

CITY OF ALAMO HEIGHTS  
CITY COUNCIL  
February 12, 2024

A regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Alamo Heights, Texas was held at the Council Chamber, located at 6116 Broadway, San Antonio, Texas, at 5:30 p.m. on Monday, February 12, 2024. A teleconference was held via Zoom; staff and meeting attendees were welcomed in the Council Chamber.

Composing a quorum were:  
Mayor Bobby Rosenthal  
Mayor Pro Tem Blake M. Bonner  
Councilmember Lawson Jessee  
Councilmember Karl P. Baker  
Councilmember Lynda Billa Burke  
Councilmember John Savage

Also attending were:  
City Manager Buddy Kuhn  
Assistant City Manager Phil Laney  
City Attorney Frank J. Garza  
Assistant to City Manager Jennifer Reyna  
City Secretary Elsa T. Robles  
Community Development Services Director Lety Hernandez  
Police Chief Rick Pruitt  
Deputy Police Chief Cindy Pruitt

Not attending:  
Director of Finance Robert Galindo  
Fire Chief Michael Gdovin  
Public Works Director Pat Sullivan

\* \* \*

Mayor Bobby Rosenthal opened the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

\* \* \*

*Item # 1      Approval of Minutes*

Mayor Rosenthal asked City Council for a motion on the January 22, 2024 City Council Meeting minutes. Mayor Pro Tem Blake M. Bonner moved to approve the minutes as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Lynda Billa Burke and passed by 4-0 vote.

\* \* \*

*Item # 2      Announcements*

Mayor Rosenthal read the following caption.

**a. COAH Historic Preservation**

City Manager Buddy Kuhn announced, on February 8, 2024, he, Mayor Rosenthal and Councilmember John Savage met with Ms. Kelly Little of the Texas Historical Commission to discuss enhancing and creating stronger preservation warrants allowed by the State of Texas. There was also discussion on becoming a certified local government and the process of creating a Historical Preservation Board. Mr. Kuhn stated staff would bring this to Council in the near future for public discussion.

\* \* \*

*Item # 3      Citizens to be Heard*

No comments made.

\* \* \*

*Items for Individual Consideration*

*Item # 4      Mayor Rosenthal read the following caption.*

**Public Hearing – Planning and Zoning Case No. 433. A request to replat the properties identified as CB 5571A, BLK 8, LOT 29, also known as 227 Rosemary Ave and CB 5571A, BLK 8, LOT 30, also known as 229 Rosemary Ave.**

Community Development Services Department Director Lety Hernandez stated the property owner requests to replat two separate properties into one. The properties are zoned Single-Family A and are located at 227 and 229 Rosemary Ave. on the north side of Rosemary Ave., just west of Buttercup Dr., at the intersection.

Ms. Hernandez stated in June 2022, the property in question came before the City Council and was originally made up of five 25’ wide lots which were subdivided to establish the current two properties. The property owner is proposing to replat and bring the lots back to their original state.

Ms. Hernandez reviewed existing conditions and proposed replat. She stated CPS, SAWS, and Public Works have given approval of the proposed replat regarding potential impact on utilities. The Planning and Zoning Commission considered the request at the regularly scheduled meeting of February 5, 2024 and voted unanimously to recommend approval of the request as presented.

Public notifications were mailed to property owners within the 200-foot radius. Notices were posted on the City’s website and on the property. A legal notice was published in the *San Antonio Express-News*. Staff received three responses in support, one neutral response referencing design and none in opposition.

Mayor Rosenthal opened the public hearing at 5:36 p.m. With no one to speak on the item, he closed the public hearing at 5:37 p.m.

Item # 5 Mayor Rosenthal read the following caption.

**Discussion and possible action on Planning and Zoning Case No. 433, a request to replat the properties identified as CB 5571A, BLK 8, LOT 29, also known as 227 Rosemary Ave and CB 5571A, BLK 8, LOT 30, also known as 229 Rosemary Ave.**

Councilmember Lawson Jessee moved to approve Planning and Zoning Case No. 433 as presented. The motion was seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Blake M. Bonner and passed by 4-0 vote.

