

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 11, 1979.

* * * *

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 P.M. by the presiding officer, Mayor Lila Cockrell, with the following members present: WEBB, DUTMER, WING, EURESTE, THOMPSON, ALDERETE, CANAVAN, ARCHER, STEEN, COCKRELL
Absent: CISNEROS.

79-48 The invocation was given by The Reverend Gregory Robertson, Coker United Methodist Church.

79-48 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

79-48 SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mayor Cockrell announced that the public hearing regarding the proposed annexation discussion is scheduled at 3:00 p.m. She stated that thirty minutes would be allowed to each of the three separate areas that would be affected by the proposed annexation. Mayor Cockrell asked that persons wishing to speak on the matter sign up accordingly.

79-48 The minutes of the regular meeting of September 20, 1979 including the verbatim addendum, and the minutes of the regular meeting and the special meeting of October 4, 1979, were approved.

79-48 "ANTI-ARSON MONTH"

Mayor Cockrell asked Mayor Pro-Tem Canavan to read the following Proclamation:

- WHEREAS, An estimated 1,000 Fire Fighters are killed annually by arson and approximately 10,000 individuals are injured in arson fires across the nation, and,
- WHEREAS, annual arson property damage nationwide is estimated at \$15 billion with national insurance losses exceeding \$3 billion, and
- WHEREAS, The United States Department of Commerce's National Fire and Control Administration reports that 40 to 50% of the claims paid by insurance companies result from arson, and
- WHEREAS, The National Insurance Institute estimates that since 1968, one-half of the home insurance premium increases are attributable to arson; officials estimate that a \$200 annual fire insurance premium could be reduced by a 21 percent to \$158, if arson losses could be reduced, and
- WHEREAS, in San Antonio, last year, 447 fires were attributed to arson, 6 deaths were attributed to arson; reported building losses exceeded to \$1,732,215; and building content losses exceeded \$738,875, and
- WHEREAS, the City of San Antonio's Fire Department and the Independent Insurance Agents of San Antonio, have launched a community awareness campaign entitled, "Burn an Arsonist for Cold Cash", to fight against the rising crime of arson, and

WHEREAS, These two organizations have established a 24-hour hotline at 227-1882 and are offering a \$5,000 arson reward fund to encourage citizens of San Antonio to report suspicious arson related activity,

NOW, THEREFORE, I, LILA COCKRELL, Mayor of the City of San Antonio, in recognition thereof, do hereby proclaim, October, 1979, as

"ANTI-ARSON MONTH"

in San Antonio, Texas

* * * *

Mr. John Best, President of the Independent Insurance Agents in San Antonio, thanked the Mayor and the Council for the Proclamation and commended them for taking a leadership role in trying to curtail this crime.

79-48 CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Steen moved that items #5-21 constituting the consent agenda be approved with the exception of items #13, 14, and 18, to be considered individually. Mr. Webb seconded the motion.

On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinances, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Eureste.

AN ORDINANCE 51,354

ACCEPTING THE BID OF LIGHTBOURN EQUIPMENT COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO FIRE DEPARTMENT WITH A 12-KW DIESEL ENGINE DRIVEN GENERATOR FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$6,004.00.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51,355

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL FROM HONEYWELL, INC., FOR A MAINTENANCE CONTRACT ON THE HONEYWELL TEMPERATURE CONTROL UNIT AT THE CONVENTION CENTER FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$16,009.00.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51,356

ACCEPTING THE BID OF GUIDO BROTHERS CONSTRUCTION COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT WITH THE RENTAL OF HEAVY EQUIPMENT FOR SITE WORK FOR ROSEDALE PARK - PHASE III FOR A TOTAL NOT TO EXCEED \$59,981.25.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51,357

AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURE OF THE SUM OF \$10,170.00 OUT OF VARIOUS FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS; ACCEPTING THE DEDICATION OF EASEMENTS TO CERTAIN LANDS; ALL TO BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN RIGHT OF WAY PROJECTS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51,358

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF ED GRUETZNER ELECTRICAL COMPANY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$12,014.51 TO CONSTRUCT THE TENNIS COURT LIGHTING AT CUELLAR PARK PROJECT; AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A STANDARD CITY PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT COVERING SAID CONSTRUCTION; AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT THEREOF.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51,359

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE FIELD ALTERATION NO. 1 IN THE AMOUNT OF \$80,510.00 TO THE CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE SAUNDERS STREET DRAINAGE PROJECT #47-D.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51,360

AUTHORIZING ADDITIONAL ENGINEERING FEES TO PAPE-DAWSON, ENGINEERS, IN CONNECTION WITH THE BIBB-BREUER PROPERTIES LIMITED OFF-SITE SEWER MAIN PROJECT; APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$4,343,78 FOR SUCH PURPOSE; TRANSFERRING UNEXPENDED BALANCES FROM OTHER INDEX CODES IN THIS PROJECT TO INDEX CODE 412767; AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF SAID AMOUNTS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51,361

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF FIELD ALTERATION NO. 2 TO THE CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT FOR THE COLUMBIA HEIGHTS PAVING PROJECT, PHASE II (CONSTRUCTION OF CONCRETE STEPS FOR ACCESS TO RESIDENCES FROM A LOWERED STREET).

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51,362

ACCEPTING THE BID IN THE AMOUNT OF \$55,500.00 SUBMITTED BY ABRAMOFF-KURAS ASSOCIATES FOR THE SALE OF SURPLUS CITY-OWNED PROPERTY AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A SPECIAL WARRANTY DEED THERETO.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51,363

AUTHORIZING THE CLOSURE OF HOWARD STREET BETWEEN MULBERRY STREET AND HUISACHE STREET ON SUNDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1979, FOR THE PURPOSE OF CELEBRATING THE ST. ANTHONY SCHOOL'S ANNUAL FALL FESTIVAL.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51,364

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY AND QUEST HOMES INC., FOR A LEASE ON 2.471 ACRES OF LAND IN WESTWOOD VILLAGE.

* * * *

3

AN ORDINANCE 51,365

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE SUPPLEMENTAL AGREEMENT NO. 3 TO LEASE NO. DOT-FA73SW-1256 TO LEASE SPACE AT INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT TO THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51,366

AUTHORIZING CONTRIBUTIONS OF \$13,533.05 TO ENERGY CONSERVATION GRANT PROGRAM FUNDS FROM THE GENERAL FUND TO RESTITUTE SAID GRANT FUNDS FOR EXPENDITURES HELD BY THE GRANTING AGENCY - TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION AS INELIGIBLE PROGRAM COSTS PURSUANT TO AN AUDIT OF THE PROJECT BY THE AGENCY.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51,367

AUTHORIZING A TRANSFER IN THE 1979/80 BUDGET OF THE GENERAL FUND FROM THE APPROPRIATION TO THE DISTRICT 8 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS CONTINGENCY OF THE AMOUNT OF \$39,200.00 TO ACCOUNTS FOR FIRE DEPARTMENT EQUIPMENT PURCHASES AND BURR OAK DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS.

* * * *

79-48 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,368

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF FIELD ALTERATION NO. 9 TO THE YOLANDA DRAINAGE PROJECT NO. 58G CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT (RECONSTRUCTION OF PART OF LARK AVENUE FOR BETTER DRINAGE, AND ADDITIONAL CURBING ALONG WATKINS ALLEY TO PREVENT EROSION).

* * * *

Mr. Wing moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

Mr. Canavan disqualified himself from voting on this Ordinance.

After consideration, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Thompson, Alderete, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; DISQUALIFICATION: Canavan; ABSENT: Cisneros, Eureste.

79-48 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,369

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF FIELD ALTERATION NO. 1 TO THE KYLE STREET DRAINAGE PROJECT CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT (ADJUSTMENTS TO SHALLOW SEWER SYSTEM TO ALLOW LOWER STREET GRADES).

* * * *

Mr. Wing moved to approve the Ordinance. Mrs. Dutmer seconded the motion.

Mr. Canavan disqualified himself from voting on this Ordinance.

After consideration, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Thompson, Alderete, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; DISQUALIFICATION: Canavan; ABSENT: Cisneros, Eureste.

79-48 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,370

AUTHORIZING AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO AND THE COUNTY OF BEXAR FOR THE CONTINUANCE OF A JOINT BOARD OF EQUALIZATION ADMINISTRATIVE STAFF AND ESTABLISHING A BUDGET THEREFOR.

* * * *

Mr. Steen moved to approve the Ordinance. Mrs. Dutmer seconded the motion.

In response to a question by Mr. Alderete, Ms. Jane Macon, City Attorney, explained that the Joint Board of Equalization Administrative Staff is a requirement by State Law.

After consideration, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Eureste.

79-48 ZONING HEARING

22. CASE 7791 - to rezone a 1.418 acre tract of land out of NCB 15823, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-1" Business District, located on the south side of Spring Time Drive, being 395' west of the intersection of Babcock Road and Spring Time Drive, having 150' on Spring Time Drive and a maximum depth of 412'; a 3.691 acre tract of land out of NCB 15823, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located southwest of the intersection of Spring Time Drive and Babcock Road, having 395' on Spring Time Drive and 379' on Babcock Road.

The Zoning Commission has recommended that this request of change of zone be approved by the City Council.

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Canavan moved that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that the property is properly platted and that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained along the west property line of the requested "B-1". Mr. Steen seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Eureste.

AN ORDINANCE 51,371

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS A 1.418 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 15823, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT; A 3.691 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 15823, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT THE PROPERTY IS PROPERLY PLATTED AND THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG THE WEST PROPERTY LINE OF THE REQUESTED "B-1".

* * * *

23. CASE 7846 - to rezone a 3.976 acre tract of land out of Lot 1, Block 1, NCB 16481, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk, from Temporary "R-1" E.R.Z.D. One Family Residential Edwards Recharge Zone District to "B-2" E.R.Z.D. Business Edwards Recharge Zone District, located 300' east of San Pedro Avenue and 210' southwest of Springhill Drive, being 131' strip of land adjacent to the 70' C.P.S.B. easement and having a maximum length of 1401.06'.

The Zoning Commission has recommended that this request of change of zone be approved by the City Council.

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Steen moved that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that proper platting is accomplished and that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained along the northeast property that is southwest of the single family area. Mrs. Dutmer seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros.

AN ORDINANCE 51,372

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS A 3.976 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF LOT 1, BLOCK 1, NCB 16481, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" E.R.Z.D. ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL EDWARDS RECHARGE ZONE DISTRICT TO "B-2" E.R.Z.D. BUSINESS EDWARDS RECHARGE ZONE DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED AND THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG THE NORTHEAST PROPERTY THAT IS SOUTHWEST OF THE SINGLE FAMILY AREA.

* * * *

24. CASE 7847 - to rezone an 18.115 acre tract of land out of Lot 1, Block 1, NCB 16481, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk, in the 16600 and 16700 Blocks of San Pedro Avenue from Temporary "R-1" E.R.Z.D. One Family Residential Edwards Recharge Zone District to "B-3" E.R.Z.D. Business Edwards Recharge Zone District, located on the southeast side of San Pedro Avenue, being 35' northeast of the intersection of Thousand Oaks Drive and San Pedro Avenue, having 78.23' on San Pedro Avenue and a maximum depth of 1400'.

The Zoning Commission has recommended that this request of change of zone be approved by the City Council.

