



CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
**CENTER CITY DEVELOPMENT
 & OPERATIONS DEPARTMENT**

**Alamo Plaza Advisory Committee
 MINUTES
 Thursday, July 31, 2014
 1:00 P.M. – 5:00 P.M.
 Central Library Auditorium**

Councilmember Diego Bernal	Tri-Chair	Present
Marise McDermott	Tri-Chair	Present
Sue Ann Pemberton, FAIA	Tri-Chair	Present
Howard Peak	1994 Alamo Plaza Study Committee Representative	Present
Ramon J. Vasquez	History/Archeology Representative	Present
Dr. Steve Tomka	History/Archeology Representative	Present
Dr. Sharon Skrobarcek	History/Archeology Representative	Present
Larry L. Laine	State of Texas Designee	Present
Mardi Arce	Federal Government Designee	Present
Frank Z. Ruttenberg	Private Property Owner Representative	Present
Davis Phillips	Tourism Designee	Present
Roger Perez	District 1 Appointee	Present, arrived late
Anthony Edwards	District 2 Appointee	Present
Patricia Mejia	District 3 Appointee	Present
Rudolph F. Rodriguez	District 4 Appointee	Present
Gabe Farias	District 5 Appointee	Absent
Rudi Rodriguez	District 6 Appointee	Absent
Ed Torres	District 7 Appointee	Present
Boone Powell, FAIA	District 8 Appointee	Present
Bill Brendel	District 9 Appointee	Present
Jack Judson	District 10 Appointee	Present

Others Present: Colleen Swain (CCDO), Sarah Esserlieu (CCDO), Lori Houston (CCDO), Mimi Quintanilla (Consultant, Facilitator), Alan Hantman (Consultant, Architect - present via Skype), Shannon Miller (OHP), Christopher Looney (DSD), Steve De La Haya (CVB), Carol Warkoczewski (TCI), Pat Schneider (TCI), Kaye Tucker (GLO)

DISABILITY ACCESS STATEMENT



All entrances to the San Antonio Central Library are accessible to persons with disabilities. Parking is available at the attached parking garage on Soledad Street. Auxiliary aids and services, including Deaf interpreters, must be requested forty-eight [48] hours prior to the meeting. For accessibility assistance, call (210) 207-7268 or 711 (Texas Relay Service for the Deaf).

1. Welcome, call to order by Tri-Chair Marise McDermott at 1:10 pm.
2. Sue Ann Pemberton reviewed a trip to Guerrero, Coahuila, Mexico on July 30. Two committee members attended. The purpose of the trip was to tour the mission sites in the area, the historic downtown, and the river crossing for the Camino Real at the Rio Grande. The mission in Guerrero is close to what the Alamo complex was like in the 1800s. Guerrero is the site of the mission that predates the Mission de Valero, which was located there first.
3. Colleen Swain proposed the committee approve the May and June minutes. Jack Judson made a motion to approve the minutes thus far absent any corrections or changes. Frank Ruttenberg seconded the motion. The committee agreed. The minutes will be posted on the CCDO website along with the schedule, the 1994 study, and other information.
4. Mimi Quintanilla: reminded the committee about the ground rules (see attached slide 1). She discussed the editorial piece the tri-chairs submitted on behalf of the committee on July 22. She reminded the committee of the process (see attached slide 2). Lori Houston further explained that the committee is charged with creating a vision and guiding principles, updating the 1994 plan, and presenting that to City Council. All of that will be embedded in the RFQ. The vision and guiding principles – the committee has examples from HPARC. They talk about sustainability and management. When HPARC went forward, they went further and recommended a management structure to oversee the RFQ and RFP. That is something the committee will want to talk about later on because the committee can't be doing this for three years. She clarified the role of the committee is to help create the RFQ to get a master plan started so when it goes to Council it will be clear what has been done – the vision, guiding principles, and RFQ. Marise McDermott commented that she saw a lot of heads nod and agreed that the management structure is very important. Frank Ruttenberg asked for clarification of the future role of the committee within the management structure. Lori Houston responded that the committee would continue to be part of the oversight and that the committee would benefit from examining how other sites are managed. The committee may want to look at best practices and make a recommendation based on those.

Mimi Quintanilla reminded that the public meeting is August 26th from 6 to 8 pm at the Convention Center in Room 103. She referred to the updated discussion draft of the 1994 plan that had been sent out to the committee prior to this meeting (see attached working document). She reviewed the revised themes for 2014 (see attached slide 7).

Mimi Quintanilla referred to the discussion at a previous meeting: the Alamo is the number one destination point for tourism in Texas, which should be a major consideration in the master planning process. Davis Phillips asked in what context is the Alamo the number one destination for tourism because the raw numbers indicate otherwise. He agreed that it is a significant and critical spot for tourism for Texas and certainly for San Antonio, but visitation numbers indicate that it is not number one. Mimi Quintanilla responded that it was in the 1994 plan and asked Roger Perez to further elaborate. Roger Perez responded that he recalled the data from 1994 indicated the Alamo was number one, but that was 20 years ago.