**\*\*\*Councilmember John Savage arrived at 5:38 p.m.\*\*\***

Item # 6 Mayor Rosenthal read the following caption.

**Architectural Review Board Case No. 912F, request of Aaron Recko & Cosmo Guido, owners, for the significance review of the existing main structure and compatibility review of the proposed design located at 255 Claywell Dr. in order to demolish 100% of the existing residence and construct a new single-family residence with detached garage**

Ms. Hernandez stated the Single-Family A zoned property is located at 255 Claywell Dr., on the north side between Vanderhoeven Dr. and N. New Braunfels Ave. The applicant requests approval of 100% demolition of existing single-family residence and construct a new single-family residence with a detached garage.

Ms. Hernandez stated the project had previously gone before the Architectural Review Board (ARB) on December 19, 2023, but was tabled for January 2024 to allow the applicant to make some revisions after their compatibility review. Due to the 100% demolition request, the request triggered a significance review. She went over the existing property conditions, existing/proposed site plans, elevations, and roof plans. The proposed height for the main residence is 32ft 11in. She explained the overall garage height had not been provided, but staff would confirm during review. Applicant is proposing brick and lap siding with composition roof.

In terms of lot coverage, the applicant is proposing an increase from 23.2% to 32.4%. A floor to area ratio of .50 is allowed due to the rear access and one-story garage. The applicant requests to increase from .209 to .465. Ms. Hernandez reviewed existing and proposed streetscapes.

Ms. Hernandez stated the applicant has not formally applied for a building permit and a review of plan documents has not been completed by staff for zoning compliance.

The ARB considered the request at their January 16, 2024 meeting and voted unanimously to declare the existing main structure as not significant and recommended approval of demolition as requested and design as compatible.

Public notifications were mailed to property owners within a 200-foot radius. Notices were posted on the City's website and on the property. Staff received one response in support and three responses in opposition.

Mayor Rosenthal asked to hear comments from the audience on this item.

- Mr. Andy Laird, resident, stated he was in favor of the project.

Councilmember Jessee moved to approve ARB Case No. 912F as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilmember John Savage and passed by unanimous vote.

*Item # 7* Mayor Rosenthal read the following caption.

**Public Hearing – Planning and Zoning Case No. 434. A request to replat the properties identified as CB 4024, BLK 20, LOTs south 50ft of 4, all of 5, and north 50ft of 6, also known as 231 Encino Ave.**

Ms. Hernandez stated the Single-Family A property is located at 231 Encino Ave. on the east side of Encino Ave between Mary D and Mayflower. The applicant is seeking to replat three (3) lots into two (2).

Ms. Hernandez reviewed existing conditions, noting there are 2 lots. The property is actually made up 3 full lots and 2 half lots, but the request is only to replat the lots that are facing Chester St. She stated there is a structure that currently straddles the property line.

Staff issued a permit for the demolition of that accessory structure. The applicant provided a site plan identifying the areas to be demolished to include the accessory structure and flatwork. Staff did confirm demolition was done; however, clean-up has not been completed.

Ms. Hernandez reviewed the proposed conditions and stated the proposed replat would establish two equal size lots meeting the required 8,400 square feet. Each lot would be slightly under 15,000 square feet. A minimum width of 60 feet is required and each lot would be 100 feet wide. Demolition of the existing detached accessory structure would be required in order to comply with zoning regulations and prior to release for recordation.

CPS, SAWS, and Public Works gave their approval of the proposed replat regarding potential impact on utilities. The Planning and Zoning Commission considered the request at their February 5, 2024 meeting and voted to recommend approval with the condition to demolish the accessory structure before moving forward with the project.

Public notifications were mailed to property owners within the 200-foot radius. Notices were posted on the City's website and on the property. A legal notice was published in the *San Antonio Express-News*. Staff received no responses in support, twelve (12) responses in opposition from residents within the 200ft radius, and five (5) other responses in opposition from residents outside the 200ft. radius.