In response to a question by Mr. Thompson, Ms. Jane Macon, City Attorney stated that at this point, the legal department has been working with the Edwards Aquifer Advisory Committee. She stated that there is an Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone overlay District.

Mayor Cockrell stated that an Aquifer Protection Office is maintained within the City government who goes over the area proposed for a new subdivision.

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Steen moved that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that proper platting is accomplished. Mr. Webb seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros.

AN ORDINANCE 51,373

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS AN 18.115 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF LOT 1, BLOCK 1, NCB 16481, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, IN THE 16600 AND 16700 BLOCKS OF SAN PEDRO AVENUE FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" E.R.Z.D. ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL EDWARDS RECHARGE ZONE DISTRICT TO "B-3" E.R.Z.D. BUSINESS EDWARDS RECHARGE ZONE DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

25. CASE 7845 - to rezone Lot 191-1, Block 20, NCB 11119, 401 Moursund Boulevard from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-3R" Restrictive Business District, located southwest of the intersection of Gillette Boulevard and Moursund Boulevard, having 118.5' on Gillette Boulevard and 87.6' on Moursund Boulevard.

The Zoning Commission has recommended that this request of change of zone be approved by the City Council.

Mr. Juan G. Hewtty, the applicant, stated that he is renting this property and that he wishes to work on air conditions and tune-ups. He explained the surrounding properties and asked the Council to approve the "B-3R" request for rezoning.

Mr. Wing expressed concern that the subject property is in a residential area.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, described the subject property and the surrounding areas. He stated that this lot has been vacant for the past twelve months. He stated that the Zoning Commission felt that it would be appropriate for a "B-3R" zoning at this location due to the other zonings at this major intersection.

Mr. Carl Miller spoke in opposition. He stated that he owns property three lots down from the subject property and he was in opposition to the request for rezoning because he felt that this area was residential and disapproved of any commercial buildings being erected in this area.

In rebuttal, Mr. Hewtty explained that in the last eight to twelve months, the property in question has been the target of vandalism due to the fact that it is a vacant building. He stated that by granting this zoning change it would help to upgrade the neighborhood and prevent further vandalism by putting this property to use.

Mr. Wing stated that this area has been recently restructured and drainage was constructed in the area. He expressed concern regarding the vandalism in the vacant building.

After discussion, Mr. Wing moved that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that street dedication in accordance with the Major Thoroughfare Plan and Traffic Department's recommendation is accomplished and that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained along the west property line. Mr. Canavan seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros.

AN ORDINANCE 51,374

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 191-1, BLOCK 20, NCB 11119, 401 MOURSUND BOULEVARD, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3R" RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT STREET DEDICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MAJOR THOROUGHFARE PLAN AND TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT RECOMMENDATIONS IS ACCOMPLISHED AND THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG THE WEST PROPERTY LINE.

* * * *

79-48

ZONING INFORMATION REQUEST

In response to a suggestion by Mr. Thompson, Mayor Cockrell asked that the applicant in all zoning cases, include as part of his or her presentation, whether he or she is the owner of the property; if not, state the name of the owner of the property and whether he or she concurs with the zoning request. She asked that this procedure be followed, in the future, as a matter of information for the Council.

79-48 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Webb, seconded by Mrs. Dutmer, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros.

AN ORDINANCE 51,375

AMENDING CERTAIN ORDINANCES PERTAINING TO PROGRAMS UNDER THE COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACT; AUTHORIZING THE REPROGRAMMING OF GRANT FUNDS; APPROVING REVISED BUDGETS FOR THE 1978-79 PROGRAM YEAR; AUTHORIZING GRANT AGREEMENT MODIFICATIONS WITH DEPARTMENT OF LABOR; AND, AUTHORIZING MODIFICATIONS OF THIRD-PARTY AGREEMENTS WITH PROGRAM OPERATORS.

* * * *

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,376

AMENDING CERTAIN ORDINANCES TO CHANGE THE LIMITATIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND OTHER STAFF COSTS PLACED ON CERTAIN PROGRAM OPERATING AGENCIES SELECTED TO OPERATE THE 1979 CETA TITLE IV SUMMER YOUTH EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM.

* * * *

Mr. Steen moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Webb seconded the motion.

In response to a question by Mr. Archer, Mr. Narciso Cano, Director of the Department of Economic and Employment Development, explained that this Ordinance authorizes the removal of the 14% limitations on administrative and other staff costs in the 1979 Summer Youth Employment Program. He also explained that this Ordinance serves as a closing-out of any invoices which may be pending.

Mr. Archer asked that in the future, the amounts of the invoices be listed for the Council's information.

Mayor Cockrell asked staff to furnish Mr. Archer with the information, as requested.

After discussion, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros.

79-48 DISCUSSION REGARDING THE CONSIDERATION OF CHANGES TO A CERTAIN RAILING IN THE EXPANDED PORTION OF THE CONVENTION CENTER ARENA

Mayor Cockrell gave background information regarding this subject and explained that the City Council members had viewed the situation with the railing of the new upper balcony at the Convention Center Arena.

The following Council members spoke on the matter:

Mr. Steen made a motion to leave the railing as it is and made the suggestion that the price of these seats be lowered instead of changing the railing which would cost the City \$20,000.00. He felt that this amount of money could be better used for street improvements or drainage projects. Mrs. Dutmer seconded the motion.

Mr. Eureste made a substitute motion to leave the railing at the same height but change the size of the railing for visibility reasons. Mr. Canavan seconded the motion.

Mr. Joe Madison, Assistant Director of the Convention Facilities, informed the Council that Mr. Noonan, the architect hired by the City had stated that a $\frac{1}{2}$ " bar would meet the safety or structural requirements. Mr. Madison expressed concern regarding the strength of the $\frac{1}{2}$ " bar; whether it would be able to handle a 200 pound thrust. He stated that the new proposal as outlined in the substitute motion would probably be a lesser cost than the \$20,000.00 estimate on the cable railing.

Mr. Canavan spoke in support of the substitute motion. He felt that this would meet the safety standards and improve the visibility.

Mayor Cockrell stated that she would be voting for the substitute motion because last week at a "B" Session, the City Council had voted to make a change in the railing. She stated that the Council had the opportunity to examine the different type of railings. She further stated that the arena is used by several groups and mentioned again the problem regarding visibility at the new upper balcony. She stated that correcting this problem would be a small investment on the City's part to have better usage of the seats that are there.

Mr. Alderete spoke in support of the main motion and suggested that the railing be left as it is and the money be used instead, for school sidewalks.

Mrs. Dutmer expressed concern regarding the insurance rates; if no extra cost is involved and visibility is increased, then she stated that she would be voting for the substitute motion.

In response to a question by Mr. Alderete, Mr. Joe Madison explained that the seating price for the tickets in this area are reduced to compensate for the obstructive view.

Mayor Cockrell stated that the seats in the new upper balcony are seats that in the standard arena are considered to be prime seats. She stated that the only problem involved is the problem of the sight line impediment that was raised.

After discussion, the substitute motion carried by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Eureste, Thompson, Canavan, Cockrell; NAYS: Wing, Alderete, Archer, Steen; ABSENT: Cisneros.

79-48 The Clerk read the following Resolution:

A RESOLUTION
NO. 79-48-98

DECLARING A BOND IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,000.00 FROM AETNA CASUALTY AND SURETY COMPANY AS SURETY FOR BENNIE R. CAVAZOS FORFEIT, PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 10, ARTICLE IV OF THE CITY CODE; AND FURTHER AUTHORIZING THE CITY ATTORNEY TO TAKE ALL NECESSARY LEGAL ACTION TO COLLECT SAID FORFEITURE.

* * * *

Mr. Canavan moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Wing seconded the motion.

In response to a question by Mr. Archer, Mr. Steve Arronge, Assistant City Attorney, gave background information on this matter and stated that this Ordinance will enable the Council to file suit for the purpose of recovering the bond money of \$4,000.00. He further stated that the City Council may have to act on a procedure in the near future, to have the house removed.

Mr. Lindley, Assistant Director of Building and Zoning, distributed pictures to the City Council regarding the subject property. He stated that he had no new material to present to the Council regarding this matter.

After discussion, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros.

79-48 The Clerk read the following Resolution:

A RESOLUTION
NO. 79-48-99

APPROVING BASIC ASSUMPTIONS TO BE USED IN FORMULATING THE 1980-85 LONG RANGE FINANCIAL FORECAST.

* * * *

Mrs. Dutmer moved to approve the Resolution. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

In response to a question by Mr. Archer, Mr. Marcus Jahns, Director of Budget and Research, stated that the department of Budget and Research is in the process of updating and revising the City's Long Range Financial Forecast. He stated that the Long Range Financial Forecast provides policy makers with advance information regarding the financial condition of the City. He further stated that this information would be of assistance in avoiding transitional problems by affording more time to plan city service programs in accordance with projected revenues.

A discussion then took place regarding garbage collection as a self-sustaining activity, in the 1980-1985 five year financial forecast.

Mr. Marcus Jahns explained that at this point, the Council's action will be continued to be maintained and that the items listed are simply assumptions and not policy directions. He stated that if there is no additional direction from the City Council, the proposal will be incorporated, and the forecast will be finished the later part of December. He further stated that this forecast provides the City Council with an earlier viewpoint as to what next year's budget will look like.

Councilwoman Dutmer stated that she had received phone calls from several citizens regarding the alleys which have been cleaned, but have not had garbage service.

Mayor Cockrell asked staff to investigate the matter and refer back to Mrs. Dutmer.

A discussion then took place among a few of the Council members on the pros and cons regarding staff's report pertaining to annexation.

Mr. Jahns stated that the staff had included annexation in the forecast because of the previous Council action taken on September 20, 1979, which initiated the annexation process. He then stated that the plan will be flexible.

After further discussion, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Resolution, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros.

79-48 Item 31, being a proposed resolution nominating candidates for the Board of Directors of the Appraisal District for Bexar County, was temporarily withheld pending Executive Session. See page 37 of these minutes.

79-48 The Clerk read a proposed ordinance authorizing execution of an agreement with Bexar County whereby an Appraisal Services Division of the Bexar County Tax Office will replace the Metropolitan Tax Office.

Mrs. Dutmer moved to approve the ordinance. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

Mr. Webb asked that this ordinance be explained.

At this point in the meeting, Mayor Cockrell stated that the ordinance would be temporarily withheld pending staff arrival.

The motions were withdrawn. See page 35 of these minutes for the discussion.

79-48 The meeting was recessed at 2:55 P.M. and reconvened at 3:10 P.M.

ANNEXATION - PUBLIC HEARING

Mayor Cockrell declared open a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 4.63 square miles (Areas known as Camelot II, Brookwood, Sky Harbour, Indian Creek, Forest Glen and Twin Creek).

The following persons spoke in opposition to annexation in general. They stated that the City Council should provide adequate services to the existing residents before they further annex. They also stated that no annexation be approved until capital improvements are provided to the inner City.