Diego Bernal responded that perhaps the committee could agree that if it isn't, it should be. Davis Phillips agreed. Marise McDermott recommended making it a goal. Jack Judson recommended calling it the number one destination point in San Antonio. Colleen Swain asked if maybe it's more important than a theme. Frank Ruttenberg cautioned against using 'number one' and recommended instead that it should be one of the top destination points for tourism in Texas to avoid getting into a number counting game. Davis Phillips agreed.

Mardi Arce responded that number one doesn't just mean the visitation number. It can also take into account visitor surveys that reveal that it is the best *quality* experience. She recommended defining 'number one.' Frank Ruttenberg recommended using 'top' to avoid having to further elaborate. Rudolph Rodriguez commented that it is an issue of rhetoric. It simply could be 'one of the most significant' or 'one of the premier destination points for tourism in Texas', or 'one of the most significant in the world.' It keeps the prominence of the statement, but it doesn't need to have that single slot identifier. Davis Phillips and Jack Judson agreed. Rudolph Rodriguez recommended 'one of the premier historic destination points in the world.'

Marise McDermott agreed with the revision and recommended adding the Alamo Plaza Experience. Boone Powell agreed that it's not just the Plaza. Marise McDermott agreed. The committee discussed various terms including 'the Alamo Complex,' 'district,' 'Mission San Antonio de Valero,' and the 'Alamo and Alamo Plaza' with no conclusion.

Davis Phillips asked if the committee's responsibility is the Alamo or Alamo Plaza. Mardi Arce responded that it's the Alamo Experience. Marise McDermott stated that it's an integrated process and asked for Larry Laine's input. Larry Laine agreed that people don't think of the shrine when they hear 'Alamo Plaza.' He recommended using 'complex.' Mimi Quintanilla asked for support for 'the Alamo Experience.' The committee did not support the phrase. Mimi Quintanilla responded that 'Alamo Experience and premier destination' will serve as a temporary place holder. Jack Judson recommended stating 'premier *historic* destination.' Mimi Quintanilla read the revision aloud: 'The Alamo Experience is the premier historic destination point for tourism in Texas.' She asked if the committee would like to use the qualifier 'for tourism.' Davis Phillips agreed. Mimi Quintanilla asked if it should be in the vision or if it is a guiding principle. Jack Judson responded that it should be a theme. Marise McDermott responded that it should be part of the vision.

Mimi Quintanilla recommended moving on and revisiting the question during the discussion of the vision statement. She directed the conversation to review the primary and secondary goals the committee identified. In the themes and goals, primary was about impact. Secondary was about long-term strategy. She reviewed Theme A and the revised goals (see attached slide 10).

Boone Powell asked for clarification of the terminology 'mission-towns.' Steve Tomka responded that the more recent language talks about the fact that the mission itself was an Indian pueblo, and that the term 'pueblo' comes from the way the Spanish referred to it. He acknowledged that the settlement of the area north of the Rio Grande still consisted of the presidios, the missions, and the



civilian pueblos. In San Antonio the presidio is just looking at population centers rather than military as well.

Mimi Quintanilla moved on to Theme B (see attached slide 11). Referencing the previous meeting, Mimi Quintanilla asked whether the term from the 1994 plan 'self-determination' is what the committee wanted to use, or whether the word 'determination' was more appropriate. Jack Judson recommended 'self-determination.' No other comments were made.

Mimi Quintanilla reviewed Theme C (see attached slide 12) and the goals. Davis Phillips and Mardi Arce agreed with the language of the theme. Jack Judson cautioned against being too broad in the goals. Sue Ann Pemberton responded that it puts things in context. Mardi Arce responded that the context is to the other missions. Jack Judson stated that it's too far. Mardi Arce recommended adding the relationship to the other missions to the sub points along with the Camino Real, the ranching, farming, etc. Sue Ann Pemberton agreed that it could be related to more things.

Diego Bernal commented that the second goal seems like a summary of the first goal and that it would be very difficult to demonstrate how it looked through all periods of history. It seems the first one lists all of the things whereas the second is saying to interpret the way it became. Mimi Quintanilla clarified that the committee wanted a lot of detail included under each of the goals. She suggested taking the listing – Campo Santos, La Villita, the relationship to the other missions – and put them as bullet points under the goal to make sure they are included when that goal is turned into an interpretive strategy to deliver information to the visitor experience. The committee agreed.

Mimi Quintanilla raised the issue of accurate scholarship and history, saying that it has become apparent that the committee needs a solid academic to write an historic overview of the 300+ years of the area to pull all those histories together and to include the new scholarship and language over the past 20 years. It would help not only for the committee but also to inform the RFQ and RFP so the master planning team will have the necessary background information. The committee agreed. Marise McDermott recommended Dr. Andres Tijerina for his military background and his background in south Texas. Sue Ann Pemberton agreed. Mimi Quintanilla asked for any other recommendations. No committee members responded.

