

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1976.

* * * *

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 A.M., by the presiding officer, Mayor Lila Cockrell, with the following members present: PYNDUS, BILLA, CISNEROS, BLACK, HARTMAN, ROHDE, NIELSEN, COCKRELL; Absent: TENIENTE.

76-7 The invocation was given by The Reverend Joseph Deane, St. Ann's Catholic Church.

76-7 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

76-7 PRESENTATION BY FATHER JOSEPH DEANE

Father Joseph Deane presented a volume of the Bicentennial American Catholic Heritage to Mayor Cockrell from the members of St. Ann's Catholic Church.

Mayor Cockrell thanked Father Deane for this gift.

76-7 FORMER COUNCILMAN CLIFFORD MORTON

Mayor Cockrell recognized Mr. Clifford Morton, who was in the audience, and welcomed him to the meeting.

76-7 The minutes of the meetings of January 29 and February 5, 1976, were approved.

76-7 REPORT OF THE COUNCIL COMMITTEE ON AQUIFER POLICY

The following discussion took place:

MAYOR COCKRELL: As you may know, the Council's Committee met last Friday and after reaching some preliminary conclusions announced that it would be making a report today to the City Council. This was posted legally as an add-on item after the original City docket had been prepared. So, on behalf of that Committee, I will be making the report.

"The Council Committee studying policy recommendations for development over the Edwards Recharge Zone has had two meetings and has come up with the following recommendations:

1. That the City Council direct the City staff to proceed with advertising for proposals from consultants to determine to what extent activity and development can occur on the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone and related areas (1) without any degradation of the water in the Edwards Aquifer, (2) without degradation of the water in the Edwards Aquifer to require treatment (other than chlorination) to meet the U. S. Public Health Service Drinking Water Standards and (3) the degree of degradation associated with successive increments of development between these limits. In each case the study will

February 12, 1976

outline the necessary steps for legal implementation of the recommendations and provide cost analysis for accomplishing same. (An outline of materials to be submitted in the proposals including the purpose of the study is attached.)

2. The Committee recommends that a moratorium be placed on zoning changes on all properties over the Edwards Recharge Zone and drainage areas until such time as a comprehensive master plan has been completed or until the City Council adopts policy regarding development over the Recharge Zone and drainage areas, whichever occurs first. It is the City Attorney's recommendation that in no case should a moratorium extend beyond January 31, 1977. The City Attorney has also ruled that there is no way that the Council can prohibit approval of new subdivision plats in the area provided the subdivision plats that are submitted meet all of the requirements of the existing subdivision regulations. A copy of the City Attorney's report is attached.

The Council Committee will meet again on Friday, February 13, to consider the advisability and legality of a moratorium on building permits over the Recharge Zone and the drainage areas.

Two resolutions are attached for consideration. One is authorizing the City staff to proceed with advertising for proposals for a consultant and the other placing a moratorium on zoning on the Edwards Recharge Zone and drainage areas."

Now, we do have persons who are scheduled, who have signed up to speak on the moratorium. Perhaps the idea should be considered separately that we should first consider the matter of the resolution appointing the or taking proposals for the consultants and then, second, consider the resolution on the moratorium in which time we will hear from those citizens who have registered to speak. Yes, Dr. Cisneros.

DR. HENRY G. CISNEROS: Mayor, my suggestion would be that we take them concurrently because it's ridiculous to get a study underway if things are going to be proceeding during the time that the study is being done. So, they really go hand in glove and it would be, I think, a mistake to get a study underway without...

REV. CLAUDE W. BLACK: Mayor, I'd like to, because I think if you simply say because you don't adopt a moratorium that things go on as they have, that's an error because I think you've got to separate the moratorium from the free action of this Council. Now, the free action of the Council could be a denial of zoning at any time that it's brought before us so it does not necessarily mean because you don't act upon the moratorium that you've got something going on. I would like to make that distinction for Councilman Cisneros.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. It's your point then that they might be considered separately or you prefer...

REV. BLACK: Yes, separately, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes Mr. Hartman.

MR. GLEN HARTMAN: I would view it strictly from the aspect of the time factor in response to Mr. Cisneros' suggestion. I think that the matter of getting into process, the matter of advertising for professional services realizing that this will take some time, it would be advantageous from that standpoint to proceed with the advertising for the professional services. I think that, while I would certainly

agree that there needs to be a very close consideration of the two items, I would see nothing wrong, however, in having the advertising action begin now realizing this is going to be a lengthy process.

DR. D. FORD NIELSEN: Madam Mayor, I think that's quite valid. Also, in the report there is a bit of inherent reductionism. It says that the, first page number two, well, the Committee recommends that a moratorium be placed on all zoning changes on all properties over the Edwards Recharge Zone and drainage areas until such time as a comprehensive master plan has been developed or until the City Council adopts a policy regarding development. We already have a good number of policies regarding development over the Recharge Zone and drainage areas. So, that's a little confusing to put it very bluntly.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I'd be glad to amplify on that.

DR. NIELSEN: Well, at some point it's relative to the whole question of the consultants or advertising, I would hope that we would have some amplification. This is not adequate, in my humble opinion, relative to advertising for bids until we have a little more specifics about what we're going to advertise for and what areas. You know, there's a whole lot of things we can talk about.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Did you see the second page?

DR. NIELSEN: Yes, I saw them, yeah, but that still doesn't, in my humble opinion, address what we're fundamentally talking about regarding the type of expertise that we're going to be asking for.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine, I will then go into the supplemental report since it seems to be required. So, let me just invite your attention to the suggested steps for selecting the consultants for determining development and implementation.

"It was decided by the Committee to accept a recommendation that was made by staff that we divide the study into two parts and that the first step would be to invite proposals determining the scope of study with an analysis of existing data by the consultants. Mr. Sueltenfuss is in the process of gathering all available studies and data that are presently available and these will be on file and available in his office. We would first ask that the consultants review all of the existing data and determine from that what they would propose and see as areas which still need to be addressed and, in effect, brought together in a final conclusion in order to answer any unresolved questions at this point.

The first step will also include a listing of the personnel, the background of all the personnel proposed to be used by the consultants in preparing and relating their studies. Then, as phase two, we will determine that this data will be included. It would include the outline of procedures to be used by the consultant in accomplishing phase two and carrying out the mission, including additional studies in methodology, recommendations to accomplish the goal, procedures for legally implementing the recommendations, the overall economic and ecological impact of implementing the recommendations and the time frame to accomplish the study. Also, methods of financing the recommendations and the citizen participation components. Also, to list the personnel and background to be used in each of the studies including lists of the related studies or activities indicating experience in related work.

Now, those are the outlines of what would be required in the consultant's proposal. The City Council would make the final determination of the consultant. It would be on recommendation of

the Council's Committee but the Council will make the final decision. We would then advertise for the proposals. We would advertise if the Council passes this resolution but the final determination of the selection would be by the City Council.

DR. NIELSEN: Madam Mayor, is Mr. Sueltenfuss here? About how long will it take you and staff to compile what studies and information going back to X number of years, whenever you got that kind of data, how long will that take?

MR. MEL SUELTFENFUSS, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS: We expect to have that done within the next two weeks.

DR. NIELSEN: Okay.

MR. SUELTFENFUSS: And we've got the bibliography done. It's a matter now of trying to pull in the reports that relate to the bibliography.

DR. NIELSEN: In your perusal of the bibliography, what areas have already been studied fundamentally in your opinion, Mel?

MR. SUELTFENFUSS: I think basically all the areas have been studied. Now whether they have been studied to the depth, that final conclusions can be drawn, I think that's the basic question and I think that...

DR. NIELSEN: How about in terms of urban land economics? Have you really ever done anything in that particular area at all?

MR. SUELTFENFUSS: Some of the bibliography we have relates to that but I don't know the depth. I haven't seen the depth on some of that. There are some on economics, we have some studies that relate to economics but I really haven't had a chance to go into depth on it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I might say this is one of the areas that the Council Committee felt was very important to be sure that we had looked at carefully, the relation of all aspects of economics to the landowners, to the City, to related areas. Yes, Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, I think there's another aspect too that was of course discussed during the Committee's discussions. Mr. Sueltenfuss has pointed out, for example, that all of the areas have at one time or other been addressed and I think that during the Committee discussion the point that was made and agreed to was the fact that, whereas there has been this kind of addressal in the past, one of the tasks inherent in the task to be undertaken by this consultant was, in effect, to serve as a reviewer if you will, to put eventually the, you know, review and indicate the applicability, or if you want to call it authority of this particular study and with the idea of putting to an end hopefully, finally, the question of my expert is better than your expert type of argument. So, we can have beforehand the understanding that the compendium of the study to be undertaken would include the input of the very studies done before with an evaluation of those studies and putting them into their proper perspective.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PHIL PYNDUS: Mayor Cockrell, I was wondering inasmuch as the Committee did recommend a moratorium and one date was mentioned and that was not passed, January of 1977. To me this is a rather abrupt approach and I'm wondering what type of input the Committee had from people who would be affected by a moratorium, particularly those people who might have legitimate zoning cases that could be passed

by the Council. Did you have this input so that you could state categorically that this moratorium is recommended period and the length of time that you have mentioned, particularly after a comprehensive master plan is complete, is unsatisfactory? I'm not comfortable with that because that is so vague a date.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, I'll be glad to amplify that. The City Attorney had advised us, I understood, that we could set a moratorium that would have a definite and reasonable time limit and that would be tied to a specific reason for selecting the date. Now, it seems to us that there would be two possible dates to select. Since the Council has already given strong direction that we wish the comprehensive master plan to be completed and adopted by the end of January of this next year, certainly that would contain, we would hope, resolution of any land use considerations that would perhaps underlie zoning decisions in this area. That would be one date that it could be substantiated legally as a reason for having that particular date.

The other would be, should the Council after receiving the consultant's final report at that time adopt its definite policies regarding the land over this area that even though the master plan had not been completed in all of its entirety, that having the final Council policy determination which would follow the receipt of the study that that would also be a reasonable point to peg as a time when the moratorium would be listed. So, those two dates were selected by having action that would correspond and provide the legal basis for listing of the moratorium at that time.

Now, in terms of the input from affected persons, we did try to notify some of those persons in agencies whom we know were interested and certainly we had some adverse comments. I could not say that the recommendations of the City Council meet with any sort of general approval from all sources and I'm sure that some of the persons who are here today would speak for themselves on those issues. Yes, Mr. Rohde.

MR. AL ROHDE: Mayor, I want to be fair to the citizens because I do have a prepared statement. I thought perhaps the proper procedure would be to read it after the debate but I feel in fairness to the citizens who are here to speak on the issue that some may disagree with me and I feel that this is the time to do it. I would like to read this statement as to the moratorium on the zoning change on the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone. I'm making this statement so that my words are not misinterpreted or otherwise because it's going to be a part of this record.

"Greater San Antonio must grow and live in all areas of the City or die. I see no reason to misuse the power and ability I have to effect my will, by my vote to effect a stagnation and slow death over any one area of this City at the direct expense of other areas. Progress is impossible without change. But change doesn't always produce progress. Progress can also produce regression. I think sometimes those elected can easily mistake one for the other.

I did not come to City Hall to alienate any citizen, business or growth. San Antonio's good life is based around a good, strong economy and military base. To maintain that good, strong economy, a careful prepared program of economic growth is necessary for our survival. The Edwards Aquifer is not out of control as to the health, safety and welfare of our water supply. It's a fact there has been no hard technical evidence to date that the water quality of the Edwards Aquifer is endangered or polluted, that construction over it is hazardous to the quality of the water.

This proposed Aquifer moratorium resolution will only fuel future fires to burn down the growth of San Antonio. This resolution is in its present form an expression of "anti-business", "anti-growth", "anti-respect" of the constitutional rights of landowners over the Edwards Aquifer.

If the Council passes this resolution on its present form, the next item of anti-business and anti-growth to come before the Council will be to ban all new building permits and approve plats over the Edwards Aquifer.

For me to support this type of a resolution, there must be a better reason and compromise that future livelihood in the San Antonio City limits of the Edwards Aquifer will not become neutered territory."

