MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Regular Meeting

May 12, 1960 10:00 A.M.

Council Chamber, City Hall

The meeting was called to order with Mayor Miller presiding.

Roll call:

Present: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller 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 REV. JOHN BARCLAY, Central Christian Church.

Councilman White moved that the Minutes of the Meeting of May 5, 1960, be approved with correction noted by Councilman Bechtol. The motion, seconded by Councilman Bechtol, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

MR. and MRS. TOM EASTON, appeared before the Council regarding a final notice received from the Health Department concerning their having a septic tank in use with a sewer line available at 2903 Oakcrest Drive. Mr. Easton stated the trouble was not with the septic tank but with the 18"x30"x24" grease trap. Mrs. Easton stated connection with the sewer would cost between \$450 and \$500, and she could not get an exact price. She complained of an employee trying to get one of her neighbors to file a complaint against her on this septic tank, and then later she heard the charges would be filed on Monday. Dr. Primer, the Health Officer, explained the procedures of trying to get everyone to connect with the sewer when it was available to their property; that this line became available in 1952. Mr. and Mrs. Easton were notified when this tank began to give trouble. Mrs. Easton complained about being required to make this connection with the sewer line, and other people still having septic tanks. She made a complaint about a former city employee conducting an industrial use in a residential neighborhood. The City Attorney explained the history of this zoning case, stating the application for change of zoning to a commercial use was denied; but the industrial use was non-conforming. Mrs. Easton complained

of the dog ordinance. The Council stated it would make a personal inspection of the property she complained about with regard to the non-conforming industrial use.

Councilmen White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption: (RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, there has been submitted to the Building Inspector, the application of William Campbell (Capitol City Athletic Club) for a building permit together with a site plan dated _______ meeting the requirements of Section 10-B, 3 of the Zoning Ordinance of the City, for certain building establishment at 605 West 13th 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 apartment house addition to Capitol City Athletic Club building 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 eight parking spaces; Now, Therefore,

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

That eight (8) spaces is an adequate number of parking spaces for the establishment shown on the site plan of Wm.Campbell (Capitol City Athletic Club) dated May 5, 1960, for use of the premises for the purpose of Apartment house addition to present club building.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Palmer, carried by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the following:

"May 11, 1960

"W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager

Contract No. 60-D-12

"Following is a tabulation of the bids received at 10:00 A.M., Tuesday, May 10, 1960 for the widening with reinforced concrete of the existing bridge on Rosewood Avenue at Chestnut Avenue - Contract No. 60-D-12.

"Maufrais Brothers, Inc.	\$ 5,910.00
Giesen & Latson Construction Co.	7,364.60
Texas Bridge Company, Inc.	13,312.50
Walter W. Schmidt	14,133.30

"City's Estimate

\$ 5,560.00

"I recommend that Maufrais Brothers, Inc. with their low bid of \$5,910.00 be awarded the contract for this project.

"S. Reuben Rountree, Jr. Director of Public Works"

Councilman White offered the following resolution and moved its adoption: (RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on May 10, 1960, for the widening, with reinforced concrete, of the existing bridge on Rosewood Avenue at Chestnut Avenue; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of Maufrais Brothers, Inc., in the sum of \$5,910.00 was the lowest and best bid therefor, and the acceptance of such bid has been recommended by the Director of Public Works 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 Maufrais Brothers, Inc., in the sum of \$5,910.00 be and the same is hereby accepted, and W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager of the City of Austin is hereby authorized and directed to execute a contract on behalf of the City of Austin with Maufrais Brothers, Inc.

The motion, seconded by Councilman Bechtol, carried by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the following:

"Sealed bids opened 2:00 P.M. May 5 & 6, 1960 Tabulated by: O. G. Brush, Purchasing Agent

CITY OF AUSTIN BIDS ON AUTOMOBILES

Bid No. Department	Description of Automobile	Armstrong Johnson Quan.Motors	Capitol Carr Chevrolet Motor Company Sales
8555 W & L Office 8556 Construction Engr. 8557 Water Distribution 8558 Klec.Distribution 8559 Traffic & Trans. 8560 Electric 8561 Recreation 8562 Fire Dept. 8563 Filter Plant 8564 Elec.Distribution 8565 Police Dept.	106"WB 2 Door Sedan 100"WB 2 Door Sedan 100"WB 4 Door Sedan 100"WB 2 Door Sedan 100"WB 2 Door Sedan 117"WB 4 Door Sedan 117"WB 4 Door Sedan 117"WB 4 Door Sedan 117"WB 4 Door Sedan 117"WB 5 Door Sedan 114"WB 2 Door Sedan 4 Door Police Cars Manufacturer	3* \$4,117.00 1 1,571.00 1 1,616.00 2* 2,957.00 1* 1,499.00 1 1,772.00 1 1,772.00 1 1,772.00 1 1,772.00 1 1,772.00 1 1,544.00 30* 48,695.00 Ford & Falcon	1,493.00 1,528.76 1,763.00 No Bid 1,513.00 No Bid 1,763.00 No Bid 1,763.00 No Bid 1,763.00 1,604.63

