

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
MONDAY, JANUARY 19, 1976.

* * * *

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 A. M. by the presiding officer, Mayor Lila Cockrell, with the following members present: PYNDUS, BILLA, CISNEROS, BLACK, HARTMAN, ROHDE, TENIENTE, COCKRELL; Absent: NIELSEN.

76-3 Mayor Cockrell stated that the purpose of the meeting was to canvass the votes of the Special Referendum Election held January 17, 1976.

The members of the City Council then proceeded to canvass the returns of the Election.

After the canvass was complete, the Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 46,247

CANVASSING RETURNS AND DECLARING THE
RESULT OF A REFERENDUM ELECTION HELD
JANUARY 17, 1976, ON AN ORDINANCE
PROVIDING FOR THE ZONING OF CERTAIN
PROPERTIES IN THE CITY.

* * * *

WHEREAS, Ordinance 45863 passed and approved on October 16, 1975, provided for the zoning of certain properties of the City; and

WHEREAS, prior to the expiration of the period prescribed by Charter, a petition bearing the valid signature of the required number of qualified voters of the City of San Antonio was duly filed requesting that said ordinance be repealed or a referendum election be held on said Ordinance; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, in response to said petition, by Ordinance 46045 of December 11, 1975, ordered that a referendum election on said ordinance be held on Saturday, January 17, 1976, on said ordinance; and

WHEREAS, said election was duly and legally held on the 17th day of January, 1976, in conformity with the Charter and the election ordinance heretofore passed by the City Council, and the result of said election has been certified and returned to this Council by the proper officials; and

WHEREAS, this Council has this day considered the returns of said election on the proposition hereinabove stated; and

WHEREAS, said election was in all respects lawfully held and said returns duly and legally made and there were cast at said election the following votes:

January 19, 1976

img

"Ordinance No. 45863 passed and approved October 16, 1975, providing for the zoning of certain properties in the vicinity of F. M. 1604 and U. S. 281, from 'Tempoary R-1' to 'R-1', Single Family Residential District, and 'P-1 (B-2)', Planned Unit Development Business District. FOR THE ORDINANCE."

12,407 votes;

"Ordinance No. 45863 passed and approved October 16, 1975, providing for the zoning of certain properties in the vicinity of F. M. 1604 and U. S. 281, from 'Tempoary R-1' to 'R-1', Single Family Residential District, and 'P-1 (B-2)', Planned Unit Development Business District. AGAINST THE ORDINANCE."

44,541 votes;

NOW, THEREFORE:

BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO:

The referred ordinance (No. 45863) providing for the zoning of certain properties in the vicinity of F. M. 1604 and U. S. 281 was not approved by a majority of the electors voting thereon at the aforementioned referendum election and is, therefore, repealed.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Rohde, seconded by Mr. Pyndus, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Nielsen.

The following discussion took place:

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: I would like to read a memo that I have issued this morning to the Council.

"As an immediate follow-up to the Saturday referendum on the Aquifer zoning case, I am recommending that the City Council request its Planning and Policy Objectives Committee, Chaired by Councilman Glen Hartman, to develop criteria to recommend to City Council for a City request for proposals for a Multi-Disciplinary Research Team. This Team would conduct impartial research into specific areas of concern and advise the City Council on the development of policy affecting the question of development over the Aquifer.

In developing the criteria, the Committee would consult with community leaders for their recommendations as to specific areas of concern and scope of studies which would be covered by the study. In addition, the Planning and Policy Objectives Committee would be requested to furnish the City Council with estimates as to probable costs and length of time the study would require.

January 19, 1976
img

-2-

Also, the City Council will need to adopt an interim policy to be in effect pending the completion of the Research Team's report and the City Council's final policy determination, and I feel we should request that the Planning and Policy Objectives Committee recommend this interim policy as a part of their report.

The City Council has already given strong direction to staff that the Council wants the Comprehensive Master Plan to move forward on an accelerated schedule with a goal of completion in January, 1977. I ask that the City staff prepare a plan for citizen participation in the Comprehensive Master Plan process. We need to provide an opportunity for the citizens in all quadrants of our city to continue their interest and participation which was exhibited so well in the Saturday referendum. I am sure that all members of the City Council wish to congratulate the citizens of San Antonio on the excellent participation in the election. We welcome that interest and concern."

DR. HENRY G. CISNEROS: Mayor, I think your sentiments which you expressed are exactly the kind of direction we need at this stage. With your permission I'd like to also read a short statement.