Yesterday, Mayor, I went to the Planning Commission and polled the Planning Commission as to my wisdom and judgment in this matter. There were seven members present. It was about an hour discussion. In polling all the seven members, five said that they did not approve this moratorium. I think this Council should listen to the wisdom of this important group. They gave me reasons and justifications why they should not. That made a majority of that Planning Commission. The Planning Commission was further disturbed that they did not even receive a copy of this ordinance in advance to make a comment on it and they did not have it in their possession. They had no knowledge that it was probably going to be on the agenda other than just verbal reports. I do feel that while this thing will be debated here this morning in its present form, I will not support and vote for it unless there is a compromise to take out the hardness that I feel it has in it at the present time. Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, thank you. Let us, shall we first consider the resolution on the advertising authorizing for sealed bids and then we will hear the citizens on the second. Is that agreeable? All right, will the City Clerk read the caption.

The Clerk read the following Resolution:

A RESOLUTION
NO. 76-7-7

AUTHORIZING CITY STAFF TO ADVERTISE
FOR SEALED PROPOSALS FOR PROFESSIONAL
SERVICES FOR A STUDY AND RECOMMENDATIONS
TO DETERMINE WHAT DEVELOPMENT OR ACTIVITY
CAN SAFELY OCCUR OVER THE EDWARDS AQUIFER
RECHARGE ZONE AND RELATED AREAS WITHOUT
ENDANGERING THE WATER QUALITY IN THE
EDWARDS AQUIFER.

* * * *

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is there a motion?

MR. PYNDUS: I move for adoption of the Resolution.

MR. BOB BILLA: I second the motion.

DR. NIELSEN: Yes, point of clarification. I was just checking with the City Attorney. I think we should make it clear that these proposals for professional services are not specifically in the area of engineers, etcetera who are by law forbidden to make a sealed bid. I think you should clarify the other aspect of this just for the record, Jim.

CITY ATTORNEY JAMES PARKER: Well, it could be somebody that it is not in the realm of preparing a set plan or to build one project. So, therefore, I think in that area that they would not be prohibited to furnish or bid on furnishing a service to compile information of that type of situation. My only personal advice is that whoever you ultimately hire that they be a person or organization that will be able to qualify in a court of law as an expert to be able to testify. Some people we listen to around here are, would not so qualify in a court of law but whoever we actually end up with I would strongly recommend that they would be a person or group that would be recognized in a legal capacity to testify and qualify as an expert.

DR. NIELSEN: One other point of clarification. This would be a team. I don't know what the subcommittee has talked about but it would take several kinds of expertise within the so-called consultants.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Right, the committee had discussed this but we felt that the exact personnel who would be in the team possibly would be going too far to specify there had to be these different components, that we would let the person making the proposal enumerate what he thought he needed.

DR. NIELSEN: I was hoping that it is understood just from one person on this Council that there's going to have to be someone very skilled in urban land economics, in my opinion. Not only economics of that area but that relationship to the whole tax base and everything else.

MR. HARTMAN: Yes, I think the thing, again Ford, to underscore is the fact that we're talking here about a multi-disciplinary study and I think that's the point that needs to be underscored and I think certainly land use economics is a key factor, I think, from both sides of the issue. The idea of advertising with the objective delineated in the advertising and then having a response by possible, you know, people we could hire was felt could be a way to proceed. Now, with regard to the point that you raised, City Attorney, the matter in other words recognizing we would be advertising for multi-disciplinary consortium or something of this sort, the item or the limitations that pertain to sealed bids with regard to engineers, etc., that would not pertain in that sense. In other words, once you get into a multi-disciplinary areas it supercedes that legal implication.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: That's right. That's what I was trying to say. Whoever you end up with, please make sure he's an expert that will qualify in that part of a court of law.

MR. HARTMAN: By all means.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Mayor, looking over what you've outlined - the committee's outline as a schedule for selecting and interviewing and recommending and hiring and so forth, it does seem to be a schedule that is inordinately long. Perhaps you could give us some insight on why some of those figures are in there. My concern is this.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Part of it I think I can respond to that.

DR. CISNEROS: As I understand it, the problem or the biggest problem to those who own land and those who are in government and everything else is a continuing period of uncertainty so we want to end that uncertainty just as soon as possible. Which means we want this consultant's report in by some specific date. The longer we take to start it, the longer it's going to be before it's finished and some of these figures look long on the starting side.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The reason was tied to the fact that we intend to advertise in recognized national journals of planners and similar expertise. They have monthly publications of varying degrees of deadlines. Mr. Sueltenfuss, would you like to comment on that.

MR. SUELTFENFUSS: I think in number four by setting April 6th we have cut that 60-90 day period, we've already taken that, defined it back to 60 in fact a little less than 60. The proposal says April 6th

DR. CISNEROS: The ranking and interviewing seems real long.

MR. SUELTFENFUSS: Well, the problem with the ranking and interviewing is that this really I think is the key whoever the Council committee does the selection really of getting people in and talking to them and getting their feeling. Like I say these are some outside dates, 30 days may be ample for that. It depends on the number of responses too.

DR. CISNEROS: It looks like about six months before they can get started doing their work.

DR. NIELSEN: Well, I would just guess - wouldn't you, Mel, that we'll probably have 30 or 40 proposals. It would take a while to weed them out.

MR. SUELTFENFUSS: Oh, yes, I would.

DR. NIELSEN: Look at what we're running into in 201 and 208.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Mr. Billa.

MR. BILLA: I think in the resolution there's no provision or no section that would provide whereby this study that we're authorizing would be accepted as a basis for making future determinations of what's going to happen over the aquifer, I mean, it's important that that be included in the resolution. Another thing that I'd like to point out, we're acting on a resolution here supposedly proposing or attempting or thinking about acting and we had an agreement on this Council that we wouldn't act on any resolutions unless we had a week prior to review so we could make our own thoughts known and our own recommendations be heard. And I think

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Billa, if I may respond to that. I think that was on resolutions that came up spontaneously on the day of the meeting. This was furnished in the information packet which every Council member receives and was legally posted in advance,

MR. BILLA: I agree with that but I think it's of such magnitude and importance that you've got to review all the facets of it before you act on it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, any other comments. We have a motion and the second on the floor for - this is adoption of the resolution which would permit staff to authorize to advertise for sealed bids.

MR. BILLA: Any comment about including some statements on one section that's not appropriate?

MAYOR COCKRELL: On the matter of the fact that the Council would utilize the consultant's recommendation as the basis for its policy, that is something that I think should be a general understanding by the members of the Council. We hope that through the entire process of retaining the consultants, getting full public understanding of the process, that we will not only feel that the Council will base its policy on it but that in general that the recommendations will prove to be accepted by a broad base of our citizenry, that in the process of conducting their work that they will do so in such a manner with interim reports and that the entire citizenry will have the feeling of great credibility in the work of the consultants and it will be accepted.

MR. BILLA: Speaking in generalities has been a lot of our problem.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: I have one more question, if I may, Mayor. The request for proposal or request for bids or whatever it is that goes out. The advertisement is going to be very critical in terms of the quality of the firm that bid and in terms of what they understand the job to be. At this moment, what exists? Is that this the suggestive steps or what exists by way of the substance of what's going to be requested in the advertisement?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Sueltenfuss, would you comment to that?

DR. CISNEROS: I'd like to see that, Mel, if you

MR. SUELTFENFUSS: All right, fine. I think what we've done here is outline a basic procedure. The feeling, after discussing with everybody concerned, is that really the type of response you get to the project and how the persons attempts to do it I think is some indication as to his qualifications and if we spell the thing out

DR. CISNEROS: That's not what I was getting at. What I was getting at.... is that

MR. SUELTFENFUSS: If we spell it out, one, two, three and everybody will respond, yeah, we can do that, I think that we'll get a feel for how much the person understands the problem in his proposal.

DR. CISNEROS: Yeah, the question that I'm getting at.....is just, you know, the most important step in any research effort is defining the research in question. And I just wanted to get

MAYOR COCKRELL: Let me say on that that we see that first of all there would be an advertisement but that in addition that once we get the initial inquiry that there would be a complete packet of material that would be mailed to each person making inquiry about the procedure and that would include much more detailed information, background information then would be available in the - just the advertisement. Yes, Dr. Nielsen.

DR. NIELSEN: Since Mel's here, how do you understand in Section 1 here, Mel, where it says I think it's just one long sentence, that without any degradation of the water in the Edwards Aquifer and then, two, without degradation beyond chlorination, why is even one in there when we're already chlorinating anyway?

MR. SUELTFUSS: No, number one says, let's look at number one very carefully. No degradation of the water at all. Now that's one extreme. In other words, we're going to study the two limits of extremes. One would be that we don't degrade the existing water one iota. It would - no matter what we put in there, it would remain 99.7 percent pure or whatever the factor is. That's one limit. That would be the extreme limit that we put nothing in there that would degrade the water all. The other limit that a lot of people have talked about is that we should not degrade it to a point where we need to treat the water, other than the chlorination that we're doing now.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Under the U. S. Health standards.-----

MR. SUELTFUSS: Under the U. S. Public Health Service standards.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The point being that the present quality of the water far exceeds the requirements of the U. S. Public Health Service so that area between what the present quality of the water is and what is the quality of water that would be acceptable to the U. S. Public Health Service is the area that we are looking at.

DR. NIELSEN: Strictly speaking as such, our water, whether you use degradation or purity or whatever is such that we do treat it with chlorine.

MR. SUELTFUSS: Yes, that's why I put without chlorination in there.

DR. NIELSEN: Okay. I see. Well, then, one more thing that I would like to see that we add in Section 3, the degradation, should such occur, associate with successive increments and development between the (inaudible). You know, that's assuming that degradation is going to occur. Should such occur.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, fine. We'll be happy to add that, yes, Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: With the understanding, Madam Mayor, I think the term to degrade meaning to make worse than it is now and you accept that realizing that there may be some things you treat now with chlorine but this means also to make it worse shape than it is at the present time.

DR. NIELSEN: Well, other than, I think you clarified it when you say to meet U. S. Public Health Service standards cause they're liable to change those in five or ten years anyway.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Any further comments? We have a motion and a second for approval of this resolution. Will the Clerk call the roll?

AYES: Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell, Pyndus.
NAYS: None. ABSENT: Teniente.

CITY CLERK JACKSON: Motion carried.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. The second item is the resolution declaring the moratorium. I think by way of procedure we would ask the Clerk to read the caption officially and then I'll call for those citizens to be heard who are registered to speak.

CITY CLERK JACKSON: A Resolution declaring a moratorium on zoning changes within the area designated as being subject to regulation under Order No. 75-0128-20 of the Texas Water Quality Board and its drainage area until January 31, 1977, or until the completion, approval and adoption of a new Master Plan for development of said area, or adoption by the City Council of policies creating rules and regulations for development over the Aquifer, whichever comes first.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the first person registered to speak is Mr. Charles Dempsey.

MR. CHARLES DEMPSEY: My name is Charles Dempsey. My address is 1800 North East Loop 410. The North San Antonio Chamber of Commerce wishes to acknowledge the proposed moratorium on zoning changes for properties located over the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone. We do not support the moratorium as recommended by the Mayor's Subcommittee because of the tremendous impact it will have on people in and out of business. It is difficult for the Chamber to understand this being considered at this time since there is an absence of any proof that development could be harmful. However, realizing that the City Council must act in the best interest of the City and in such measures that politically expedient is present, the North San Antonio Chamber of Commerce will give its support in cooperation with Council's decision based on premise that first any moratorium will be for a reasonable period and not to exceed six months from this date. Second, that future City policy would be based on the merits of the proposed study and in the best interest of all citizens of San Antonio.

We would like to remind the Council that based on existing studies, none of the actions already taken or contemplated to preserve the purity of the aquifer water will in any way enhance the future water supply needs for the citizens of the City of San Antonio. Conversely, certain actions have already produced a noticeable effect on the economy of San Antonio and further restrictions without good justifications could be chaotic to the future of the City.

Constitutional rights to private property protect the individual in that there can be no condemnation of such properties without fair compensation. Yet many citizens who have purchased land in good faith will now be denied immediate usage for best utilization of their properties. Also, they will be required to continue to pay interest and taxes as well as suffer loss of value because of such action. Such conditions cannot be expected to continue indefinitely without proper legal recourse being taken by those affected. The North San Antonio Chamber of Commerce therefore, will continue to support the Council as long as the Council continues to demonstrate their desire to work for the best interest of all citizens of San Antonio and not just the vocal minority. However, we stand ready to employ strong objections if further damaging restrictions are contemplated.

In closing we challenge the Council to meet these and all other issues head on to eliminate the rhetoric and make decisions for the people of San Antonio based on evidence that is not only factual but also true. Thank you.