Mimi Quintanilla moved on to reviewing Theme D (see attached slide 13). Mardi Arce requested to settle on the theme because it seems to repeat previous themes. Marise McDermott agreed recommending that this theme should be specifically related to Alamo Plaza as the others pertain to the larger story of the Alamo. She recommended removing the words 'cultures' and 'story' because it's more about the physicality of the space. Mimi Quintanilla recommended using 'the role of Alamo Plaza.' Marise McDermott agreed with the change. Mardi Arce asked about the wording in the 1994 plan for Theme B. Mimi Quintanilla responded that it was 'this hallowed ground: Alamo Plaza.' Mardi Arce responded that the two goals are very distinctive from everything else, but it's not about hallowed ground anymore. Ramon Vasquez recommended using the term 'hallowed ground' from 1994. There was a general lack of support because 'hallowed ground' refers strictly to the Alamo and the shrine, and



it only honors those that died inside the walls. It disrespects people that died all around the area and is offensive to the descendants of those that died on the other side of the battle.

Mardi Arce recommended using the phrase ‘a place of remembrance’ from the 1994 plan. Mimi Quintanilla asked for support for using ‘Remember and recognize the role of Alamo Plaza as a place of remembrance.’ Ramon Vasquez recommended against separating the shrine from the Plaza. Mardi Arce agreed and recommended removing the word ‘Plaza.’ Ed Torres recommended including ‘a tribute to those who have fallen.’ Roger Perez recommended removing the word ‘role.’ Mimi Quintanilla rephrased ‘Recognize the Alamo Plaza as a place of remembrance.’

Anthony Edwards recommended the phrase ‘fought and died there’ because there were those who died, and those were those who escaped. The phrase gives a lot more latitude to include the truth of knowing exactly what happened. Ramon Vasquez recommended the phrase ‘lived, fought, and died’ because there were many families that were not associated with the battle. He repeated the request to remove the word ‘Plaza’ because it’s not just about the Plaza, it’s about the remains buried inside the shrine and the remains that are buried outside in the Plaza. Mimi Quintanilla rephrased ‘recognize the Alamo.’

The committee discussed more terms to refer to the site including ‘the Alamo and the Plaza,’ ‘the Alamo and the Alamo grounds,’ ‘the Alamo Compound,’ or whether it should be broader than that. Mimi Quintanilla rephrased ‘recognize the Alamo and the Alamo Complex as a place of remembrance.’ Marise McDermott recommended adding ‘a tribute to those who have fought and died.’ Mardi Arce recommended ‘the Alamo is a place of remembrance’ as the theme. Then the goal could be to recognize that people fought and died in the whole area, people lived in the whole area, or whatever else. The committee agreed. Mimi Quintanilla recommended that each table take five minutes to discuss among themselves the goals under the new theme.

The committee took a few minutes to discuss the goals and wrote down ideas.

Mimi reviewed the themes once more. Steve Tomka recommended adding the word ‘cultural’ to Theme D so it would read ‘the Alamo is a place of cultural remembrance,’ so Goal 1 could be removed. The committee disagreed with this change. Mimi Quintanilla read a written suggestion from a committee member for the theme: ‘the Alamo: a tribute for all who lived, fought, and died.’ Rudolph Rodriguez asked for other suggestions. Frank Ruttenberg noted the committee was divided and asked the committee whether this theme is intended to focus solely on the Battle of the Alamo or if the ‘remembrance’ part is committed to the fight for independence *and* the battle. Ramon Vasquez responded that the discussion at his table was that it is more than the Battle of the Alamo – it is about all of the cultures that shaped San Antonio. Mimi Quintanilla referred back to Theme B as being about the battle and reminded the committee that the master planner will not be taking the themes as independent from each other but rather as interrelated parts of a whole. Marise McDermott responded to Frank Ruttenberg’s question stating that the themes already reflect the role of the battle, the cultures, and the development of architecture, but they do not yet address the Plaza’s relationship to the bigger story. For example, ‘the tribute to the Alamo’ is bigger than the Plaza but the tribute could take place in the Plaza.



Rudolph Rodriguez stated that when people hear “the Alamo” they immediately think of the battle and recommended adding the word ‘mission,’ so that it would be ‘the Alamo Mission is a place of remembrance’ to include the battle and to open it up to the wider community. Marise McDermott agreed. Jack Judson disagreed. Ramon Vasquez discussed the cemetery and the importance of the descendants of those buried at the site. He supported Rudolph Rodriguez’s suggestion.