Mr. James M. Sweeney, Sr., 403 Roslyn Avenue
 Mr. Tony F. Ibarra, First Vice-President of C.O.P.S.
 Mrs. Beatrice Cortez, C.O.P.S.
 Mr. Bernardo P. Chavez, St. James-Palm Heights C.O.P.S.
 Mrs. Linda Ledesma, C.O.P.S.
 Mrs. Rita Galindo, C.O.P.S.
 Mrs. Sonia Turner, Executive Secretary of C.O.P.S.
 Mr. T. L. Vandever

* * * *

Those speaking against the proposed annexation of the Camelot II area were:

Mr. Forrest L. Fowler, 8350 Greenhaven Dr. (a copy of his statement is on file with the papers of this meeting)
 Mr. David B. Kipp, 8022 Cool Forest (presented a petition which is on file with the papers of this meeting)
 Mr. James D. Bradley, 8423 Littleport
 Mr. Guenter Krellwitz, 5518 Chancellor
 Mrs. Diane Malloch, 6101 Windy Forest
 Mrs. Pamela Cheeseman, 7926 Mountain Forest
 Mrs. Shirley Pilus, 7811 Sun Forest
 Mrs. Helen Walter, 5286 Round Table
 Mr. Tom Callison, 6826 Burnley Drive
 Mr. E. S. Kolesar, 6902 Glen Fair
 Mr. Bill Needham, 6806

* * * *

Those speaking against the proposed annexation of Area XII, also known as Sky Harbor and Indian Creek were: (copies of petitions are on file with the papers of this meeting)

Mrs. Dot Wyndroski, 5903 Lubbers Way
 Mr. Jack Gentry, 8731 Yellow Knife
 Mrs. Jo Anna Moore, 5911 Lubbers Way
 Mrs. Gloria Ann Riggs, 5911 Sail Loft Circle
 Mr. Leandro Flores, 5950 Cape Ann
 Mr. Michael Nethken, 9100 Kings Harbor
 Mr. Leroy Gardner
 Mr. Robert W. Marte, 8730 Big Creek

* * * *

Those speaking against annexation in Area XVII, also known as Forest Glen and Twin Creek were:

Mrs. Nancy T. Brann, 7619 Meadow Lawn

Mrs. Susan L. Gerfers, 7626 Meadow Lawn
Mr. Douglas Tolar, 4607 Brierbrook
Mr. Phillip M. Rainwater, 7714 Piper Lane

* * * *

Mayor Cockrell then declared the hearing closed.

* * * *

The following discussion then took place:

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Are we going to have a presentation by the staff?

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: May I ask, does the Council desire to have this at this time?

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Well, I was just wondering, are we going to have a presentation, period?

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: Would you like - May I ask the Manager would you like

CITY MANAGER TOM HUEBNER: If the Council wants a brief presentation by the staff, yes we can provide that.

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: We'll be happy to ask then, for the staff to make this presentation.

MR. BOB HUNTER: Yesterday, I believe you received a copy of the analysis of the three areas that you had recommended we hold the public hearing on, and you've heard from individuals concerning areas, A, B, and C. We have also passed out to you, I believe around 3:00 o'clock, a report called, Notes for Annual Recurring Costs for Police and Fire Service. However, just to - I'll say summarize these three areas for you, we're talking about area # A generally known as the Camelot Area is 1.34 square miles.

MR. JOE ALDERETE: Excuse me, Bob. Mayor, do we have those extra forms he's talking about?

MR. BOB HUNTER: We're talking about again in Area #A, 1.34 square miles. You're looking at approximately 1,733 residential units, the number of persons is approximately 6,204 units. On Area B we're talking about .98 square miles, 984 residential units, the number of persons approximately 3,749. The Forest Glen area, Area #C total square miles is approximately 2.31, residential units is 1,349 and number of person approximately is 3,629. In summary dealing with all three Areas you're talking about 4.63 square miles, number of residential units of 4,066 and the population of 13,582. I'm aware that this is higher than the Council was discussing the other night dealing with 9,000, but this is the population according to our figures of the areas just recently delineated by field notes. I would like to refer to the individual pages, briefly in that most of the data is exactly the same as you have seen it in the previous staff reports. However, as has been noted there is a difference in the police protection and the fire protection. In discussing this with the two chiefs the City, as we have said on this attachment, the Police and Fire Department can provide service to the areas without additional capital or manpower requirements initially. And that's why we indicated on there a zero as far as recurring costs go. Going on down on that attachment, we will be diminishing the police and fire service and you can use all sorts of statistics, I'll say to make your

October 11, 1979

-13-

db

13

different points. We used the analysis or the figure that was discussed the last time you met concerning police per square mile. To give you an example, if you annexed these areas, don't increase the police budget, you will be diminishing the sworn policemen per square mile by .07. Presently you have 4.34 sworn officers per square mile. With this annexation, without increasing the budget you will have 4.30 so you'll be changing the complement and diminishing it by .07. It's just a figure to keep in your mind very similar with fire protection dealing with fire fighters per square mile. The existing is 3.05 fire fighters per square mile with this annexation you reduce it down to 3.00 or a reduction of .05. Another comparison that we've identified in the attachment which I think is important to give you a feeling of what we're looking at in these areas is in that fifth paragraph, we're talking about annexing approximately 4,000 units, 4066 units. The City on an average basis approves of and has built within the existing City limits, 6,000 units a year, so this is less than what is coming on line every day in the existing City limits. However, we did want to point out that if you do not wish to diminish your police and fire complement we've identified the figures for you for the remainder of the fiscal year '79-80 as \$199,000 for Police and for next fiscal year, approximately 262,000 dollars. On the next page concerning fire if you don't wish to diminish the fire protection that .05 for the remainder of the fiscal year it's approximately \$83,000. For the next fiscal year it's about \$110,000. Again, this is a quick summary concerning the report and the attachment. We tried to show you as accurately as possible the figures on the recurring costs. If you have any questions I'll try and answer them.

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: Are there any questions of the report? Mr. Eureste.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Yes, Madam. I'm concerned about the way this report was prepared, this last one now, in that the annual recurring cost for fire and police were zeroed out. I know you just explained it, but I don't know what you said. You know it's either going to be there or it's not going to be there. Now, in the first memorandum that you submitted to us and I really don't know who is to blame here. I'd sometimes like to blame the Manager but then he says that you did it, and then if I blame you then you say that you work for him. I don't know who to blame for this but let's assume that you have some responsibility in preparing this documentation and you have identified long term needs in 1979 dollars and you call them, Annual & Recurring Costs for Fire and Police and this is for each of the areas that are identified and this is in your September 11th memorandum. You identified a cost for each of the areas and I think if we look at Area 7, although it's much more reduced than what it was before we were talking about \$367,000 of annual recurring costs for fire and police. We chopped off some houses, perhaps maybe 50% of what we had proposed to take in or maybe, you know, something less than that that we deleted. But anyway there was a cost identified and then a cost was identified for the Area 12 and a cost was identified for Area 17.

Yesterday when I received your memorandum which was dated October 9th you came back with a new analysis, new financial analysis of each of the three areas. You're looking at those areas from '72 evaluations or values on those dwellings, on those properties and when you get to the point of annual recurring costs for fire and police you say zero for Area 7 and then for Area 12 which is the Sky Harbor and the Indian Creek you say zero. When you get to the Area 17 which is Forest Glen and Twin Creek the annual recurring cost for fire and police is zero and the total for fire and police when you add up zero and zero and zero is zero. You know it's just - and when you've got zero dollars committed to fire and police then what I had to draw, you know, from this information was that we were not going to be doing anything in the fire and police above and beyond what we have at the present time and yet we're talking about bringing in 4,066 residential units,

October 11, 1979

db

we're talking about annexing a total 2,963 acres or 4.63 square miles, we're talking about more than anything else bringing in 13,582 people.

I can't understand - I can't understand how we can use one set of standard in one case and another set at another point. Now the net revenue change to the City for these three areas was \$764,489 but, you know, I assume from this document that those dollars are just going to come into the City and I think as they had claimed earlier that we're not going to give them anymore, that we are simply going to redraw out petroleum districts and we are simply going to redraw the boundaries of the areas that each of the fire stations cover. That's what I see in here.

I asked last night then - I was concerned enough to make a phone call to the Asst. City Manager and told him the concerns that I had. Why do we get one type of presentation for this round and we receive another type of presentation for the first round, why don't we remain consistent because when you do not remain consistent then I begin to question the motive, you know, behind what you are doing as a professional planner for the City of San Antonio. Now can you explain to me why the annual.....

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: I would appreciate it if you would not impugn the motive of the staff member?

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: I haven't even impugned it I just questioned it, that's all I did. I wouldn't - I'll be very frank with you. I wouldn't know how to impugn his motive, I don't know how to do those things.

MR. BOB HUNTER: Could I respond to that one statement, sir?

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Can you tell me why we use one and the other?

MR. BOB HUNTER: I'd like to. In the areas if you will, Area 7, 12 and 17 looking at that specific map we've gone over this with Chief Peters and Chief Martinez and each area per say in itself does not deserve a new fire station.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: No, that's correct.

MR. BOB HUNTER: That's correct. Each area per say in itself doesn't warrant a police substation or even perhaps a police district. It warrants as we've indicated in the attachment in the information we've provided to you. Mr. Fox talked with me this morning concerning what you had mentioned to him because we felt that we would be diminishing and actually the truth diminishing our existing standard now. I think everyone understands that but we felt that it didn't have that much of a significant impact but the reason that we've provided this attachment to you is so that the Council, if you do decide to annex these areas may determine whether you wish to diminish slightly the existing police and fire service or attempt to find a way to fund it and keep it at its same level.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Well, I did not expect you to have a good response and I think I got exactly what I expected. There's no way to defend what you're saying. I'm not naive enough to think that we are going to put a new fire station in each of these areas; however, I don't think we were simply talking about adding, you know, fire stations when we were breaking down the costs and we did it on a per capita basis, the cost of additional police and additional fire protection for this area. You're covering a larger area, you're going to have added costs in the wear and tear of your equipment and perhaps in the manning of some of the fire stations because of the load - the workload that the fire personnel are going to be carrying.

October 11, 1979

-15-

db

Now for some reasons you've included the annual recurring costs for fire and police in the September 11th and you've identified how much it would cost for each of the 34 areas. Now in this one you only had to work up the figures on three areas and you should've done the same thing and have identified them.

MR. BOB HUNTER: On that first report you do have a per capita amount, I mean we certainly weren't trying to hide that one from you. We were aware that you had received it, but if you will look at the Sky Harbor - Indian Creek map in itself that is not a large area at all. We're quite aware that you have received the per capita costs, but dealing with increasing the complement for fire protection it's not necessary for that one area. They already have a fire station generally in that area at the present time. The same rationale staff views concerning the police protection, we're quite aware that we did provide to you the per capita costs, that was one of the important, I think, figures that we did bring to light last time we presented it to you. So we certainly weren't trying to hide that from you.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Well, shall we say that I'm less than satisfied with the report I have - because I had to go out and ask for more information and you know that's fine. I hope it doesn't happen again and what bothers me is that this is just repetition of problems that I see. In the September 11th report we had some difficulties because you were using 1979 property values, you come back now and made some modifications which is fine, I think - I think what you're using though is a little high in terms of the value, I think if you would've sampled what is in the Courthouse records on these properties you might've come closer to what are being used to '72 values for those properties and I'll tell you they're not in the range that you have worked them out and I think in one area you worked out the average value '72 being at 30,000 there about.

MR. BOB HUNTER: The average perhaps - we also felt that it was somewhat high but the average figure for each area was given to us from the tax appraiser's office, so we went with that.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Well, they gave you a '79 value.

MR. BOB HUNTER: No, they gave us '72.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Based on what? Did you ask them?

MR. BOB HUNTER: They took it back from the '79 value, but they do have a '72 average for each one of the areas.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Let me ask you another question, on the Sky Harbor - Indian Creek area, have you visited that area?