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, I have a question.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Mr. Dempsey. Yes, Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: Mr. Dempsey is an architect and is an expert in land planning. I'm going to give you a question that's hypothetical. If I wanted to go out and build 100 houses on the Aquifer tomorrow, I could do it with no problem if I pass this ordinance, but if I want to build 100 apartments I'd need zoning, now, what's the difference?

MR. DEMPSEY: Well, it would primarily be density I'll say there.

MR. ROHDE: Yes, but what would be the most harm?

MR. DEMPSEY: I don't know of any harm, personally.

MR. ROHDE: What would be the most harm between apartments and houses to the environmental? I'm just giving that as a point - I can go build 100 houses but I can't build 100 apartments.

MR. DEMPSEY: Mr. Rohde, I do a lot of it. I've never claimed to be an expert but

MR. ROHDE: Okay, would you address yourself to the question.

MR. DEMPSEY: I'm not sure I really understand what your question is, are you asking about the density of the number of apartments?

MR. ROHDE: I'm making a point here that if - no, it's not apartments but we're saying we can't build apartments, we can go out and build homes and if we had 100 homes or 100 apartments, isn't it really the same. If we pass this ordinance we can't build the apartments but we can build the 100 homes. That's what I want you to get on the record.

MR. DEMPSEY: That's correct. Well, you're saying "R-1" and everything is temporary before its zoning changes.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: Charlie, you made the point about the need to meet this head on and I think you will have to agree that basically that's what we're all trying to do and proceeding forthwith to get the question settled. Basically, I think, we'd agree on that. You made the point about the fact that this moratorium would have a "tremendous impact" on the economy. Would you elaborate what that tremendous impact would be?

MR. DEMPSEY: Well, I think number one, Glen, if you own property out there now, as many people do that are sitting in this room and if you try to sell your property today with this stigma or cloud, whatever you wish to call it, I don't think you can sell your property.

MR. HARTMAN: During the period of the moratorium, you're saying?

MR. DEMPSEY: You can't sell it now and definitely you couldn't sell it during this period.

MR. HARTMAN: Okay, so if you can't

MR. DEMPSEY: There are many sales that are affected.- that have been affected by just this kind of talk.

MR. HARTMAN: Now, we're talking here in terms of a moratorium on zoning which, of course, rezoning presumably from a Temporary "R-1" to some other use. Now, could I ask a question as to, say, during the remainder of this year, how much building could continue or could take place over that land which is already zoned in this area? In other words, isn't there a great deal of land that is already zoned that is ready to build that is not being built because of the economy is slow in San Antonio?

MR. DEMPSEY: If I recall, I think there were something like 900 acres, somewhere in that count 2400 zoned and I assume that that is primarily other than "R-1".

MR. HARTMAN: All right, but my point is the fact that there, that I'm concerned about how one relates economic impact to what factor and I think it's generally

MR. DEMPSEY: I think I understand your question. What you're saying here is somewhat of a hedge because information and financial process is very hard at this time that what difference can it make.

MR. HARTMAN: No, I'm saying

MR. DEMPSEY: I think our main problem here is that it is a stigma and.....

MR. HARTMAN: Well, if I may finish my question, Charley, I'm not sure you're answering.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, fine.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, I'd like to finish my question. I am saying that in effect the question I've like to ask is the point of - how much building could conceivably be undertaken with land that is now zoned. That is

MR. BILLA: Mayor, that is not the question we're trying to resolve.

MR. DEMPSEY: Glen, I think that a great deal of building could be one if a person were so moved to do it. I think there is some now waiting to be done.

MR. HARTMAN: Well, in other words, there is zoned land. I'm saying there is zoned land which would be built now is the point that I'm making.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Maybe I can help. Right now there are 6,880 acres in the recharge zone. Of that amount 2,443 acres have already been zoned other than "R-1". What you're asking is, what he's asking, I believe, is how much building you think will take place in the 2,443 acres within the next year?

MR. HARTMAN: My whole point is to address the question or the statement that this would be a tremendous impact by ceasing zoning. I relate that to how much is already zoned which could be built and that was the essence of my question. Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Did you have any further comment, Mr. Dempsey? Thank you, sir. Additional questions? Yes, Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: Mr. Dempsey, I noted with interest that you mentioned a six month moratorium, would you like to enlarge on that rather than a twelve month moratorium?

MR. DEMPSEY: Yes sir. Well, I noted with interest your statement earlier that alluded to that. I feel like it was said in the meeting earlier the Planning Commission was given two weeks to address some of the problems that the Councilmen suggested this morning in the "B" Session. I think that anything at the time is damaging. I think the length of time should be made realistic, I think it should not be drawn out just to tie in necessarily with a master plan because the City Attorney thinks it could be legally done. I'm not sure this is how you interpret it but I think it's an easy thing to pick up and say let's make it a year from now. You can pull any trigger you want out of the air but I think the six month is long enough and really too long. I would say two to three weeks, even if we had to have it at all. I don't think we should have any at a-1, I don't think we should have a moratorium at all.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Mr. Dempsey. Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Mr. Dempsey, I've noted during the recent campaign the particularly temperant moderate voice of the Northside Chamber of Commerce. I thought it was a very refreshing voice that called for a six month moratorium also during the course of the campaign and is continuing to advocate that six months. What, in your opinion, is the purpose of a six month moratorium?

MR. DEMPSEY: Our purpose in saying six months, is simply this, if you have to have it, let's make it a reasonable amount of time. This is what we're basically trying to say.

DR. CISNEROS: But you must believe that we need to have it or you wouldn't be advocating six months.

MR. DEMPSEY: I don't believe that you have to have it. Our statement is simply to support your moratorium, so if we say that you have to have it, then let's make it a reasonable amount of time.

DR. CISNEROS: The reason we have to have it is because we're - if you said that we have to have it, is that we're trying to get the study done. In the Chamber a moment ago you heard the discussion we had. In fact, just the process of advertising and all of that is going to take six months in and of itself. What would be the purpose of a six month moratorium as opposed to a year moratorium if the study is not going to be complete or even started within.....

MR. DEMPSEY: Conversely, how do you know the study will be completed by January, 1977?

DR. CISNEROS: Well, that's a good question. I think we need to expedite them. My whole point is simply that we're arguing over a length of time and that cannot be arbitrary, can't be six months or can't be a year, whatever. It's got to make sense in terms of the data and the number that we're trying to come up with.

MR. DEMPSEY: The idea of a moratorium is arbitrary.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, thank you, sir. Gentlemen, may I share the fact that we have a number of speakers and we'll need to hear them all, of course. Thank you. Mr. George Leeah.

MR. GEORGE LEEAH: My name is George Leeah. My address is 5250 Fredericksburg Road. I'm President of the San Antonio Board of Realtors for the year of 1976 and I'd like to say to you this morning that, based on the very short period of time that I myself, and I know of some other people, have had knowledge of this proposal, I am very much opposed to it. I feel that it is an unnecessary type of action because of the fact that the zoning processes that we have now give us this type of protection, if that's what you want to call it, to begin with.

Secondly, I think it's unconstitutional particularly and directly to the individual property owners whom you're putting restrictions on. I think those people, particularly, should be heard and should be given better consideration than has been done so far. Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Mr. Leeah. The next speaker is Dr. Ivan Fitzwater.

DR. IVAN FITZWATER: My name is Ivan Fitzwater and I am Superintendent of Schools in the North East School District. I want to thank you for this opportunity to appear and share some information with you. I have been re-writing my notes in attempt not to be redundant of anything that has been said thus far. My purpose, really, is to share some information with you.

Growth is extremely important to our school district, mainly from the standpoint of what's happening in student enrollment. We are experiencing a new phenomina that we have not experienced before until three years ago. We now graduate far in excess the number of students that we take in in first grade. We are graduating about 700 students a year more than we take in the first grade. Now, if our district is to maintain its size and not shrink we need to have development in our part of the County and this is what has been happening. We have had enough growth in terms of housing to complete that gap and actually grow a little bit in terms of enrollment and, of course, this keeps us from having to decrease the size of our faculty and put people out of jobs.

Another thing that is very important to us, the cost of education is increasing every year. We are able to meet a large percentage of that cost through increased assessed valuation and we are very concerned if growth would stop of what would happen to our assessed evaluation and what would happen to taxes. I wanted to share those few points with you. We are certainly for clean water, we believe in that and we hope that a way can be found to have orderly development that won't jeopardize our water and won't jeopardize our situation in the school district.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Dr. Fitzwater, may I just ask what percentage of the total land area that is encompassed in your school district is actually on the Recharge Zone?

DR. FITZWATER: We have a rather small percentage in our particular school district, a lot less than some other school districts. I believe it's something like 20 percent.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I see, thank you sir. Mr. Hartman.

MR. GLEN HARTMAN: Yes, Dr. Fitzwater, I am intimately familiar with tax base. I am part of it in the North East School District. You made the statement that there are fewer students enrolling in the first grade than are graduating at the top which communicates to me that we are seeing the end of this bulge of students which everybody has been predicting. If that be the case, then I would have to conclude from that that the requirements for educational facilities will be on the projected decline in future years, is that not correct?

DR. FITZWATER: No, not if development continues in our part of the County.

MR. HARTMAN: But I mean though in terms of per capita in relation to unit per unit. There is a decline in the number of students, is there not?

DR. FITZWATER: The decline in the number of students per household, yes.

MR. HARTMAN: So in effect, the demand for education is what you use as the basis for deciding what expenditure you make for educational facilities, isn't that true?

DR. FITZWATER: Certainly, that's part of it. Yes.

MR. HARTMAN: So, in effect then the demand for educational facilities over the long haul then would decline in relation to the per capita of people living in that school district, isn't that correct?

MR. FITZWATER: Yes, that statement is correct.

MR. HARTMAN: I find it difficult to follow then the fact that we have to keep growing in order to maintain the same level of school expenditures if the requirement is going to decrease.

DR. FITZWATER: If we are going to make use of the facilities we now have, we are going to have to keep growing, that's the main point.

MR. HARTMAN: In other words, even if we make use of the facilities, we keep them open so we get more students in there in order to maintain the use of these facilities. In other words, that is not relating it to the requirement. It seems to me that we are sort of losing sight as to what, where is the beginning point requirement for educational facilities.

DR. FITZWATER: If growth stops in the North East School District, we will have empty buildings, that's our situation.

MR. HARTMAN: Which indicates were overbuilt.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right.

DR. FITZWATER: No, it indicates that we built properly for the number of students we now have.

MR. BILLA: I think, Dr. Fitzwater, what you are saying actually is that you had a plan and based on your projections you had so many class rooms predicted on a projected growth and this has not occurred. You followed the plan, but now in order to make the plan work, well we are going to meet these projections that you made. It's that simple I imagine, isn't it?

DR. FITZWATER: That is not exactly it. We have enough rooms now for the students that we now have. We don't have any out in the rain. We don't have a lot of empty class rooms either. So we are on schedule now with what we have. What I am saying is what will happen in the future with the new experience we are having in the first grade.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you sir. All right. Doctor Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: I don't think the intent of this Council is at all to stop growth in any part of the City. The whole discussion that we are relating to this morning has to do with protection of the water supply and it is only a water issue. It is not a question related to growth or no growth and that has been one of the mistakes that people have made this whole time in this whole discussion. The issue relates to the purity of our water and as soon as we have information that we are going to be able to protect our water supply, that the regulations are tough enough, then we will proceed and growth which has been to the North naturally in the City for the last 15 years may well proceed in that direction. But, as long as you bring up the subject of what is happening in school districts, and the likelihood of decreases in tax base and the closing of schools and so forth, let us not forget that there are portions of this City where exactly that is happening because we have not been wise in our planning and I am speaking for example the fact that in the San Antonio Independent School District, 15 schools have been closed in the last five years. So that is happening in this City right now.

DR. FITZWATER: But, I get paid to look after North East and that's a full time job.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine, thank you. Gentlemen.

DR. D. FORD NIELSEN: Just for the record, Henry, not all of those schools were closed. Several have since been built, but there have been in fact in the last two years been four schools that have been closed and not replaced. I think that is right.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Dr. Fitzwater. Now, then, the next speaker, I am not sure if it was on this subject, Terry Thrift, is this the subject or were you to speak on another subject. (Inaudible) Fine, then we will call on Mr. Ed Cody, also from the Northside School District.