Charlie Partlow	P.K. Williams Motors	Smith Bros.	Dependable Motors	Low Bidder
No Bid 1,523.30 1,563.80 2,882.90 1,423.30 No Bid No Bid No Bid No Bid	No Bid 1,524.88 1,558.20 2,930.00 1,490.58 No Bid No Bid No Bid No Bid	No Bid No Bid No Bid No Bid 1,802.10 1,652.10 1,802.10 1,802.10	No Bid	Armstrong Johnson Charlie Partlow P.K. Williams Charlie Partlow Charlie Partlow Capitol Chevrolet Capitol Chevrolet Capitol Chevrolet Capitol Chevrolet Armstrong Johnson
No Bid Rambler	No Bid Rambler	55,995.00 Plymouth	52,449.00 Dodge	Armstrong Johnson

*Includes trade-in.

NOTE: Police cars, low bid \$2,389.00 each or \$22,975.00 total net difference for 30 new cars \$48,695.00 or \$1,602.00 each including trade-in.

RECOMMENDATION: Recommend low bidder each bid as noted.

"W. T. Williams, Jr. City Manager"

The Council studied the bids for various cars.

Councilman Perry offered the following resolution and moved its adoption: (RESOLUTION)

WHEREAS, bids were received by the City of Austin on May 5 & 6, 1960, for the purchase of automobiles for use by various departments of the City of Austin; and,

WHEREAS, the bids of Armstrong-Johnson in the sum of \$4,117.00 and tradeins for three 106" WB 2 Door Sedans, in the sum of \$1,544.00 and trade-in for one 114" WB 2 Door Sedan, and in the sum of \$48,695.00 and trade-ins for thirty 4 Door Police Cars, were the lowest bids therefor; and,

WHEREAS, the bids of Capitol Chevrolet in the sum of \$1,763.00 for one 117" WB 4 Door Sedan, in the sum of \$1,513.00 and trade-in for one 117" WB 4 Door Sedan, in the sum of \$1,763.00 for one 117" WB 4 Door Sedan, and in the sum of \$1,763.00 for one 117" WB 4 Door Sedan, were the lowest bids therefor; and,

WHEREAS, the bids of Charlie Partlow in the sum of \$1,523.30 for one 100" WB 2 Door Sedan, in the sum of \$2,882.90 and trade-ins for two 100" WB 2 Door Sedans, and in the sum of \$1,423.30 and trade-in for one 100" WB 2 Door Sedan, were the lowest bids therefor; and,

WHEREAS, the bid of P. K. Williams in the sum of \$1,558.20 for one 100" WB 4 Door Sedan, was the lowest bid therefor; and,

WHEREAS, the acceptance of these 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 Armstrong-Johnson in the sum of \$4,117.00 and trade-ins for three 106" WB 2 Door Sedans, in the sum of \$1,544.00 and trade-in for one 114" WB 2 Door Sedan, and in the sum of \$48,695.00 and trade-ins for thirty 4 Door Police Cars; the bids of Capitol Chevrolet in the sum of \$1,763.00 for one 117" WB 4 Door Sedan, in the sum of \$1,513.00 and trade-in for one 117" WB 4 Door Sedan, in the sum of \$1,763.00 for one 117" WB 4 Door Sedan, and in the sum of \$1,763.00 for one 117" WB 4 Door Sedan, in the sum of \$2,882.90 and trade-ins for two 100" WB 2 Door Sedans, and in the sum of \$2,882.90 and trade-ins for two 100" WB 2 Door Sedans, and in the sum of \$1,423.30 and trade-in for one 100" WB 2 Door Sedan; the bid of P. K. Williams in the sum of \$1,558.20 for one 100" WB 4 Door Sedan, be and the same are hereby accepted, and W. T. Williams, Jr., City Manager, is hereby authorized to enter into contracts with said companies for the purchase of said automobiles.

