the personnel turnover of 25% this year. He believed there would be \$650,000 left in the personnel turnover accounts that could take care of the \$65,000 deficit. The City Manager expressed hope that the budget expense could be reduced by \$600,000 as there already had been budgeted \$600,000 more transfers to take care of the expenditures than the 20% to be transferred. If the actual expenditures are not reduced by at least \$600,000 below what is being budgeted for next year, the desirable transfer will be exceeded.

MAYOR PALMER stated there were \$1,069,433 less revenue than there is budgeted. There was saved \$673,000 in the operating budget which includes the \$650,000 Councilman LaRue was discussing. Property additions of \$590,200 were more than were budgeted out of current earnings because when the unfavorable money market appeared in February, the Council decided rather than selling \$14,000,000 Revenue Bonds, only \$6,000,000 would be sold and that as much as possible be paid out of current earnings. \$590,000 more was invested than anticipated. The \$315,000 actually budgeted for subdividers' refunds ran \$277,000, leaving a \$37,280 savings. The amazing thing is the City would have been

\$1,248,653 short of the budgeted items had it not been that by not selling the \$4,000,000 bonds and selling only \$6,000,000 the debt service requirement was reduced from \$6,710,720 to \$5,446,880, leaving a net gain there of \$1,263,840 and that left \$15,187. This \$650,000 was not in dollars that can be carried over in this year's budget. He pointed out if the projected revenues and expenses do hold out, adjustments must be made.

The City Manager referred to the statement "Combined Receipts, Disbursements and Balances of Operating Funds for the Fiscal Year Ending September 30, 1966", explaining the balances at the end of the year. The reduction in expense of \$650,000 and lower revenues than anticipated, and the items mentioned by Mayor Palmer were taken into account, and it is not anticipated a balance only of \$4,217 in General Fund, and a combined total of \$70,297 in the Utility Fund and General Fund and they are resources brought forward and taken into account as what money will be available for expenditures next year.

COUNCILMAN LONG discussing the Statement of "Combined Estimated Receipts, Disbursements and Balances Operating Funds for the Fiscal Year Ending 1967", said the utility revenue of \$26,493,000 plus customer deposits of \$30,000 would be \$26,523,000 and operating expenses of \$9,156,640 which is \$398,000 above last year's. The operating expenses or figures are too high and an adjustment might be made there. The City Manager explained a considerable part of that operating expense was salaries; there would be extra men to operate the new equipment of the new Power Plant; and extra money for fuel to generate the electricity. This year it is estimated \$3,020,000 and next year \$3,179,500 a \$159,000 increase for fuel.

COUNCILMAN LARUE discussed the \$65,000 which was the only basis for his contention there would be more than that next year which would present an opportunity to find the \$35,000 for the additional law enforcement. He said in addition there were some 100 extra individuals allocated, 44 being nurses, which he hoped would be hired on October 1st, but it was recognized they would not be. This fact plus the increase labor turnover would leave that much money available. To belabor the point of \$65,000 as it applies to \$40,000,000 was something he did not want to do with the Council's time, but that was his presentation.

MAYOR PALMER said Medicare was new. The Hospital is difficult to anticipate, and he, for one, would not attempt to adopt a budget gambling on what Medicare might do. It was his belief charges at the Hospital might have to be raised. He said if a budget is to be figured on how many people are going to be sick in order to pay personnel, this would not be sound budgeting, sound accounting, or a sound financial position. If it is thought a certain number of people are needed the money should be provided; otherwise, the money should be taken out. Councilman Long said not only in the personnel accounts but other accounts there was money left over, and the \$68,000 could be taken care of and she was not going to vote for the 11 cent increase. She said she could find the \$78,000. The City Manager pointed out this was a matter of opinion. On taxes, they have an opinion on what percentage will be collected, and this opinion is based on experience. All of their estimates are opinions. It is believed Medicare may not prove as lucrative as first thought, and the Council has been warned already that in all probability the rates at the Hospital will need to be raised in order to meet next year's revenue. They have come up with the conclusion these estimates are as nearly correct as possible.

By coming in under what had been budgeted, they were trying to reduce the amount of what they would transfer from the Utility System to the General Government. This should be done next year by about \$600,000.

COUNCILMAN WHITE asked why the 11 cent increase when the budget was worked out on 10¢. The Mayor explained there were \$101,000 expenditures added by the Council by adding 15 additional policemen and raising some salaries. He recognized when the budget was increased, that additional funds would be necessary, and when \$65,000 is raised, he was aware it would take a penny tax to meet that. Councilman White stated he was voting for a 10¢ increase and that was all.

Councilman Long moved that the City Manager be required before changing the budget switching money from one account to another to present this to the Council for its approval.

She discussed the monthly accounting statements. The City Manager stated a copy of the monthly statements prepared on budget operations are on file in the Mayor's office, available to the Council at all times. Councilman LaRue discussed the transferring of funds from one account to another, and asked the Finance Director to explain. MR. NORMAN BARKER, Finance Director, stated the Council gave a 5% pay increase to all employees except Police and Firemen who had been granted previously a pay increase. The recommended 5% increase from the Council came in after the budgets had been presented and the pay raise figure was put into one account with a foot note on that page that it would be distributed to all other accounts. Instead of changing all necessary pages of the budget, as soon as it was authorized by the Council, the money was distributed to all the departments. COUNCILMAN SHANKS stated this method was a one time transaction, and was an accounting distribution. The City Manager said there was a foot note added that it would be distributed on the basis of 5% pay raise, so 5% of each payroll was taken from this account and added to each department's payroll.