MR. BOB HUNTER: Yes.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Are you familiar with the development that's occurring in the Indian Creek side - that would be Hidden Cove or Americana or something like that?

MR. BOB HUNTER: Do you mean, if you're looking at this map on the right hand side?

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Yes.

MR. BOB HUNTER: No, I'm not. I know that there are other subdivisions being planned in this area and some of the streets are presently cut.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Do you think from your experience that development will continue there by the developer, given that there now is a disadvantage to continue development in that area? What might a developer do if he can just move across the City line if we do annex this area?

MR. BOB HUNTER: If you're talking about this specific development I think we've excluded a lot of the undeveloped land. So I think he would continue in the area, yes.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: They're still pouring concrete out there.

MR. BOB HUNTER: They're still cutting streets, he has various subdivisions in various stages, some of them he's pouring concrete for slabs, some of them which are outside of these lines- they're building streets on.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: No, I'm talking about the ones that are inside that area.

MR. BOB HUNTER: I would presume if he's pouring slabs now he'd complete those and attempt to sell them.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Okay. He's got a number of units to go out there, probably maybe a couple of hundred more units and I'm just wondering whether those - that subdivision will be completed according to the plans that they had and apparently not because I understand that developers are going to be looking for the tax advantage and why build there when you can just move across the line.

MR. BOB HUNTER: On the slabs that are poured I would imagine he'd attempt to complete those and then move to other plats that are outside the City limits.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Thank you very much. Madam Mayor, I had a conversation with you this morning and I just don't know exactly how the Council is going to proceed on this matter. After a public hearing generally what we have is the Council then giving direction to staff as to the desires of the Council. The motion that was passed a few weeks ago to bring about this public hearing was for that very purpose - to bring about a public hearing and to consider these areas for annexation. I feel that following tradition and following procedure that we have used here before that what is in line sometime before we leave this matter, that direction be given to staff one way or the other. And I think this is the way we've worked it before, I don't think that it's automatic that we move on without taking any action today and consider an ordinance to annex these areas two weeks from now. That I understand is the way you have understood the process that we are to follow, and I'm saying that that is not proper, given that it really changes the procedure that we've used in the past. I feel that it needs direction so that if there are votes here to move on annexation that the City Clerk so prepare the ordinance for two weeks from now. I don't think you can just leave this public hearing and assume that this Council has asked for the placement of that ordinance when, in fact, we have not given that direction. So, I'd like an interpretation at this point.

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: All right. May I ask the City Attorney to interpret exactly what the status is relative to the fact what has been set in motion by the previous Council action.

CITY ATTORNEY JANE ' MACON: The Council has set in motion a process for annexation. That does not mean that you are going to annex, it merely means that you have established a process. Today, this is merely a public

hearing for you to formulate your ideas as to whether you are or are not going to vote on an Ordinance which would be put on the agenda ten to twenty days after this hearing. The ten to twenty days is statutory primarily so that you can receive additional comments.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Can we take an action today to give direction one way or the other?

CITY ATTORNEY JANE MACON: No action as it relates to the annexation under the statute.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Well, you cannot annex today, but you can give the staff direction to prepare the Ordinance for posting two weeks or three weeks or four weeks from now.

CITY ATTORNEY JANE MACON: That is correct; however, the schedule that is established is that you would have this on the agenda for the twenty-fifth of October, and in terms of that there is no vote needed today, Mr. Eureste, that's the key.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: That's what I'm debating, I think the vote is needed because what we voted on last time on a motion that Mr. Steen made was to have a public hearing. We didn't vote on that schedule. Now, had the motion been made very clear that we were voting on a process, I don't think I would be debating the matter right now.

CITY ATTORNEY JANE MACON: That's your opinion.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Well, what is it? Do we have a - maybe Mr. Steen who made the motion will need to clarify what that motion was.

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: Let me just say, if there were - if you wish to give direction today to stop the further process would the Council be authorized to pass such a motion today if that was what a majority wished to do?

CITY ATTORNEY JANE MACON: Only if we posted that particular item because under the Ordinances as we have it now, the first reading is scheduled for October twenty-fifth. What has happened is we've merely had a commencement of the proceedings and so any vote that you would take at this point would merely be an informal vote and would not be a legislative action by the Council.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: The matter on annexation is posted. It is posted already because we had a public hearing.

CITY ATTORNEY JANE MACON: It is posted, but it's posted as a hearing and nothing more.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: We've taken action before out of public hearings. Man, I'll be very frank with you. Today when I talked to the Mayor I was so frustrated that I told her - well, I told her a few things and then hung up on her, and she told me that I had hurt her feelings and I told her, well, you've hurt my feelings because I feel that we are circumventing process. We are re-doing the procedures that we've used in the past on matters that this Council acts on. I think it's being done purposely so that, while people are here this Council does not make a decision, but I'll tell you, if you want to wait for two weeks, three weeks, four weeks or whatever, maybe we'll get more people here. Maybe that's what we'll have to do. I think it is completely; I think it is completely, completely unfair to not have advised this Council that after this public hearing we

could not initiate an action one way or the other. Most of us came here assuming that we would be given further direction which is what we have done in the past, and I want to state that over and over again because I want the new Council members to understand that and I want the citizens who are here to understand that, that we are circumventing process, circumventing process, and we've gotten a legal interpretation which I think doesn't hold water. It doesn't hold water. You might have the position of the legal interpreter for the City, but that interpretation that you rendered does not hold water because after every public hearing this Council has been asked to give further direction on the matter that has been considered. It is understood at that time that that is not a formal motion. It is an opportunity for the Council to give direction, to give direction, and if we want to give direction for the Clerk to go ahead and prepare the Ordinance then we ought to be brave enough and people enough to do it right here and stop the business that we have in motion a process that gets us an Ordinance four weeks from now and that we can't do anything on that process because the matter hasn't been posted. Well, my God, I'm glad that it is not an atomic bomb that has gone loose and berserk because we don't have control of that process and that process is controlling us and we're not controlling that process and I think that's wrong. I don't think that State law, City Ordinance and City Charter was made for a process to dominate the City Council.

I would like to make the motion to reject what is before us right here.

MR. WEBB: Second.

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: All right. The Chair will accept the motion, and I would like to make a statement.

During all of this hearing, this Chair, the members of the Council have tried to listen very courteously to every individual who spoke here. I don't think there's anyone who has been treated in any way with discourtesy. It was a matter of great regret to me that a member of the Council this morning treated me with discourtesy. It's between us, he has brought it out loud, and so I'll just have to say that I think that is regrettable.

At any rate I do want the members who are here, the individuals who are here to know that what is being followed in this case is exactly the same that has been followed in every annexation case that has ever come before the City. There isn't anything different about this, and I don't want you to feel that there is. When the Council voted to start the annexation proceeding, they simply voted to set a process, to have a public hearing and then following the public hearing then the next action is what they call first reading. Now, at that time the Council would normally vote either yes or no for the next reading. Then it would either stop, or it would proceed to the next reading. The annexation process is different from many other types of hearings that we have. Many times there's a hearing, and we have the caption of an Ordinance read when we begin the public hearing and we read the caption and we have the hearing and then when that is concluded the Council votes and then posts it that way. This one was different. Now, in spite of that I do feel that if it turns out that there are six members of this Council who today wish to stop the annexation proceedings that I will accept the motion, certainly give them the opportunity to express themselves whether in fact we still would have to go through another meeting under those conditions I don't know. I will leave it to the City Attorney. Certainly, I will find out if there are six persons who wish to stop. So, at this point if there is no further discussion on the motion. All right.

October 11, 1979
db

-19-

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: There is a lot. Let me tell you why I think what we're doing is wrong. This was a statement that was made by

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: Mr. Eureste, I'm sorry, but the point has been raised that actually the floor should proceed to the next person waiting which was Mr. Webb.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: Oh, that's fine. I'll come back.

MR. WEBB: Mayor and Council Members, I told you so. The last time we talked about annexation I pointed out very clearly that I did not think that we could afford to annex anybody because we were not providing the services to those people that we have already annexed.

A few days ago I went out to Shady Oaks, and I thought I was going to another - well, I drove and I drove and I drove and I found out that I was about fifteen or sixteen miles out IH 10 East and came to a place called Shady Oaks. The man gives me his address as Route 1, Box 205, Converse, Bobby Herrera. I said that he pays City taxes; this is an area that was annexed - 5,887 acres annexed in 1972. He tells me that he pays City taxes and receives no City services. There are about two hundred to three hundred families that live in this areas and what was surprising to me that he was in District 2. He told me that he voted against me. I did not even know him and couldn't care about that area because I didn't even know it existed. But, I have a map here of the area that was annexed, and he tells me that they're in District 2. I said well, fine but I'll listen to all of your problems. So he said that they pay their school taxes at East Central. They're in the East Central School District. They receive water from Schertz through a Schaefer Rural water supply, and it only goes down one road, I think that's Pfeil Road, the water system. There are no laterals on either side and anybody living a hundred feet or two hundred feet or three hundred feet east or west has a cistern where you pay by the month for your water or buy the cistern, you know, when your cistern gets emptied then you go and buy some more water. Get lights from City Public Service, gas by butane, telephone by Bell, and sewage by septic tank, pays transit taxes, 5½ percent taxes he collects. He has a Gulf Service Station, and he collects taxes and he lives next door. He owns the property, and he pays City taxes, and he collects transit system and everybody else's taxes, but he receives no transit system, no bus services, and no fire protection. This was annexed in 1972 and the Ordinance is Ordinance 43744. So he asked for some reasonable requests that those of you who are going to be annexed are promised in the event that you become annexed, he asked for - that either he become a City participant and receive City services, he and those other two hundred families that are out there, either they receive some services or either that they would like to be de-annexed. But he has some reasonable requests, and I think perhaps maybe we can reach maybe one or two of them. That he would like for the water system to be purchased by the City of San Antonio or by the water supply that we enjoy and that good flowing City water - incidently the water was cut off at the time because there was a break in the pipe, and I think it had been off for a couple of days, so whatever they received the water hasn't been very good. They would like that the City of San Antonio recognize them as citizens of San Antonio in this fashion, that instead of the police going down IH 10 East get off on Greytown Road and patrol down Pfeil Road, Ware Road, and Seguin Roads at the area that was annexed, and if you need any further, I'll show you where that particular area that you annexed is at. It's Randolph on the east, IH 10 on the south, 1604 on the west and something else. Anyway, that's the area that I'm talking about. They would like at least, once a day, to see a City police car come down either one of those streets, that are in question. They would also like some kind of topping. They are not asking for any curbs or sidewalks, or drainage or anything. They're only

asking for the standard that the County had the roads at, with a little asphalt on them. All of the asphalt is just about gone on every road out there. There's only small patches, anywhere from 12 to 20 feet left of the asphalt that was there. Because they haven't had any maintenance by the County, because they were annexed since 1972, and therefore, then the County dropped them at that point. So they haven't had any, not any, road repairs to any of those areas since 1972. There is a lady, there's one problem - the drainage problem out there. That one of the drainage - the drainage ditch that was there, is all in overgrowth. And that the drainage is going right immediately under her house. And she lives, well I have her address in any event that you would like to have it. The final thing that I would like to point out is that there are no signs for dumping. And they're dumping trash all up and down Ware and Seguin Road. And they would like the City to come out and post dumping signs or try to get - dumping signs need to be posted in the area. So, I have this information. Also, there's two other things that I would like to point out. And that he says he pays two or three hundred dollars a year for taxes and his neighbors pay as well. But, he pointed out that he wanted to erect a sign, "Natural Bridge Caverns". Wanted to put a sign on his property, and it was out of City Code it was too large or for some reason or another. They wanted to pay him a hundred dollars a month, and he said that would have helped him pay his City taxes for services he doesn't receive. He doesn't know why he is annexed, and he would like to know that if you could provide him that information. And the final thing is that he had homeowners insurance, and he had it for six months until they found out that he was provided no fire protection and no other water services, so they dropped his homeowners insurance. So, I just thought I'd bring that his name is Bobby Herrera, and I have his address here. But anyway, he handed me this document; he wanted me to have it, and he was asking me for a report about it. These people want to be deannexed, unless they can receive minimal services of some kind, from that area. And like I pointed out, it's 5,887 areas. Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine. Mr. Alderete.