Mayor Rosenthal opened the public hearing at 5:46 p.m.

- Mr. Gilbert Mathews, resident, stated he opposed the replat because the replat presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission did not elaborate improvements to the property.

Mayor Rosenthal asked City Attorney Frank J. Garza for his opinion on this point. Mr. Garza explained staff had reviewed the replat and found it met all the terms and conditions of the City's code of ordinances.

With no one else to speak on this item, Mayor Rosenthal closed the public hearing at 5:48 p.m.

*Item # 8* Mayor Rosenthal read the following caption.

**Discussion and possible action on Planning and Zoning Case No. 434, a request to replat the properties identified as CB 4024, BLK 20, LOTs south 50ft of 4, all of 5, and north 50ft of 6, also known as 231 Encino Ave.**

Mayor Rosenthal asked Mr. Garza if he had anything to share on this item before Council discussed and took any action.

Mr. Garza stated in 2019 the legislature took away a lot of authority from the cities in regards to their decisions on replats. In the past, cities were able to deny replats because they "just weren't good for the community". That ability was taken away by the legislature in 2019. He explained, if the replat meets the terms of the code of ordinances, Council has no option but to approve the replat. If it is denied, the City must provide the property owner the specific reasons why it failed to meet the code. He stated, in this case, staff advised in their presentation that the replat met the terms of the City's code and therefore, took away Council's discretion to deny the replat because it met the terms of the city code. Mr. Garza further explained, if denied without cause, the property owner could file suit against the City.

Council questioned why the owner wanted to replat into two lots. Attorney Frank Burney representing owner Lisa Nichols, stated they were seeking to replat the property into two very large lots and stated they met all the conditions and requirements of platting. Mr. Burney noted the demolition of the accessory structure was complete and clean-up was next. He added, fortunately for the City of Alamo Heights, demand is very high for lots to be developed. Not many lots are available and there is a demand in the city for lots this size.

Councilmember Jessee commented he would like the staff to review the code of ordinances in reference to lot minimums because this has been a big issue when property owners request to subdivide lots. He stated in this case the legal ramifications are clear if denied.

Councilmember Billa Burke encouraged everyone to take the opportunity to contact State Representative Steve Allison and voice their concerns regarding these legislative changes in community development.

For the record, Mr. Garza clarified the condition put forth by the Planning and Zoning Commission to demolish the accessory structure had been met and only lacked clean-up. With that explanation, Councilmember Billa Burke moved to approve Planning and Zoning Case No. 434 as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Lawson and passed by unanimous vote.

*Item # 9* Mayor Rosenthal read the following caption.

**Architectural Review Board Case No. 914F, request of Lisa Nichols of Nic Abbey Homes, owner, for the significance review of the existing main structure located at 231 Encino Ave. in order to demolish 100% of the existing single-family residence**

Ms. Hernandez stated the Single-Family A zoned property is located at 231 Encino Ave., on the east side of Encino between Mayflower St and Mary D Ave. The applicant requests approval of 100% demolition of existing single-family residence. She stated due to the 100% demolition request, the request triggered the significance review under demolition.

Ms. Hernandez reviewed the existing survey, property conditions, and streetscape. She commented staff had not received an application for a replacement structure; however, any future construction of a single-family residence would be subject to Compatibility Review by the ARB and approval by Council.

The ARB considered the request at their January 16, 2024 meeting and voted unanimously to declare the structure as significant and recommend denial of the demolition as requested.

Public notifications were mailed to property owners within a 200-foot radius. Notices were posted on the City's website and on the property. Staff received one response in support and eight responses in opposition from residents within the 200-foot radius. Staff received one neutral response and twelve in opposition from residents outside the 200-foot radius.

Mr. Burney addressed the Council and stated Ms. Nichols has been listening to residents' concerns and is open to try to find a solution that works for every one involved. He advised Ms. Nichols is open to delay the demolition for 90 days in order to provide time to work with the community and find solution.

Mayor Rosenthal asked to hear comments from citizens.