MAYOR PALMER stated on September 17, 1964, the date the budget was adopted on Councilman LaRue's motion, the Council passed an ordinance setting the new Wage and Salary Schedule for the classified employees. In the paper of that very same day, there was an item that Williams said the tautness of his proposed budget was dictated by a 5% pay increase voted for City employees after preparation of the budget, thereby putting most of the salary expense in the General Overhead Account. The Mayor said rather than republish and retype every budget and allocate this amount so the budget could be adopted, it was stated publicly; it was stated in the paper that it was put in the General Overhead Account. It was later transferred and allocated by the auditor to each respective department as it applied. The Mayor said if this were a transfer by the City Manager or change from one Department to another, he would like to be convinced. The City Manager stated the budget message recited the money was to be distributed to the departments and the page on which the appropriation appeared had a foot note at the bottom saying the money was to be distributed to the Departments on the basis of 5% of payroll. What the Council adopted was the direction that the money be distributed. It could have been done a different way and every time a check was made out to an employee, a part could have been charged to his department and the 5% to the General Overhead Account. Councilman LaRue stated in no minutes he had ever read, did he find that the Council directed money to be put into one account and at some subsequent date taken out. The City Manager stated the budget had this in it, and the Council adopted the budget.

COUNCILMAN LONG and COUNCILMAN LaRUE discussed transferring accounts within a department and a supplemental budget or revised budget which is made at the end of the eight months period. It was explained there was no supplement nor a revised budget. The City Manager stated an auditor's report had carried something to the effect that when the Council approved the next year's budget, it also approved the revised expenditures for the current year; but that was not his idea. Discussion was held on preparation of the budget.

MAYOR PALMER stated according to the Charter, the Finance Director is required to certify as to the availability of funds for all proposed expenditures. If it is shown there is a deficit of \$68,000 he could not certify there was a balanced budget. The Finance Director stated if it is deficit financing, he was restricted from certifying.

COUNCILMAN LONG maintained the \$68,000 was there and she was willing to pass the budget as it is with a 10¢ tax increase. She said the Finance Director certified to the availability of funds month by month. As the City Manager says they might not get the \$324,000 from Medicare, and in case they do not then it will have to be made up. The City Manager stated in places where a reduction in revenue could be anticipated, or if tax collections do not come in on as high a percentage of collection it is necessary to find some way of reducing the expense. It is necessary to have the appropriation to spend the money, and it is necessary to have the money. The Mayor asked if any Council Member could find \$68,000 and have it here, he would vote for the 10¢ also, if they would show where it is and what they want to cut out.

COUNCILMAN LaRUE mentioned again the Medicare estimate and two months operating experience under Medicare and said he did not want to belabor the point for some \$65,000 as it applied to \$40,000,000 but he did feel it was imperative that it be brought to the Council's attention.

COUNCILMAN LONG made a motion that the City Manager be required to report to the Council before switching money from one account to another and changing the budget that he present this for the Council's approval. Councilman LaRue seconded the motion. The City Attorney stated the City Manager is legally prohibited from changing the budget. The only persons who can change the budget is the Council. Discussion followed. The City Manager read the Charter provision concerning transfer of funds from one expenditure account to another within a single office, department or agency of the City.

Councilman Long moved that the City Manager be required to report to the Council any transfer of money within a Department. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: Councilman Shanks

The City Manager stated this could be done and would be no problem.

Councilman Shanks made the following statement concerning his vote:

"We have a City Manager in whom we have confidence, and I could not vote for this motion because this reflects against that confidence. I vote 'no'."

Mayor Palmer made the following statement regarding his vote:

"With the understanding there is no inference that this has been done and that there is no accusation, and that this is a new form of reporting the Council asks for, and the City Manager says he can do it, I'll vote 'aye'."

Councilman Long moved that the budget be adopted as amended by the Council. The City Manager pointed out it was out of balance, as it is now. Something will have to be provided to show where the revenue will come from to balance the resources.

COUNCILMAN LONG stated she could find some places where it was over estimated--and suggested not spending so much to operate the power plant. The City Manager pointed out if there were a savings realized from that it would be in the utility fund not the general fund; and it would have to be transferred. Councilman Long suggested transferring \$10,000 more from the Utility Fund, and taking up a little more slack in the hospital. She thought the expenditures had been over estimated for the amount to be paid out for employees. She said the City Manager might want to wait and or revise the estimates wholesale which she would do. The City Manager stated his position was they had come up with the best estimate they could make. Councilman Long stated it was a matter of changing the estimates and she could come up with some revised estimates. She was not going for 11¢. Councilman White asked Councilman Long if she thought the budget should be adopted today. She stated it did not have to be adopted today, as this was not the last day. She thought she could find the money very easily, as it was already there; just a matter of readjusting the figures.

MAYOR PALMER asked if under the State law if a city, or corporate body was permitted to adopt a deficit budget. The City Attorney stated they could not.

Councilman Shanks moved that the budget as proposed by the City Manager based on an 11¢ tax increase be adopted. The motion died for lack of a second.

Councilman LaRue pointed out again this was only \$65,000 as to a \$40,000,000 budget. In his mind there was no doubt that the \$68,000 would be there based on the information he had. He would not want to quibble all day or take the rest of the Council's time the rest of this week working on this. In effect the City Manager's recommendation for this additional penny for the \$65,000 will go into the City's coffers anyway; and it would be there at the end of the year.

Councilman Shanks asked if Mr. LaRue were willing to second his motion? Councilman LaRue stated he had his say any number of times and again here today. If there is an under estimation of revenue the \$65-\$68,000 is not going to be there. If there were some other aspect he said he would stay until considerably later in the day and reiterate his points; but under the circumstances he would be inclined to accept the City Manager's recommendation for the additional 11¢.

Councilman Shanks moved that the budget recommended by the City Manager be adopted based on an 11¢ tax rate increase. The motion lost for lack of a second.

Councilman Long moved that the budget be adopted as recommended by the City Manager and amended by the Council. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

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

Councilman Shanks made the following statement concerning his vote:

"I am voting with this with the opinion that we will have an 11¢ tax."

Councilman Shanks moved that the City Manager be instructed to prepare an ordinance setting the tax rate at an increase of 11¢. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Shanks, Mayor Palmer
Noes: Councilmen Long, White

Councilman LaRue stated he voiced his intent to vote for the 11¢ increase.

Councilman White voted against the motion, stating he believed they could have made it on the 10¢.