MR. ALDERETE: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Let me just state very clearly, that I am against annexation. Okay. Now I'll tell you why I'm against annexation. Mr. Hunter, in your addendum or this other report that you handed out at three o'clock. You say we have before annexation, 4.37 sworn officers per square mile. Are we including the Police Chief and the janitor as people patrolling the area out there?

MR. HUNTER: No.

MR. ALDERETE: Well, Bob, what are we really saying that at any given time we're going to find 4.37 officers for square mile traveling the residential and the business districts?

MR. HUNTER: No.

MR. ALDERETE: What are we really saying to the folks out there? What do we really have out there?

MR. HUNTER: There are three shifts.

MR. ALDERETE: Okay.

MR. HUNTER: Okay. So, if you are talking about on the street at any one time as an average you could divide that by three. It's a very similar..

October 11, 1979

-21-

yl

MR. ALDERETE: So, in other words 4.37 per square mile is really deceiving and that it....

MR. HUNTER: That's total officer complement.

MR. ALDERETE: Yes, but you are talking about a 24 hour period of time I assume. And that doesn't happen in an eight hour period of time. Are you saying we have then about one officer per square mile, at a given point and time we could go to any square mile in the City of San Antonio and find an officer?

MR. HUNTER: No.

MR. ALDERETE: Then we are not even saying that we have one officer per square mile. What do we really have of officer per square mile traveling the residential and the business district at a given time? What do we really have?

MR. HUNTER: Perhaps, Chief Peters can answer that. I think it's around what, a hundred and fifty policemen. I'm not sure of that exact figure.

MR. ALDERETE: Is the Chief here to answer?

MR. HUNTER: Yes, he's here.

MR. ALDERETE: The question is, Chief, we have a figure here that is given to us, but it's a little bit inaccurate. Okay? To be somewhat mild. What I want to know is that - how many officers do we have, really traveling the streets of San Antonio, both in residential and commercial areas at any given time. Well, how many officers per square mile? How could-- We have two hundred and sixty-three square miles.

CHIEF EMIL PETERS: Right.

MR. ALDERETE: How many officers can I safely say are traveling a square mile? Is it less than one?

CHIEF PETERS: At a certain time of day, it would maybe one. From seven to eleven at night, we have two traffic teams. Two shifts rather, and they are marked. They are uniformed. And again from six till two we have community relations people who are marked and in uniform. And that adds up, too. But otherwise...

MR. ALDERETE: Chief, we have 263 square miles. What we are saying, is that, if we have one officer, we're saying that we have 263 men out there covering each square mile. Is that correct?

CHIEF PETERS: Right.

MR. ALDERETE: 263 patrolmen actually out there in the residential areas covering that?

CHIEF PETERS: No, not

MR. ALDERETE: Okay. I see that's what I really - That's where the deception if you will, is there. I want to know how many officers do we really have out there?

CHIEF PETERS: Yes. We would have in patrol anywhere from one hundred and ten to a hundred forty-five and about forty to sixty traffic, varying

on a day of the week, Friday or Saturday, as opposed to a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday. So,

MR. ALDERETE: Let me rephrase.

CHIEF PETERS: Now, again this is from seven till eleven. Then it drops off till two. Then it drops off again from two till seven in the morning is our lightest force, of course. Then we would possibly, counting supervisors, in all, who do some amount of driving on the streets in marked cars, around ninety to a hundred and ten.

MR. ALDERETE: We have police districts, don't we?

CHIEF PETERS: Yes sir.

MR. ALDERETE: How many officers are assigned to a police district?

CHIEF PETERS: A police district from eight to ten. Some districts have eight, some sections. I'm sorry. We have ten sections, and each section has from eight to ten officers in there. They're subdivided into districts.

MR. ALDERETE: You have ten sections.

CHIEF PETERS: Yes sir. So that may be eight, there may be ten.

MR. ALDERETE: How many sections do we have geographically, in square miles? What are we talking about?

CHIEF PETERS: We are talking about eighty-eight districts in ten sections.

MR. ALDERETE: Eighty-eight square miles.

CHIEF PETERS: No, districts. Eighty-eight districts. Eight-eight districts. So, if one was in each district, it would be eighty-eight. But there are some districts where we use two men. So it goes over, generally over a hundred counting the supervisors and the D.I.'s.

MR. ALDERETE: When a patrolman is patrolling an area - Let me break it down this way. When a patrolman is patrolling an area, how big is the area that he has to cover?

CHIEF PETERS: It varies from some districts, which are less than a mile, to some which are as much to four to five square miles.

MR. ALDERETE: So, in other words, we have in some cases, one officer covering up to five square miles?

CHIEF PETERS: Correct, at times.

MR. ALDERETE: Okay. That's a point we want to get across. Because we are talking about what looks like 4.37 sworn officers per square mile. That is not the case, because at any given time the resident cannot expect four officers to be in that little square mile he lives in.

CHIEF PETERS: No, that's right.

MR. ALDERETE: Is that correct? Okay. Thank you, Chief. I just wanted to clarify that because I was getting - There was a real problem here and what we had here was some statistics that were being thrown at us, that were not completely accurate. Another point is that there are situations on weekends, when you get extremely busy. I know of a particular case because I was personally involved in it. That it took the police officer thirty minutes to respond to what I thought was a prowler situation.

October 11, 1979

-23-

db 23

Is that a pretty common situation like on your heavy nights, like Friday and Saturday nights?

CHIEF PETERS: It could be, not quite so often on a prowler or any action call. We do have to prioritize on - during peak periods - and give crimes in action priority and a prowler would be generally, handled much faster than that. We do have some highs and lows, of course, where some of the calls, just a multiple number of them come in at one given time.

MR. ALDERETE: Chief, the point I'm trying to make is that I thought the prowler situation was very important to me at the time.

CHIEF PETERS: Correct.

MR. ALDERETE: As other people think, any crime that is happening around them, is very important to them at the time. Be it a burglary, a prowler, or a murder, or whatever the case may be. But, it took him thirty minutes and he told me that wasn't unusual. And he told me he still had about nine or ten calls, back logged. And this was on a Friday evening. I think what I.....

CHIEF PETERS: I'm going to say that was unusual. I'm going to say. I'll take exception to it. In fact, that was unusual to have that many...

MR. ALDERETE: I think that the community feels that we don't have enough police protection.

CHIEF PETERS: Yes, I do, too.

MR. ALDERETE: All right, that's

CHIEF PETERS: To give optimum service, well certainly we need more people.

MR. ALDERETE: Chief, is it fair to say that we are now undermanned in the police department.

CHIEF PETERS: Yes, sir.

MR. ALDERETE: All right. Chief, I was noticing that murders have risen twenty one per cent, that rape is up thirty nine per cent, and robberies are up thirty seven per cent. Is that correct?

CHIEF PETERS: Yes, sir. In six months. First six months.

MR. ALDERETE: To me, that's a good indication that we're in a little bit of trouble.

CHIEF PETERS: We see some fluctuations.

MR. ALDERETE: And this does not reflect on the capacity of the personnel or their abilities- I'm saying that we are talking about limited manpower, and their inadequacy because of limited numbers to really handle the existing situation.

CHIEF PETERS: The only fair way to take those statistics, though, is if you look at the other cities of comparable size, of how they compare to those cities. This nationwide crime is up - violent crime is up.....

MR. ALDERETE: Chief, I would say yes, let's compare it to Dallas, Houston, San Diego, whatever, but people aren't concerned about how we rate against Dallas or Houston, or anything. They are concerned about their property, concerned about their families. And you know, they are not concerned about that, Chief. And I think this is the point I'm trying to get across. Thank you very much, Chief. I don't have any further questions. The other thing on fire protection, Mr. Hunter. Is this 305 fire fighters per square mile? Are we dealing with the

same situation where it's not really truly the amount of fire protection we really have out there to protect the resident and the home owner of this City?

MR. HUNTER: Well, they have to, of course, normally be housed in a fire station. So, if.....

MR. ALDERETE: So, we really have to cut that down, because we are on shifts. Right? Or what?

MR. HUNTER: Yes, I would also like.....

MR. ALDERETE: What does the three really cut down to. Let's start whittling away at this situation.

MR. HUNTER: It depends on the number of hours they're working and how many are there at the present--you know, whenever a call comes in. I don't know--if you try and say--we don't have the specific three eight hour shifts that I would like.....

MR. ALDERETE: Would it be safe to say that we cut them down to a third?

MR. HUNTER: Well, Chief Martinez is here to answer that, but I would like to refer you to an attachment in the report you received yesterday. Not wanting to mislead you.

MR. ALDERETE: Alright, yeah, about the back-ups?

MR. HUNTER: Well, the report--It's about the fourth or fifth page concerning public safety and the annexed areas. San Antonio's area covers approximately 263 sq. miles. The current number of police patrol units is between 180 and 205, however, no more than 150 units, as Chief Peters had indicated, are in service at any one time. We did give you the information. What we are trying to do here is just relate on the attachment, a statistical figure to you. We could have divided that by three if you'd wanted to. Last week, when it was being discussed, you discussed the committment that was implied in 1972, concerning one officer per square mile, and we addressed that in this narrative.

MR. ALDERETE: So, we really didn't even meet up with our committment in 1972 because we promised them one officer per square mile and what we're saying-- one unit---

MR. HUNTER: But that wasn't clarified. That in itself was correct. But it wasn't one officer per square mile all the time. It -- as a whole- they didn't divide it into the three shifts. That's why I'm trying to clarify that for you today. Perhaps Chief Martinez can answer your question concerning the average fireman though in the area. I'm sure the average is diminished also. Let me just ask the Chief--Chief, if you will---do we presently have fire fighting equipment and fire stations that are either under-manned or un-manned--let me ask you that.

CHIEF MARTINEZ: We have perhaps ninety vacancies that --

MR. ALDERETE: 9-0?

CHIEF MARTINEZ: 9-zero. Yes.

CHIEF MARTINEZ: We have a class in the fire academy with 24 people. We will begin another class in the fire academy with an additional 60 people on the fifteenth of this month, next Monday. However, to answer one of your previous questions. We have approximately 230 people on the street around the clock, for each shift.

MR. ALDERETE: Around the clock. 230 people so that's less than one fire fighter per square mile, because we have 263 square miles. Yes. That's fair, right?

CHIEF MARTINEZ: We have approximately 230 fire fighters.

MR. ALDERETE: Thank you, Chief. So, we have less than one fire fighter per square mile. Chief, let me ask you something. There was a unique situation that happened in my district, that took the fire engine, or the station to respond. I think it took about 30 minutes or 45 minutes.