"Saturday's vote in the Edwards Aquifer referendum must not be interpreted by this City Council as an expression of negative sentiment. It was, and should be viewed, as a positive statement -- a positive expression of a desire for adequate and trustworthy protective standards for development over the Aquifer. If viewed in that manner, then Saturday's vote on one parcel of land can have very beneficial and positive results. This City Council must now act forthrightly and positively to enact adequate standards, assure their faithful enforcement, and to place before the citizens reasonable assurances that their city's water supply will not be threatened by haphazard growth.

Now that the election is behind us, it should be clear to all San Antonians that there are certain issues which are of concern to us all and which serve to draw us together as a city. There is no greater need before San Antonio than to achieve a sense of direction, a sense of unity for our city. Rational, well-advised policies for orderly growth and development can serve the interests of all San Antonians. I would call for deliberate and honest participation in the decisions before our city by all who have been opponents in this debate. Those whose view prevailed in Saturday's election have a responsibility to support a positive plan of action. Those whose position was not sustained have a duty to continue to advocate their position and thereby to keep the process honest.

It is my feeling that the job before the Council now is as follows:

1. Begin the long-overdue research effort on the relationship between development and protection of the city's water supply.
2. Work on tightening up the city's monitoring and enforcement capacity, to serve as a no-nonsense back-up system to those that now exist.
3. Move deliberately on a master plan for the city's growth that takes into account the scientific research findings concerning the Aquifer.

It is my firm belief that Saturday's vote was an expression of strong citizen concern for positive action by its City Council for quality growth in San Antonio."

January 19, 1976

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you. Mr. Hartman.

MR. GLEN HARTMAN: I would like to say, first of all, that I think your summation here is very excellent. I think I would like to say, first of all, that I'm always very happy to see the democratic process exercised in an enthusiastic manner. I think that was what we saw Saturday. I would likewise, also like to state that I think that now is the time we get on with the great deal of work ahead. There's a lot to be done. There are many, many hours of consideration, consultation, and decision making that lie ahead, and I think it's time now that all elements within the community address themselves to the all important aspects of this issue that lie ahead. As the Chairman of the Planning and Policy Objectives Committee, I enthusiastically accept the responsibility on behalf of my committee for undertaking this action. I can assure you that we will work diligently and consider this to be first priority task. Again, in closing, I would like to say that the democratic process continues to exercise from day to day and hour to hour and now we must take the next step. That is to insure that we carry out in a precise manner that which the citizenry requested that we do.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Madam Mayor, certainly the election that was held last Saturday was affirming the position that several of us took earlier when we voted to rescind the ordinance and we would have been at least two or three weeks ahead of this particular type of development and research and attitude that we would want to continue for the purpose of looking into the specific areas concerning any kind of growth or building or construction over sensitive areas. I feel, however, that I, as a person, would recommend that you, Madam Mayor, take the leadership in this committee because my position from the very beginning when I supported the issue of this zoning - this particular ordinance - was because I had supported the committee report of Planning and Policy Objectives Committee that came out from reports one time, only to find out that several of the members of that committee after submitting to Council several projects and several recommendations, then did not feel that that was adequate. Which is fine, and I understood that situation later, but I think this is of such importance and such magnitude that you, as Mayor, should handle this particular committee and possibly with Mr. Hartman, who has worked hard at it, could possibly work with you on this because they have quite a bit to offer. I think that this particular issue is of such importance that it should be handled by you Madam Mayor, and I respectfully request that you reconsider this type of situation because we've had the report from Planning and Policy Objectives Committee in the past and it wasn't supposedly complete. Now, we're asking that an interim status or the report be given to us that would recommend an interim policy, and I don't know what that would be at this time, and I have a lot of confidence in the committee that Mr. Hartman has, but on the other hand, I think that they have had an opportunity to deal with this, and I think it's just a change of the situation a little bit, and I would strongly urge that you head this particular committee at this point.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, Mayor Pro-Tem Teniente, I would be most happy to work with the committee. I do feel that it's going to take, really a committee effort to sit down and try to develop these criteria and after the recommendation will come to the Council, and it will be the entire Council that would have to approve or disapprove whatever we do.

MR. TENIENTE: Right, but....

MAYOR COCKRELL: But I would be happy if, Mr. Hartman, would that meet with your approval if I sit in and work with you on that?