Mimi Quintanilla brought up some table conversations she had heard indicated that the primary draw to the site is the Battle of the Alamo and that is getting lost in the inclusivity. Rudolph Rodriguez asked Ramon Vasquez whether the most significant event in the history of the site is the Battle of the Alamo. Ramon Vasquez responded that it is significant but disagreed that it is *the most* significant; it was one battle of many. Rudolph Rodriguez asked whether the most significant thing for the work of the committee is the Battle of the Alamo. Ramon Vasquez responded that the battle is what is most recognized because the rest of the history hasn’t been. Now is the opportunity to be inclusive of the story including the cemetery and the living descendants. Rudolph Rodriguez responded that those elements are essential in telling the whole story, but that the Battle of the Alamo is the most significant single event. Mimi Quintanilla asked for clarification, whether it is the most recognized or significant. Rudolph Rodriguez responded that it is both – that it is the most well recognized event worldwide, but he encouraged telling the balanced story. The 1836 Battle of the Alamo is the reason the committee convened. Ramon Vasquez stated that the committee convened to look at the 1994 study and to revisit some concerns. The committee didn’t convene simply because of the Battle of the Alamo.

Diego Bernal commented that those two concepts don’t necessarily contradict each other. The Alamo is well known worldwide because of the battle, but that’s not all it needs to be. The committee’s goal is to recognize both of those things at the same time. He acknowledged Ramon Vasquez’s comments and said that his point was understood and well taken. He explained that Rudolph Rodriguez’s point was to not dismiss the reason this site is known across the globe, and the committee’s challenge is to recognize the first part without minimizing its meaning in the lives of the people and the cultures. Rudolph Rodriguez responded that it is a more complete and greater story when the other stories are included. Jack Judson agreed. Davis Phillips acknowledged that most people come because of the battle and while presenting context is important, visitors ultimately come for the battle. The battle shouldn’t be lost as one point in the time continuum.

Anthony Edwards noticed that the themes are not chronological. He requested a reorganization.

Mardi Arce commented that not all themes are interpreted equally in interpretive planning. Some themes lend themselves to different forms of interpretation. The Battle of the Alamo is what people know, and that can be the tool used to tell the rest of the stories. Themes aren’t a timeline, themes are different ideas. Ramon Vasquez responded in terms of the visitors, locals need to be a part of it. Diego Bernal discussed that the committee should not get too myopic. He reflected back at the themes and noticed that it is balanced nicely: the battle is given its proper due but other parts of the Alamo before and after the battle are all there.



Mimi Quintanilla thanked the committee for the candor and the passion of the committee. The committee discussed refining the goals under theme D (see attached slide 13). Bill Brendel commented that the discussion at his table was that Goal 1 and Goal 2 are very similar and that Goal 2 is better. He also recommended replacing ‘appropriate’ with ‘respectful’ or ‘reverent’ in Goal 3. Mimi Quintanilla asked the committee for support for replacing the word ‘appropriate.’ There was no support. Bill Brendel commented that the third goal simply restates the theme and is unnecessary. Sue Ann Pemberton expressed that Goal 3 has two different ideas and that Goal 3 and Goal 4 should be combined to say ‘Alamo Plaza shall be a place of remembrance and provide background and context for the fight for self-determination.’ Goal 4 could then be ‘Alamo Plaza shall serve as an appropriate gateway or entry point.’ Boone Powell expressed that a gateway is a physical goal that should be placed elsewhere, not under ‘remembrance.’ Sue Ann Pemberton agreed and again recommended to combine Goal 3 and Goal 4. Bill Brendel suggested removing ‘Alamo Plaza shall be a place of remembrance’ because that is the exact phrasing of Theme D. Mimi Quintanilla rephrased ‘Alamo Plaza shall provide a background for the fight.’ Sue Ann Pemberton reminded the committee that Rudolph Rodriguez’s idea of adding the word ‘mission’ for it to read ‘the Alamo Mission’ and recommended considering it. Rudolph Rodriguez restated that it would be more inclusive.

Boone Powell recommended changing ‘will be’ to ‘shall be’ or ‘must be’ to be more definitive. The committee agreed.

Mimi Quintanilla recognized a written committee request to change Goal 1 to state ‘recognize all cultures and events that have contributed to the history of the Alamo Plaza site.’ There was no response from the committee. Sue Ann Pemberton recommended ‘Alamo Mission as a place of remembrance’ as it includes everything inside and outside of the wall, before, during, and after. Mimi Quintanilla reviewed the goals under Theme D once more. Sue Ann Pemberton and Rudolph Rodriguez recommended removing the word ‘remember’ from the first goal. The committee agreed. Sue Ann Pemberton recommended changing Goal 2 to state ‘regard Alamo Plaza with reverence.’ Boone Powell and Rudolph Rodriguez agreed. Mardi Arce stated that the committee needs to agree on how to refer to the site consistently.

The committee took a ten minute break.

5. Mimi Quintanilla reviewed the purpose of a vision statement and the guiding principles (see attached slide 17). She asked the committee what the Alamo Plaza aspires to be and used the HemisFair Park vision statement as an example (see attached slide 18). She presented a rough draft vision that Alan Hantman put together for the committee to fine tune (see attached slide 19). Bill Brendel recommended changing ‘reinterpretation’ to ‘interpretation.’ Davis Phillips encouraged that the vision statement should be concise. Mimi Quintanilla agreed that it is the 30,000 foot perspective and that it should be a concise way to express major goals and strategic objectives. Mimi Quintanilla gave the committee five minutes to discuss in small groups what the vision statement should look like.