Where we had a situation where one station got called out to a fire, so then you had to move another station to sort of take over two districts. And then that one then got called out to another fire. So, then you had a situation where the station moved over and had to cover 3 districts or 2 districts. But the point is - Is there something a little bit, well, I think that we have to inform the public about. Is that when a station gets called out to a fire, and those fire fighters get called out, then you've got one station that moves in to cover two areas. Is that correct, or basically correct?

CHIEF MARTINEZ: When only one station moves, the supervisor on duty, supervising all of the 230 fire fighters, is aware that it is out of the station. When more than one moves, then he begins relocating other stations, moving them closer in to fill in gaps.

MR. ALDERETE: Okay. So, we have- whenever there's a fire we have people shifting around to sort of fill in the gaps to try and balance it out.

CHIEF MARTINEZ: That's correct. In the incident that you referred to, there were simultaneous fires, which...inaudible...that particular area of the City because all of the four units responding to each alarm, pre-empted the nine units in that general area. So, there was quite a bit of re-location from the rest of the City to bring in the troops.

MR. ALDERETE: Okay, Chief. What I'm trying to say. What I just want to inform the public about. That there are sometimes situations, that are maybe not very common, but can cause a delay of a response to a fire from anywhere to 30 or 45 minutes as in the case of this lady, where she said it took them 30 or 45 minutes. Well, the house is evidence of it, Chief, because the house is burned to the ground. And, it didn't reflect on you, as a department, it just said that that kind of situation can occur and yet we are 90 men short, according to your figures. And this 90 men would just bring us up to par to handle just the City of San Antonio as it now exists. I would assume. And yet we are talking about annexing another area. And these areas lie to the outer fringes, which is another situation. So, I just want to lay the cards on the table, when we are dealing with these folks, because they really need to know what the facts are. Chief, I thank you, very much that's fine.

There's another reason that I'm concerned about the situation here. And the report here, states that there will be no recurring costs or EMS service. I remember there was a crowd about as big as this crowd is here, about dealing with the EMS Service. And the folks were from Thousand Oaks. And I think the accident took anywhere from 12 to 15 minutes of response time. Those people presently live within the City limits of San Antonio. So, where are you going to be, and where's the rest of the city going to be, when we take you on, and we do not expand the EMS Service, I think there are a lot of reasons and a lot of good facts why nobody in good conscience should support annexation because all the reasons are there why we should not support annexation.

The other thing, Madam Mayor, I don't know if we have the votes to stop this process or not. But I tell you on October 25, we have the first reading of the ordinance according to the process. And the only thing I would suggest to this Council, is that we make it at a convenient time, so that the public can come and respond. And let's see how many people, not only from outside the City, but inside the City, that are against annexation. Mr. Hunter, another question. How many dollars of capital improvements do we have right now within the existing boundaries of the City limits.

MR. HUNTER: Perhaps, seven hundred million.

MR. ALDERETE: Seven hundred million dollars worth of capital improvement problems, we have within the City limits.

MR. HUNTER: That's on our list, yes.

MR. ALDERETE: How long-How many decades-and a decade being ten years-how many decades would it take us to resolve seven hundred million dollars worth of capital improvement projects. We are not talking about the annexed areas. We're just talking about what we presently have.

MR. HUNTER: I don't have any idea. I really don't. Seven hundred million.....

MR. ALDERETE: Well, let's say, we are going to pay off a hundred million dollar bond issue if it would have passed, how many years would it take us to pay it.

MR. HUNTER: Well, it depends on if you increase taxes or not, also.

MR. ALDERETE: Well, it's probably safe to say, maybe five, maybe six decades. Maybe we would never finish all the capital improvement projects that we presently have right now that are identified.....

MR. HUNTER: If it would be that long, then the capital improvements at this time, that are not on the list would probably come due.

MR. ALDERETE: That's right. We'd never do them. We'd never get them done. As a matter of fact, right now, I think the people from 1970, that voted on a bond issue still haven't gotten all the things that they asked for, and it's nine years later. Seven hundred million dollars worth of capital improvements. And by the time we finish doing ours, and then we get to the newly annexed areas, yes. I would, - Thank you, Bob. You answered my questions. I just wanted the folks to know how much we really have as an anchor, a burden. That's why I'm voting against annexation.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. John Steen.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. I think it's rather ironical that some of the people around the Council table that are discussing this issue, voted for a tax rate increase for this City even before I warmed up my seat that I'm sitting in right today. I want to say this, I'm speaking against the motion, so there's no mistake about that. The motion is to kill annexation. Let me state again. I am for an orderly processed annexation. But, I'm not for the motion which is on the floor which is to kill annexation today. Although it might be an illegal motion, it's there.

Let me talk a little bit about annexation. Some people have said it's a political motive, behind annexation. How can you say it's a political motive when I've recieved many phone calls these last few days. And the people in the Camelot area have been telling me some of them, not all of them, that if I vote to annex them, that they will work and vote against me in the next election. So, how can I be politically motivated. I would be working against myself by being for annexation, not getting more votes for myself, because I would be annexing people that don't want me because I annexed them. So, you'll have to say that I'm looking out for the good of the whole City, and I'm certainly not looking out just for my own political future, because I would certainly be against annexation, if I was.

Some people have said that we want to annex this territory and and these people so that we will remain the tenth largest City, or maybe move up to ninth, or eighth, or seventh, or sixth. That's a fallacy. There's no way that we could annex four and a half plus miles of land, plus ten or eleven thousand people and expect to move up in the ratings in the nation. There's just no way to do that. That's not a good reason for annexation.

Some people have said we'll get more federal money, if we have more people living within the City limits. That's probably a true statement. And ironically enough, that Federal money that we would get, would go to help the less affluent districts here in this City. So, if some of you people that are speaking against annexation are speaking really against yourself in a way because we are not going to get the Federal money that we would get if we had more people in the City. But let me tell you this. I, for one, am not in favor of annexation for more Federal money because I don't care that much about Federal money. Federal money has caused me more trouble in my district than anything else that has come along. And if we don't get another dollar it wouldn't make any difference to me, but I'm telling you, some of the reasons that are being used for being against annexation.

As far as railroading annexation, how can you say that we are railroading it, because we are going through a long lengthy process which started back on September the 13. We are now on October 11, we are having the first reading of the Ordinances on October the 25th. On the 26th, they are advertised. On November the 29th, we have a second and final reading. December the 10th is the effective date of annexation, if the Council votes on that day to annex. And we don't know at this time whether there will be six votes on December the 10th to annex the territory. We merely have the process in motion. We could be annexing. We cannot be. We don't know at this time, but if we don't go along with the process, we'll never get all the facts together to find out whether we really should annex or not.

I have been told that if you are annexed that you will not receive any City tax bills until May the 31st, 1981. So, you have that long before you would get any City tax bills.

Let me say this, annexation is a serious problem. And the Council is right now thinking about it. And mulling it over, but it is serious. And I admit that. But I want to tell you something else. In my personal opinion, the resolution of this problem- of this annexation problem, is probably going to have more effect on the long term future of this City than anything else that this Council can think about or handle or mishandle, today, or the next day, or maybe the Councils that come after this Council. It's a very important thing. I want to say this, what's really at stake, when you look at the picture, and not all of this other that we are talking about. Looking at the whole picture- the big picture. What's really at stake is the future of this City, that we live in, or that most of us live in. I realize that some of us still don't live in it, that are in the audience. But, what we are deciding today, really has a broad horizon. And that's what we ought to think about. I really feel, in my personal opinion that, it's only right that certain areas, in this City which have been built up and are in and around the City, in unincorporated areas should be annexed and become part of this City, because it is a great City. And by being annexed, you people are going to make it greater. Now, I sincerely feel, that we do need to continue to grow geographically. What if we don't continue to grow geographically? What if thirty years ago, the City Council said or the Commission form of government, or whatever we had, what if they said at that time, we don't want to grow we want to stay at two hundred thousand people. That wouldn't have been good. We are a City today approaching eight hundred and twenty-five- eight hundred and forty thousand people. And we've become great in the last thirty years. But we wouldn't have become great, or we wouldn't be the City we are today. A few comments doesn't make

any difference to me, Madam Mayor, I'll speak loud. But we wouldn't be the great city today, if we hadn't continued to grow geographically and, therefore, population-wise. That's a proven fact no matter what you think.

And we talk about lots of reasons for annexation, but to me the most important reason is economic development. We want better jobs for our citizens. We want you to prosper. We know you have to make more money in times of inflation. That's a cinch. We're all hard up for money, because inflation has eroded the value of the dollar away. So, we need better jobs. We need more industry. We need more business. Well, I'll tell you one thing. If we really are serious about economic development around this Council table. One of the things that we have to consider is annexation because if we're going to try to recruit bigger business and bigger industry, and more industry, and more business, for this City, I'm telling you, that we need to continue a steady growth of annexation in this City. We need to incept with this little annexation plan that we have that's before us, today and will be in the future. We need to incept a solid plan of annexation of some sort. I'm not for a big annexation plan. We started out, thinking about 27 square miles, and 53 thousand people. We are down to thirteen thousand people or less, and less than five miles. And that's small. But I think, we ought to have an orderly annual plan, of annexation. Whereby over the years, we consider the annexation or a little bit of territory and a few people, each year. And when we pass into 1980, and we drop a year and we add a year on the plan. And we do it like we do everything else. That's the only way, to handle annexation. And that's what we are trying to incept with this annexation now. And I know you people out there in the audience. Many of you live in these areas. And I know you have spoken against annexation. But we want you in the City. Because we need you in the City, and I think once you are in the City, you'll help us a lot, and we'll help you, and we're just going to continue the great growth we had.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Alright. Thank you, Mr. Steen. Mr. Wing.

MR. STEEN: I'm finished. Thank you very much.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Canavan.

MR. CANAVAN: I just wanted to make a couple of comments. One is that, we have capital improvement needs all over the City. And I think we need to address them. I think the bond issue that we are working on now, is a process that hopefully will pass and relieve some of the problems. I heard the figure of one billion dollars worth of streets in repairs is needed, and a half billion dollars worth of drainage. Well, if we wait for these capital improvements to be completed, there will never be annexation in this City. You know, you say finish your homework. Well, I think we are trying to do that. When it comes to fire department, you say fire service. Someone said that their volunteer fire department was within a mile and a half. Well, I would venture to say, that the people that are going to man that volunteer fire department are not within a mile and a half. And the response time isn't going to be as good. One of the things that I can tell you, that is fact, and not fiction when it comes to the fire department, is that in the state of Texas, we are rated to have a superior fire department in the state. Our fire rates are the lowest of any in the state of Texas. And that's attributable to fire fighting and fire prevention facilities of the City. So, that argument really doesn't wash when you talk about well, our response time is bad or whatever.

When it come to police protection, I really fell like having been new on the Council, I missed the boat there. But we looked at the possibility of as many as 80 new police officers. We didn't do a thing about it, at that time. And that was a mistake. We should have, and I sincerely will pledge to you, because I'm going to support annexation. I don't know whether it's this package or not. I'm going to ride every area, and I've already started that. I'm going to look, and I'm going

to be certain. That there is one thing for sure, I'm going to work for the drainage project, for better police protection, because you deserve it. And I want your tax dollars used wisely, and I will work for that also. Next budget period time, I think you are going to find there are a whole lot of Council people that understand what this mass of people that's down here, saying to us today. And I think we will respond.