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

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

The City Manager submitted the recommendation that Unit 60.57, Stevenson Avenue from Pecos Street to Hopi Trail be deleted in the Ordinance declaring the necessity to pave 21 units, Adams Avenue and sundry other streets. Councilman White moved that Unit 60.57, Stevenson Avenue, be deleted. The motion, seconded by Councilman Bechtol, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

Mayor Miller introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE DECLARING THE NECESSITY FOR AND ORDERING THE PAVING AND IMPROVEMENT OF PORTIONS OF CERTAIN STREETS IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, APPROVING PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR SUCH WORK, AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS, DIRECTING THE PREPARA-TION OF ESTIMATES, INVOKING THE ALTERNATE PROCEDURE PROVIDED BY ARTICLE I, SECTION 5 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN AND CHAPTER 106 OF THE ACTS OF THE FIRST CALLED SESSION OF THE 40TH LEGISLATURE OF TEXAS, DETERMINING THAT THE COST OF SUCH IMPROVEMENTS SHALL BE PAID BY THE CITY OF AUSTIN, PROVIDING A METHOD OF REIMBURSING THE CITY OF AUSTIN FOR A PORTION OF SUCH COSTS BY ASSESSMENT OF A PORTION OF SUCH COSTS AGAINST THE PROPERTY ABUTTING SUCH STREETS OR PORTIONS THEREOF TO BE IMPROVED, AND FOR THE FIXING OF A LIEN TO SECURE PAYMENT OF SUCH ASSESSMENTS, STATING THE TIME AND MANNER PROPOSED FOR PAYMENT OF ALL SUCH COSTS, DIRECT-ING THE CITY CLERK TO CAUSE A NOTICE OF THE ENACTMENT OF THIS ORDINANCE TO BE FILED IN THE MORTGAGE OR DEED OF TRUST RECORDS OF TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS, AND DECLAR-ING AN EMERGENCY. (Adams Avenue and sundry other streets) 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 Bechtol, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

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 Bechtol, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

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

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

The Council received the notice of appeal from the decision of the Planning Commission on its decision on approval of plans for a special permit on the W. L. Mayfield Property, 2815-2841 Hancock Drive, and took no action at this meeting.

Mayor Miller introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THAT CERTAIN ORDINANCE PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS, JULY 17, 1941, AND RECORDED IN ORDINANCE BOOK "L" PAGES 152-174, INCLUSIVE, OF THE ORDINANCE RECORDS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, WHICH ORDINANCE WAS AMENDA-TORY OF THAT CERTAIN ORDINANCE ESTABLISHING ZONING REGULATIONS AND DISTRICTS IN ACCORDANCE WITH A COM-PREHENSIVE PLAN PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL APRIL 23, 1931 AND RECORDED IN BOOK "I", PAGES 301-318, INCLUSIVE, OF THE ORDINANCE RECORDS OF THE CITY OF AUSTIN, THE AMENDATORY ORDINANCE HEREBY ESTABLISH-ING THE BOUNDARIES FOR VARIOUS ORIGINAL USE DISTRICTS AND HEIGHT AND AREA DISTRICTS, IN AREAS ANNEXED TO THE CITY OF AUSTIN ON AUGUST 22, 1957, AND TIMES SUBSEQUENT THERETO; ORDERING A CHANGE IN THE USE AND HEIGHT AND AREA MAPS SO AS TO RECORD SUCH DISTRICTS; AND SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF ORDINANCES ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS.

The ordinance was read the first time and Councilman Perry 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 Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

The ordinance was read the second time and Councilman Perry 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 Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

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

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

The City Manager made a report on Mr. Crockett's request to abandon East 55th Street between Airport Boulevard and Middle Fiskville Road. The City Attorney reviewed the zoning of the triangularly shaped property and the Planning Commission's recommendation that 55th Street be opened. He stated that Mr. Crockett had plans to put a \$50,000 building at this location and wants the street closed. He said that the Planning Department still wanted 55th Street opened, but the Traffic Engineer was of the opinion there should not be any opening at all on Airport Boulevard. Even though there were no intersecting streets, there might be privately owned drives that would enter into Airport Boulevard. The City Manager explained the reasons for wanting 55th Street opened rather than 56th Street, as 56th Street was too near the intersection of Koenig Iane and Airport Boulevard, and the grade of the railroad tract at 55th would enable crossing on 55th more easily than 56th. He said the Traffic Engineer's view was to permit the flow of traffic into Airport Boulevard any where would be a mistake; but the Planning Department's recommendation is to have some kind of exit into the street. The City Attorney explained the status of the deed which Mr. Crockett had signed for the opening of 55th Street. Councilman Perry stated there were two advantages to the city by abandoning East 55th: A \$50,000.00 building would be on the tax roll, and no exit into the boulevard which exit the Traffic Engineer thinks would be a hazard; and on the other hand, there would be a cross street into the Boulevard, which others feel would be an asset rather than a hazard. Discussion of development of other property in the neighborhood was held. Councilman Perry moved that since at this time there was not sufficient reasoning for abandoning East 55th Street, the Council not consider doing that until pertinent facts are called to its attention. The motion, seconded by Councilman Bechtol, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White