MR. ED CODY: Thank you, your Honor and members of the Council for the opportunity to speak to you. I will try not to repeat the things that Dr. Fitzwater said. We are of the same concerns that he does. Let me make two points with the Council for your consideration though. Northside School District about three years passed a \$31 million bond issue for plant construction programs in our school district. We are right on schedule with this plant construction in order to meet the needs of youngsters who are moving into our community. I don't know the percentage of land that would be affected over the aquifer but it is a sizeable amount. I think probably as much if not slightly more than would be affected in the North East School District. We just completed, for example, a brand new elementary school that borders sits on the Recharge Zone on DeZavala Road. We opened it just last week. We opened this new school, its a little over a million dollar project, we opened this new school anticipating continued growth in that particular area. Adjacent to it, we just purchased land for a brand new high school to be built and, in fact, the plans are out right now for the construction of this high school. It is our concern that growth continue in our community. We have a rather sizeable capital outlay committment to this project and to our entire growth pattern and consequently we are concerned that growth will not be stymied or stopped at our particular area. One other thing I would bring to Council's attention and I am sure you are concerned with is the land value. I think Dr. Nielsen brought the point up as a major point of concern. We have the capital outlay, we have capital committments, we have long term debt requirements that has to be met in our community and we are concerned of land values and how a moratorium on all construction in that area would affect land value in our community. We would hope that you would certainly take that into consideration as you consider this question for a moratorium.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you. The next is Father Al Benavides.

FATHER AL BENAVIDES: Members of the City Council, we thank you for your vote this morning to indeed begin advertising for a study team to come in to determine whether development will in any way affect the aquifer or not. The one thing though that we have problems with is while you sponsor this study team, while you finance the study team and yet if you let business continue as usual, then I think you will in certain ways prejudice the study team. I don't see how we can possibly ask a study team to determine whether development is going to affect the aquifer while at the same time development continues as usual. I don't see how you can ask the study team to determine whether building over the aquifer will in any way pollute the water when you continue to have zoning changes as usual or issue building permits as usual.

Then what are you saying? You are saying that in your mind then, that danger doesn't exist for if it did exist you would then put a stop to it. I think in order to establish definitively for all of the citizens of San Antonio, whether development over the aquifer will in any way endanger our water supply, that in order to give that every possible consideration in order to make sure that you reach as definitive conclusion as possible I think that it is essential that this zoning moratorium be held for a year. Otherwise, I think to do anything else would be to prejudice the outcome of the study and to continue this political debate which is controversial and which is highly devisive.

We hear again that we have heard over and over and over again that since it would lead to no growth, that this would stagnate the economy of San Antonio. We hear over and over that there are no facts in this case. And we agree. There aren't any facts. But there is one fact, one fact that over 44,000 voters went to the polls and expressed their views. And I think, very candidly, what they did say that they have reservations about whether

development over the Recharge Zone will in any way affect our water supply or not, that they have reservations and that they want these reservations addressed and in some way resolved and I think every consideration has to be given to those 50,000 people who voted to these 44,000 who voted against the zoning change. I think that every possible consideration includes a moratorium to show that you did hear them and to show that you are doing something to establish whether or not development is detrimental to the Aquifer. To think or to have people say over and over again that San Antonio will die if we don't have development over the Aquifer is a contention that the citizens of San Antonio have rejected once already. It's a continuation of a tactic meant only to scare and not to inform and the citizens rejected it once. Must they reject it again? When is the Council going to stand up for what the 44,000 asks for. I think it's imperative that we have the zoning changed. Otherwise the study is prejudiced and this debate will go on and on and on. It's incredible to me to think that the school district's success and the school district's future is completely dependent on whether homes are built over the Aquifer. That's not acceptable. No one in San Antonio buys it. I certainly hope this Council doesn't buy it. I urge and us through C.O.P.S., urge this Council to please put a zoning moratorium. If not - then whatever study team comes in will have its work already prejudicated by business continuing as usual, and this debate and this controversy will continue.

February 12, 1976

lm

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Father Benavides. Any questions?

MR. ROHDE: Thank you, Father.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The next speaker is Don Cloud.

MR. DON CLOUD: Mayor Cockrell, gentlemen of the Council. I'd like to thank you for this opportunity. My name is Don Cloud. My address is 11131 Nacogdoches Road. I also tried to rewrite my comments here to avoid being redundant. I guess the principle point which I would like to make is that, unlike Father Benavides has said, business is not going on as usual within the community. This is the principle point to which I wish to address myself in requesting that you certainly not impose a moratorium and further complicate the orderly return, hopefully, of our economy as well as the rest of the country to a point where we are providing what I consider much more important issues, solutions to these issues which are order of economic growth, development, an increase in incomes of our population. Things which at the moment, are not going to occur if we continue embroiled in controversy and imposing such things as a moratorium.

One point was made earlier, I believe, by Councilman Hartman about there is land which is already zoned, therefore, a moratorium would not impose any problem. Granted, there may be isolated pieces of property within this recharge zone which are currently zoned for other than residential development. However, as an investor, particularly investors from outside our City, these people are running scared of San Antonio at the moment. They wouldn't go out and approve an investment on an isolated piece of property not knowing what the development of the overall region is going to be. You might find some place that you can go out and build a store or build a warehouse or something of this nature, but they have to plan on what the general growth of the area was.

Now a specific project which was a shopping center was defeated by recent referendum of the voters. Naturally, there are other projects which could use some of this land, but certainly aren't going to, if every time that someone wants to build on this area they have to go through the delaying and costly process of getting approval, particularly if it goes to referendum.

In terms of the economic impact of the delay of what this moratorium might impose, it's my understanding that directly over the Aquifer, there are some 6,000 acres and including the drainage areas an additional 4,000 acres. A total of 10,000 acres that could be affected by this moratorium. If we pick an arbitrary figure out of the air as to the value of this land you're looking at, let's say \$5,000 an acre. You're looking at some 50 million dollars that people conceivably are paying interest on which they cannot take any action if their potential buyers are scared off by the uncertainty of the moratorium. Now, the specific, if we take the ten months that are composed through the January 1, 1977 date, the interest alone could amount to some \$400,000 if you want to quantify, just for this delay. Now, granted, each and every parcel of land in this area is not going to be affected. I may be way low. Some people bought land, the State of Texas chose to locate a university out in this area. People anticipated orderly growth and development in this area. This is all up in the air and uncertain. I would say that what we do need is not a moratorium on further zoning because there is certainly no evidence at this point that a moratorium is justified. There is no evidence to date that development regulated under our existing procedure of zoning and so forth would cause any harm.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Mr. Hartman. You have a question?

MR. HARTMAN: Yes, Madam Mayor. Mr. Cloud, I appreciate your points. You, I think, are partly correct in some of the figures that you were giving in the beginning inasmuch as the percentages you were quoting were on the assumption that nothing had been built over this entire area which, of course, it has. And secondly, the fact that there's no other land zoned for other than Temporary R-1 which, of course, the City Manager has indicated that some, over 2,000 acres has, indeed been zoned additionally for the purposes.

MR. CLOUD: No, sir, I'd like to comment. I would say that while there is that land zoned, I don't think anyone is going to use it with the cloud of uncertainty that a moratorium would put over this area. Not just this area but the entire City of San Antonio if you're talking about investors from outside the City.

MR. HARTMAN: In other words, if the land is already zoned, you can go ahead and build and I don't follow the - where this cloud of uncertainty comes from with regard to that....

MR. CLOUD: It's very simple. There could be a plot that someone could build a factory or something on or apartment house, or convenience store or what have you....

MR. HARTMAN: There's no industrial out there at all...

MR. CLOUD: But they're not going to build anything out there, in my opinion, if they don't know what the future of the area is going to be. Well, I think it would be, you know, utter foolishness.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. I think the next hand was Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: I know Don Cloud to be a very reasonable man and a man for whom I have a good deal of respect. Don, I wonder whether you could just think through for a minute. If the uncertainty would exist in the situation of a moratorium, wouldn't the same uncertainty exist with continuing period as we have now, although no moratorium exists. Everybody has testified that the uncertainty continues to be there.

MR. CLOUD: I think that's a lot of the problem of the economic development of San Antonio at the moment is the uncertainty.

DR. CISNEROS: See my point. My point is that the uncertainty would continue to be there as long as the doubt exists and the doubt isn't going to be resolved until we finish this process of study.

MR. CLOUD: I think most investors, I can't speak for them but I would say most people have satisfied themselves that there is no danger and that any study would not produce any new evidence that would require different restrictions that now exist.

DR. CISNEROS: If I may just follow up on it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: May I ask that the Council members begin to limit questions. It's now ten of eleven and we have a number of other speakers who still are registered.

DR. CISNEROS: Don, if you were sitting here and you had to, you had to face the reality that you couldn't be as positive in your position that development is not going to pollute the water supply because you have heard evidence on both sides as all of us sitting have...experts that come to say one thing and other experts that come and say another thing. It's a very difficult situation when people who are supposed to be experts in their fields disagree. If you were trying to resolve that uncertainty by going about the process of a study as what we've talked about here, something definitive that's finally going to resolve it, would it make sense to you to allow the continuing development at the time that we're trying to determine whether development pollutes or not?

MR. CLOUD: I think we should allow the marketplace that choice. Each individual person operating in the economy would have to make that decision for himself...until the Council had finally acted.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, yes, Dr. Nielsen.

DR. NIELSEN: I think I hear you pretty clearly. I think you're beginning to try to sum this up for us. Business is not as usual for at least a year. Right?

MR. CLOUD: That's right.

DR. NIELSEN: That's what you very clearly indicated, if it's not, you are suggesting then rather than a moratorium which takes it out of this arena or any other arena, you'd rather see if someone has a piece of property knowing all the uncertainties and the business not as usual and he wants to bring this before the Planning Commission and the City Council for the usual process of hearings and all, you'd rather see that take place than for six months or a year or whatever no decision be made. That's pretty much what you're saying, right?

MR. CLOUD: That's correct.

DR. NIELSEN: Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, thank you. Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: I'd like to follow up on that and ask you this question, Mr. Cloud. Would there be more certainty, could you plan a little bit more intelligently if you knew for positive sure that there would be a moratorium of six months or whatever the period is, declared, and you would have that certainty fixed in your mind as of this moment or would you have less or more certainty if the Council in reviewing all the zoning cases turned them down hoping to protect and to buy time until the study is complete. Which of the two actions would you prefer?

MR. CLOUD: Well, there's a presumption that Council can turn them all down.

MR. PYNDUS: Knowing the feeling upon the Council and knowing that the study is breathlessly being awaited?

MR. CLOUD: I would still prefer the moratorium. The reason that I - that the moratorium - would prefer that there would not be a moratorium. My principle reason for this is I think our City has a number of problems utilities for one, but if we're going to get the incomes of our population up and have solved some of the problems, take some of the people off the food stamp program, and cut our unemployment, things of this nature, I think we've got to have economic growth. Now we talk about, in fact, Councilman Cisneros just proposed a program of industrial bonds and things of this nature to assist and attract industry and so forth. But if we take an action here or if you take an action rather, as a Council and place a moratorium, it's just one more thing that is going to be considered by any potential investor. The businessman or what have you. Because it reflects, I think, on - we don't trust the process that we now have - the regular zoning process and so forth. I think the people ought to have the opportunity to continue until there is evidence to the contrary to grow, locate wherever they wish to. There may be companies that would locate near the University of Texas to utilize student labor. Things of this nature. This isn't going to take place.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you very much. The next speaker, Fay Sinkin. All right. May we ask the audience to refrain from applause.

MRS. FAY SINKIN: Madam Mayor, and members of the City Council. My name is Fay Sinkin, and I am the Coordinator of the Aquifer Protection Association. The Aquifer Protection Association urges you to enact the moratorium for the year. The alternative to such a moratorium is a continued case by case zoning in the Edwards. On what grounds would such decisions be made? Would it be the same grounds as the mall zoning? The APA is certain the election of January 17, 1976 was at a minimum a call for a halt to business as usual in zoning the Aquifer area.

Today you have discussed the needs for further studies by outside consultants. If these studies are recognized as necessary, how can zoning go forward until they are complete? Furthermore, we expect the studies to lead to better regulations of development and overall policies such as a master plan for the Edwards area. The problem for the City Council, the school districts, the developers, and the citizens of San Antonio is that failure to plan adequately forces us to deal with an aggravated problem. It is an unfortunate situation but still must be dealt with as it now stands. Zoning should be halted until the regulations are in place and the policies enacted. Then the cloud of uncertainty that Mr. Cloud was mentioning should be lifted and the future will be clear. Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you. Yes, Reverend.