Mimi Quintanilla asked each table to share thoughts on the vision statement with the group. Steve Tomka recommended ‘to be a historical premier experience that is sensitive to the San Antonio

community.’ Marise McDermott recommended ‘to expand the Alamo Mission experience by creating immersive experiences of the stories, people, and sacrifices through physical and interpretive transformation.’ Sue Ann Pemberton recommended ‘remember, interpret, and honor the history of Mission de Valero.’ Davis Phillips recommended ‘to ensure the relevance, preservation, and interpretation of the Alamo grounds for the people of today and tomorrow.’ He explained that he used the word relevance because trends in tourism and visitation to historic sites are declining because younger people are not getting engaged. He recommended that the master plan will have to engage the 8-year-old, the 16-year-old, and the 38-year-old mom and dad. This will have to be done differently to engage the visitors so that young people are no longer bored and uninterested. Bill Brendel suggested adding ‘to provide high-quality, interesting and meaningful experiences at the Alamo for San Antonians and visitors.’

Mimi Quintanilla summarized that the proposed vision statements include who the site is for and asked for key words to be included, such as ‘interpretation.’ The words ‘immersive,’ ‘relevant,’ ‘engaging,’ ‘reverence,’ ‘multicultural,’ and the phrase ‘evolution of the site’ were discussed. Marise McDermott agreed that the physical transformation is important. Mimi Quintanilla asked if it should be ‘evolution of the site’ or ‘evolution of the community.’ Sue Ann Pemberton supported ‘evolution of the community.’ Davis Phillips encouraged that the vision statement should be as simple and concise as possible. Mimi Quintanilla read aloud written feedback from a committee member: ‘through uniting the Alamo’s history, provide a coherent and comprehensive story for all visitors.’ There was no support for this recommendation. Mimi Quintanilla offered to combine all ideas for the vision statement and to send them to committee members in order to have a discussion at the next meeting.

6. Mimi Quintanilla reviewed the purpose of guiding principles (see attached slide 20) and explained they serve as core values that guide the compass of the project and the organization. She reviewed the guiding principles of HemisFair Park as examples (see attached slides 21 through 23). Mimi Quintanilla pulled from previous discussions and drafted some guiding principles for discussion (see attached slide 24). Frank Ruttenberg asked for clarification of ‘access and inclusion.’ Mimi Quintanilla responded that access refers to physical and intellectual access. Previous discussions have included the physical issues with curbs, the multilingual accessibility of information, seating, transportation, etc. Steve Tomka recommended including something about the scale of interpretation to be expected – the Battle is not limited to the Alamo Complex. Diego Bernal commented that it is important to include how physically different the committee expects the area to be compared to the way it is now. Mimi Quintanilla agreed that it is important to include that the Battle of the Alamo provides the opportunity to tell the whole history. Steve Tomka replied that the physical demarcation will be a challenge as the battle itself incorporated a much larger area than the downtown site. Marise McDermott agreed and added that the vision is an ideal while the guiding principles outline *how* it is going to happen and discussed the importance of a sustainable leadership structure.



Rudolph Rodriguez added to Steve Tomka's comment: whether the master planner should be limited to a certain area or whether it should be left to the master planner to define the site. He asked if that decision is up to the committee. Marise McDermott asserted it is.

Ramon Vasquez asked what effect that would have on the commercialism in the area. He acknowledged that the committee hasn't yet discussed the topic. Mimi Quintanilla agreed that the topic needs to be discussed further referencing Marise's McDermott's discussion of the level of preservation, sustainability, and the management structure. Davis Phillips commented that the management under one entity will be difficult with a divided baby – the Plaza cannot be separated from the Alamo, and that if this cannot be addressed it will accomplish nothing. The committee agreed. Diego Bernal added that it could be an entity comprised of a group of people. He also repeated his previous statement that the site in front of the Alamo and the surrounding area should be physically drastically different – that the master planner will be charged with completely reinventing the area.

Davis Phillips asked whether that would include taking down buildings. Diego Bernal responded that the committee has not agreed upon specifics, but that the reason the committee's charge is to make it better than it is. Davis Phillips agreed but cautioned that it should not be a blank license to take down four blocks of downtown. Sue Ann Pemberton asserted that it is a design issue not a philosophical issue. Boone Powell asked about the term 'preservation' and whether that is the goal. He proposed balancing 'preservation' with a word that suggests opportunity, perhaps 'reinterpret' or 'redevelop.' Sue Ann Pemberton and Ramon Vasquez agreed. Colleen Swain agreed that there are a variety of structures to which 'preservation' could apply. She agreed with Sue Ann Pemberton that the details will be vetted through the master planning process.