Noes: None

Not in Council Room when vote was taken: Mayor Miller

The Council discussed the space assignments requested by Southern Union Gas Company for its mains to the Holly Street Power Station. The Director of Public Works displayed a map showing the route of the line. The Council discussed the assignments. The Mayor stated that Mr. Denius, The Attorney, would be over at 1:45, and the Council deferred action until after this meeting with the Attorney.

The Council discussed the lease with the Cerebral Palsy Center. The City Attorney stated that Mr. Frank Rundell had requested a 50 year lease, as they had received federal money through the Hill-Burton Agency for the construction of the building. The Mayor suggested that the lease have provisions that the property can never be used for any purpose except philanthropic and non-profit; and if it were ever abandoned for the use of helping children that the property and improvements revert to the city. Councilman Palmer moved that a 50 year lease be granted on the property on West $28\frac{1}{2}$ Street and Lamar, with all the provisions and safeguards that the property will be used for the purpose the Council has in mind. The motion, seconded by Councilman Perry, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

Not in Council Room when vote was taken: Councilman Bechtol

MRS. L.C. PROCTER appeared before the Council regarding off street parking for her property on West 8th Street between Rio Grande and West Avenue. The Council deferred action until it could make a personal inspection of the area on the ground. Later in the afternoon, Councilman Perry moved the parking arrangement be approved as recommended by the Director of Public Works (head-in-parking) until such time as it becomes necessary to widen the street. The motion seconded by Councilman White, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

At 12:30 P.M. the Council recessed until 2:00 P.M.

RECESSED MEETING

2:00 P.M.

At 2:00 P.M. the Council resumed its meeting.

The Mayor stated this was a continuation of the morning session.

MR. ROBERT SPEARS, President of the Austin Fire Fighters Association, presented MR. TOM PINCKNEY, spokesman for the group. MR. PINCKNEY read the following:

"The Austin Fire Fighters Pay Raise Grievance:

"R. L. Dickerson - Fire Chief Bill Williams - City Manager Mayor Tom Miller & Council Members

"Dear Sir:

"The Austin Fire Fighters are proud of our city. However we have an economic problem, you might say it is a bread and butter problem. This salary plan or readjustment pay scale along with the matter of straightening out our classification is a justifiable request, and hope that you the council will reciprocate after studying our request.

"We know and realize that our city has many financial problems, and it is certainly not our desire to add to the problems, but the fact that we have been through without any salary increases for several fiscal years, even though the cost of living has continued to increase. And all over the nation they have found it expedient to increase the salary of their employees, we the members of the Austin Fire Department prayfully petition your deepest consideration of salary increases in the beginning of this fiscal year, October 1st, 1960. That will bring our base salaries up in line with the classifications that are similar in line with the police department. Plus any additional raises that the police department receives.

"We would like to present the facts to you in order to bring you up to date about what has happened to put our salaries behind, and why we are asking for salary raises, along with a classification justification in line with the police--Plus any additional raises that they receive in the next budget.

"The reason we mention the police scale is that we have a story to tell in regards to how our pay scales got out of balance. This we are going to do without any quarrel or argument with the police. In fact, we only mention them as we have pointed out before is that our fire fighters have a justification raise, plus our classifications being straightened out. We say this in all sincerity, we might add that our firemen voted unanimous to go for the plan that we are presenting to you today.

"We want it plainly stated that the fire fighters are not criticizing any one in the police department from the top man to the rawest rookie. In fact it's just the contrary, we think they are a fine group. But still at the same time we have got to bring out the facts about how the fire fighters got behind in pay scales that are now way below the police base pays.

"When the fire fighters received the 63 hour week in 1955, we did not receive any more pay than we had been receiving for the 72 hour week. Like to add that we did not expect a pay raise along with our hour cut. At this time we received a 9 hour cut in hours.