REV. BLACK: As I've listened to several speakers, I get the impression that we sort of exchanged words in the midst of our presentation that a moratorium on zoning would be a moratorium on development. Now I don't get the impression, I think, that there's land, there's land already zoned that development. The picture that I don't get though is what could happen if the present zoning was utilized. Now, would the Aquifer be endangered by utilizing the present zoning or are we actually - what I'm really trying to get at, are we actually protecting the Aquifer by asking for a moratorium on zoning. Are we actually doing that?

MRS. SINKIN: All right, all right, Rev. Black.....

REV. BLACK: If we could use the zoning that they already have, would this not endanger the Aquifer as well?

MRS. SINKIN: Rev. Black, we started a year ago, August. In August, it will be two years to ask this City Council to identify the sensitive areas of the Recharge Zone and to purchase those and then to have a study that would show what kind of development could take place on the rest of the Recharge Zone. We were talking about Bexar County and 81,000 acres. That was a year and a half ago. If this study had been done at that time, we would not have 2400 acres already zoned over the Aquifer that we have now. That's number one. Number two, we do not understand or do not know what continued development over the Aquifer will do to the quantity and the quality of our water. We simply don't know. So we must draw a line some place. You are surely not saying to us that because there are 2400 acres already zoned that we should go ahead and zone the rest of the 8000 acres.

REV. BLACK: No, what I'm saying is the moratorium on zoning does not necessarily stop development. In other words, I could vote against every zoning issue that came for change here now. But it would not necessarily stop development. The persons would build under the zoning they would already have. That's what I'm trying to say. The only thing it would do is stop changes in the format of zoning as it is presently designed. Now what I'm trying to.....

MRS. SINKIN: And that's desirable.

REV. BLACK: Is whether or not that zoning that is already there is not also or are we correcting the issue that we - are we really addressing the issue that we're talking about and that is that we're trying - that this moratorium will, in fact, offer the protection that we're talking.

MRS. SINKIN: No, all it does as far as we see it is if you have already adopted the idea of hiring outside experts to give you that kind of information whether continued development over the Recharge Zone will, in fact, harm the Recharge Zone. That's what we're doing. You cannot have adopted this first part without saying logically, we must do the rest of it, and declare no more rezoning over the Recharge Zone. Until we get the advice of these experts. Until they bring in their report. It may very well be that they will come in and they'll say, you can go ahead and do it. Then everybody's satisfied. We'll be satisfied.

MR. BILLA: Will you?

MRS. SINKIN: I don't like that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, let me just say to the Council. That in their meetings of the subcommittee that I felt that all of the parties who were there representing different points of view stated their own willingness to abide by the results of the consultants. We were trying to do it all in the most open way and have everyone's advice on the - the process and the selection of the consultants, and there was some fear expressed that another group might not accept it. But I felt the great sincerity on the part of everyone there to say that they would accept it and I thought that was true of representative of the Aquifer Protection Association.

MR. ROHDE: I have a question, Mrs. Sinkin.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: Fay, I'm sorry, I had to step out a moment but I'm back to hear you.

MRS. SINKIN: I'd be happy to repeat it.

MR. ROHDE: If Dr. Peter Flawn came to me and said, Mr. Rohde, as a realtor that I need a hundred housing units this year.....

MRS. SINKIN: Did he say that to you?

MR. ROHDE: No, if he did - I'm putting a hypothetical question to you and.....

MRS. SINKIN: Don't do that to Peter.

MR. ROHDE: Okay, well, I think it's proper - you got to - you sort of take your stand too, a little bit. I can go out and build a hundred homes tomorrow without any problems if I - if this ordinance is passed, but if I wanted to build a hundred apartment units and the land was not to be rezoned, I could not do it. What would really be the difference in the area if we did one or the other?

MRS. SINKIN: I'm having the same trouble with that question that the man you asked for the first time had trouble with that question.

MR. ROHDE: Would you be in favor of building the hundred units?

MRS. SINKIN: I don't understand the question.

MR. ROHDE: You don't understand the question.

MRS. SINKIN: No.

MR. ROHDE: Well, I'm sorry I didn't give it to you in a more intelligent way.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: Mrs. Sinkin had addressed a question to the Council, and I'd like to answer it as far as I am personally concerned.

MRS. SINKIN: Okay.

MR. PYNDUS: You mentioned the fact on what grounds would this Council permit zoning to continue while the study is going on.

MRS. SINKIN: Right.

MR. PYNDUS: And I would like to answer that with the fact that prior to the large mall that brought the purity of the water to a head, we were under an ordinance that was prepared with your help, and the City Council. We had designated the zoning over the Aquifer, and there were several areas that we had not taken into consideration. However, prior to the zoning of the mall, we had approved zoning changes. We had approved development over the Aquifer and under that same context, I would say there would be justification for doing some business while we're waiting for the study to come through.

MRS. SINKIN: Well, I'd like to say this. It was precisely because the overlay district that you're talking about was adopted and two weeks later you had the zoning of the mall which couldn't help but be zoned because of the inadequacies of the overlay district that the whole election took place that never should have taken place, never. But it was precipitated because of the inadequacies of the overlay district. We were here to testify to those inadequacies of the overlay district. That was the key to the whole thing. Now that has to be addressed.

MR. PYNDUS: I agree.

MRS. SINKIN: That's what people voted against.

MR. PYNDUS: I agree with you. However, I would say that the density and the size of that mall put it in a category by itself, and that there will be other cases that do not fall in that same category that probably should be taken up before the Council while the study is being anticipated.

MRS. SINKIN: Well, we differ on that. We are saying that you're doing a study. Get the results of that study. Let us all be satisfied that we know about the quantity and the quality of our water. What development will do to it. And then go ahead. Go to it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine. Mr. Billa.

MR. BILLA: Mrs. Sinkin, suppose that San Antonio does everything that you're recommending. Absolutely everything. As a moratorium, there's no construction or anything within the confines of our jurisdiction and yet, nothing is done by the county or state. How will that affect with our water supply in your good judgement and expertise that you bring to us?

MRS. SINKIN: You have responsibility here.

MR. BILLA: Yes, Madam.

MRS. SINKIN: Okay, that's all we're asking.

MR. ROHDE: Well, help me with it.

MRS. SINKIN: Do what you think is best.

MR. BILLA: Well, I don't think that that's sufficient because you're addressing too big a thing. And you're asking us to impose restriction on our citizens that are paying taxes and so forth - we can't ask of those people that are also responsible for this problem you say exists.

MRS. SINKIN: We're going to be at the county, we're going to be in the state legislature, we're going to be in a lot of different places. You have to show good faith here and then the county and the state and everybody else will understand that this Council is serious and wants to protect the quantity and quality of the water. Everybody else will at least have an example of someone who wants to do that.

MR. BILLA: Okay, then in reading the Charter it states that we're not supposed to enact any acts that are arbitrary and capricious, and I think that the Charter and the subdivision ordinance provides, as in the zoning regulations, provides for this Council to view or to hear cases on zoning and if in any of our minds it's in bad interest or not in the public interest that will affect the public welfare, we could deny that zoning. I think we have sufficient safeguards there.

MRS. SINKIN: But Mr. Parker has already told you that you are within your rights to declare a moratorium.

MR. BILLA: Yes, madam, if someone will define a reasonable time for them, he said that we would be within our rights.

MRS. SINKIN: But you have to define it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine, thank you.

MR. ROHDE: That's what I have problems with.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The next person has not indicated a subject and may not be on this subject. Mr. Richie, were you to speak on this subject?

(INAUDIBLE)

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, I think, Mr. Richie, you were going to speak at the 1:30 time, fine. Rowena Rodgers, League of Women Voters.

MS. ROWENA RODGERS: I'm Rowena Rodgers, President of the League of Women Voters and I live at 2128 La Manda. The League is pleased that you're considering this moratorium and we, as you know, had asked for a moratorium since March 12th until your policy over the Recharge Zone is complete. We'll lend our support for the following reasons. The referendum vote of 4 to 1 reflects the voter concern for the adequate protection of this water supply in the Aquifer Recharge area. During the time there was a moratorium last year there were studies made but nothing conclusive in such areas as surface water run-off, provision for density and the designation of the sensitive areas. We think the City needs to finish in these areas which would finish the intent of your Edwards Recharge Overlay District, which was the first step but an incomplete one. Everybody agrees that the Texas Water Quality Board will be the main vehicle for protection for the Aquifer but now, as you know, that's being reviewed and the City is involved in that as well as AACOG. These local governments should get as strong protection as possible through the Order before the City allows more zoning changes. Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Mrs. Rodgers. Next speaker, Mr. Ed Harrington.

MR. ED HARRINGTON: Madam Mayor, members of the Council, I'm Ed Harrington. My office is at 602 West Rhapsody, San Antonio, Texas, 78216, and I am President of the Greater San Antonio Homebuilders

Association. I'm a landowner, property owner inside the City limits of San Antonio. I'm a taxpayer, and I'm a registered voter within the City limits of San Antonio and I appear here before you this morning because I am somewhat concerned in all of those capacities. I'd like to extend to you for a moment my concern.

My concern is in regard to you considering placing a zoning moratorium over the area described as the Recharge Zone and drainage area within the City limits of San Antonio. I think that some liberty has been taken by referring to the vote concerning the mall at FM 1604 and San Pedro in saying that that is an electable mandate that we address all of these things. That vote considered one thing, the mall at that area.

The zoning that we're concerned about inside the City limits comprises 6,800 acres of which in the Recharge Zone, 2,112 acres have been zoned. But it also addresses the drainage area within the City limits of San Antonio. There are 4,150 acres in that drainage area. There's 33 per cent of that land zoned so that leaves 7,500 acres that you're going to plant a moratorium on if this ordinance passes that you're going to lock and say you can't use that until we decide somewhere down the line what would be appropriate use of it. And there are thousands of landowners, literally thousands of people who own that acreage. There's not one or two or a group of homebuilders or a group of developers that own that acreage. There is literally thousands of people.

I think this recommendation for a moratorium is a cursory recommendation and I don't think that it addresses all the problems in inveterate as they are and the ramifications of those problems when we concern ourselves with the total citizenry of San Antonio because those people are citizens too and those people have rights that this ordinance would usurp. Those people hurt and they bleed and they cry just like anyone else does. I think that this ordinance would be an onus to those people and to those thousands of landowners. It would produce financial hardship, it would disrupt their plans, disrupt their inalienable rights to the use of that land. There are 11,000 acres that we're concerned with. There are not 6,600 acres. Contrary to the espousals that have been made, the sample ballot said for or against the ordinance. It does not address the 11,000 acres and the thousands of landowners in that area.

I would call upon you to beseech yourself that if you can vote in good conscience that you have considered all the ramifications, economic hardships that will be placed upon business, individuals, the schools in that area that comprise this 11,000 acres tax base, if you can vote in good faith with a clear conscience, I hope that you would concern all of these things to be sure that your conscience is clear and that you have done as we try to do in service to serve all of those people. I would encourage you in that capacity not to pass this ordinance today. Thank you very much, Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Mr. Harrington, I am not comfortable as an individual with, completely comfortable with the idea of a moratorium. I think we have a good deal more thinking to do about all the ramifications but I do want to say one thing and that is that I'm not sympathetic to the position that's been taken much of the morning by individuals representing either the Homebuilders Association or realtors or others for this reason. I think you fellows, and I say you in general terms, have brought much of this upon yourselves. You have used the organizations, the professional associations and the profits you've gotten over the years and every trick in the book to find a way for govern-

ment not to deal with this issue forthrightly. You've tried every trick available over years and years to keep government from doing precisely the kind of definitive analysis and the kind of studies and come to a definitive decision that are now required. Now that the public demands, and that this thing is before the public light of day, demands those definitive answers before we proceed, then you find yourself in a situation where it's going to take a year before the studies are available, because they've not been done before when they should have been done because the matter was not addressed straightforwardly when it should have been by people such as yourself in positions of responsibility. People such as Mr. Morton who served on the City Council, people who for years and years have had the access and tools available to address forthrightly this issue but chose not to thinking if they could bypass the process, subvert the process or otherwise, thinking if they could somehow get a painless deal and the truth of the matter is the public is not going to allow that any more and so now we all find ourselves in this sad situation.

I'm not comfortable with the moratorium and I'm not even sure that I'm going to be able to vote for it because there are a lot of ramifications that infringe upon the whole City but I do think that it's not the fault of this Council that if we've come to this sad state of affairs, part of it is due to the role that your organization and other such organizations with ideas about subverting and bypassing in certain areas of process have utilized in the past two years.