- Ms. Claire Alexander, resident, stated she cares about her community and thanked Ms. Nichols for agreeing to delay the demolition to allow time to find a possible alternative.
- Mr. John Joseph, resident, read a brief poem regarding his opposition to the demolition.
- Mr. Gilbert Mathews, resident, stated the case is important to the community and he urged Ms. Nichols to listen to local architects regarding the future of the home in question.
- Mr. Mike McGlone, resident, stated there was no fundamental reason to demolish this house. In his opinion, it was perfectly usable, practical, and every effort should be made to preserve it.
- Ms. Ann McGlone, resident, she wanted to encourage Council and staff to consider historical preservation measures and establish historical districts.
- Mr. Charles Huber, resident, stated he was against demolition and shared the same concerns as the other residents.

- Mr. Lukin Gilliland, Jr., resident, stated he's spent most of his life fighting to maintain the integrity of this neighborhood. He thanked Ms. Nichols for considering a 90 day delay and thanked Council for looking into establishing a historical district.
- Mr. Ted Flato, resident, stated he was thrilled that Ms. Nichols was willing to wait 90 days to work with the neighborhood to hopefully preserve this house.

After a brief discussion, Councilmember Jessee moved to approve a 90-day demolition delay on ARB Case No. 914F. The motion was seconded by Mayor Pro Tem Bonner and passed by unanimous vote.

Mayor Rosenthal stated he didn't want any misunderstanding and explained Council had the ability to delay the project an additional 90 days; however, he wanted the residents to know this would probably not happen. He assured the audience Council would hear the case again between 90 and 180 days.

**\*\*\*Mayor Rosenthal called for a brief recess from 6:23 p.m. to 6:38 p.m.\*\*\***

*Item # 10* Mayor Rosenthal read the following caption.

**Architectural Review Board Case No. 918F, request of Eric Baumgartner of LPA Design Studios, applicant, representing the Alamo Heights Independent School District, owner, for the significance review of an existing academic building located at 6900 Broadway St. in order to demolish 100% of the existing structure fronting Broadway St and Castano Ave.**

Ms. Hernandez stated the property is located at 6900 Broadway, on the East side of Broadway St between E Fair Oaks Pl and E Castano Ave. The applicant requests approval of 100% demolition of existing academic building.

Ms. Hernandez stated due to the 100% demolition request, the request triggered a significance review. She reviewed the existing site plan, property conditions, and streetscape. She noted any future construction would be subject to Final Review by the ARB and approval by Council under Chapter 2 Administration.

The ARB considered the request at their January 16, 2024. During the review, the motion to declare the structure as significant did not receive the four (4) affirmative votes as required per Section 2-48(a) of the City's Code of Ordinances.

- AYES: 3 (Board Member Ashley Armes, Board Member Larry Gottsman, Board Member Lyndsay Thorn)
- NAYS: 1 (Board Chairman John Gaines, Board Member Clay Hagendorf, Board Member Phil Solomon)

Public notifications were mailed to property owners within a 200-foot radius. Notices were posted on the City's website and on the property. Staff received three responses in support and none in opposition from residents within the 200-foot radius. Staff received one response in support and seven in opposition from residents outside the 200-foot radius. An additional four comments were received from residents in opposition; however, staff was unable to determine if they were located within the 200-foot radius.

Architect Sara Flowers of LPA Design Studios, presented on behalf of Alamo Heights ISD. She stated the school was built in the 1950's to accommodate 800 students. At present time, the Alamo Heights High School has 1,600 students currently enrolled. She stated they gathered information to begin planning for a new facility using several methods: facilities assessments & utilization studies, educational visioning session with all campuses, student visioning sessions with all campuses, and community input meetings. The current high school campus is 110,900 gross square feet and proposed is 148,300 gross square feet.

Architect Eric Baumgartner of LPA Design Studios, continued the presentation. He stated the School Board directed them to evaluate the existing building with the understanding that it has a lot of history in the community. He noted the original building was built in 1949 and has gone through several renovations since then. Currently, building does not meet many of the current applicable codes as adopted by the City of Alamo Heights, including the National Energy Code, International Building Codes, and the American with Disabilities Act.