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, by all means, the committee would certainly welcome your participation, and we will certainly be more than happy with you. I would like to state that, for the benefit of the Mayor Pro-Tem's information that the words throughout here with regard, as a matter of fact for any committee, is that of recommendation. This is recommendation to the whole City Council so whatever inadequacies he may feel with regard to this committee it only be in the form of a recommendation, and as he well knows it requires five votes for anything to become final on this Council.

MR. TENIENTE: That's well understood, Councilman, but you have four members on that committee, and all you have to do is pick up one vote and you've got the thing going. And this is a situation we have, and so I'd have a little better feeling if Madam Mayor would work in this particular area. That's all because, here we have a committee with four persons and all they need is one more vote, and it will swing any way they want. And I'd like to see this whole Council be able to work with the policies at some point or other but the recommendation would just then need this one more vote, and I'm just being practical about it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: I can't help but respond to that. I would say that if you would review all the projects that have been undertaken by the Planning and Policy Committee that you will find there has been a divergent vote in several instances with regards to the water rate.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: I'm not talking about those things

MR. PYNDUS: I would say that rather than - there's some inconsistency with regards to - do you have four votes? Actually, each person on that committee has a different input and a divergent

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: But the problem is that this issue has already been brought before us with a recommendation from that committee and it wasn't acceptable, is what I'm saying. This particular issue is what I'm addressing to right now and the people have said that they want a change and they don't want it as it was. So I'd like to just

MR. PYNDUS: Well, I feel very hesitant in tying our Mayor down to subcommittee work.

MR. ROHDE: There's no bigger issue than this one.

MR. PYNDUS: We would invite the participation. I'm sure our Chairman, Glen Hartman, would invite the participation of every member on the Council.....

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Then you have a majority of Council, that's what I'm saying. One more member on that would make a majority.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, let me just ask this, is there general agreement that the thing that the Council wishes to do is to develop the criteria and that we wish to advertise for proposals for a research team to answer the questions that are still unanswered in the minds of our citizens or Council members and to advise the Council on reaching its final policy decisions. Is this the move that we all feel?

MR. PYNDUS: I respond very strongly to that, Mayor Cockrell, in fact I think that that position rests with this Council with or without the referendum. I think definitely I would so move to accept your recommendations and hope for a second.

MR. HARTMAN: I second that motion.

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, I'd like to say a few remarks.

MR. BILLA: Madam Mayor, I'd like to discuss this.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine, you certainly may.

MR. BILLA: I'd like to discuss, your Honor, it's not related to what we're talking about, but I certainly am delighted with the turnout. I don't think it - it certainly reflects the citizens' don't want something, but I don't think it resolves the real question and issue at hand. I respect your recommendation but I think that we have this problem of a committee that nearly constitutes the majority coming into the Council and making recommendations to it, and I think that probably an outside consultant to make recommendations to this Council would be the most appropriate step because I think that this - I still believe it's an emotionalism involved in the judgements that have been made, and whenever you get supposed testimony of experts that say one thing can be done, and then we listen to another group - about 8 people's opinions that are not experts. Yet the will of the people always prevails, as Mr. Hartman has said, the democratic process must prevail and I'm certain that that's true and I want to concur with Mr. Teniente. I think that we could accomplish as much by rescinding the ordinance but that's all history now. So I think that it is important that the issue is of such magnitude and such monumental importance to the City that whatever we undertake not necessarily has to be on a committee but that you should take the leadership in not only making recommendations

but defining how we proceed in this question of what's to be done about our growth which I think is essentially the issue that we're really addressing.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: Thank you, Mayor. I want to make a little statement and then I'd like to address myself to the ten commandments of the Aquifer. I look at the mall vote Saturday as a quality of life vote. It's a vote that the citizens do not want an unheavenly City, they want a heavenly City. The voters said, give this City balance and a sensible direction in its growth, jobs, and economics and protect its quality of life better. It's asking for a dike to protect not only its pure water in the Edwards Aquifer but also protect all neighborhoods and inner cities. It's asking that all citizens want the rewards of the City government distribution according to all areas on a one man, one vote principal.