Later in the afternoon meeting, Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ADOPTING AND APPROVING THE BUDGET
FOR THE FISCAL YEAR BEGINNING OCTOBER 1, 1966,
AND TERMINATING SEPTEMBER 30, 1967, AND MAKING
APPROPRIATIONS FOR EACH DEPARTMENT, PROJECT AND
ACCOUNT: AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.
(Ordinance No. 660915-G)

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman Long 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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman Long 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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman Long moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman LaRue, carried by the following vote:

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

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Later in the afternoon meeting, Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE FIXING AND LEVYING MUNICIPAL AD VALOREM TAXES FOR THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, FOR THE YEAR 1966; AND FOR EACH YEAR THEREAFTER UNTIL OTHERWISE PROVIDED; DIRECTING THE ASSESSMENT AND COLLECTION THEREOF; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY. (92¢ General Fund and 34¢ Interest and Sinking Fund)

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

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Shanks, Mayor Palmer
Noes: Councilmen Long, White

The Council recessed until 2:30 P.M.

RECESSED MEETING

2:30 P.M.

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

Councilman Long moved that the tax hearings set for 2:30 P.M. be recessed to hear MR. EDWIN B. FULLER. The motion, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

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

MR. FULLER, representing the terminated Sanitation Department employees, asked the Council to make such investigation as in its opinion was appropriate as many things had happened and there were misunderstandings. Perhaps they were ill advised when they took off without legal counsel. He discussed the Personnel Policies, sick leave, and vacation time as concerned these discharged employees. The City Manager stated these employees were not discharged. On September 9th, the Council directed him to carry out the Personnel Policies, and asked him to state what they were. He had reported these men were absent without leave; and that three days absence without leave, under the provisions of the Personnel Policies had the effect of resignation, and the Council voted that those policies be carried out. Mr. Fuller was asked to file a letter with the Council stating his position.

The Council opened the hearings on Tax Appeals covering the following:

JAMES M. DOBSON, JR. and JOE DOBSON by ROGAN B. GILES - Riverside Drive and Parker Lane - 16.48 ac Santiago Del Valle Grant - Parcel No. 3-0407-0201

	Full Value by the Tax Dept. 1965	Full Value by the Tax Dept. 1966	Assessed Value by the Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board- Equalization
Land	\$48,122	\$48,122	\$36,090	\$12,360	\$36,090
Improvements	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	\$48,122	\$48,122	\$36,090	\$12,360	\$36,090

- Parker Lane - 1.05 ac Santiago Del Valle Grant - Parcel No. 3-0605-0204

Land	\$4,457	\$ 8,172	\$ 6,130	Not Rendered	\$ 6,130
Improvements	-0-	-0-	-0-		-0-
Total	\$4,457	\$ 8,172	\$ 6,130		\$ 6,130

- Parker Lane - .73 ac Santiago Del Valle Grant - Parcel No. 3-0605-0206

Land	\$ 3,116	\$ 5,712	\$ 4,280	Not Rendered	\$ 4,280
Improvements	-0-	-0-	-0-		-0-
Total	\$ 3,116	\$ 5,712	\$ 4,280		\$ 4,280

- East Riverside Drive - 26.33 ac Santiago Del Valle Grant - Parcel No. 3-0407-0203

Land	\$46,078	\$46,078	\$34,560	\$19,750	\$34,560
Improvements	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	\$46,078	\$46,078	\$34,560	\$19,750	\$34,560

- East Riverside Drive - 14.92 ac Santiago Del Valle Grant - Parcel No. 9-3-0605-0113

Land	\$26,110	\$26,110	\$19,580	\$11,190	\$19,580
Improvements	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total	\$26,110	\$26,110	\$19,580	\$11,190	\$19,580

MR. ROGAN GILES stated out of the five pieces of property listed only three were under appeal--the 16.48 acre tract which has a full market value set by the Tax Department at \$2500 an acre; and the 26.33 and 14.92 acre tracts on which was set \$1,750 an acre. This is extremely rough, and hilly property with valleys and mesquite trees, and the value perhaps had been influenced by the high development--Town Lake Plaza and the Kassuba Development--on the north fronting on Town Lake. A big difference exists between the river property and this hilly and rough country. He pointed out adjacent tracts of heavy development which were valued at \$1,000 an acre. He listed other properties with \$1,000 per acre values which had been selling far in excess of that amount. Mr. Giles said these three tracts were over valued in relation to other properties, and should be lowered to \$1,000 full valuation. MR. KLITGAARD, Tax Assessor explained the unit values should not be taken off the

maps without giving consideration to the values placed on the properties. The front foot unit was placed on the frontage, and then the acreage value was used on the remaining. Councilman Long asked the Tax Assessor if he had any property inside the City limits that is not taxed, but subject to taxation. The Tax Assessor answered to his knowledge there was none. Mr. Giles compared his property with the adjacent property, pointing out a difference in terrain; and the property to the north had lake frontage, while his was rough and hilly with no lake frontage. Mr. Klitgaard noted several factors that had influences on this property--the part on Riverside Drive is inside the City limits; the property east of his is outside and utilities are unavailable. Another tract had bad drainage. The Mayor stated the Council would go look at this property and give an answer as early as possible.

- - - - -

CAMBRIDGE TOWER by J. C. HINSLEY - 1801 Lavaca - West 133' and East 143' of South 80' of Outlot 42, Division E - Parcel No. 2-1002-3009

	Full Value by the Tax Dept. 1965	Full Value by the Tax Dept. 1966	Assessed Value by the Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board - Equalization
Land	\$ 142,250	\$ 139,879	\$ 104,910	\$ 106,690	\$ 104,910
Improvements	2,125,003	4,213,709	3,160,280	1,593,750	3,160,280
Total	<u>\$2,267,253</u>	<u>\$4,353,588</u>	<u>\$3,265,190</u>	<u>\$1,700,440</u>	<u>\$3,265,190</u>