Mr. Baumgartner added during the evaluation of the building, they studied the structural assessment, operational analysis, and site analysis with several professionals in the industry. They explored five different scenarios for this project.

- Renovate the existing building
- Add a third level to the existing building
- Add square footage to the existing building
- Reorganize classrooms in the existing building
- Replace the existing building

The team found structure deficiencies in the building. Classrooms did not meet the District's and Texas Education Agency (TEA) recommended square footages for student count, there is no secure vestibule present, columns in classrooms inhibit visibility, operational & maintenance costs estimated 50% energy use reduction and many systems are nearing end of life.

Mr. Baumgartner stated based on the analysis provided, the AHISD concluded that replacing the existing building is the best use of the community's resources. He continued to present the proposed new development. He stated the footprint of the building will be almost centered exactly at the current location and set back from the AH Mule statue in front of the existing building. He reviewed images of the proposed building utilizing the existing campus brick. The new structure will be three stories and will maintain existing heritage trees.

Mayor Rosenthal asked to hear comments from citizens on this item.

- Mr. Cy Goudge, resident, stated he was in support of a new building for the high school campus. He understood the history of the building, but it was time for a new one. He noted some residents felt they were deceived by the AHISD regarding renovations. He did not agree and added the community was well informed.
- Ms. Sarah Jo LeMessurier, resident and former teacher at AHISD, was in favor of the proposal to demolish the high school and replacing it with a new building. She stated this will send a positive message to the community that cares about the future of its children.
- Ms. Brooke Meabon, resident, stated she was in favor of the new building and she, along with 70% of our community neighborhood, voted in favor of the AHISD



Building bond. She agreed when it makes fiscal, operational, and logistical sense, renovations and preservations hold value, but this is not true in this case.

- Mr. David Hornberger, current AHISD School Board President and member of the Bond Communications Committee, shared he was in support of the changes at the high school. He stated the bond counsel communicated extensively with the community regarding the specifics of the proposed bonds, and especially regarding the possibility of rebuilding the academic structures at the high school. He noted the process had started about 10 years ago with public meetings and steps were taken to overly communicate with the community outlining each bond proposition and noting the need for new academic buildings at the high School.
- Mr. John Joseph, resident, asked if there was an issue about asbestos in the building and what has been done about it.

AHISD Project Manager Mike Hagar responded. Per State law, there are inspections every three years to identify any asbestos in the building and have it removed. Going forward with demolition, any asbestos found in the walls would be abated before moving forward with the project.

Councilmember Jessee stated he appreciated the efforts the school district has gone through to see if this building could be salvaged. In the end, they will add almost 30% square footage. He understood it was painful to lose historic buildings, but noted the district had done everything they could to see if they could save it.

Councilmember Billa Burke asked if anything special would be done to address the frequent ground settling.

Ms. Flowers commented they had engaged a geotechnical engineer to ensure the proper foundation is designed to maintain the potential vertical rise at one inch or less.

After a brief discussion, Mayor Pro Tem Bonner moved to approve ARB Case No. 918F as presented. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Jessee and passed by unanimous vote.

***\*\*\*Councilmember Lawson Jessee left the meeting at 7:30 p.m.\*\*\****

*Item # 11* Mayor Rosenthal read the following caption.

**ORDINANCE NO. 2218**

**AN ORDINANCE ORDERING A GENERAL ELECTION IN THE CITY OF ALAMO HEIGHTS, TEXAS, TO BE HELD ON THE 4TH DAY OF MAY, 2024, FOR THE ELECTION OF THREE COUNCIL MEMBERS FOR PLACES THREE (3), FOUR (4), AND FIVE (5), AS PROVIDED BY THE CITY CHARTER, THE TERM OF SUCH OFFICES TO BE FOR TWO (2) YEARS TERMINATING WHEN THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE ELECTED AND QUALIFIED; DESIGNATING JACQUELYN F. CALLANEN, BEXAR COUNTY ELECTIONS ADMINISTRATOR, AS THE ELECTION ADMINISTRATOR**