"The Austin Police at this time were working a 48 hour week. The base pay at this time were the same for the patrolmen and the hosemen. These are the two starting classifications in each department.

"The Austin Police at the time we received the 63 hour week decided to stay on the 48 hour week, and not take an hour cut so they could receive a pay raise. Their patrolmen were raised \$20.00, along with their other brackets being raised accordingly.

"Might mention here that before this took place the policemen and the fire fighters classifications in a lot of brackets were the same, but this is not the picture at the present time, and we want to straighten this matter out.

"Now then in 1959, the Austin Fire Fighters received a 60 hour week. We went from a 63 hour week to a 60 hour week. The fire fighters received a 3 hour cut. In 1959 the Austin Police received a 8 hour cut. They went from a 48 hour week to a 40 hour week. This is equivalent to one day.

"As we have mentioned before: the fire fighters did not receive any pay raise in 1959, when they only received a 3 hour cut.

"The fire fighters didn't say anything about the raise the police got when we received a 9 hour cut. For they certainly deserved the raise and chose to take the raise in place of an hour cut at that time.

"But let us stop a minute and find out what constitutes a working day in the fire department, and a working day in the police department. In the police department 8 hours is considered a day. In the fire department 12 hours is considered a working day.

"When we received a 9 hour cut in hours, that was actually three-fourths of a day cut-off. That is when the police received a raise that we didn't. Now then in 1959 we had a 3 hour reduction, which when you add to the 9 hours we had been cut before makes a total of 12 hours or one day. This is with out any pay raises during the hours cut for the fire fighters.

"In 1959 the Police got a full 8 hour day knocked off their work week. In other words they went from a 48 hour to a 40 hour week. But the point we want you to keep in mind is that we have never received the \$20.00 raise for each classification that they have received, plus the straightening out of their classifications. We also feel that when we received the 9 hour cut we were not entitled to a raise. But when we received the 3 hour cut which makes a total of 12 hours and constitutes a 12 hour day, which is similar to the police 8 hour day. All of the fire fighters should have received this \$20.00 several months ago, plus the straightening out our classifications, which would be some additional raise to the \$20.00.

"As was pointed out earlier we are asking that the fire fighters classifications be straightened out. So in the chart below we are asking for the following base pays for our classifications—Plus any additional raises that the police classifications receive.

"In the chart below we show our present base pay: What base pays we are asking for and what the present police base pay is.

Austin Firemen Present Base Pay	: What we are asking for:	Present Austin Police Base Pay:
Hoseman \$325.00 Driver \$345.00 Captain \$370.00 Dist.Chief \$410.00 Asst.Chief \$470.00	Hoseman \$345.00 Driver \$390.00 Captain . \$440.00 Dist.Chief . \$490.00 Asst.Chief . \$600.00	BasePatrolman .\$345.00 BaseDetective .\$390.00 BaseLieutenant.\$440.00 BaseCaptain\$490.00 BaseDeputy Chief Assist.
Chief \$708.50	Chief \$791.66	Chief \$600.00 Base Chief \$791.66

"We want it clearly understood that we are not comparing personalities, only facts that need to be presented in order to bring our classifications up to the standards that they need to be, and these classifications of the police best describe our position in this matter, for at one time most of the classifications of the police and fire department were the same. We the fire fighters have needed this straightened out for a great many years.

"We want to clarify our position further in this matter to show why we are using the police base pays. For one thing our longevity is the same. Our fire fighters did not want to be selfish in this matter, for if they did they would have asked for our hoseman to be raised to the base pays of some of the following cities:

HOSEMAN:

AUSTIN HOSEMAN:

	\$325.00 Houston \$80.00 Higher
Dallas \$410.00	\$325.00 Dallas \$85.00 Higher
	\$325.00 San Antonio \$35.00 Higher
Ft. Worth \$360.00	\$325.00 Ft. Worth \$35.00 Higher
El Paso \$409.00	\$325.00 El Paso \$84.00 Higher

"From the above cities you can readily see how far our hoseman are behind. If we were selfish about the matter we would be trying to get our base pay up with these cities, which is not the case at all. We are only trying to get our hosemans base pay in line with the patrolmen, along with our other classifications, and any additional raises the police receive. Would also like to mention that some of the above cities the fire fighters will be receiving pay raises in their next budgets.

"We sincerely believe that we are fair and reasonable in using the police pay scales as a guide in bringing our base pays for the different classifications in line. In fact if we were to take the top 10 fire departments in the State and average their base pays for the different classifications it would be a lot higher than the scales set out that we are asking for, in most cases.