MR. J. C. HINSLEY represented MR. WAYNE SWEARINGEN, property manager for the Mayflower Investment Company, owner of Cambridge Tower. The appeal covered only the improvements on which they had rendered at \$1,593,750 as the 75% value. Subsequently prior to August 8, they were notified the Tax Department had increased the assessed value to \$3,160,280. An appeal was made to the Board of Equalization, on the basis the building cost the Mayflower Investment Company \$3,667,317, not including the personal property which was rendered separately. (Mr. Hinsley filed schedules with the Council, one showing the cost of the building at \$2,837,767; and one showing the extras at \$829,550, totaling the \$3,667,317.) In answer to MAYOR PALMER'S inquiry, Mr. Hinsley stated there was no relationship between the construction firm and the present owners; that they paid the cost plus \$50,000. Discussion was held on the 1965 tax which was based on 50% completion of the building, Councilman Shanks stating there was no misunderstanding about that at that time that he knew of. Mr. Hinsley said the understanding was when the building was completed and was approaching full occupancy, they would expect to pay on the full occupancy basis. As of January 1, 1966, the occupancy was approximately 50%. Mr. Hinsley mentioned a high-rise apartment which recently sold under \$350,000 and suggested the fair cash market value of high-rise apartments was pretty closely related to cost. Comparison of unit cost per square foot was made on Westgate, the Penthouse, Executive House, and Cambridge Tower, Mr. Hinsley stating the unit cost on Cambridge Tower ran \$2.00-\$4.00 higher. He filed with the Council a statement from the Assistant Secretary of the Mayflower Investment Company, for income tax purposes showing the cost of the building at \$3,558,813.69 and a C.P.A. statement supporting records of the owner and contractor. Councilman Long asked if this letter

were written just to get a record for the City Council. Mr. Hinsley stated that was right. Mayor Palmer asked if he were contending the cost should be the fair market value, and Mr. Hinsley said in this case they were. The listed cost of \$3,667,317 included the cost plus the \$50,000 and architect's fee. Councilman LaRue noted the deducted interim interest, loan fee, and title policy, and asked if this should be considered a part of the cost of the building. (\$3,847,218) Mr. Swearingen explained the C.P.A. had figured the cost from the invoices and had not included carpets. Mr. Hinsley's position was with respect to leasing; the building would not bring a premium above cost, and the cost is all there is on which to base the value. The Tax Department's value is \$4,213,709 or \$410,000 difference. Discussing the square footage basis, the Tax Assessor said the same square footage basis was used as last year when the 50% completion value was established.

The Assistant City Attorney, MR. TOM de STEIGUER had a deed of trust where Mayflower mortgaged the property for \$4,000,000 and asked for an explanation. What was included in the mortgage was discussed. Mayor Palmer stated the value was set last year at \$2,100,000 (50% complete), and asked why would it not be \$4,200,000 this year. Mr. Hinsley said it did not cost anything like \$4,000,000. The Tax Assessor reviewed some of the matters considered in evaluating the property -- the deeds of trust on record; a sheet put out by the Cambridge Tower people, publicizing the total cost as in excess of \$4,500,000. Mr. Swearingen said their initial loan of December of last year was \$3,500,000 and they would not give the full \$4,000,000 until they reached a certain income level. Now they had the cost figures; last year they had the estimates. The Council wanted to look into this further.

- - - - -

KAY GURLEY - 3507 Mt. Barker - Lot 2, Resub. of Lots 2 and 3, Block Y,
Balcones Park Addition, Section 8 Parcel No. 1-2708-0211

	Full Value by the Tax Dept. 1965	Full Value by the Tax Dept. 1966	Assessed Value by the Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board- Equalization
Land	\$ 7,846	\$ 8,154	\$ 6,120	\$ 5,880	\$ 6,120
Improvements	15,446	15,446	11,580	11,580	11,580
Total	\$23,292	\$23,600	\$17,700	\$17,460	\$17,700

MISS KAY GURLEY said she was appealing the improvements only and although she signed the rendition as a matter of routine, she did not take into account damage done by blasting near by, and the Tax Department did not realize the improvements had been damaged. The house has not been repaired yet, and she feared future financing due to the blasting damage. She could not estimate the amount of damage she suffered but the outside wall was damaged and six or eight bricks were loosened; the house perhaps needed waterproofing, the retaining wall was out of plumb, and the roof needed repairing. She did have some insurance; and after a year she settled realizing the settlement would not replace the damage. The Tax Assessor reported the house was constructed in 1958. The Department recognized there was some damage to the house and an allowance was made. The Mayor stated the Council would go by and look at this property.

- - - - -

AUSTIN CREST HOTEL INC. by RICHARD BAKER - 101 East 1st Street -
 Lots 1-9, Block 180 - Parcel No. 2-0502-0301

	Full Value by the Tax Dept. 1965	Full Value by the Tax Dept. 1966	Assessed Value by the Tax Dept.	Value Rendered by Owner	Assessed Value Fixed by Board - Equalization
Land	\$252,918	\$ 252,918	\$ 189,690	\$ 189,690	No Appeal
Improvements	500,000	2,536,598	1,902,450	1,125,000	
Total	\$752,918	\$2,789,516	\$2,092,140	\$1,314,690	

PERSONAL PROPERTY AT 101 East 1st Street

Merchandise	\$ 14,010	Not	No Appeal
Supplies, Furniture,		Rendered	
Fixtures and Equipment	339,180		
Total	\$ 353,190		

MR. BAKER stated the appeal covered only the personal property this year. He made a statement regarding the real property, in that he represented the present owners of the hotel. The tax notices mailed out were not brought to the attention of the owners. The hotel concluded inasmuch as it did not own the property on January 1, 1966, and there was not sufficient time to analyze the breakdown furnished by the City, they were not objecting to the evaluation. By their not objecting to the valuation, they would not want to be put in the position that they were agreeing to the valuation, and next year they might want to come back to the Council if it is concluded after a year that the values are wrong after they have given them ample study.