In addressing myself to the committee, that I've been very disturbed, Mayor, that a committee wrote the ten commandments of the Edwards Aquifer after great study and detail and brought it to this Council. When the time came for them to back that document up, which was not a holy document, but it was a guideline and a direction that this Council would go into and they supported it and didn't support it all the way, to me, is an unforgiveable sin. It's caused this problem that we have here today. I do support the vote and I've heard the message from the citizens but to send this back to the same committee is not in the best interest of the City of San Antonio. I speak that from my heart and from my experience of fifty-five years that once you back something you've got to back it all the way or it's not going to work.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, I should like to refresh the memory of some people present here today with regard to exactly what happened. Inasmuch as this matter has been brought up with regard to the so called ten commandments of the Aquifer, I certainly am awed by the great deal of inspired writing that has been ascribed to the committee. I would like to state that the recommendations made at that time with regard to the Mall or the Aquifer Ordinance related to the execution of the Texas Water Quality Board Order and the Texas Water Quality Board Order was the basis on which that particular Ordinance was recommended to the Council. The Texas Water Quality Board Order did not address the matter of storm drainage runoff and it was, therefore, not considered within the purview of the committee to go beyond the purview of the Texas Water Quality Board on that very vital issue. As several of the gentlemen who have spoken earlier will recall, it was the issue of storm drainage runoff which I think was perhaps the principle issue on this particular parcel of land. It, therefore, evolved that the portion which had not been covered by the Order which had not been covered by the Ordinance was perhaps one of the main stickpoints in the entire issue.

So I would like to just summarize by stating that the action - the recommendations made by the committee earlier in early October were as far as the committee felt the Council could go within existing ground rules of the Texas Water Quality Board, and in so did that. It would also be well to remind persons that at that time the committee stated that this was merely the first step that should be taken on this issue that there were many other steps to be taken beyond that. I think the record will so reflect and to indicate that there was any sort of a cop out or inconsistency or misleading is - reflects a faulty memory.

MR. BILLA: Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Mr. Billa.

MR. BILLA: I think that what Mr. Hartman says is essentially correct, but I think that the resolution they they proposed addressed all zoning over the Aquifer and over the sensitive areas, and then he mentioned the Texas Water Quality Board having influence in the recommendations they made, but I think the City and the citizens of this City apparently want stricter rules. We can impose any rules that we want. So, I don't think that has benefits. We can impose stricter rules than the State actually requires, I believe, and you do it in the subdivision ordinance in many respects.

MAYOR COCKRELL: May I just sum up. It seems that we're all agreed as to the fact that we want to employ a team of experts to continue research. We want a report made to the Council. We want to get input from the citizens as to what types of questions they feel should be included in the study. We want to get a handle on drawing up the criteria. There is some difference of opinion as to just how we should go about doing this. The suggestion that I had made was to having Planning and Policy Objectives Committee do this. The Mayor Pro-Tem has asked that I serve in a leadership role in this effort, and I think this is the only area that we have not yet really reached agreement on our approach. Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, I would just like to state again, the fact that we do have a motion before the Council which has been seconded, and not yet voted on. That is the fact that the Planning and Policy Objectives Committee, as the Mayor Pro-Tem and other members of this Council who have spoken against that committee this morning are well aware of, the committee has not only discussed the issue, for example, of the City Water Board rate increase openly but has invited every, each and every participant of the community to be present, and it has a very solid record of presence of just about every element that I think has any particular interest in that matter. They have participated; the committee invites all participation. We would certainly hope that it would be conducted in that fashion with the matter of total participation, which the committee welcomes, and it would certainly be the will of the committee that anyone who wishes to sit in and participate would be invited to do so, and this has been the case of all committee deliberations, as the Mayor Pro-Tem and two of his colleagues are well aware.

MR. TENIENTE: Madam Mayor, we cannot take action on any motion unless they have posted this particular item. I think the only thing we can legally act upon this morning is the canvassing of the votes, and I'm not an attorney, but would you...

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: That's correct. The only thing you could do is whatever is posted...

MR. TENIENTE: We're just discussing. We're just talking. So, we can close this discussion Councilman Hartman.

January 19, 1976
img

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, in just simply referring to a committee we cannot go that far.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: That would be something that doesn't require action anyhow because it would be an official body.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: Mayor, I would ask that we put this on the agenda for Thursday. I think that this resolution is well intended, and it's something that we need to begin with immediately.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Actually, what is needed is not necessarily a resolution or a formal action. This is really reaching consensus of the Council. It's just to how we want to proceed, and I think that perhaps Council members need another day or so to think about it. I think that we're agreed as to a part of the recommendation which is what we want to do which is to employ a research team. We're not quite agreed as to whether we wish to refer this to a committee or whether we wish perhaps the Council as a committee of the whole to address this. It's simply going to mean that someone is going to have to sit down and try to work with the citizens, work with the City staff developing a detailed criteria. Now, do you want a little more time to have a chance to review that?