Davis Phillips asked for clarification of the role of the committee through the master planning process. Colleen Swain responded that the committee will serve in an oversight capacity that will guide the process. Frank Ruttenberg suggested the possibility of a public-private partnership in which there is governmental participation as well as private sector involvement that operates under a nonprofit. Colleen Swain responded that the committee does not need to decide the details of the management structure, but does need to decide whether it should fall under the management of one entity or as it continues to be managed today under divided leadership. HemisFair's decision was to incorporate sustainable leadership as a guiding principle, which may serve as a good model for this process. Frank Ruttenberg responded that deciding whether the private sector will be involved or whether it will be only publicly managed is a key decision that needs to be made. Davis Phillips agreed. Steve Tomka asked whether there is a discussion to involve the federal government. Marise McDermott disagreed with involving the federal government. Mardi Arce stated that at one time it was normal for the federal government to get involved with sites like these. However, she stated that it would not work now. Steve Tomka stated there must be substantial financial means to offer the private property owners a sufficient amount to allow for an exchange of property that would promote thinking on a grander scale. Rudolph Rodriguez stated that he fully supports Frank Ruttenberg's idea of having a public-private authority that oversees the site. He expressed concern that he does not wish to limit the thinking of the



master planner or designer and that before a management structure is decided, the committee has to decide what exactly they will be managing. He encouraged broad thinking that is realistic to ensure the best end result.

Diego Bernal reminded the committee that they will provide the master planner with guidance, and there will be elaborate involvement with the committee and the public. He referred to HemisFair's process as a good model and agreed that the management structure will come later. Mimi Quintanilla reviewed Theme C (see attached slide 12) and noted that it seems to be in conflict with razing historic structures. Rudolph Rodriguez stated that it must be weighed against the importance of the Battle of 1836. Frank Ruttenberg stated that while HemisFair serves as a good model, the two projects are vastly different. What might work for this site might require a long-term evolution of the area over time. Davis Phillips requested clarification of what the master planner will be proposing, whether it only involves the space the City controls or if it will also incorporate the Alamo grounds and the surrounding area. Colleen Swain responded that the City can only design the space it owns but that it should be compatible with the State. Diego Bernal stated that the two parts will have to correspond. Marise McDermott asked for Larry Laine's input. Larry Laine responded that the State doesn't generally like to be a co-investor and a limited partner but would prefer to be a general partner. He explained that it would behoove both entities to work together in a combined management structure. Davis Phillips recommended getting the management structure worked out first in order to work on the whole space together. Diego Bernal respectfully disagreed because the committee has to recognize the decades of inactivity. The purpose of the committee is to do as much as it can with what it has. Then others will recognize the seriousness of the effort and agree that it is time to change. Marise McDermott asked that in terms of the guiding principles, should the committee be considering the whole thing or just the Plaza. Diego Bernal responded that the master planner should anticipate collaboration.

Mimi Quintanilla explained that she would compile the input from today's meeting and update the draft update plan for discussion at the next meeting.

7. Colleen Swain acknowledged a request from a committee member to show Gary Foreman's Alamo Plaza Project video called Alamo Plaza: A Star Reborn. It presents a vision for the Plaza to stimulate a discussion among committee members and to aid the guiding principles.

(<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3WjFjnpHx3s>).

Frank Ruttenberg asked about the ability to use the Federal Building. Colleen Swain responded that there were \$70 million of improvements on the building and it is highly unlikely they would give up the building. Roger Perez responded that the long term goal is that the federal courts will end up in the old San Antonio Police Department (SAPD) lot, where the intent is to build the courthouse. Colleen Swain responded that they would relocate their operations at HemisFair plus other operations at the former SAPD site. From current conversations with people at GSA, they intend to use [the Federal Building]. The other building is subject to federal appropriations, which is a long-term process. Mardi Arce responded that the goal within the federal government now is to reduce the amount of leased space it has. Because of this, office space is being consolidated into any federally owned buildings. She

explained that even if some offices were to move out of the building, it is likely that other offices would move in because that is the long-term strategy.

Colleen Swain repeated that in her conversations regarding facilities planning, it seems that nothing has been appropriated for the SAPD site yet. Rudolph Rodriguez proposed that perhaps a portion of the building could be used as an interpretive center or museum. Colleen Swain stated the video was likely developed before the building renovations and asked the committee whether a similar interpretive center could be located elsewhere if it's not possible at the Federal Building.

Bill Brendel recognized that the idea in the video would be incredibly expensive but looked at what is possible without considering private property owners and the Federal Building. The video presents a leveled platform, a redefined the entrance to the original compound, more places of shade, and interpretive elements. However, the video skips the Gibbs building, the Emily Morgan, the Crockett Hotel, the Menger, and doesn't take into account the far-reaching ramifications for traffic flow. Colleen Swain responded that some of the things Bill Brendel listed can be captured in the guiding principles. Bill Brendel responded that the main idea in the video is to reclaim the entire footprint, which is almost impossible to do. Colleen Swain responded that the master plan will have to be phased and the \$1 million from the bond will likely only result in a master plan. In order to move forward, she suggested a future bond or fundraising would be appropriate. Diego Bernal stated that he is planned on asking for some of the streetcar money for Alamo Plaza. Colleen Swain explained that it is important to decide what is important to do first and money will have to be raised in addition to government funds. Diego Bernal agreed that getting the private sector, city, state, and federal resources will be important to get this going.