By appearing before the Council in reference to the Austin Crest Hotel, they were in no way making an allegation that they now own the personal property or that they had owned it. They appear in behalf of the first lien holders and in behalf of the Austin Crest Hotel as custodians of the property. They contend they will acquire all or a portion of the personal property. Argument with the valuation where it relates to the personal property is difficult at this time. The renditions were made by Mr. Eades who reportedly represented the Hotel. Mr. Baker was appearing in an effort to reduce these values lower than the Tax Department had placed on them on the basis the figures as submitted by Mr. Eades were high and based on values set forth in the chattel mortgages. They were trying to determine what the furniture could be replaced for of equal value, equal or better quality, item by item; and to ascertain since they acquired the hotel in June what would be the reasonable market value of the particular items of personal property. He submitted an inventory of the personal property, and reviewed it with Mr. Klitgaard item by item. Mr. Baker and Mr. Klitgaard had gone over the various items--linens, uniforms, janitor supplies, food, etc. which they acquired. Their figure is \$14,000 as against the City's figure of \$19,950. Furniture and fixtures are shown on chattel mortgages in excess of \$500,000; the City picks them up at full value at \$367,397.02. Mr. Baker pointed out the appraisals room by room they had arranged for, and there were discrepancies in the furniture in the hotel and what was called for in the purchase order. Total cost of furniture, carpet and drapes was \$265,272.99 plus \$12,695.50 freight makes \$283,273.95, and installation costs of \$35,000. Councilman Shanks said he would want to look at the furnishings. Included in the furnishings were the kitchen, dining, bar and cold storage, \$139,368. Mr. Baker

stated the \$257,580 using the same depreciation 10% allowance figures should be used rather than the \$367,337. The difference is \$109,757. The Tax Assessor stated his department had not had but two days to review the figures. Their figures were arrived by two ways. A duly representative of the company submitted a sworn rendition and gave his costs, and they came out after checking within \$6,000 of both figures. Mayor Palmer suggested that Mr. Shanks look into this and asked that the Council go down and look at the furniture in the Lobby and Club. Mr. Baker mentioned other items, T.V., Music and Inter-com. Mr. Baker was to furnish the Council with a copy of the confidential personal property return. The Mayor stated the Council would look at this.

MAYOR PALMER recognized MR. WILFORD TURNER and MR. BILL MOORE, members of the Equalization Board. Regarding the Cambridge Tower Appeal, Mr. Turner stated the testimony presented at this hearing was about what was brought out before the Board. Mayor Palmer thanked the Board of Equalization publicly for having only these few appeals. MR. TURNER stated again that the fine work and cooperation by the Tax Department were somewhat responsible for such few appeals.

The City Manager submitted the following:

"September 15, 1966

"To the City Council
City of Austin, Texas

"Re: Completion and Acceptance of Work Improving
Portions of Certain Streets in the City of
Austin Being Assessment Paving Contract
Number 65-A-13

"The work of improving portions of the following named streets in the City of Austin, being Assessment Paving Contract Number 65-A-13, dated November 18, 1965, between the City of Austin and Lee Maners, has been performed and completed by Lee Maners in full compliance with the contract and the plans and specifications therein contained:

<u>Street</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Bennett Avenue	NPL East 49th Street	SPL East 51st Street
Burnet Road	NPL West 42nd Street	SPL West 44th Street
Depew Avenue	NPL East 45th Street	WGL Clarkson Avenue
Elton Lane	NGL Quarry Road	A point 225' north of NPL Quarry Road
Evans Avenue	A point 106' south of SPL East 46th Street	SPL East 47th Street
Leralynn Street	NPL West 51st Street	SPL Zennia Street
Merèdith Street	EGL Rockmoor Avenue	WPL Raleigh Avenue
Newman Drive	NCL West 7th Street	SPL West 10th Street
Paul Street	NPL West 4th Street	SPL West 5th Street
Polo Road	EGL Newfield Lane	WGL Hartford Road
Quarry Road	WCL Elton Lane	WPL Dailey Street
Roosevelt Avenue	NPL Houston Street	A point 1078' north of NPL Houston Street
Rosedale Avenue	NPL West 39½ Street	SPL West 40th Street

<u>Street</u>	<u>From</u>	<u>To</u>
Verde Vista	A point 266' west of WPL Exposition Blvd.	WPL Exposition Boulevard
West 8th Street	EPL Exposition Boulevard	WPL Wayside Drive
West 9th Street	EPL Norwalk Lane	WPL Meriden Lane
East 25th Street	EPL Oldham Street	WPL Swisher Street
West 41st Street	EPL Shoal Creek Boulevard	WPL Burnet Road
West 43rd Street	EPL Shoalwood Avenue	WPL Rosedale Avenue
West 44th Street	EPL Shoalwood Avenue	WPL Sinclair Avenue
East 47th Street	EPL Red River Street	EGL Clarkson Avenue

"I have inspected, approved, and accepted the work and improvements referred to, and I now recommend that the same be accepted and received by the City Council as having been performed and completed in compliance with the contract, plans, and specifications referred to above.

"Respectfully submitted,
s/ S. Reuben Rountree, Jr.
S. Reuben Rountree, Jr.
Director of Public Works"

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE RECEIVING AND ACCEPTING THE WORK OF IMPROVING BENNETT AVENUE AND SUNDRY OTHER STREETS IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, WITHIN THE LIMITS HEREBELOW DEFINED, PERFORMED BY LEE MANERS; AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE ISSUANCE OF SPECIAL ASSESSMENT CERTIFICATES IN CONNECTION THEREWITH; DECLARING AN EMERGENCY, AND PROVIDING THAT THIS ORDINANCE SHALL BECOME EFFECTIVE IMMEDIATELY UPON 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 Long, carried by the following vote:

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

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 Long, carried by the following vote:

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

The ordinance was read the third time and Councilman White moved that the ordinance be finally passed. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

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

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

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 Manager be and he is hereby authorized and directed to enter into a Pipe Line License, on behalf of the City of Austin, with Missouri Pacific Railroad Company for the installation of an 8-inch cast iron sanitary sewer main crossing under tracks and right of way south of Paul Street (at E.C.S. 9451 / 76, Mile Post 179, Pole 2), Travis County, Texas, in accordance with the terms and provisions of a certain Pipe Line License exhibited to the City Council; and,

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED:

That the City Clerk is hereby directed to file a copy of said Pipe Line License in the permanent records of her office without recordation in the Minutes of the City Council.

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

The City Manager submitted the following:

"September 12, 1966

"TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council.

SUBJECT: Bids on Tires and Tubes for all Departments for a twelve (12) months period.

"Sealed bids were opened in the office of the Purchasing Agent at 2:00 P.M. September 9, 1966 for the estimated requirements of Tires and Tubes for all Departments for a twelve (12) months period beginning October 1, 1966

"Invitations to bid were advertised in the Austin American Statesman on Sunday August 21 and August 28, 1966 and sent to all known interested bidders.

