

Minutes
PARKS AND RECREATION BOARD
October 8, 1979

The Parks and Recreation Board met for its regular meeting at 12:00 noon, Monday, October 8, 1979, at the Parks and Recreation Department. Present were Mr. Garrison, Chairman; Mr. Hall Vice Chairman; and members Mrs. Arnold, Mr. Bray, Mr. Britton, Mr. Coffee, Ms. Doering, Miss Dominguez, Mr. Ramos and Mr. Reed. Members absent were Mr. Nalle and Mr. Shaw. Staff members present included Leonard Ehrler, Roy Guerrero, Don Cramer, David Reed, Bob Baker, Preston Wheeler, Sherry Sybesma, Jo Bright and Louise Nivison. Visitors included Mr. Campbell McGinnis and Mr. Clay Strange, Assistant City Attorney, Legal Department.

The board left the Parks and Recreation Department at 12:10 p.m., and toured the proposed park site located from 911 to 917 East Oltorf Street, extending south to St. Edwards Drive and bounded on the east by Travis High School, on Blunn Creek. The board returned to the Board and Recreation Department Board Room.

The meeting was called to order at 1:05 p.m., by Mr. Garrison, Chairman.

Mr. Garrison asked for citizen communications and items from Parks and Recreation Board members. There were none.

Mr. Garrison appointed Mrs. Mary Arnold as the Parks and Recreation Board liaison to serve with the Environmental Board on the Barton Creek Watershed Growth Management Plan. Mr. Ehrler explained it was his understanding this would also be a committee for other projects. Mr. David Reed explained the committee working on the Barton Creek Watershed Growth Management Plan would be composed of two members of the Environmental Board, two Barton Creek land owners, and one Parks and Recreation Board member. They would be meeting with the Eston Huston Company and the first meeting will be held today at 4:30 p.m., in the Environmental Resource Management Department Office.

Mr. Garrison appointed Mr. Danny Reed to serve with Mr. Nalle, Mrs. Arnold and Mr. Bray on a committee to propose navigation policies for board approval. Mrs. Arnold explained the committee has completed three parts of the proposed policy statement and were presently working on the fourth part.

PROPOSAL FROM THE MCGINNIS FAMILY FOR USE OF A PORTION OF PARKLAND
IN THE SAND BEACH RESERVE ON TOWN LAKE FOR A PARKING LOT

Mr. Garrison stated that Mr. Campbell McGinnis was present to speak to this item. Mr. McGinnis stated that he was present to ask that the board send the McGinnis family proposal to City Council with the notation that approval is not recommended because of board policy. He was asking that this be done in accordance with the same Parks and Recreation Board policy that was used in denying use of parkland in the San Beach Reserve on Town Lake for a parking lot for the Holiday Inns, Inc. Mr. Hall asked why it was being presented to the board if he was asking that the request be denied. Mr. McGinnis explained the board has considered an application for commercial use of parkland as a matter of policy and not as a matter of what the site plan is, and he would like for this recommendation to go to City Council as a matter of policy. If in fact, the City Council decides it has a policy that is different from the policy established by the Parks and Recreation Board, he would like to be able to

come back to the board and present site plans to be evaluated along with any other site plans that might be submitted. Mr. Garrison explained that when the matter was presented to the board initially from the Holiday Inns that it was determined by the board that they would uphold their policy of retaining parkland for park use and this should be the future long-term policy of the board.

Mr. Coffee asked if the proposed water ski lift commercial venture at the east end of Town Lake, planned use of City land for parking purposes. Mr. Ehrler explained there is not a contract on this venture as yet, but City Council did approve entering into such a contract. Mr. Clay Strange, Assistant City Attorney, explained the City Council directed the Parks and Recreation Department staff and Legal Department staff to work out a lease agreement. He has been working with the representative of the corporation. There appears to be a portion of the lease agreement they will not agree to and he has not heard from the representative in quite some time. Mr. Strange explained they have received more information on a like facility in Houston and it would be his recommendation that the matter come back to the board for a closer look at the facility proposed, before a contract goes back to the City Council for final approval. Mr. Garrison asked about the basis of review by the board again. Mr. Strange stated that it would be a similar use such as the Little League use of City land, and the pictures of the facility presented to the City Council do not in any way resemble the one now in use in Houston. Mr. Coffee explained it would be a concession and the waters of Town Lake are really park property. The City has a concession with the operators of the Town Lake Sail-A-Way on Town Lake. The board has a policy direction, but he felt there would definitely be exceptions where we would want to give franchises for uses that would benefit the public recreationally. Mr. Hall stated that this should be only for what the City cannot do itself. Mr. Garrison explained this request was to use parkland strictly for parking. Mr. Coffee stated that he could see the possibility of parkland along Town Lake being used for dining barge anchorage and other usage that in the future would be very beneficial for recreational activities on Town Lake. Mr. Hall explained that what Mr. Coffee was saying was that the board could alter the policy just as easy as they made it in the first place, depending on the circumstances as presented. Mrs. Arnold stated that Mr. McGinnis' proposal was to use parkland for a parking lot in connection with the construction of a hotel, and this was the same request that the Holiday Inns made. Mrs. Isely asked if the board could say they turned down the McGinnis family request if they have not seen a plan? Mr. Ehrler stated that he has talked with Mr. McGinnis over the telephone and also corresponded with him concerning this request. At this point and time the board has nothing to approve or disapprove as Mr. McGinnis has not presented site plans.