There's people in the county, that say well they are going to work very hard against everyone who votes for this package. And I think that's good. I think that everyone should start getting out. We had less than a fifty percent of registered voter turnout in this City. It's time the American public expressed their opinions. If it's against us, that's fine. But I am glad to see people that are willing to start working for the democratic process. So, that part doesn't bother me, and I just tell you for the remaining year and a half, that I've got to go, I am going to work to improve this situation. And I hope that you will be happy when it's all over. Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, I think that's great. I know you are not going to like what I have to say, either. But I'm just going to bring a few facts out that perhaps you don't know about and even some of my colleagues on the Council do not know. And one is addressing the problem that Mr. Webb was addressing. Ordinance #43774, which encompasses that territory around Randolph Field. The City of San Antonio didn't particularly want to annex that portion of the territory either, because they could not afford to give them the services with the amount of money, however, the Federal government and now, stop and think of this. The Federal government issued an edict to us. Either we had to protect Randolph Field from further encroachment by the annexation process, or they would close Randolph Field. And how many jobs do you suppose, and how many tears would we see at City Hall had that occurred. So, as a matter of fact, the City of San Antonio did its duty even though it may not have been the most pleasant duty.

I further would submit to you, I heard one man say increase the sales tax. I agree with you. I have been fighting for this ever since I've been on this Council to collect that other half cent sales tax, and it would take care of every capital improvement this City needs, without having to float bond issues, with great interest rates or anything else. It would take care of everyone of our Capital needs, and yes, the people that are surrounding this City, then would help us pay for the capital improvements. Because some of the citizens of this City are a little bit tired of carrying some of our outside neighbors on their backs as far as having to pay for all these bond issues. All right. Now, I told you in the beginning you wouldn't like what I had to say. And if you want to work and that's all right with me- You come over my territory and work all you want to, and- because I care nothing about political career. I'm going to do what I can for the City while I'm on this Council. And if I'm off tomorrow, I'm not going to shed any tears.

If you will look, we've heard how Dallas and Houston presents all the services to their people. How many policemen they have. I'll ask you then to stop and take a look at Dallas and Houston's tax rate, and then see how you stack up tax against their tax rate. We can give it to you, too, if the Council people want to do their duty. To provide these services by raising your tax rates in the City of San Antonio. Further, I would submit, that we could already have some of these policemen and some of these firemen, if some of our colleagues didn't try to support every cotton pickin' program that comes before this City that knows how to write a proposal and needs a job. So, they support the program with the monies that could be supplying you, with the services that you do not have right now. So, you're always going to have capital improvements in a big city. You're always going to have problems with your services in a larg City. And there is no panacea. If you want us

If you want us to raise your taxes, I'll raise your taxes, that's fine with me. But if we don't protect this City, so that we can grow and grow orderly, then you are going to have on your hands, a dead City, just like the City of Dallas. Dallas, is completely surrounded by incorporated cities, and cannot grow any further. The only way they can go is up and they can only go so far that way.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: Yes, madam. Well, if we don't succeed here, we'll try it again in October, whatever, the 25th. I've got to take a look at that schedule. So, see when this item is coming up. Okay. I don't know what it takes the Council to change their view on this particular matter. I think one of the statements that was made earlier today, by a resident in the area was, "please leave us alone." I felt it was the best statement that was made. We should leave them alone. They don't want to come into the City. I think they told you in very clear words that they don't want to come into the City. They've got petitions, after petitions. And perhaps we shouldn't fear political attack or criticism or whatever. Maybe that's not of concern. Because there are some people in those areas that probably won't be able to vote for any number of reasons. They are under age, or they are registered somewhere else in another State, or in another area of the State perhaps. But, they are still people. And they are people that are telling you that they don't want in. And I think the best that we could do is to honor that position, and to respect that position. You have here, just from one area, you have here, signatures. This one has twenty-five. This other one has twenty-six. This one has eighteen. This one has fourteen, and on and on, and on. And this is just one stack of signatures that was brought in. This is from one area, I think this is the Camelot area. So, I just don't know what it takes for this Council to understand what people are saying. And they are not talking about the controversial issues that were presented before this Council last week. They are presenting to you, a position that is opposite of the position that the City is taking right now, and that is, no annexation. They are the people. They are the people. You can't beat that kind of representation. As far as democracy is concerned, that is representation by each and everyone of those people that own houses on those areas, that are raising families in those areas, that are making payments on those houses that have budgeted around that house, in any number of ways. Now when, you've got working families, many of these houses have husbands and wives that are working. Many of them. They have to work this way, in order to make ends meet. And we are talking here about monthly payments that run anywhere from three hundred to five hundred- What was that? I would appreciate it if I wouldn't be interrupted by a member of the Council. I think you should have at least a little respect.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The Chair would ask all members of the Council to accord courtesy to each member of the Council.

MR. EURESTE: It might be a funny matter to some members of the Council. It's a serious matter to me. And I don't like joking about this matter. It's a serious matter. You're talking about hitting people's pocket book. You're talking about many people perhaps being forced to readjust their budgets. Some of them have said, this tax increase is going to break us. And we will not be able to continue living in that neighborhood. I think, most of you know what happened in the stock market, the day before yesterday, what happened yesterday to the lending rate, and again the day before yesterday. You've heard the news that the housing situation is going to be very tight. It's going to be very tight for this next year. I don't know, I think there's so many things that are going on -the state of the economy, the inability perhaps of the City to meet its present needs and what these people are saying. I think that aside from listening to anything else that we would simply listen to what these people are saying. And then vote accordingly. That would be the best thing that we could do as a Council. Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: Madam Mayor, I think I have the unique distinction of being the only one on this Council that was annexed in 1972. I don't know if anyone else can say that. But I was. I'm familiar with the annexation issues. One thing I do want to make perfectly clear, to the people that came down here and to my colleagues, that the argument this City cannot take care of its own, and I want to make sure you hear this, the argument that this City cannot take care of its own is wrong. And I will tell you why. Well, listen to me. There was 1.4 million dollars left over out of last year's budget that could have hired 70 policemen. It was not used in that capacity. It was not used in that capacity. Seventy policemen could have been hired. So, when I hear the argument the City of San Antonio can't take care of its own, that's not true. The City of San Antonio chose not to take care of its own. That was a decision that was made. That decision was an error. That decision was an error. You heard me today, if you've been here for the last five hours. You heard me today, say, that I wanted to hire two hundred policemen. I'll be calling on every Councilman to support me on that maneuver. I want to hire two hundred policemen. And that's not enough even when we do that. But that's all we can do.

So, the annexation issue certainly we are going to listen to it. I'm not going to tell you which way we are going to go. I don't know. I haven't made up my mind yet. But I will hear both sides. And after I've heard both sides, then I'll make up my mind. If I can have the floor please, Madam Mayor, can I have...

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes. Let me just say, that members of this audience clapped just a few minutes ago, when I asked everyone to show courtesy to the Council persons speaking, and I would certainly ask that the audience show that same kind of courtesy. Because I'm sure that you approve of that procedure, and you don't always agree with the person speaking but, we want to all show each other courtesy in this process.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't want to carry on a dialogue, and I think it's the fairness of the procedure is its breath. That we hear all sides of the argument. The Council hear the entire argument. And then in the wisdom of the Council, a decision is made. And whatever it is, I'm confident that I will support it one hundred percent. Which ever way it goes. I'll give it my full support. And the issue that I just alluded to, about our budgeting process. I was very new in that. It is no excuse. But I was at least counseled by some of the senior members on this Council. And now at looking back, that was an error, that was a mistake. We have to take care of those municipal services, and I took notes on every body that came up here. If you want to find out what I thought was important about what you said, I've got it right here. I want the Council to be aware, and I want to be able to remind the Council of the opinions that were brought down here today is that the City of San Antonio can't take care of its own and it's in every one of these cryptic notes, then how can they take care of someone else. Well, I'm going to pledge to do everything I can to make sure we do take of our own, that we do take care of this City, and we do spend our budget-spend our money- on services that the citizens require the City to spend it on. That's my commitment. Now, the annexation issue, we are going to hear both sides and once we have heard it, we'll make a decision.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Wing.

MR. WING: I just wanted to remind my colleague that he was the one that voted for - to use that one point four million dollars in another direction.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Were you finished, Mr. Wing?

MR. WING: Yes, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: Yes, Madam Mayor. I don't know. Who is the other side? We've heard one side, which are the people that have come here, and I haven't heard too many people say we want to come into the City. And I don't think you are going to hear that. We can wait, and I think we could wait another four weeks for that the masses of the people to come in here and say we want in. But, I don't think it's going to happen. I think what you have here is what you are going to have four weeks from now. You have heard both sides and the side that is carrying right now as far as where people are at, is that they are opposed to annexation. It's this Council and a limited number of staff members of the City that have pushed this annexation issue. So, it's this Council, the elected officials, some staff people who are for, and it's those folks out there, not only who live in the areas that we are proposing to annex, but also people who live in the City Proper who are saying we are against it. Now, I don't know where the other side is going to emerge from, and I don't know if we are going to see a delegation of people caravanning down to the City Hall saying bring them in, bring them in, with signs and the whole works. I don't think that is going to happen. I don't think that is going to happen. So, the sides have been heard, and we should be ready for some action. But if you want to wait, we'll wait and maybe the sides will emerge even more louder. And these people that are here today will come with others.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Let me urge that we get to a vote if we can, because we have an addition to everyone, we have thirteen people on the citizens to be heard, and we have the rest of the Council agenda. Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, I'm ready to vote. I'm just going to point out, yes, we have only heard one side of it, and I would guarantee you we would have to build another City Hall from all the people I have talked to that do want to bring them in.

MAYOR COCKRELL: If there's no further discussion. The motion is to direct City staff to put a halt to the process of the annexation proceedings and as I say we're not sure exactly of the legal status of it, but we certainly entertain the motion, and get at least an expression from the Council.

MR. EURESTE: Well, I think I need to comment now that the legal matter has been brought up. I don't know why-when I throw something out that maybe you don't happen to agree with or somebody else doesn't happen to agree with that there's a legal matter. Hell, we've done this- I've been here two and a half years. And some of you have been here longer. The presiding officer has been here longer than I have. I've been here two and a half years and we have conducted business in this fashion. We have conducted business in this fashion. and if this motion was to pass.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, let me just ask, Mr. Eureste do you recall having voted on an annexation before?

MR. EURESTE: No, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: That's what we're trying to say is that process is different.

MR. EURESTE: Well, the action that we would be taking here, Madam Mayor, and let me tell you the legal point of it. Is that you, this Council, if this matter passes, if this motion passes, to bring it into legal form, we would have an ordinance appear, either two hours from right now, or next week. That is the way we have handled these matters in the past. Okay. That's why I don't see a legal problem. And I'd need to clarify that because I don't want people leaving here thinking that I am breaking the law, that I'm some sort of criminal, or something like that. To me that is very important. I don't want to be pegged like that. And I know some people do it intentionally, because they

try to be mean, but I don't like that. And I'm going to take your time and everybody's else's time to clarify that point. There is nothing illegal about what we are doing right here, if it requires formal action, this action here would put it on an agenda in the future. That's all.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Let me just then state that certainly that the staff would accept this as a direction from the Council. If it requires further legal action, as I have stated, then, of course, it would have to be followed up on. That is all we are saying. All right, fine. The Clerk will call the roll on Mr. Eureste's motion.