"The bids received are as follows:

			Low Bid - 1965
	Walker Tire	Jackson Tire	Using Present
	Company	Company	Estimated
	(Dayton & Cooper)	(Armstrong & Dunlop)	Quantities
Tires and Tubes			(Walker)
(Estimated Quantities			
Based on Previous	Net		
Purchases)	Total		
	\$27,848.90	\$29,797.74	\$29,439.28

"Our present contract for Tires and Tubes is with Walker Tire Company and the quality and service have been satisfactory.

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

Councilman LaRue offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on September 9, 1966, on tires and tubes for all Departments of the City of Austin for a twelve (12) months period; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of Walker Tire Company, in the sum of \$27,848.90, 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 Walker Tire Company, in the sum of \$27,848.90, 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 Walker Tire Company.

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

The City Manager submitted the following:

"CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS BIDS FOR GASOLINE, KEROSENE, NAPHTHA, DIESEL, OILS & GREASES - ONE YEAR CONTRACT BEGINNING OCTOBER 1, 1966

"Sealed bids opened 10:00 A.M. September 9, 1966
Tabulated by: B.J. Bonds, Purchasing Agent

DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED QUANTITY	SINCLAIR REFINING CO.	HUMBLE OIL & MOBIL OIL REFINING CO. CORPORATION	LOW BIDS - 1965 USING PRESENT ESTIMATED QUANTITIES
Gasoline:				
Regular-Transport	800,000 Gal.	\$ 89,733.60	\$ 84,031.20	\$ 84,506.40
Regular-Tankwagon	40,000 Gal.	5,140.00	5,076.00	4,616.00
Premium-Transport	350,000 Gal.	45,322.20	42,827.40	43,035.30
Net Total		140,195.80	131,934.60	132,157.70
		CONTINENTAL OIL COMPANY	GULF OIL CORPORATION	
		\$ 93,852.00	\$ 80,784.00	\$ 76,269.60 - Mobil
		5,549.00	4,492.00	4,496.00 - Mobil
		51,455.25	41,822.55	38,392.20 - Mobil
		150,847.25	<u>127,098.55</u>	119,157.80 - Mobil
Low unit price by Gulf for Regular-Transport this bid \$.10098 - Last bid \$.095337				
Low unit price by Gulf for Regular-Tankwagon this bid \$.1123 - Last bid \$.1124				
Low unit price by Gulf for Premium-Transport this bid \$.119493 - Last bid \$.109692				

"DESCRIPTION	ESTIMATED QUANTITY	SINCLAIR REFINING CO.	HUMBLE OIL & REFINING CO.	MOBIL OIL CORPORATION	CONTINENTAL OIL COMPANY	GULF OIL CORPORATION
"Kerosene	15,000 Gal.	\$1,710.00	\$1,785.00	\$1,860.00	\$1,800.00	<u>\$1,701.00</u>

LOW BIDS - 1965
USING PRESENT
ESTIMATED QUANTITIES

\$1,710 - Sinclair

Low unit price by Gulf for Kerosene this bid \$.1134 - Last bid \$.1140

"Naphtha	4000 Gal.	\$ 740.00	\$ 680.00	\$ 860.00	No Bid	<u>\$ 676.00</u>
					\$ 686.00 - Gulf	

Low unit price by Gulf for Naphtha this bid \$.1690 - Last bid \$.1715

"Diesel Fuel	80,000 Gal.	\$3,368.00	\$3,720.00	\$3,224.00	\$3,800.00	<u>\$7,800.00</u>
						\$7,444.80 - Ritter

Low unit price for Gulf for Diesel Fuel this bid \$.0975 - Last bid \$.09306

"Lubricating Oils and Greases	Net Total	\$10,595.20	\$11,564.38	<u>\$ 9,186.47</u>	\$14,705.81	\$9,217.22
						\$3,811.36 - Mobil

"Note: All prices shown are net. Net total for all estimated products this bid \$146,462.02 compared with net total on bids taken in 1965 using present estimated of \$137,809.96.

"This tabulation is submitted with the apparent low bids 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 September 9, 1966, for the furnishing of gasoline, kerosene, naphtha, diesel fuel and oils and greases, for one year beginning October 1, 1966; and,

WHEREAS, the bids of Gulf Oil Corporation in the sum of \$127,098.55 for gasoline, in the sum of \$1,701.00 for kerosene, in the sum of \$676.00 for naphtha and in the sum of \$7,800.00; and the bid of Mobil Oil Corporation in the sum of \$9,186.47 for lubricating oils and greases, were the lowest and best bids therefor, and the acceptance of such bids 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 bids of Gulf Oil Corporation and of Mobil Oil Corporation, as above enumerated, 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 contract, on behalf of the City, with Gulf Oil Corporation and Mobil Oil Corporation.

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

The City Manager submitted the following:

"September 9, 1966

"TO: Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council.

SUBJECT: Bids for Welding Gases (Oxygen and Acetylene) for all City Departments and Hydrogen, Nitrogen and CO₂ for the Power Plants for a twelve (12) months period.

"Sealed bids were opened in the office of the Purchasing Agent at 2:00 P.M. September 7, 1966 for the estimated requirements of Welding Gases (Oxygen and Acetylene) for all City Departments and Hydrogen, Nitrogen and CO₂ for the Power Plants for a period of twelve (12) months beginning October 1, 1966. These gases are to be delivered to the various City Departments as required during this period. Invitations to bid were sent to all known local suppliers of this type of material.

"The bids received are as follows:

		<u>Welding Gases</u>	<u>Hydrogen & Nitrogen</u>	<u>CO₂</u>
Big Three Industrial	Net			
Gas & Equipment Co.	Total	<u>\$1,626.50</u>	<u>\$4,086.00</u>	<u>\$680.00</u>
Austin Oxygen Company	Net			
	Total	<u>\$2,096.90</u>	<u>\$7,430.50</u>	No Bid

"Our present contract is with Big Three Industrial Gas & Equipment Company and the service has been excellent.