Mr. McGinnis explained that the McGinnis family has applied for permission to build a hotel on their property along Town Lake and plan to keep that application on file. The reason they did not submit a detailed site plan was because they felt the board should disapprove the request based on their present policy concerning use of parkland for park purposes. The Holiday Inns appeared before the board and presented two detailed site plans for the board to consider and the board sent their recommendation to the City Council that the request for a parking lot on parkland be denied. He had a limited time frame and did not feel it was sufficient time to prepare a site plan to present to the board to have the board deny the request and send on to City Council as a matter of policy. He will be happy to submit to the board any kind of information desired by the

Parks and Recreation Department pursuant to the application. At the time it is appropriate to submit this information they will do so, but they feel the issue before the City Council at this time is a matter of policy. If the City Council decides they have a policy whereby parkland can be used for other than park purposes, they along with the Holiday Inns, would like to have the board reevaluate their requests on the basis of site plans. They do plan to have site plans available to the City Council when needed. Mrs. Arnold asked if the deed restrictions were found concerning the SandBeach Reserve land. Mr. Strange explained that in the deed from the State of Texas to the City of Austin for the Sand Beach Reserve it stated the area was to be used for public purposes. Although the area has been used for parkland he did not think it has been officially dedicated as parkland.

Mrs. Isely asked what Mr. McGinnis wanted the board to say to the City Council. Did he want the board to deny the request and for what reason? Mr. McGinnis stated that they would like for the board to deny the request because of board policy concerning the use of parkland for park purposes. They are prepared to present a site plan to the City Council when requested.

It was moved by Mr. Coffee and seconded by Mr. Hall, that the Parks and Recreation Board recommend to the Mayor and City Council disapproval of Mr. McGinnis' proposal from the McGinnis family for use of a portion of parkland in the SandBeach Reserve for a parking lot, on the basis that proper plans have not been submitted for review by the board. Mrs. Arnold made a substitute motion that the board disapprove the McGinnis request on the same basis the Holiday Inns request was disapproved, i.e., that the board reaffirm their policy that parkland not be used for purposes other than park use. Mr. Ehrler explained there was nothing to approve or disapprove at this point, as no plans have been presented. Mr. Garrison asked Mr. Coffee if he would like to accept the substitute motion made by Mrs. Arnold. Mr. Coffee stated he would like the board to vote on his original motion. The motion carried with Mrs. Arnold and Mrs. Isely voting no.

PROPOSED ALCOHOL ORDINANCE FOR PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT FACILITIES

Mr. Garrison asked Mr. Clay Strange, Assistant City Attorney, to speak. Mr. Strange stated that the ordinance in the board agenda packet was basically the same as the previous one. Recreation centers are now specifically listed. The only major change is sub-section (c) which gives the Parks and Recreation Department director power to exempt any area in sub-section (b). This would not include the area within any school district/park area adjacent to a school district facility, as this is covered under a State law. He would like comments from the board if they have any concerning the second sentence of sub-section (c) which reads: "In making such exemption decision the director shall consider the impact on the surrounding neighborhood(s), whether the area is one in which there traditionally has been alcohol consumption/or sale with no resultant problems, whether there will be sufficient trash and refuse policing of the area by the person or persons requesting the exemption, as well as any citizen input deemed relevant." Mr. Ehrler stated that he felt that the areas designated as restricted areas should be reviewed annually and the ordinance amended if necessary. Mr. Strange stated that he felt the ordinance would probably have to be amended once each year. He felt there should be a sub-section (d) added to enable the Parks and Recreation Board to annually

review the areas designated.

It was moved by Mrs. Isely and seconded by Mr. Coffee that the Parks and Recreation Board recommend to the Mayor and City Council approval of the proposed Ordinance No. 79, amending Section 24-20, Regulating the possession, consumption and sale of alcoholic beverages in parks and playgrounds, and adding the following sub-section (d):

"(d) The Parks and Recreation Board is hereby authorized to annually review those areas where alcohol is prohibited under sub-section (b) (3) above, as well as those areas which have been periodically exempted under sub-section (c) above. After such review the board shall make recommendations to the director of the Parks and Recreation Department as they may deem appropriate with regard to such future designation of exempted or prohibited areas."

The motion carried with Miss Dominguez, Mr. Hall and Mrs. Arnold voting no.

PUBLIC HEARING DATE FOR NAMING OF THE NORTHWEST RECREATION CENTER

Mr. Garrison stated that the date of October 23, 1979, will be the date set for a public hearing for the naming of the Northwest Recreation Center.

LOOP 360 BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION OVER LAKE AUSTIN

Mr. Ehrler stated that Mr. Lonnie Davis, Director of the Building Department, has offered to give the board a presentation on the bridge construction over Lake Austin. Preston Wheeler, Supervisor of Park Rangers, explained there would be nothing constructed in the waters of Lake Austin and the bridge would be a suspension bridge.

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.