**TO CONDUCT SAID ELECTION; DESIGNATING THE POLLING PLACES; DESIGNATING FILING DEADLINES; ORDERING NOTICES OF ELECTION TO BE POSTED AND PUBLISHED AS PRESCRIBED BY LAW IN CONNECTION WITH SAID ELECTION; PROVIDING A SEVERABILITY CLAUSE; AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.**

City Secretary Elsa T. Robles stated she was requesting approval of an ordinance ordering the General Election for the City of Alamo Heights to be held May 4, 2024 to elect three Councilmembers: Place Three (3), Place Four (4), and Place Five (5). The ordinance also designates Bexar County Elections Administrator Jacquelyn F. Callanen as the Election Administrator.

Bexar County conducts both Early Voting and Election Day activities. Other voting opportunities are Ballot by Mail and Curbside Voting by appointment or upon arrival at a polling location. Early voting is April 22nd – April 30th, 2024 with Lion’s Field Adult/Senior Center, and Tobin Library as nearby Early and Election Day polling sites. Alamo Heights City Hall will serve as a polling site from 7:00 a.m. – 7:00 p.m. on Election Day.

Ms. Robles explained Bexar County practices the Voter Center model as approved by the Texas Secretary of State. This allows Bexar County voters to vote at any designated Bexar County polling site during Early Voting and on Election Day. All related Election information is available on the City’s website, kiosk, and in the March & April City newsletters. Election information will also be published in the *San Antonio Express-News* and *La Prensa* on April 10th and April 17th.

The candidate filing period started on January 17, 2024 and will end on February 16, 2024. Any interested candidates have until 5:00 p.m. on February 16th to submit their application along with a \$100 filing fee. There are several qualifications that must be met to apply for the open Councilmember positions. These positions are two-year terms.

Ms. Robles stated elections cost an average of \$3,660 - \$5,000; however, if the general election is cancelled, there will be no cost to the City.

State law requires the City Council to order a general election for city officials. Councilmember Billa Burke moved to approve Ordinance No. 2218 ordering a General Election in the City of Alamo Heights, Texas to be held on May 4, 2024. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Baker and passed by a 4-0 vote.

\* \* \*

Staff Reports

Item # 12 Mayor Rosenthal read the following caption.

**Staff report on potential midblock pedestrian crossing improvement on Broadway**

Assistant City Manager Phillip Laney presented a staff report on a potential pedestrian crossing on Broadway. Per Council’s direction during a Beautification Workshop in November 2023, staff coordinated with City Engineers Freese and Nichols (FNI) to explore options to install a mid-block pedestrian crossing on Broadway. The engineers studied possible locations of crossing and configurations to maximize pedestrian safety and use. There are two configurations recommended for consideration. If Council desires to move forward, the mid-block crossing may be included in 2024 Street Maintenance Program (SMP).

Mr. Laney stated current available crossings are located at stop light intersections, at Blue Bonnet and at Castano. FNI studied to identify the best location to add a crossing between that stretch of Broadway.

The engineers factored in traffic/site conditions, safety, and ease of improvements. The recommended crossing location is Broadway between Rosemary and College. This location is closest to the midway point between the two signal lights, longest distance between side streets or alleys, and has the benefit of having a very wide right-of-way on the east side of the street to install needed infrastructure.

Mr. Laney reviewed the crossing configurations as recommended by the City Engineer.