MR. WEBB: YES.

MRS. DUTMER: NO.

MR. WING: YES.

MR. EURESTE: YES.

MR. THOMPSON: NO.

MR. ALDERETE: YES.

MR. CANAVAN: NO.

MR. ARCHER: NO.

MR. STEEN: NO.

MAYOR COCKRELL: NO.

DR. CISNEROS: ABSENT.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion fails, and so we will now go to the remaining portions of our agenda.

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,377

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AN AGREEMENT WITH
BEXAR COUNTY WHEREBY AN APPRAISAL SERVICES
DIVISION OF THE BEXAR COUNTY TAX OFFICE WILL
REPLACE THE METROPOLITAN TAX OFFICE.

* * * *

Mrs. Dutmer moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

Assistant City Manager, Mr. Louis Fox, stated that he had asked Mr. Alfred Hughes, Director of Appraisal Services Division at the County Tax Office, to be present in case technical questions needed to be answered.

Mr. Webb expressed concern about the power given to the County Tax Assessor by this Ordinance. He stated that the Tax Assessor of Bexar County, had recently fired two long-time employees and he stated that he was concerned about City employees also being fired.

Assistant City Manager, Louis Fox, stated that the two individuals were not a part of this particular section. He explained the purpose of this Ordinance.

Mr. Alfred Hughes, stated that these are two separate organizations performing two separate duties. He stated that they wish to consolidate it to have a single contract for one single effort. He further explained the Ordinance.

Mr. Webb stated that this item should be pulled and asked that Mr. Shaw, Bexar County Tax Assessor, to address his particular concerns.

Mr. Fox stated that he could comment on the matter of the individual being fired and further stated that Mr. Shaw would be willing to meet with Mr. Webb on this matter. Mr. Fox stated that with regard to this Ordinance, he would not suggest postponing it.

Mr. Webb moved to postpone this Ordinance. The motion died for a lack of a second.

Mrs. Dutmer asked that the cases of the two individuals not be discussed, because at the present time, it is now in litigation, and she asked that this Ordinance not be delayed.

Mr. Thompson stated that this Ordinance includes a 90 day extension. He expressed concern about what is occurring in the project, and the fact that the project is decelerating. He asked for a report on the status of the program.

Mr. Alfred Hughes stated that by combining the organizations, the program will be accelerated and the schedule met.

Mr. Thompson asked that he be kept advised of any deadline that might not be met.

After much discussion, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Dutmer, Wing, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: Webb; ABSENT: Cisneros, Eureste.

79-48 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Steen, seconded by Mr. Thompson, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Eureste.

AN ORDINANCE 51,378

APPOINTING MR. FRANK VAUGHAN TO THE SES-
QUICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

* * * *

79-48 The following Resolution was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Steen, seconded by Mr. Archer, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Eureste.

A RESOLUTION
NO. 79-48-100

AUTHORIZING AND APPROVING THE CREATION OF A
NONPROFIT INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
TO ACT ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO,
TEXAS.

* * * *

79-48 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,379

GRANTING A VARIANCE TO THE FIRE CODE TO
SAN ANTONIO PROFESSIONAL SPORTS, INC.,
RELATIVE TO SEATING IN THE ARENA.

* * * *

Mayor Cockrell explained that there are two options available to the City Council on this Ordinance.

Mr. Webb moved that option 1 be approved which would grant the San Antonio Spurs two additional rows of seats with no public liability insurance necessary. The motion died for a lack of a second.

Mr. Alderete spoke in favor of option 2, which includes Section 5 stating, "San Antonio Professional Sports, Inc., must file with the City Clerk evidence of a Public Liability Insurance Policy, naming the City as an additional insured or equivalent, issued by a company licensed to do business in Texas, in the minimum amount of \$1,000,000 per occurrence, for bodily injury or death or property damage arising by reason of its placement of seating as allowed herein. The temporary seating must be removed at the Spurs' expense and the aisle returned to its previous condition at the end of the 1979-80 Professional Basketball season. San Antonio Professional Sports, Inc., is authorized to install one (1) row of permanent seating at its expense following the 1979-80 season." Mr. Alderete made a motion to approve the Ordinance, Option 2. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

Mr. Wing took exception to several statements attributed to Mr. Angelo Drossos of the San Antonio Spurs. He stated that the City of San Antonio has been more than willing to work with the group.

Mr. Eureste also took exception to statements made. He said that he is not anti-Spur, and resented that he was labeled as such.

Mrs. Dutmer stated that she would be voting against the Ordinance because she has consistently voted against the waiver of the fire code and wants to be consistent.

Mayor Cockrell gave background history regarding this Ordinance and stated that the Spurs had asked for the use of the two rows which they had used in the last two years. She stated that the City Council learned that the Spurs had sold season tickets for the two additional rows of seats in anticipation of the City Council's approval. She further stated that the City Council has shown a great interest in the Spurs and will continue to work with them.

79-48 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Steen, seconded by Mr. Dutmer, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Mr. Dutmer, Wing, Euste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, and McKrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros.

AN ORDINANCE 51,380

MANIFESTING AN AGREEMENT TO AMEND LEASE DOT-FA78SW-1092 BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AND THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AMENDED LEASE DOT-FA78SW-1092 BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO AND SECURITY AIRPARK, INC.

* * * *

79-48 The meeting was recessed at 6:50 to allow the Council members to go into Execution Session and reconvened at 7:00 P.M.

79-48 The Clerk read the following Resolution:

A RESOLUTION
NO. 79-48-101

NOMINATING CANDIDATES FOR THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE APPRAISAL DISTRICT FOR BEXAR COUNTY.

* * * *

The following persons are hereby nominated as candidates for the Board of Directors of the Appraisal District for Bexar County:

1. Eloy Centeno
2. Mago Garcia
3. Scruggs Love
4. Clarence Williams
5. Sue Weems

CITIZENS TO BE HEARDMR. GAYLORD STEVENS

Mr. Gaylord Stevens, representing the Artists Alliance, proposed that the City Council investigate the possibility of leasing certain areas of the Riverwalk Area, that is the space underneath the bridges, to certain artists. He stated that these areas presently lie idle and leasing the space could create activity and provide revenue to the City. The present Riverwalk Ordinance prohibits this.

Mrs. Dutmer stated that she would be receptive to the suggestion and thanked Mr. Stevens for appearing before the City Council.

Assistant City Manager Lou Fox stated that he will work with the Parks Department on this matter and report to Council.

MR. CARL HENRY

Mr. Carl Henry, 153 Linares, spoke about the many improvements that have occurred in the City of San Antonio during the past three years. He asked that the City Council investigate the possibility of using municipal bonds for mortgages to help develop undeveloped areas within the City of San Antonio. The City of Houston is presently involved in such a project. He stated that forty percent of the land within the City limits is undeveloped, and something must be done.

MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ

Mr. Raul Rodriguez again spoke to the Council about a particular case involving a Police Detective. He stated that Fire and Police Civil Service Commission had reinstated the Detective after he had been dismissed by Chief of Police Emil Peters. He asked that the City Council instruct the Chief to appear before the City Council. He also asked that they instruct the Civil Service Commission to address the Council on this case.

Assistant City Manager Fox stated that a report to the Council on this matter will be forthcoming.

MR. ARTURO CUELLAR

Mr. Arturo Cuellar, 4830 Ray Bon, spoke to the Council regarding the proposed low-income housing complex to be erected in the northeast side of town. He stated that no one has a right to prevent someone from proper shelter and said it is against constitutional, civil and human rights.

MRS. NANCY BRUTON

Mrs. Nancy Bruton, 328 N. Pine Street, spoke to the Council regarding the rising crime rate in the east side of town. She stated that the YWCA on Pine Street has been vandalized twelve times in the past year. She spoke about the loss of equipment and supplies they have suffered. She spoke about the loss of security and safety they have now experienced. She asked that the City Council commit itself to better protect its citizens.

In response to a question by Mr. Webb, Mr. Bruton stated that some of the programs and activities are now taking place at the downtown YWCA. This could mean the phasing out of the East Side YWCA which has existed for over 70 years.

Assistant City Manager Fox stated that he would contact the Chief of Police and meet with representatives of the YWCA facility on suggestions about security and methods of preventing this type of vandalism. He also spoke about stepping up protection in this particular area.

MRS. EVELYN HAYS

Mrs. Evelyn Hays, a resident of the San Antonio Housing Authority, stated that she along with a group of citizens in the audience were present to defend low rent housing. She stated that public assistance has been in existence for many years, and they simply cannot do without it. She stated that they are trying to go forward and have the right to live anywhere in the City that they so desire.

Councilman Thompson stated that the resolution approved by the City Council at its meeting last week should be reviewed and reconsidered, and felt that it is wrong to stop the project in the north-east side of town.

Mr. Eureste commended Mr. Thompson on his comments and said that he would like for the resolution to be reconsidered by the City Council.

Mr. Steen stated that he had obtained a list of projects located in each Council District and proceeded to read the list.

Mrs. Dutmer took exception to the number listed in the report and stated that she personally knows of twelve such projects in her District.

MR. ED L. MINARICH

Mr. Ed L. Minarich spoke to the Council regarding the placing of low income complexes in the City of San Antonio. He stated that the notices which are sent out in rezoning cases should properly identify such projects so that residents will be aware of such cases.

Mr. Eureste stated that the notices sent out by the staff are in proper order, and if any other information is to be noted the staff would be taking on additional volume of work. He also stated that many times no stated use is listed in the application.

A discussion then took place on the permitted uses allowed in the different zoning classifications.

MR. M. CORONADO SANCHEZ

Mr. M. Coronado Sanchez stated that he is a resident of Alazan-Apache Courts. He further stated that the San Antonio Housing Authority is an agency attempting to help the low income citizens find adequate shelter. He said that he can't understand the logic of the northeast citizens being afraid of sixty-six families.

MR. R. E. WALBY

Mr. R. E. Walby, 5283 Round Table, asked for the Council to reconsider Zoning Case 7697 which had previously been approved by the Council. He stated that several promises made by the applicants, the Leeper Brothers, are not being adhered to. He stated that he had been before the Council before and they told him to report on any stipulations which were not being met.

Mr. Wing stated that he remembered the Case and that Mr. Walby does indeed have recourse on the matter if the building is not in accordance with the plat. He requested that the staff make a report on the plat approval and to check to see if what was approved by the City Council and the Planning Commission is being adhered to. He also offered to assist Mr. Walby with the matter.

Mrs. Dutmer suggested that Mr. Walby contact Mr. Quincy Lee and discuss the matter with him. She assured Mr. Walby of Mr. Lee's word.

Mr. Steen then stated that the Public Works Department is going to require the drainage problem to be addressed which had been a source of major concern to Mr. and Mrs. Walby.

Assistant City Manager Louis Fox stated that before a building permit is issued, the plans and specifications will have to be approved. He said that unless the drainage easement is addressed, the permit will not be issued.

Mrs. Dutmer then explained the procedure to having a plat approved by the Planning Commission.

- - -
MRS. J.A. BOUCHER

Mayor Pro-Tem Canavan then called upon Mrs. J.A. Boucher who stated that she did not wish to speak due to the lateness of the meeting.

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 8:20 P.M.

A P P R O V E D

Lela Cockrell

M A Y O R

ATTEST:

Roma S. Rodriguez
 City Clerk