"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 September 7, 1966, for welding gases (oxygen and acetylene) for all City Departments and hydrogen, nitrogen and CO₂ for the Power Plants for a twelve (12) months period; and,

WHEREAS, the bids of Big Three Industrial Gas & Equipment Company, in the sum of \$1,626.50 for welding gases, in the sum of \$4,086.00 for hydrogen and nitrogen, and in the sum of \$680.00 for CO₂, were the lowest and best bids therefor, and the acceptance of such bids 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 bids of Big Three Industrial Gas & Equipment Company, in the sum of \$1,626.50 for welding gases, in the sum of \$4,086.00 for hydrogen and nitrogen, and in the sum of \$680.00 for CO₂, 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 a contract, on behalf of the City with Big Three Industrial Gas & Equipment Company.

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

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the following:

"September 12, 1966

"To: Mr. W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager Subject: Sale of Houses

"Bids were opened in my office September 12, 1966 at 10:00 A.M. for the sale of six (6) houses that Urban Renewal has turned over to us for disposal by demolition.

"Bids from six different individuals were received and a breakdown of the bidding is as follows:

	1401	1705	1703	1802	1176	1803
"BIDDERS	E. 12th	E. 12th	New York	Rosewood	Angelina	Washington
W. Johnston	\$32.00	\$78.00	\$33.00	-----	\$27.00	\$37.50
A. Heyer	31.00	51.63	35.80	-----	15.00	36.76
M. T. Powell	<u>36.50</u>	<u>83.65</u>	21.10	<u>\$1.10</u>	<u>35.15</u>	<u>56.30</u>
A. Bracy	-----	-----	-----	-----	20.65	-----
J. Bradshaw	-----	-----	12.00	-----	10.00	35.00
C. F. Hoerling	-----	-----	7.50	-----	-----	-----

"The high bid on each house is underscored in red. Due to the fact that these structures are dilapidated and also the fact that it would cost this office several hundred dollars if we had to demolish them, it is recommended that these bids be accepted.

"If the bids are acceptable, the contracts will be forwarded to you for your signature, and should be returned to me for attestation and distribution.

"From: Dick T. Jordan, Building Official
Signed Dick T. Jordan"

Councilman LaRue offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

(RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on September 12, 1966, for the sale of six (6) houses that Urban Renewal has turned over to the City for disposal by demolition; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of A. Heyer in the sum of \$35.80 for house located at 1703 New York, and the bids of M. T. Powell in the sum of \$36.50 for house located at 1401 East 12th Street, in the sum of \$33.65 for house located at 1705 East 12th Street, in the sum of \$1.10 for house located at 1802 Rosewood, in the sum of \$35.15 for house located at 1176 Angelina and in the sum of \$56.30 for house located at 1803 Washington, were the highest and best bids therefor, and the acceptance of such bids has been recommended by the Building Official 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 above enumerated bids of A. Heyer and M. T. Powell 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 A. Heyer and M. T. Powell.

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

Ayes: Councilmen LaRue, Long, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer

Noes: None

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 CODE OF 1954 AS FOLLOWS:

(1) A 10,947 SQUARE FOOT TRACT OF LAND, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 704-706 WEST 28TH STREET, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT AND FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE DISTRICT AND SECOND HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; (2) LOT 18 AND THE WEST 86.5 FEET OF LOT 16, THE WEST 86.5 FEET AND THE SOUTH 38.5 FEET LESS THE EAST 48.5 FEET THEREOF OF LOT 17, SUBDIVISION OF OUTLOT 49, FROM SECOND HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO FOURTH HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; (3) A 1,500 SQUARE FOOT TRACT OF LAND, LOCALLY KNOWN AS REAR OF 6307-6309 CAMERON ROAD, FROM "GR" GENERAL RETAIL DISTRICT TO "C-2" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; (4) THE SOUTH 56 FEET OF SMYTH'S ADDITION OF OUTLOT 75, FROM "BB" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE DISTRICT; (5) THE WEST 62 FEET OF LOTS 1 AND 2 AND THE SOUTH 16 FEET OF THE WEST 62 FEET OF LOT 3, BLOCK 43, THE HIGHLANDS, FROM "LR" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT TO "GR" GENERAL RETAIL DISTRICT; (6) A 5 ACRE TRACT OF LAND, LOCALLY KNOWN AS 3401-3507 SOUTH FIRST STREET AND 502-516 ALPINE ROAD, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "LR" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT; (7) THE NORTH 100 FEET OF SOUTH 200 FEET OF THE WEST 103.5 FEET OF LOT 10, BLOCK 13 OF THE RAYMOND AND WHITIS SUBDIVISION, FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "C" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; AND (8) LOT 1 LESS THE NORTH 7.5 FEET, BLOCK 29 OF THE CHRISTIAN AND FELLMAN ADDITION, AND ADDITIONAL AREA: LOT 10, BLOCK 29 OF

THE CHRISTIAN AND FELLMAN ADDITION, FROM "BB" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "C" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT; ALL OF SAID PROPERTY BEING SITUATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; AND SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS.

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, seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

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

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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

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 CODE OF 1954 AS FOLLOWS: FIVE (5) TRACTS OF LAND OUT OF AND AS PART OF THE JAMES P. WALLACE SURVEY NUMBER 18, LOCALLY KNOWN AS FOLLOWS: TRACT 1: 8714-8728 BALCONES DRIVE; TRACT 2: 8616-8632 BALCONES DRIVE; TRACT 3: 8600-8606 BALCONES DRIVE; AND TRACT 4: 8730-8738 BALCONES DRIVE, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT AND INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "GR" GENERAL RETAIL DISTRICT AND FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT, SAVE AND EXCEPT THE WEST 30 FEET WHICH IS TO BE CHANGED FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT AND INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE DISTRICT AND FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; AND TRACT 5: 8800-8932 BALCONES DRIVE AND 3501-3735 OLD BURNET ROAD, FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT AND INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "C" COMMERCIAL DISTRICT AND FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT SAVE AND EXCEPT THE WEST 60 FEET WHICH IS TO BE CHANGED FROM INTERIM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT AND INTERIM FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT TO "O" OFFICE DISTRICT AND FIRST HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICT; ALL OF SAID PROPERTY BEING SITUATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; 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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND CHANGING THE USE MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 39 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1954 AS FOLLOWS: A 21,780 SQUARE FOOT TRACT OF LAND LOCALLY KNOWN AS 2301 ANDERSON LANE, FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "GR" GENERAL RETAIL DISTRICT; SAID PROPERTY BEING SITUATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; 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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Mayor Palmer introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A CHANGE IN USE AND CHANGING THE USE MAPS ACCOMPANYING CHAPTER 39 OF THE AUSTIN CITY CODE OF 1954 AS FOLLOWS: LOTS 8 AND 11 OF ROBBINS SUBDIVISION, AND LOT 11 OF DON WILSON'S SUBDIVISION, ALL OF OUTLOT 72, FROM "O" OFFICE DISTRICT AND "BB" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "GR" GENERAL RETAIL DISTRICT; SAID PROPERTY BEING SITUATED IN AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; 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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