Technical Considerations (Federal Report)	Alternatives Evaluated by City Engineer
Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon	Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon, without median
Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon	Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon, without median*
Pedestrian refuge island	Pedestrian Traffic Signal, without median*
High visibility crosswalk, adequate nighttime lighting & advance warning signs	Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon, with median
	Intersection Traffic Signal

\* Only two proposals – Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon & Pedestrian Traffic Signal – supported by FNI

Mr. Laney explained the differences between the two recommended options.

a) Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon, Without Median

- 2 pedestrian hybrid beacon (PHB) signals & crossing sign facing each direction on single pole, extends across all 4 lanes
- PHB activated in both directions upon pedestrian activation; timing to cross all travel lanes in single phase
- Traffic would see solid red light in both directions during crossing phase; dark until activated
- Estimated cost \$230,000

b) Pedestrian Traffic Signal, Without Median

- 2 traffic signals & crossing sign facing each direction on single pole, extends across all 4 lanes
- Upon pedestrian activation, traffic signal to cycle from green to yellow to red in both directions; pedestrian to cross all 4 travel lanes in single phase
- Traffic would see solid red light in both directions during crossing phase; green light until activated
- Estimated cost \$230,000

Mr. Laney commented, if Council decided to proceed with this project, it could be included in the FY 2024 \$1M SMP using the dedicated ½ sales tax. The Texas Comptroller confirmed this would be an eligible funding source for a crossing project.

The potential 2024 SMP includes Broadway pedestrian crossing, base repairs & resurfacing for 7 project areas:

- Broadway – Blue Bonnet to Primrose
- Kampmann – N New Braunfels to Austin Hwy
- Ellwood – Cleveland Ct to Austin Hwy
- Arcadia – Cleveland Ct to Broadway
- Marcia – Cleveland Ct to N New Braunfels
- Olmos Dam – City limit boundary to Crescent
- Estes Ave – Patterson to Cambridge Oval

Mr. Laney stated staff desired to finalize the 2024 SMP scope in February. Council may award the SMP contract in May, construction is slated to take place June – August to include installation of crossing infrastructure if approved. He noted there may be potential delays before the crossing will be operational. Mr. Laney asked for Council’s direction on the Broadway pedestrian crossing.

Councilmember Baker stated both options were similar; however, he was concerned with the Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon where the traffic would see a dark light until it’s activated.

Freese and Nichols Engineer Kevin St. Jacques stated he understood the concern and noted drivers are used to behaving in a certain way when coming to a traditional stop light. People are not use to the pedestrian hybrid beacon. It’s dark until it is activated. It starts flashing yellow and finally turns red alerting drivers to a stop. The beacon then goes through a transition zone of doing a flashing red, and people are not quite sure what to do. Pedestrians get the “walk” signal and the “don’t walk” signal, so it is easier for them.

Councilmember Baker commented the City did not have to get approval from TxDOT to install a crossing on this stretch of Broadway. It was up to the City’s discretion on which crossing infrastructure to install.

Mayor Pro Tem Bonner felt the cost was excessive for a crossing beacon and asked if there were cheaper alternatives.

Mr. Kuhn commented the crossing would have to be ADA compliant and the cost would be included as part of the 2024 SMP. He stated these were the only two options recommended and approved by FNI. Mr. Kuhn added staff listened to everything Council requested and asked FNI to look into every possibility to establish this crossing. He reiterated these were the two options FNI are willing to approve for construction. Mr. Kuhn reminded Council this was not an action item, but asked them for direction on how to proceed in order to meet the timeline to include it in the 2024 SMP.

Councilmember Baker stated he like the traditional signal and understood the sticker shock. He added even though the money will be spent in the next few months, Council should see it as a long-term investment because the crossing will be there for decades to come. It would add to the safety of the community, especially when trying to cross a busy street like Broadway.

Mr. Kuhn agreed and stated as part of this is project, FNI did a traffic study during school hours. The number of citations that the police wrote for people that were going 38 miles per hour or more was staggering. FNI took the traffic study into consideration when devising options for the crosswalk. Mr. Kuhn reminded Council the City can use sales tax money to pay for this project through the SMP.

Council agreed to have staff bring this item back at the next Council meeting on February 26, 2024.

\* \* \*

With no further business to consider, Mayor Pro Tem Bonner moved to adjourn the meeting at 7:56 p.m. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Baker and passed by 4-0 vote.

**PASSED AND APPROVED THIS 26<sup>th</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2024.**

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Elsa T. Robles, TRMC  
City Secretary

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Bobby Rosenthal  
Mayor