MAYOR COCKRELL: May we ask that the audience will not respond. It does delay us and we are trying to give everyone a fair and equal hearing. Yes, Mr. Hartman was the next hand.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor...

MR. HARRINGTON: I appreciate what Councilman Cisneros says and I respect it, his opinion, and I'm entitled to my opinion and, of course, we have a disparity of views on this, and a couple of other issues, but he's certainly entitled to his opinion but we've got a lot of...inaudible...in this area but I lay down at night and I'm comfortable and I sleep very well.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Glen Hartman

MR. HARTMAN: Yes, Madam Mayor, Mr. Harrinton, at the, after you expressed the capacities in which you were expressing this concern I would like to ask how you would view this proposal in your capacity as Chairman of the Planning and Zoning Commission from the standpoint of the mechanics, from the standpoint of looking at it as what it would do in the zoning process.

MR. HARRINGTON: Mr. Hartman, I cannot speak for the Planning and Zoning Commission because the Planning and Zoning Commission has not given me directions to speak for them. I can only speak for myself. Mr. Rohde did come in to the Planning and Zoning Commission yesterday and showed the concern that he had for their opinion. He polled the Commission himself, I did not do so. I was not acting Chairman at that time.

MR. HARTMAN: I'm speaking in terms of the reasonable mechanics of the moratorium as it relates to the Planning and Zoning Commission. What just and perhaps these are figures that are pertinent, how many cases during the last year that are over this area were considered by the Planning and Zoning Commission?

MR. HARRINGTON: I cannot tell you, actually, I could not remember all of the figures. I can tell you that of the zoned land over the Aquifer, the Recharge Zone, that about 50 per cent of it is residential and about 50, no about two-thirds of it is residential and about one-third of it is commercial.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Mr. Rohde was next, I believe.

MR. ROHDE: I want to address my youngest Councilman on the Council and reject his remarks because we would not have the Texas Water Quality Board that's there and I think they're working in very close partnership with the parties that you address your remarks to and I think they worked very closely with the last Council and the previous Councils and the realtors and the homebuilders of this state and other citizen groups and they've heard Mrs. Sinkin's voice. I think there's been a lot of input in there and you say that there's been tricks and deceit and whatnot and I just can't buy that and I hope that the intelligent citizen in the area will understand that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Mr. Billa.

MR. BILLA: Mayor, I just want to respond. Dr. Cisneros, I think that it's not true that these developers have not been responsible. I think that they have complied with all the rules that this government can impose on it and it's some of these rules that were imposed that forced some of them to go outside the City and to create some of these problems that we're having now such as the utilization of septic tanks, etc. etc. I think that they've done a good job and they've been responsive to the rules and regulations we can impose. I just cannot agree that...

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Dr. Nielsen.

DR. NIELSEN: Henry, I appreciate your sense of responsibility in dealing with the problems as they are, the importance of the rhetoric. I would think, however, that it's the Council's responsibility at this time to not inflame feelings or anything like that to deal in trying to resolve these problems, these conflicts. I really think that's what we're here about.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: The whole point is very simple. We find ourselves in a position we should have to look forward a year. That work should have been done a long time ago but it wasn't done for a whole lot of reasons and not the least of which is that we have not dealt forthrightly with that and when I say we, the whole community including all the interested groups. If we had then we wouldn't be in a position where they have to come and blame us for imposing a year moratorium when that work should have been done long before now.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Harrington, did you have a concluding statement? Yes sir.

MR. HARRINGTON: I have one comment to make. I would like to say that when you consider this ordinance, the backup consideration is already on the board for Friday at 2:30 to consider not issuing any building permits over this 11,000 acres. So, if you talk about incremental steps, you're walking down the path and I encourage you to defeat this ordinance. Thank you very much.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you. The next speaker is Helen Dutmer.

MRS. HELEN DUTMER: Madam Mayor, Council, for the record, my name is Helen Dutmer. I reside at 739 McKinley Avenue. We have a real donnybrook here, don't we. It seems to me this Council has inherited the problems of previous Councils. Had the previous Councils of this City gotten off their duff, so to speak, and gone ahead with their surface water supply from City of San Antonio, we wouldn't now have this problem. But at that time the surface water supply at Cibolo Reservoir, the Applewhite Reservoir, was vehemently opposed by some of the very people who are vehemently opposing now the moratorium over the Aquifer. Most of these people have immigrated here from other states and we welcome them. However, they immigrated here mostly through the military but the reason they stayed is because San Antonio had so many things to offer. Clean air, good water, sunshine and all of the other amenities that go to make up a beautiful area. They saw the possibilities. Let's not ruin the possibilities.

I heard a remark made here about the vocal minority. It would seem to me that the vocal minority is, in fact, the vocal majority after your referendum vote. I want to stress here again that I am not now, have never been, nor in the foreseeable future do I intend to be a member of the C.O.P.S. organization or, for that matter, the APA organization. I think that really what it would benefit this Council is to know that the APA organization was made up of a consortium of organizations over the City. This was not an organization that was formed strictly to put their feet in the mud over the Aquifer. It is concerned with representatives there of every organization that have expressed their concerns over the water situation. It would seem to me that the developers would be cognizant also of the fact that no matter what your land is worth, it is worth nothing without water supply. You have dead land!

The next thing, Mr. Rohde, is a simple question in answer to your question that everyone seems to...your question was, if you could build 100 houses over the area now and 100 apartments, what would the difference be, is a very simple question to answer. I believe that there is a regulation now that says that you can build a one family resident on one acre of ground before you can acquire a septic tank, however, when you say apartments it has a connotation of more than one family being put on the same amount of ground so if you're building single family dwellings you are using 100 acres, if you are using multi-family dwellings you are putting that X amount of people more over that acre than you were in the single family dwelling.

MR. ROHDE: Thank you.

MRS. DUTMER: Now, I very, very seldom spout religious sayings when I get up here before this Council, but this morning I am going to give them a little bit of something to ponder over. First, I would like to have this Council again, implement surface water supply from City of San Antonio because something does have to be done and there is no doubt about it. I would also like for these developers, each one to go home and sit down and think. Now, if they are big enough and they have power enough to strike a rock and get water from it, then I say go ahead and build over the Aquifer, but until you can do this, then don't take a chance with the one thing that we do have and that is pure water for the citizenry of the City of San Antonio.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Mrs. Dutmer. Mrs. Dutmer, I believe there's a question. Dr. Nielsen.

DR. NIELSEN: I'm glad you raised the question of the quantity of water. That in the long run of the economics, of future equity and everything else is, I think, a much larger overriding issue and, for your information, the City, the City Water Board are deep into negotiations in terms of securing a minimum of 30,000 acre feet of surface

water, 150,000 from Canyon Lake. Day by day we're making more progress in that so finally a good part of the this question of the quantity of water is going to be addressed, at least surface water. I think that that needs to be emphasized. I don't know that there's any direct relationship between any consideration regarding moratorium and the quantity of water question. I just want to say that we're raising it and I don't see any relationship.

MRS. DUTMER: Ford, to use of our Mayors' terminology, I didn't come into town on a load of green wood either. I have been sitting here in this Council Chamber longer than what you have been Council people. I have heard for the last ten to twelve years how San Antonio needs a surface water supply and each and every time something comes up to knock it in the head and 30,000 feet, acre feet of water for the City of San Antonio for its residents might give us each three drops a day to drink but that is foregoing baths or anything else you might have to have around.

MR. BILLA: Mayor, I want to thank Helen Dutmer for supporting the Cibolo Reservoir. I feel likewise and I agree with you in this particular subject.

MRS. DUTMER: Good, I'm glad we agree on something.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Mrs. Dutmer. The next speaker, Maria Dominguez. Did you wish to speak on this subject, Mrs. Dominguez?

MARIA DOMINGUEZ: I would like to speak later, but you didn't let me.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right fine. Go right ahead Mrs. Dominguez.

MRS. DOMINGUEZ: Well, I don't think, well, for the record I'm Maria Dominguez. I really don't know where I live because I haven't been able to resolve that my house is safe. I don't know where to go to resolve it. Now, they tell me that because I haven't been able to live there, I don't have the home loan, the homestead. So, I really don't know where I live or where I go or how I'm going to make my income tax. One thing that I want to say in this respect, is the school district happy that we don't need to fabricate more kids to keep this school district the way they are. I'm saying that if we're ...inaudible...in schools, do we...inaudible...can concentrate school districts. To begin with I think that we have too many. Have always had more than we need. The money that goes to schools, you know, to the high salaries and to education. Now, these people need more. I think that with the few land, when a school is closing, I would like to know what they do with that money. Why it's not just given back on recreation of little league or on those things that we need so much. Then we'll get two benefits. The kids will have supervised supervision. We don't have enough places for them to play. So, we don't need more kids. What we need is where to put the ones we have to take them out of the streets. Because, can anybody answer me? Where the monies are? I mean how they put that money, when sent to schools.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mrs. Dominguez, let me just say this. Some of these issues that you raised perhaps should be raised at the other citizens, the regular Citizens to be Heard. But on this, right today we're talking about the moratorium on the zoning.

MRS. DOMINGUEZ: Yes, but they're talking about having, not being able to get a moratorium because they have so much invested in buildings that they have to build in order to fill those buildings. I think it's in the same line, Mrs. Cockrell. Unless I'm, I get the...inaudible... and give the wrong impression. But it seems like every time that my name is next, you get very hungry and I have to wait.

MAYOR COCKRELL: We'll wait.

MRS. DOMINGUEZ: I'm almost starving.

MR. BILLA: That's my fault, Mrs. Dominguez.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, that concludes the persons who were registered to speak on the zoning moratorium. Now, to the Council, we have had the..excuse me. I beg your pardon, there was an additional page brought up that I did not see. John Griesehaber, I'm not sure of that last name. Eight hundred Babcock. Yes sir.

MR. JOHN GRIESEHABER: I'm John Griesehaber. I live at 800 Babcock Road in San Antonio, and I am here with concern. I'm a Director of the North San Antonio Chamber of Commerce and we did discuss in depth the six month moratorium which I was not sure that I could vote for at that time, so I can understand how some of you feel today on voting on this. I would like to state a couple of things. It's very important. Many people have said there is no problem in getting some one to get out and buy a piece of property and construct an improvement on a piece of property that is already zoned over the Recharge. I was sitting back with a local mortgage man, and he said several of his people, his lenders have said, I'm really not interested in San Antonio right now. You've got too many problems. Another position that I have with the North San Antonio Chamber of Commerce is I'm in charge of the Industrial Development Team in contacting industry. Where are we, how can we tell them that we have a healthy situation for them to come in and choose a location in San Antonio that meets with their specifications today with the problems that we're having in situations such as this. We have a problem attracting the industry; we have a problem getting the loans to improve the properties; and at the same that you consider a six month or a year moratorium on rezoning, what would happen if we would consider a six month or a year moratorium on taxes on these properties. I don't think that we can do that. That's all that I have to say.

DR. NIELSEN: Okay, John, yes..

MR. ROHDE: Are you favoring a six month moratorium or what?

MR. GRIESEHABER: I was not personally in favor of a six month moratorium.

MR. ROHDE: What is, what is the compromise in this area?

MR. GRIESEHABER: I feel that the Planning Commission is a body that I have gone to and been turned down many times for many legitimate reasons. I mean, I'm there as much as any realtor in town. I try to stay out of there, but when they have a legitimate reason for turning it down, they should turn it down. Then it passes on to the Council. If they approve it, if the City Planning Department says no, we don't want an industry on Loop 410 and San Pedro or 1604 and San Pedro or 281 North that the City Planning Department says no, you take it to, I mean you take it to the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission says no, and we bring it to the Council and the Council says no, we don't do it.

MR. ROHDE: What does the word moratorium mean to you as a citizen?

MR. GRIESEHABER: A moratorium means to me, don't mess with it. Don't even go out there, forget about it, stay away from it. It's something that I mean I can relate to you one instance of a man. I'm going to change up all the numbers because someone might be able to figure out the distress situation the man's in. He paid, say, a thousand dollars an acre for a piece of property two years ago. Say, it was 500 acres. All of these are not actually true but this is an actual

case. The man calls me and says, "I was offered \$2,500 an acre for my property two years ago, but I did not take it because I thought that it was going to be more valuable if I held and I could develop it." He was out of Houston. He came in, he came in to me and he says, "Can you get me \$2,000 an acre for the property right away?" Saying he paid a thousand. I said, "No, I don't have any buyers for your property." Not 500 acres over the Recharge Zone. He called me back, "Can you get me \$1,500 an acre?" I told him, "No, I can't get you that." After having gone out to the buyers in the market and found that there was no one wanting to touch anything over the Recharge, he came back and said, "Can you get me what I paid for it?" I said, "Let me try." I go out for two weeks and I can't get him what he paid for his property two years ago. I can't get him half of what he paid for this property. Right now, two years.