"We are going to list the top 10 cities in Texas along with their base pays. As was pointed out above this does not include the raises that a lot of them will be receiving when their next fiscal year begins.

"A lot of times we have been compared with the El Paso firemen and the San Antonio firemen in regards to wages. We would be very happy to take the El Paso base pays for each of our classifications or we would be willing to take the San Antonio fire fighters base pays for our classifications. For either of these two cities would amount to a lot more raise than what we are asking for under this readjustment plan.

"We think our hoseman base pay should be as much as the patrolmen, this applies for our drivers along with their detectives; Our Captains in line with their Lieutenants; Our District Chiefs in line with their Captains; Our Asst. Chiefs in line with their Deputy Chief or Assistant Chief. We go a little further and certainly think our Chiefs pay should be as much as the police Chief. All of the lives and property in this city is entrusted to each of these men.

"Gentlemen we think our grievance is presented to you in a reasonable and fair manner. We the Austin Fire Fighters very humbly ask your consience to deliberate on these requests. We then think you will grant them.

"With best personal regards, I remain,

"Fraternally yours,
(Sgd) R. A. Spears
R. A. Spears - Captain
President Austin Fire Fighters
Association."

"CITY	HOSEMAN	DRIVER	CAPTAIN	DIST. CHIEF	ASST. CHIEF	CHIEF
Houston	1,05.00	425.00	530.00	575.00	850.00	950.00
Dallas	410.00	425.00	475.00	541.00	787.00	1,183.00
San Antonio	360.00	375.00	430.00	η85.00	525.00	790.00
Ft. Worth	360.00	375.00	415.00	οο • 08η	610.00	920.00
El Paso	00°60†	184.00	599.00	680.00	754.00	970.00
Corpus C.	341.00	352.00	401.00	00*191	∞.11.3	670.00
Beaumont	362.00	362.00	383.00	η62.00	260.00	840.00
Waco	300.00	315.00	375.00		425.00	625.00
Amerillo	330.00	360.00	415.00	450.00	1,90.00	625.00
Lubbock	315.00	325.00	365.00		415.00	610.00
Average For the Above Cities Are	369.20	379.80	438.80	517.13	592.70	820.80

"WOULD LIKE TO POINT OUT AS STATED IN THE LETTER. THE ABOVE BASE PAYS WILL BE SUBJECT TO CHANGE IN THEIR RESPECTIVE CITY BUDGETS - BECAUSE THE FIRE FICHTERS IN MOST OF THE ABOVE CITIES ARE IN THE PROCESS OF REQUESTING RAISES - "

He listed hazards that were always encountered. Mayor Miller reviewed the increases and benefits granted the Fire Department since 1955, including a cut in hours from 72 to 63, and pension contribution increase from 3 to 4% of employees' pay in 1955; general increase in 1956; clothing allowance, 1957; longevity increase, 1957; pay increase to cover all employees in 1958; cut in hours from 63 to 60, 1959; and gave the total payroll raises and the added manpower. MAYOR MILLER gave information as it pertained to the Police Department. He said it was very difficult to try to help the firemen; that last year he had worked hard to try to get the firemen to take a nice pay raise and work the same number of hours, but the firemen chose the shorter hour-week. The shorter hourweek cost several hundred thousands dollars more. Before, the fire and police were given an 8-11% increase, and other employees 6%. If these increases are considered, and other employees', it would mean an increase in the tax rate. He stated continous complaints were received about the firemen and their outside work, but the Council had done nothing about that; but should a depression come along, some Council would have to do something about the outside work. The Mayor said if one group had an increase, the others would have to have one too, and this would mean a substantial tax raise. He said if the people wanted the city employees to have this raise, that it will be pointed out to them how much they will have to pay. COUNCIIMAN WHITE told the firemen that if they get a raise, all the other city employees will get a raise; and if the people wanted that tax raise and would foot the bill, the firemen would not have any trouble; but when they get a raise, all of the other city employees would have the same thing. COUNCILMAN BECHTOL stated he had studied this quite a bit; and in the studying he had done thus far, he could not justify an increase this year. COUNCILMAN PERRY stated he had not given this any consideration up to now, and would prefer to study it for a while and give some serious thought before he expressed his opinion. COUNCIIMAN PALMER stated there were so many things to consider -- the fringe benefits are different; different pay schedules, different allowances, and other things, that even though the base pay was lower than other cities, if it were put on a real basis, it would be higher. He said that comparisons with Houston would not be in order, as the living costs were much higher on the coast than in Austin. He said it would be easy to say to turn this over to the people and if they vote for it, all right; but he wanted to study it over. He stated the firemen were now making more than some of these other towns with the clothing allowance, longevity, base pay, etc. He said he could not at this time be expected to make an intelligent statement without analyzing. Mayor Miller complimented the Fire Department, and said Austin had the finest Fire and Police Departments. Brief discussion was held on the painting of the fire hydrants as a duty of the fire-fighters. Mr. Pinckney thanked the Council for giving them its kind consideration.