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, I feel that there's a little emotion on the Council as yet, and I'm surprised but I always believe in a cool hand and a cool glass of water always settles us down, and let's postpone this action.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, we - perhaps we can have it discussed on the "B" Session then very briefly on Thursday, and by then we may have jelled as to which approach we would prefer.

COUNCIL MEMBER: I would like to have it in "B" Session, Mayor Cockrell.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine, thank you. Mrs. Gallego.

MRS. BEATRICE GALLEGO: I would like to be recognized please.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Certainly.

MRS. GALLEGO: The San Antonio COPS Organization is overwhelmed at the magnitude of support shown by the citizens of San Antonio for the policy concerning their own best interests with respect of growth policy and protection of San Antonio's precious water supply, the Edwards Aquifer. COPS is extremely pleased with the citizens overwhelmingly reject, a hate-filled vicious campaign which was financed by Charles Becker and John Monfrey. These men raised \$50,000 to try to confuse the citizens with respect to their own best interests. It is clear from the results of Saturday's election...

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mrs. Gallego, may I just ask that you do not direct it at any personalities. We're trying to get away from that kind of thing.

MRS. GALLEGO: Fine, it is clear from the results of Saturday's election that the City Council has a mandate to take steps to institute a land to use a master plan. The elements of which will include: (1) Down zoning of the nine hundred plus acres of commercial land over the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone; (2) Insist upon a set of regulations by Texas Water Quality Board that provides for the collection and treatment of all storm water run-off; (3) The hiring of a nationally known firm to

investigate the technical and economics feasible of pollution free development; (4) There should be a moratorium on all zoning cases, plat approval and building permits over the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone until the results of such study has been translated into a set of policies, guidelines satisfactory to the citizens of San Antonio. Such a study, of course, should involve steps to identify the critically sensitive areas of the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone. So that, if such a process should culminate in the purchase of such areas to give the landowners fair market value return on their property. Such a purchase plan should be a package plan which would involve participation by state, county and federal government. Any land-use plan should involve a set of policy guidelines that encourage redevelopment of the central city and the older neighborhoods. It is clear that the C.O.P.S. organization has cast over 30,000 votes on the south and the west and the east, and the near north. Just a sample is the Edgewood area, 35 to 1 and in my area, 16 to 1. Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Mrs. Gallego. May I just - excuse me, one thing I have failed to do is clear the Council minutes. May I ask that that previous motion and the second be withdrawn. We had agreed informally to - we had the motion referring to the committee and.....

MR. PYNDUS: I moved and I will withdraw the motion.

MR. HARTMAN: I was the seconder, and inasmuch as no formal motion would be proper, I will withdraw that if we just appear to be an informal action that we were taking. It was in that context that I seconded it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, so we do have the motion withdrawn. Thank you, Mrs. Gallego. Yes. Mrs. Sinkin would like to be recognized. Mr. Rohde, while she's coming, would you like to be recognized?

MR. ROHDE: I'd like to put for the record in the minutes of this meeting that since I voted for the referendum vote that Councilman Al Rohde did not participate directly or indirectly, with any groups, any organizations, did not attend any meetings, I did not attend any group pro or con, I did not make any speeches, I did not make any press releases regarding of telling the citizens of - take a stand either for or against the Aquifer issue, and I think that's important that I put that in the minutes.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Thank you, sir. Mrs. Sinkin.

MRS. FAY SINKIN: Good morning. We have not - we were not going to make a statement today, but we are disturbed listening to you because you have placed a most important issue into your "B" session, and we request that where we go from here should be an open Council meeting, and that we be permitted to give you our suggestions. We have a board meeting tonight and we will be coming down Thursday with a number of suggestions for your consideration.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Let me say, the "B" session is open and you may be heard at the "B" session. The only difference between the "B" session and the "A" session is that the "B" session is just a more informal session which we have, in effect, work items and we were - and this is at the stage where we're discussing procedure and how we're going to move in terms of procedure rather than in taking final actions and so, if we decide to act as a committee as a whole, that will be under discussion, or if we decide to refer to the Planning and Policy Objectives Committee. That's the area.....