Sue Ann Pemberton commented that the video contradicts the committee's discussions for the past few meetings. It presents a movie setting that eliminates a lot of reality and adds a fountain and parkway in the middle that is not authentic. She explained that they weren't defending that particular building; they were defending the people outside of the space. Reconstruction sets a false sense of history that is not authentic. She stated that she and Gary Foreman have disagreed and that if he really wanted to be authentic he would have to take the parapet off of the building. Mardi Arce agreed that if he wants to be authentic, the Federal Building would need to be removed. Boone Powell agreed. Sue Ann Pemberton restated that it goes against what the committee has been discussing for weeks.

Colleen Swain suggested that this could be captured in the guiding principles – what is to be preserved and what the space is. Mimi Quintanilla responded that this is a well-done video done by a private citizen who is very passionate about the story. It demonstrates what most people know and cling to. It is important to acknowledge that story as it is so important to people. This is an opportunity to put the story into context and to broaden the information available.

8. Mimi Quintanilla thanked the committee. Meeting adjourned at 5:03 pm.

ATTACHMENT 1
PowerPoint Presentation

Ground Rules

- All comments are good and will be considered
- Focus on the topic of discussion and the task
- Be clear and concise in making your comments and expressing your thoughts
- Be a good listener and respect all points of view– listening does not require agreement
- Avoid talking while others are speaking
- Respect agreements about time
- Conversations and challenges are a part of the process
- **Tri-Chairs or Staff will speak for the Committee**

Process

- Discussions at meetings are between the committee members and consultants and include staff as requested by the Tri-Chairs
- The Public Meeting on August 26 is the opportunity for comments and input by the public
- Based on public input, Committee will refine and revise Vision and Guiding Principles for inclusion in the RFQ
- Presentation to the Quality of Life Committee
- Presentation at City Council B Session
- Presentation to City Council for consideration of recommended 1994 updates, Vision, Guiding Principles and Request for Qualifications.
- Issue RFQ and then RFP
- Master Plan team to be identified in 2015
- Committee provides general oversight of the development of the master plan selection process and makes recommendations for completion

Communications

- All meetings are open to the public
- A quorum consists of a simple majority.

For More Information

If you would like more information contact:

Colleen Swain, Assistant Director
Center City Development and Operations Department
210.207.4089 or Colleen.Swain@sanantonio.gov

Sarah Esserlieu
Center City Development & Operations Department
210.207.0108 or Sarah.Esserlieu@sanantonio.gov

Public Meeting

August 26
6:00 pm – 8:00 pm
Convention Center
Room 103

1994 Plan Update

Discussion Draft

Themes

Goals

Philosophy

Updated Themes

- A) The evolution of settlements and cultures at Alamo Plaza
- B) Tell the story of the 1836 Battle of the Alamo
- C) Alamo Plaza represents a continuum of urban development and commerce in San Antonio
- D) Remember and recognize the cultures that have played a role in the Alamo Plaza story

1994 Theme D

Alamo Plaza: The # 1
destination point for tourism
in Texas

Include as a major consideration in
the Master Plan process

Primary and Secondary Goals

Primary - Impact

Secondary - Long-term strategy

Theme A

The evolution of settlements and cultures at Alamo Plaza

1994

Goals

2014

- To tell the story of the environment and the Native Americans
- To tell the story of the Spanish Settlement, including the three types of towns: the Mission-Led Indian Town, the Soldier/Settler Town, the Civilian Town
- To tell the story of the Mexican/Anglo American Settlement and the coming of the Revolution

- Tell the story of the environment and the Native Americans
- Tell the story of the Spanish settlement, including the three types of towns: the Indian-Led Mission Towns/Pueblos, the Soldier/Settler Town, the Civilian Town
- Tell the story of the Mexicans, the settlement by Americans and other Texian immigrant cultures, and the coming of the Revolution

Theme B

Tell the story of the Battle of the Alamo

Goals

1994

- Tell all sides of the military story
- Tell the politics of the Texas Revolution
- Tell the local population reaction and participation in the battle
- The geography of the battlefield
- Tell the story of the 1836 Battle of the Alamo
- The Battle of the Alamo as a symbol

2014

- Explore the politics of the Texas Revolution
- Provide background to set the stage for the Battle: September 1835 to February 22, 1836
- Provide ways to understand the geography of the battlefield site
- Be inclusive in telling all sides of the military story
- Tell the story of the local population's participation and reaction to the battle
- Interpret the role of the Alamo as an ongoing symbol of determination

Theme C

Alamo Plaza represents a continuum of urban development and commerce in San Antonio

1994

Goals

2014

- Describe /illustrate what the Plaza looked like during all periods of history
- Describe/illustrate how the uses changed over time for all periods of history