The City Manager submitted a request of Mr. Ragsdale for permission to construct a radio room on the land he already leases from the City. Mr. Ragsdale wants to construct this building himself, and did not want to pay rent on what he built himself. The City Manager stated the city would have title to the building when the lease expired. Councilman Palmer suggested if it should become necessary to use this area, that Mr. Ragsdale would not claim any damages. Mayor Miller stated that he ought to pay rent after five years. The City Manager said the building would be taxed each year. After discussion, Councilman Bechtol moved that the City Manager be authorized to work out a contract with MR. RAGSDALE for the extension of his present hangar building on the unoccupied area shown on the map. (Map show on following page.) The motion, seconded by Councilman Perry, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

SDALE AVIATION, and

CESSNA SALES AND SERVICE

1831 EAST SIN STREET AUSTIN 5 TEXAS PHONE HO 5 ***

	 ≺ -35′		r-20'-+
100'	FUTURE SURP 3 Resposes Caparistan Ruma PRESENT ANGRE ENGINE SURP	ORIGINAL HANGAR HERA	Lower of Dears
	- 16	New	FACILITIES S.

1 1225 SQ FT.

\$ 1040 SQ FT.

7 2000 SQ FT.

SCALE -2 -30-

The City Manager submitted a further request of Mr. Ragsdale for the use of an area east of the taxi-way from his hangars to the field. Mr. Ragsdale wants to use that area for T-Hangars, and he has submitted a proposal to rent the ground under the same kind of arrangement as he has -- four cents per square foot per year. Mr. Ragsdale did not known how rapidly he would build these hangars, and he would like to arrange to build them as needed and to pay the four cents rental. Councilman Palmer inquired if he would always keep the other hangars that are under contract rented out. The City Attorney said these hangars were on a monthly rental basis. Councilman Palmer also inquired if he would ob-Ligate himself for all of the area. The Director of Public Works said Mr. Ragsdale would build the ramp, taxi-ways and maintain them at his expense, under city specifications. He recommended furnishing the ground for the taxi-way and letting Mr. Ragsdale build and maintain it. After discussion, Councilman Bechtol moved that the City Manager be authorized to enter into a contract with Mr. Ragsdale for future T-Hangars, subject to the provisions suggested. The motion, seconded by Councilman Palmer, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

The City Manager gave a report on the progress of the new Terminal Building. Councilman Palmer said this was an income producing project and should be rushed up a bit.

The City Manager made inquiry as to what should be done with the old terminal building, and gave a report on the Aviation Director's recommendation that the building be removed and the area divided between the fixed base operators with the understanding that each of them construct at his own expense a pilots lounge. The City Manager said that the Aviation Director would have a complete report and recommendation later.

Mayor Miller introduced the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE PERPETUALLY VACATING AND CLOSING TO PUBLIC TRAVEL THAT CERTAIN ALLEY TRAVERSING BLOCK 129 OF THE ORIGINAL CITY OF AUSTIN AND LYING NORTH OF WEST LOTH STREET BETWEEN THE WEST LINE OF NUECES STREET AND THE EAST LINE OF RIO GRANDE STREET, IN THE CITY OF AUSTIN, TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS; RETAINING EASEMENTS FOR SANITARY SEWER PURPOSES ON TWO PORTIONS OF THE ALLEY, AND SUSPENDING THE RULE REQUIRING THE READING OF AN ORDINANCE ON THREE SEPARATE DAYS.

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

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

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

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

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

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

The Mayor announced that the ordinance had been finally passed.

The City Manager read a memorandum from the Director of Recreation regarding the drinking of alcoholic beverages on the Municipal Golf Course. Councilman Bechtol moved that the drinking of beer on any municipal golf course be prohibited as well as the sale of beer, and that this be strictly enforced. The motion, seconded by Councilman Perry, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

The Assistant City Manager brought up the golf-cart question. Councilman Bechtol stated the policy was not being carried out, as quite often there were as many as four in these carts. It was his suggestion that if in the opinion of the Manager of the course, these carts were tearing up the course, that he should be authorized to keep them off. The City Manager asked if the individual would then appeal to the Council. Councilman Palmer asked that the policy be checked to see what was authorized and that it be enforced.