MR. ROHDE: Thank you.

MR. HARTMAN: Could I ask you is this significantly different than that of any other part of town, I mean any other part of country?

MR. GRIESEHABER: Any other part of the country?

MR. HARTMAN: In other words, is land selling proliferately in, say Kansas City, where I happen to be very familiar with because I am familiar with a note right there that has defaulted because of lack of land.

MR. GRIESEHABER: This is very true. I mean land out...

MR. HARTMAN: Is that a nationwide problem?

MR. GRIESEHABER: It has been a nationwide problem that has, the light is here at the end of the tunnel. People are starting to, I mean, the homebuilders are starting to build homes. They are starting to buy property to put in streets. But again, if a piece of property is developed, I mean, if someone goes out to acquire a tract of land today, and he acquires a 500 acre tract of land and wants to put in streets and development expenses to put in the streets and utilities so he could start building houses, I don't think that if he was over the Recharge Zone that he could go to a bank in San Antonio. I'd like to go to Mr. Sinkin's bank and ask for interim financing on a commercial project over the Recharge and see if he gives it to me. Or practically any bank in this City.

MR. HARTMAN: Okay, but my basic question is the economic situation with regard to the building business any different really in San Antonio than comparable cities throughout the country?

MR. GRIESEHABER: I would say with this moratorium on this part of the City, it could be a greatly, in much worse shape than any part of the nation. Dallas and Houston right now are experiencing a housing boom. Office buildings fill up. There is development in the Dallas and Houston areas considerably more than there is in San Antonio today. The San Antonio homebuilders went to a homebuilders convention and came back most impressed with what the prospects of the future were. Here we are as a Council today saying that's okay to do it some place else but don't do it on the North side over the Recharge.

MR. HARTMAN: Well San Diego, for example, which is a comparable sized City, and which has in fact, recently initiated certain growth restriction or Memphis, Tennessee, two of them that I consider very comparable in size. The homebuilding business there seems to be no

different from what it is in the other part of the country. I just can't see why, I just can't see what has been their problem.

MR. GRIESEHABER: I mean I think that there are people around here who have continued to say this is not a no growth situation. We're not now talking about no growth. I mean I can't understand it.

MR. HARTMAN: No, no, I didn't mention no growth. I had mentioned controlled growth in both Memphis and San Diego.

MR. GRIESEHABER: Well, I think that the people that have the property that acquired it, even the original landowners that are sitting out there, I mean, at some point we're going to be in a problem with them. I mean, even the farmers and the ranchers are actually working in that area.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, fine. We are running out of time here and we appreciate your comments. The next speaker is Carl McNamee.

MR. CARL McNAMEE: Members of the Council. I appreciate the opportunity and I'll try to be brief. I am Carl McNamee. My business is 2961 Moss Rock Drive. I just want to share with you a couple of minutes of some five or six years experience that I've had in this particular area as I have served on various committees and commissions both within the City and outside the City. One of the first things that came before the Planning Commission as I recall and about five years ago when I went on the new commission was the issue of the Aquifer. It was new at the time, and through the years, I've watched the issue develop. Today, I'm hearing the same, or many if not the same, arguments that we heard in that first hearing five years ago. I've watched the issue run through the legislature and the legislature through the state preemption of control of pure water. I've watched it go up and down the courts. I've watched the various studies that come back and forth and I've come to some personal conclusions that I'd like to share with you at this point.

First of these is that under the regulation of the state under the regulation that we have put on our portion, small portion of the Aquifer that development is possible, it is possible and it going on the protection of the water supply of the City of San Antonio and of the other cities that share this water supply and proper development go on. I think that there is available today with the proper monitoring required by the QB Order and other orders through proper control through the rules and regulations that have been set both by this City and by the Water Quality Control Board and others to accomplish this. I think that as the state of the art of monitoring and control goes on, we will probably see some additional amendments to those orders but they will come as we have more experience with all of this. I think that the big thing that we must keep in mind as citizens that enforcement of these regulations, just like enforcement of any regulations depends upon the cooperation of all of the citizens, including the builders, the developers, the people who live there, the business people, cooperating with those who are in charge of enforcement of these regulations.

I feel that we have gone through this a number of times in various forms and that further delay through this moratorium is uncalled for because of the Aquifer development. I think further the principles of zoning, the principles of zoning or the principles of the use, the general use of the land not the specific uses and within any general category, "B-2", "B-3", "R-3", "R-2", there are uses, specific uses which must be controlled and perhaps even outlawed, but that these fall beyond general zoning. Overlay districts can help, control of drainage

will help outlawing completely certain kinds of uses, certain specific kinds of uses to go over the Aquifer but zoning in itself is a very general thing that says the intensity of the use of this land ought to be this and so. We have operated in this City, since I've been on a commission, on a census concept of zoning which says that we work and plan our transportation system. We look at the centers of transportation intersection and say, here is a center of high intensity. Then we look at that center and say what kind of high intensity by zoning? And then beyond that I think we look at some of the uses that must, that would pollute the Aquifer and by the overlay and by other ways would be by the QB Order and so forth would be excluded from use over the Aquifer.

I would say that the real issue is whether we take a negative stance at this point or whether we take a positive stance of how we as a group of citizens, you and all of us together, work together towards the kind of positive principle that will protect the total City and at the same time provide the climate for the kind of good group that we actually need along the way.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you sir. The next speaker registered is Saul.

SAUL: My name is Saul, a candidate for Mayor in 1977. You people think today that these people...inaudible... You're mistaken. I'd like to speak to the head honchos behind you all because I am a man that knows about McAllister. Mr. Cisneros, who's McAllister? I believe you know who he is.

MAYOR COCKRELL: May I ask, are you speaking on the question of the proposed moratorium?

SAUL: Okay, well, I'm going to talk about the moratorium but I'm going to give you about 30 seconds about this. Mr. Barshop owns that property. Okay, Mr. Barshop gets everything he wants in this City so I believe that these people are out here wasting their time and you're wasting your time because I know that thing is going to pass. And I bet anybody any type of money because that's what society wants today, money. Okay, I'll bet you, Mrs. Cockrell, and I'll bet all the members here that that mall is going to pass. And you don't believe me...

MAYOR COCKRELL: Are you for it or against it?

SAUL: Well, Mrs. Cockrell, I'll be very honest with you, I really don't care. Another thing, Mrs. Cockrell, I also know that you're not going to finish your term because Mr. Teniente over there is going to take your place.

MR. ROHDE: I wouldn't bet on that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, Mr. Teniente is not here to defend himself on that one.

SAUL: It's like Mr. Briscoe. Where's Mr. Briscoe? Never in Austin. Where's Mr. Teniente?

MR. ROHDE: Saul, you have a dollar bet on that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: If it will make you feel any better, I have every intention of serving out my term, finishing up all the way.

MR. ROHDE: Yeah, I'm betting a dollar on you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Okay, now would you kindly confine your remarks to the question of whether you are for advocating or voting for or against the moratorium on the zoning.

SAUL: Okay, I am against it. I am very sincere about it because I live out there in University Hills. I have natural well water. I do not have any chlorine in my water. As a matter of fact, I also know a little bit about chlorine because I am pretty sure everybody here has gone to a swimming pool that has chlorine. How about if a person goes swimming every day and gets that chlorine on their hair, what happens, Mrs. Lila Cockrell? Their hair will dry up, their body will dry up.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I guess that's why the cosmetic firms get money selling hand lotion.

SAUL: Well, as a matter of fact, well, they banned, as a matter of fact it will take them seven years. I also know about cosmetics. I'm also in the cosmetics business. I know a lot about things.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right.

SAUL: As a matter of fact, you look at a woman today that has a lot of makeup, lipstick, and you make that woman take off her lipstick and makeup off and let me tell you her face is wrinkled, old, that's why you shouldn't wear these cosmetics. But I'll show you a woman that doesn't wear any type of cosmetics, I'll bet you she has a better complexion than you do or than anybody in here that has makeup.

MR. ROHDE: I'm getting hungry.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Does that conclude your remarks, Saul? Thank you very much. You sounded very interesting. Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, I've been, Saul, I've been advised by the City Attorney that betting is against the law so the bet's off.

SAUL: Another thing. Excuse me, could I have a minute.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I believe the bell has rung.

SAUL: Well, could I have one minute, one second?

MAYOR COCKRELL: One second.

SAUL: If the people out here believe that history repeats itself, my name is Saul. Remember in your Bible there's man by the name of Saul. He was the first king of Israel and that's all I'm going to say.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. We have now heard of all of those persons who are registered to speak. We now have the matter of the proposed resolution and I would like to summarize simply for those who served on the committee who advocated the adoption of the resolution again what our thoughts and plans were in the resolution. It was apparent to us that the Council needed to take some further action, some definite action in response to the referendum that had occurred. You have taken part of that action by approving the taking of proposals for the employment of consultants to further advise Council ultimately on its policies regarding the Aquifer.

Now in this interim pending that final policy determination, there comes the question of what do we do about zoning. It seemed to

us that it would be on the best interest to call a halt to further zoning pending this final policy determination. Now then, I recognize that the landowners, developers, persons with interests in the area are very much concerned but it would seem to me as one individual that their best interests would lie in a speedy resolution of the ultimate Council policy. And it seems to me that the kind of continuing debate on the whole issue that has been evidenced actually in this morning's deliberation is an indication that business cannot continue as usual in this interim while we are pending the final policy determination. Now, I think the Council should pledge itself to moving as rapidly as we can with the consultants and with the final policy determination. I also think that we are going to be in a very difficult position if we attempt to continue business as usual in terms of attempting to hear zoning cases as if we were not in the middle of the policy consideration. So that would be my only comment to the Council and certainly individuals have expressed other opinions and the Council must now proceed its final determination.

REVEREND BLACK: I would like to ask a question with reference to the committee whether or not, I don't have the problem with protection of the Aquifer. I don't think anyone has. I think the fact is I have gone on record, I have voted against the mall before it became a referendum. I voted for the referendum. So, I have established my position, my willingness to take a position that I felt was desired. The big problem that I have now is and I am very sensitive to, is the method that is being used in order to deal with the Aquifer and its needs. I just wonder whether or not there were any other options that the committee considered with reference to how they might deal with the problem of zoning in connection with the Aquifer that would not impose a moratorium and whether or not there are any other options. I suppose the reason I am sensitive to this is that it seems to me to be an action on the part of a body that imposes upon the individual. I know that I stood before this Council some years ago and watched it pass an ordinance that denied me the right to enter the swimming pools of this City, which I felt was an imposition on my personal rights as a person. I saw that action and therefore I have grown sensitive to any action that imposes itself upon the individual's right in having his day in court. Now, when you begin to bunch everybody together and say all right, you are now subject to this restriction, without any examination of his particular case, it seems to me that you are dealing a significant blow against what I call this democratic progress.

Now, I am prepared to take action that's designed to protect the Aquifer but I have a problem with whether or not I am to do violence to what I call the democratic process in trying to protect this other right. Now, if you can give me, if there are some options, I would like to hear, if there are options, I would like to listen those options. I still feel that the individual's right is possibly the highest consideration of any deliberation that we might have as a Council.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, if I might respond to that. It seems to me that the Council basically has two alternatives. It certainly can select whichever route it prefers. It could either simply state that during this interim time we are going to have this moratorium pending our final policy determination, or it could on the other hand elect to hear the zoning cases on an individual basis. I point though to what has happened this morning and raised the question on whether on each successive zoning case we are going to find ourselves in the same kind of deliberation that simply the question of the moratorium has raised this morning. That's if the Council prefers that route and wishes to evaluate, to continue the zoning process, then each case will have to be heard and debated on its merits and decided individually. And so it seems to me that would be the option that the Council would have.