- Interpret what the Alamo Plaza site looked like over the different periods of the 300 year history of the plaza site and the related sites and features such as the Campo Santos, La Villita, the Camino Real, ranching, farming, acequias, the barrios to the north and south, the Barrio de Valero and Laredito
- Interpret how the Alamo Plaza site has changed over more than 300 years and how it continues to be a community gathering place

Theme D

Remember and recognize the cultures that have played a role in the Alamo Plaza story

1994

Goals

2014

- Alamo Plaza should be regarded with reverence for all who died there
- Alamo Plaza should better represent a respectful entry point to the Alamo Church
- Alamo Plaza should be a place of remembrance
- Illustrate and describe the sacrifice for self-determination
- Recognize and remember all the cultures that have contributed

- Recognize and remember all the cultures that have contributed to the history of the Alamo Plaza site
- Alamo Plaza will be regarded with reverence for all who died there
- Alamo Plaza will be a place of remembrance and present an appropriate entry point to the Alamo compound
- Provide background and context for the fight for self-determination.

The core values and philosophy
Guide the behavior of the organization
or site in all circumstances regardless
of changes in goals, strategies, or
management structure.

Updated Philosophy

1. The People
(Confluence of Cultures: the story of the diverse people living in and moving into the area and their cultures.)
2. The Stories
(Alamo Plaza as witness to the history of Texas and the City of San Antonio: the story of the events of Mission San Antonio de Valero)
3. The Sacrifice
(Alamo Plaza symbolizes the quest for self-determination)
4. New Scholarship
(Incorporate and interpret ongoing evidence-based research)

Updated Philosophy

1. The People
(Confluence of Cultures: the story of the diverse people living in and moving into the area and their cultures.)
2. The Stories
(Alamo Plaza as witness to the history of Texas and the City of San Antonio: the story of the events of Mission San Antonio de Valero)
3. The Sacrifice
(Alamo Plaza symbolizes the quest for self-determination)
4. New Scholarship
(Incorporate and interpret ongoing evidence-based research)

Vision Statements

- Concise way to express major goals and strategic objectives
- Direct all eyes towards the hoped-for results of short- and long-term decisions and actions

VISION

Becoming What You Desire

Aspiring to a different, stronger, more effective state of being

Focusing actions and means to achieve those ends

HemisFair Park Vision

The vision for the redevelopment of HemisFair is to create a vital mixed use area, centered on a city park which maintains and revitalizes the historic buildings while reconnecting the area to the adjacent neighborhoods and providing new mixed use development, compatible in scale with adjacent properties. HemisFair Park will continue to be an accessible neighborhood park that unifies the city, serves as a community gathering place, and is an opportunity for citizens to work, live, and play. HemisFair Park will have many special places and uses; some active, some quiet.

Alamo Plaza

Draft Vision

The Master Plan that flows from the work of the Alamo Plaza Advisory Committee will be committed to ensuring the Preservation and reinterpretation of the Alamo (Plaza), and the Alamo Historic District; the comprehensive interpretation of its confluence of cultures over time; and the opportunity for meaningful, diverse, and compatible Visitor and Resident experiences.

Guiding Principles

Guide the behavior of the organization or site in all circumstances regardless of changes in goals, strategies, or management structure.

Hemisfair Park Guiding Principles

1. Connectivity
2. Development
3. Green Space
4. Balance
5. Preservation
6. Sustainability
7. Leadership

- 1) **Connectivity:** Linkages within HemisFair Park and to and from the adjacent areas are necessary to the Park's viability. Connectivity must address both pedestrian and vehicular access including parking.
- 2) **Development:** Mixed use development to include mixed income housing, commercial, institutional and civic uses is desired.
- 3) **Green Space:** Expand and preserve green space.
- 4) **Balance:** A balance between green space and development is necessary.
- 5) **Preservation:** Protection of historic buildings within HemisFair Park is mandatory. However, the strategic removal of non-historic or temporary buildings may be considered. Relating development to existing historic buildings is critical to creation of a unique and urban environment.
- 6) **Sustainability:** The redevelopment within HemisFair Park and its surrounding area should consider environmental, social and economic impacts in order to ensure a better quality of life for everyone, now and for future generations.
- 7) **Leadership:** The redevelopment of HemisFair Park requires long term dedicated civic leadership in order to be sustainable.

Can this philosophy help define the guiding principles?

1. The People
(Confluence of Cultures: the story of the diverse people living in and moving into the area and their cultures.)
2. The Stories
(Alamo Plaza as witness to the history of Texas and the City of San Antonio: the story of the events of Mission San Antonio de Valero)
3. The Sacrifice
(Alamo Plaza symbolizes the quest for self-determination)
4. New Scholarship
(Incorporate and interpret ongoing evidence-based research)

Draft Guiding Principle Ideas For Discussion

Preservation and Sustainability

Unified Management and Leadership

Access and Inclusion

Balance: Historical Context and Visitor Experience

Next Meeting

Guiding Principles

August 5

Central Library Auditorium

Thank You

for time and commitment
to the process