The Council discussed junior golf fees on the Municipal Course in line with the hours they would be in effect. Councilman Bechtol moved to limit the 50 cent fee prior to 3:00 P.M. The motion, seconded by Councilman Palmer, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

The Council authorized the City Manager to write to Mr. Ham, G.S.A.: stating the views on the sites of the new Federal Building.

The City Manager stated Mr. Frank Knight had an option to purchase some property near the airport on Manor Road, and he had told Mr. Knight that the City would like to have the back part of the land, and that he would have it appraised. He said that there would probably be an application for zoning change on this property, should Mr. Knight buy the tract. The Mayor asked that the City Manager find out exactly what is needed and see what he wants and get the value of the land.

Councilman Perry moved that the following requests be approved:

- 1. Model airplane contest at the Airport.
- 2. Parade for the Knights of Columbus.
- 3. Parade for the Civitan Club.

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

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, Perry, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: None

Councilman White moved that the request of MR. R. B. SMITH for a street light in the alley (between 7th and 8th Street, just west of Chalmers) be DENIED. The motion, seconded by Councilman Bechtol, carried by the following vote:

Ayes: Councilmen Bechtol, Palmer, White, Mayor Miller

Noes: Councilman Perry

The Council discussed the sale of some property on Iamar Boulevard. Rental was discussed. The Mayor suggested that if it were not sold in another month, that possibly it should be rented.

The Mayor read letters from the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company, dated April 21, 1960, and September 26, 1959. Councilman Bechtol suggested that these letters be turned over to the City Manager and City Attorney to draw up an agreement for the Council to pass on next week.

The City Manager submitted statistics on the request of the firemen, showing the cost for the number of people working in the Fire Department in the various grades of the requested rates of pay to be \$145,000, an increase of 11%. If all city employees were given a 11% increase, the cost would be \$1,293,600, which would take a 29ϕ tax increase.

The Council discussed a plaque for the Power Plant, which will be named after MR. WALTER E. SEAHOLM. The City Manager stated that also there would be a formal resolution naming the plant.

The Council set Thursday, May 26, 2:00 P.M. as the date to hear the report from the consultant at the Hospital.

The Council received notice from the City Manager that the following zoning applications had been referred to the Planning Commission and set for public hearing before the Council on June 16, 1960:

CONCHO GOVEA
By Simon R. Govea

2301 Santa Rosa

From "B" Residence
To "LR" Local Retail

T. A. FAIREY

5602-5610 Manor Road

From "A" Residence
To "GR" General Retail

DORA E. SCARBOBROUGH By Robert L.Scarborough	3024 Windsor Road 2401-2403 Spring Lane	From "A" Residence To "O" Office
C. H. DRUMMOND	6201 Haney Drive 6208-10 North Hampton Drive	From "A" Residence To "B" Residence
MRS. VIOLA L. LOTT By J.Phillip Crawford	2328-2330 Rosewood Avenue	From "A" Residence & "C" Commercial To "C" Commercial
JOHN STUART HARRIS By Raymond Ramsey	714-716 West 19th St. 1901-05 Pearl Street	From "B" Residence To "O" Office
K. P. CARPENTER	8300 Burnet Road	From "GR" General Retai To "C" Commercial
E. M. CHOTE & WALTER CARRINGTON	2810-2816 Salado St. 2811-2817 San Pedro	From "A" Residence 1st Height & Area To "A" Residence 2nd Height & Area
RAY BROWN BUFORD STEWART By Buford Stewart	1407-09 Morgan Lane	From "A" Residence To "C" Commercial
NASH PHILLIPS CLYDE COPUS, JR. By The Marvin Turner Engineers	2001-05 Wheless Iane	From "A" Residence To "GR" General Retail
CLINT SMALL, JR. By Geo. MacDonald	Tract 1 3201-05 & 3213-21 West 35th and 3422-3428 Scenic Drive	From "A" Residence To "CR" General Retail
	Tract 2 3207-3211 West 35th St.	From "A" Residence To "C-1" Commercial
HERBERT BOHN, et al By F. M. Reed	3707-11 Jefferson St. 1607 West 38th Street	From "A" Residence To "LR" Local Retail

There being no further business, the Council adjourned at 5:20 P.M., subject to the call of the Mayor.

APPROVED JON Milla.

ATTEST:

City Clerk