MRS. SINKIN: Our question to you, though, is the "B" session has a time limit to it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It's at 8:30.

MRS. SINKIN: And it has a time limitation.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes.

MRS. SINKIN: Right. We would like to have this discussed with more time than you have at the "B" session, and we would prefer that you put it on your agenda so that we would have time to discuss it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: You could continue a "B" session in the afternoon if you wanted to.

MAYOR COCKRELL: We do - we have "B" session in the morning, and we can also continue it in the afternoon. The difference is whether it is more properly a "B" session or an "A" session item.

MAYOR PRO-TEM RICHARD TENIENTE: Madam Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Mr. Teniente.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: The "B" session is only to set up the committee that will then be working with the groups that would be bringing in the ideas. We're not making any formal - making any formal decision or are we going in any direction. This is only to set up the committee that will be working with all groups interested in providing information that will then come back to Council. And that's the only thing that's going to be handled at "B" session, if I'm correct.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Dr. Cisneros.

DR. HENRY CISNEROS: Fay, the only distinction is that in the "A" session, it's set up that matters that are discussed there have as their outcome a.....(inaudible) that has legal standing as an ordinance. That's not likely to occur in what we're talking about now. So we could cover it in "B" session if it takes longer than that, then we would have to go on into the "B" session after that.

MRS. SINKIN: All right, well, then, we would be satisfied if you would just have an item on the agenda that we could speak to on Thursday, for your regular session.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is that to present your plans?

MRS. SINKIN: Right.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: That's in Citizens to be Heard or she can remain for the "B" session which will be sometime after lunch.

DR. CISNEROS: We can make it the first "B" session item.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: No, we've got two items that have to be on the "A" session that you've got to act on.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The "B" session at 8:30 of course, if that would afford ample opportunity. It's just that you would prefer to make it in here rather than across the hall.

MR. PYNDUS: May I suggest, Mayor Cockrell?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: In the interest of time, Mrs. Sinkin, if your report could be written or digested by this Council, your presentation time would be cut down. I welcome the input, in fact, if I have something that I grapple with and study in the evening, it gives me a little bit better grip on it. So, as far as the time limit is concerned, if you

can give us this information prior to the meeting, I think it can be covered in a "B" session.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, let me make this suggestion. I think that the request has come from the citizens for having an item on the "A" session is one that we should give heed to. I don't think it makes all that much difference, and if the citizens would feel better satisfied with having it addressed in the "A" session, that's fine. I don't see any reason why not. So, let's put an item on the agenda of consideration of follow-up action to the referendum.

DR. CISNEROS: First item on the "A" session.

MAYOR COCKRELL: And let's have it the first item on the "A" session.

MR. ROHDE: I favor that.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, would that include the implication that there would be a formal vote then on that following the discussion on the "A" session?

MAYOR COCKRELL: A formal vote to - as to the establishment of a committee.

MR. HARTMAN: Yes.

MRS. SINKIN: Thank you very very much.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: You see these are all emergency items. Now that's been posted. These are all - these are emergency items. That's been posted because of the open meetings law. So, we'll have to post an emergency for this one item and put it on your docket for number one.

MR. PYNDUS: Mrs. Sinkin, I would feel like to....thank you, Mayor. I would still like to request the written information.

MRS. SINKIN: Yes, we have our meeting tonight, and we should have it in your hands by Wednesday.

MR. BILLA: That's a list of your recommendations?

MRS. SINKIN: Right.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine. Thank you. All right, then, yes, Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, I also want to add to those minutes, I didn't give any money.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, fine. Thank you.

MR. HARTMAN: Bless you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Are there any other statements? Well, we thank the citizens for coming down.

MR. BILLA: Mayor.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes.

MR. BILLA: I erroneously said something that we could have a more stringent, set more stringent rules than the TWQB, and I'm informed and recall that that's not correct but I think if they're followed, they're pretty strict if you have enforcement.

January 19, 1976

-12-

el

MR. HARTMAN: That's a big if, Mr. Billa.

MR. BILLA: Just being here is a big if, Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: I would agree, Mr. Billa.

MAYOR COCKRELL: If there's no further business, we stand adjourned.

There being no further business to come before the Council,
the meeting adjourned at 9:50 A. M.

A P P R O V E D

Lila Cockrell
M A Y O R

ATTEST:

G. V. Jackson Jr.
C i t y C l e r k

January 19, 1976
el

13