Councilman White moved that MR. ROBERT POTTS, Attorney, be granted permission to withdraw the following application:

ESTHER N. CROW,	1810-1814 West 35th Street	From "LR" Local Retail
ET AL		1st Height & Area
By Richard Baker		To "LR" Local Retail
		2nd Height & Area
		NOT Recommended by the
		Planning Commission

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

No action was taken on the following zoning applications pending from last week:

KIRK E. WILLIAMSON	1100-1126 Reinli Street	From "B" Residence 2nd
	5801-5833 Sheridan Avenue	Height & Area
		To "C" Commercial 2nd
		Height & Area

		NOT Recommended by the Planning Commission
H. D. PRUETT, JR.	402-404 East 16th Street	From "B" Residence 2nd Height & Area To "O" Office 2nd Height & Area RECOMMENDED by the Planning Commission
EDGAR MONTGOMERY	1507-1509 Newning Avenue	From "A" Residence To "B" Residence NOT Recommended by the Planning Commission
DEXTER McCARTY	906 South 1st Street	From "A" Residence To "GR" General Retail NOT Recommended by the Planning Commission
L. H. SPRADLING By Billy Zidell	1027 East 45th Street 4414-4416 Clarkson Avenue	From "A" Residence To "B" Residence NOT Recommended by the Planning Commission
NASH PHILLIPS & CLYDE COPUS By John B. Selman	4304-4308 Clarkson Avenue 1037 East 44th Street	From "A" Residence To "B" Residence TIE VOTE ON MOTION TO DENY NO Recommendation by the Planning Commission
SOPHIA WENDLANDT ESTATE, By Walter Wendlandt	3011-3319 West 35th Street 3303-3425 Maywood Avenue 3302-3416 Maywood Avenue 3008-3102 Warren Street 3009-3103 Warren Street 3303-3417 Pecos Street	From "A" Residence To "BB" Residence NOT Recommended by the Planning Commission
O. C. HARDIN	1220 East 52nd Street 5200-5204 Lancaster Court	From "BB" Residence To "O" Office NOT Recommended by the Planning Commission

Mayor Palmer brought up the following ordinance for its third reading:

AN ORDINANCE PROVIDING FOR THE EXTENSION OF CERTAIN BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND THE ANNEXATION OF CERTAIN ADDITIONAL TERRITORY CONSISTING OF (A) 20.81 ACRES OF LAND OUT OF AND A PART OF THE JAMES P. WALLACE SURVEY NUMBER 57; AND (B) 0.8 OF ONE ACRE OF LAND OUT OF AND A PART OF THE JOHN APPLGAIT SURVEY NUMBER 58, IN TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; WHICH SAID ADDITIONAL TERRITORY LIES ADJACENT TO AND ADJOINS THE PRESENT BOUNDARY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, IN PARTICULARS STATED IN THE ORDINANCE. (Heritage Hills, Sec. 3 and portions of Patton's Addition, Sec.3-A)

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, Shanks, White, Mayor Palmer
Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

The City Manager recalled that several weeks ago REVEREND CHARLES SUMNERS appeared before the Council regarding a memorial to MR. A. J. ZILKER and the Council was to appoint a committee to work on this. The Mayor stated the Council would appoint the committee next Thursday.

MAYOR PALMER stated Mr. Werner Perlitz handed each member of the Council a letter making some suggestions about Lake Austin, that litter barrels be used; do not throw bottles, trash and cans in the lake; keep to the right hand side of the lake, watch out for skiers, keep lights on boats after dark. Councilman White said Mr. Perlitz had talked to the boat people and they were perfectly willing to put such signs up. Councilman Long stated the litter barrels could be placed up there. The Director of Public Works stated at the boat ramp they did have the litter barrels. The Mayor suggested that Councilman White and the Director of Public Works go up on the lake and review some of these matters.

MAYOR PALMER read a letter from Mr. and Mrs. Roy Edmiston stating the situation with the garbage collectors had been handled in a satisfactory manner. The strikes and protests are getting to a ridiculous point. It was stated in the letter that if anyone had a legitimate complaint, they should voice it in an acceptable, proper, and sensible manner. Since the garbage department employees are getting a raise, they should be willing to accept it as a reasonable compromise.

MAYOR PALMER read a letter from G. B. Shepherd, Jr. concerning a horrifying site at the railroad crossing at the 1000 block of Springdale Road where a train was blocking Springdale from 7:23 - 7:53 A.M. and was moving backward and forward switching cars. A large number of school children were waiting to cross the track. Nineteen children crawled under the freight cars. Twelve were old enough that when they went under, they crawled under the middle of the car, but seven were very young and crawled under right next to the wheels. The train lunged forward missing one small child by inches. The City Manager reported this was being taken up with the railroad company as to the occasion for this blockage and what could be done about the company's providing guards to see that children do not cross under the trains. It is a bad time for this blockage, as the children probably feel if they do not cross under they would be late for school, and the City Manager stated they were very concerned and were looking into it, and had notified MR. HODGES with the railroad.

MAYOR PALMER called attention to a letter concerning a meeting on September 19, for the Annual Meeting of the Community Council of Austin.

September 15, 1966

There being no further business, Councilman LaRue moved that the Council adjourn. The motion, seconded by Councilman Long, carried by the following vote:

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

The Council adjourned at 5:05 P.M. subject to the call of the Mayor.

APPROVED



Mayor

ATTEST:

City Clerk