DR. NIELSEN: Madam Mayor, I think it is a very astute analysis of where we are. Let me say, there are a couple pre-suppositions floating around here that I think ought to be clarified. One, that we either are or are not in a position of business as usual. We could get hung up on the semantics on relative on what time on history. I think that about a year ago, relative to the Recharge Zone because of the work of APA in particular, the education program, the sensitizing, whatever that word means, about the responsibilities we all have, elected officials, private sector and everything else, it has not been business as usual. Anything but. The overlay ordinance when it was passed, there was general agreement. I think there were two speakers, one for the League of Women Voters and Mrs. Sinkin who had reservations, she having the greatest. The one major thing that was questioned, if I recall, during that whole overlay discussion was the run-off questions. Then somebody, I think it was the League of Women Voters also raised the question about zoning for agriculture at that particular time. But there weren't any major considerations at that particular time about the overall mapping because we had talked before about finally getting into that, step by step, all that sort of thing. I think that we need to take this on a case by case basis. I agree with Reverend Black that this denying of rights is just not where we should be. It would be easy to pass the moratorium. We wouldn't have to deal with it for a year Mayor. That would be the easy way out. But I don't think we can in all fairness to everybody, the citizens of all persuasions, the APA and everybody else and I don't think it's right to take that kind of a simple way out.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, anyone else would like to speak. Mr. Billa.

MR. BILLA: I just want to say that I have to concur with that. I have agonized over this thing, Mayor, and I think it is an infringement on individuals' rights. I think it's the fear we may make a mistake that, you know, if we don't have this moratorium, that the Edwards is going to be polluted and in the absence of factual information to that effect, I think it would be acting capriciously and arbitrarily by imposing the moratorium. It just doesn't seem realistic to me. I think that if this Council has been elected to act in the public interest that we have got to take all the facts before and act on these zoning cases on their own merit as presented and, certainly, I would like to repeat a portion of the zoning ordinance that we could invoke to deny a case even if everything else was met. So, I would be against the ordinance.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: Yes Madam Mayor. As will be recalled during the discussions of possible other alternatives, one possibility was raised and, of course, it is still on the agenda for tomorrow with regard to the moratorium on building permits which, of course, I would certainly be absolutely against because of the fact that I think that seems to, in effect, reverse what has already been done. That would be stopping the proceeding of something that has already been permitted under a zoning case. But, the other options that were explored, one was the possibility of submitting each zoning case to some other additional scrutiny during this period of time. There was a suggestion I think raised with regard to the possibility of submitting the zoning cases to the Texas Water Quality Board. I think this was discarded as saying they would not, you know, accept this kind of submission. Then I think the discussion evolved to one with the City Attorney in which, where, what are the options. It was on the basis of the information submitted by the City Attorney with regard to the Dallas case, where there had indeed been a moratorium on a zoning case, zoning being an exercise of the City's police power. It is a police power in the same context

as we pass an ordinance that sets speed limits to so many miles per hour in that particular street and I think in addressing your problem, Rev. Black, I think there is, although not total, at least some similarity here. We are dealing with what is a sensitive situation. One that we are trying to preclude from becoming, running the risk of becoming worse. In order to address the problem, we are saying, in effect, we need to put a lower speed limit here for the time period which we can do as an ordinance exercising our police powers. This involves another aspect of exercising our police power, in effect, saying you know, hold in abeyance any further zoning which could further cause harm to this very sensitive water supply. So in that context, based on the City Attorney's identification of the Dallas case, and in view of the fact that there seems to be some logic in putting a temporary halt to the further proliferation of property already zoned, and in full recognition of the fact that the economy's impact that this could have, it was concluded by the committee that a moratorium for the period of time indicated in the resolution was reasonable. I recognize the difficulties with any moratorium, any stopping of process. But I think, in considering the nature of the very sensitive nature we are dealing with, I think one has to conclude that that is a very reasonable step to take.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is that a motion?

MR. HARTMAN: I would make that in the form of a motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is there a second.

DR. CISNEROS: I second the motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, it has been moved and seconded that the resolution be passed. Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: I would like to speak against the motion. I feel that we have two options. One option is to pass the moratorium. That would be it and there would be a lot of people involved. Some unjustly, none fairly. One the other hand, if we didn't pass the moratorium, the Council still has full control of every zoning case that comes, that originates. So based on that and without further rhetoric, I would speak against it, Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine. Mr. Billa.

MR. BILLA: I have to speak against the motion. I want to reiterate what Dr. Nielsen said and then, of course, my good friend, Councilman Glen Hartman, has made a statement that we have imposed speed limits on this zoning out there. You don't have unrestricted zoning out there like you have in the other areas where you have "I-1", "I-2" zoning. I think tremendous restriction would have been imposed on the people in that area and with the absence of facts to the contrary that it will be polluted. I think I just have to be against the resolution imposing the moratorium.

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, in view of the motion in its present form of the word moratorium on it, and in view that I feel there is a connotation of death, that I will not support the motion. There would have to be more reason, more compromise for me to go.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the Clerk will call the roll. Excuse me.

DR. NIELSEN: I move that we table the motion.

MR. PYNDUS: I second the motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, there is a motion and a second to table. The Clerk will call the roll.

The motion carried on the following roll call vote: AYES: Black, Rohde, Nielsen, Pyndus, Billa; NAYS: Cisneros, Hartman, Cockrell; ABSENT: Teniente.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the motion was tabled, thus ending the debate on that issue and it is now 12:00 o'clock, we are recessed for lunch.

February 12, 1976

img

76-7 The meeting was recessed at 12:00 Noon for lunch and reconvened at 1:50 P. M.

76-7

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

MR. TOM WILSON

Mr. Tom Wilson, 4406 Sunnyvale Lane, stated that he had brought back an official Silver Medallion as a gift to the City of San Antonio and Bexar County from the City of Madrid, Spain. This was the last Silver Medallion given out. Mr. Wilson said that he is requesting that the Medallion be displayed at the Institute of Texan Cultures for viewing by the public.

Mayor Cockrell said that this was an excellent suggestion and asked that a Resolution be considered for approval by the Council next week in regard to this matter.

REVEREND R. A. CALLIES, SR.

Reverend R. A. Callies, Sr., 1211 Pecan Valley Drive, presented a written statement of Eastside grievances to the City Council. (A copy is included with the papers of this meeting.)

Reverend Callies also made reference to a letter he had received from Mayor Cockrell regarding the purchase of a monument honoring Martin Luther King, Jr., and read the letter in its entirety.

Mayor Cockrell said that in the case of the George W. Brackenridge statue which Rev. Callies mentioned, the project was initiated by school children. Mayor McAllister undertook the responsibility of completing the project through private donations which were necessary to complete the statue. The City took the responsibility of providing a site and a suitable base on which the statute was placed. Mayor Cockrell advised Rev. Callies that the City would be in complete agreement in terms of assisting with the siting arrangements and in the same manner they had assisted in the George W. Brackenridge Project.

Rev. Callies also called attention to the deplorable conditions of the City cemeteries.

Mr. Hartman said that an effort should be made by the City in conjunction with the community to improve the appearance of the cemeteries.

Mr. Rohde said that in regard to the Martin Luther King Statue, perhaps a fund drive could be initiated by Rev. Callies so that the statue could come from the people in the community.

Mr. Pyndus, in response to Rev. Callies' remarks about the Council's neglect of the Eastside, said that this City Council is making a great effort in responding to Eastside needs.

In response to Rev. Callies' comments about the extension of the Iowa bus line, Mayor Cockrell said that officials of the Transit System had been sent to meet with members of his organization.

City Manager Granata said that the Land Division had already given Rev. Callies permission to place the statue on the median on North New Braunfels. The City would also assist by removing water mains. In regard to the cemeteries, Mr. Granata said that every effort will be made to clean up the cemeteries. He will also see that private cemeteries be investigated by the Health inspectors.

Mr. Hartman said that he will personally take up the matter of extension of the Iowa bus line with the Transit System.

MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ

Mr. Raul Rodriguez stated that the City Council should be concerned with protecting the rights of individuals whose automobiles are impounded at the Police Vehicle Pound, and the rights of those citizens whose automobiles are confiscated and sold without due process and without just compensation.

Mr. Rodriguez also made mention of a letter to the City Council from Chief Peters regarding the use of impounded vehicles by different units of the Police Department. Mr. Rodriguez said that it is a violation of the law to drive a car without the owner's consent.

Chief of Police Emil Peters said that this practice is universal. The cars are used only after the owners have been notified and the autos are not claimed. Chief Peters said that he would be glad to talk to Mr. Rodriguez in order that Mr. Rodriguez can give him specific incidents.

In response to Dr. Nielsen's questions about problems at the Vehicle Pound, Inspector Martinez, in charge of the Pound, said that they have had some problems and has asked Mr. Rodriguez to meet with him and answer any questions he might have.

Mr. Rodriguez asked that the City Council instruct the Fire and Police Civil Service Commission to investigate the Police Vehicle Pound and hear the allegations.

MR. E. L. RICHEY

Mr. E. L. Richey stated that laws will never stop nudity. Government should concern itself with bettering itself.

Mr. Richey also spoke against the purchase of the Pecan Valley Golf Course.

MRS. MARIA DOMINGUEZ

Mrs. Maria Dominguez defended the actions of the police in towing wrecked automobiles to the Police Vehicle Pound.

MRS. HELEN DUTMER

Mrs. Helen Dutmer, 739 McKinley Avenue, stated that her grandson's friend has had his car stolen and stripped twice from a paid parking lot in the downtown area. She said that these parking lots should have some sort of insurance covering thefts if they are not going to hire security guards.

Mayor Cockrell asked that the City Attorney investigate this matter to see if any requirements could be placed upon this type of parking operation.

Mrs. Dutmer said she wished to commend the Police Department on the fast action in apprehending the two suspects who held up the Highland Park Bank.

Mrs. Dutmer also said that she had heard that the present form of government of Council-Manager should be changed. She said that if Council-Manager form of government would be handled correctly then it would work for the City. The Council should not supersede the City Manager but should go through the Manager in all matters.

76-7

REQUEST OF MR. PEDRO RAMIREZ

The Clerk read a proposed ordinance granting a license to Mr. Pedro Ramirez to operate a motor vehicle junk yard at 4402 Milling Road, known as Lot 71, NCB 10662.

Mr. George Vann, Director of Building and Planning Administration, explained the proposed ordinance. He said that this is an application by Mr. Pedro Ramirez to operate a salvage or a junkyard on a piece of industrial property zoned "LL". Under Section 20 of the City Charter, the Council must approve the junkyard.

Mr. Pedro Ramirez was not in the audience to appear before the Council.

Mr. Terry Thrift, Jr., 708 W. Summit, appeared before the Council. He stated that he is the Coordinator of the East and North east Junk Yard Protective Association. He also owns property near and adjacent to the property in question and felt that a junkyard would not be in order in this area. Junkyards should be at the end of a dead-end street. It would definitely reduce the value of the surrounding property. He asked the Council to deny Mr. Ramirez' request.

Mr. James F. Gardner said that he is the attorney for Litho Press, Inc., which is located adjacent to the subject property. Litho Press is a government printing contractor and has just finished building a \$250,000 plant in this area, and is actually a showcase for government printing shops. He spoke against the request of Mr. Pedro Ramirez to maintain a junkyard in this area.

Mr. H. Gordon Davis, attorney for the Trans-Tex Supply Company, said that Trans-Tex opposes this proposed junkyard and asked the City Council to deny the request.

In response to Mr. Hartman's question, Mr. Vann said that Mr. Ramirez had been operating without a junk dealer's license and has been cited for this violation. His case is now pending in Municipal Court.

Mr. Allison Burgwin, General Manager of Greyhound Van Lines and Smyth Van Lines, also spoke in opposition to the proposed application for the junkyard operation.

After consideration, Mr. Rohde made a motion that the ordinance be denied. Mr. Hartman seconded the motion, and on the following roll call vote, the motion prevailed: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente.

The application was denied.

76-7 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Members of the Administrative Staff, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 46,304

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO ONE YEAR AGREEMENTS WITH VARIOUS MEMBER LIBRARIES OF THE COUNCIL OF RESEARCH AND ACADEMIC LIBRARIES ORGANIZATION FOR THE USE OF SPACE IN THE MAIN LIBRARY ANNEX AS A CENTRAL STORAGE FACILITY FOR LITTLE-USED VOLUMES IN HIGHLY SPECIALIZED AREAS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,305

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH TRW DATACOM INTERNATIONAL, INC. WHEREBY SAID FIRM SHALL LEASE SPACE IN THE AIR CARGO BUILDING AT SAN ANTONIO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT FOR A FIVE (5) YEAR PERIOD.

* * * *

76-7 Mayor Cockrell was obliged to leave the meeting and Rev. Black presided as Acting Mayor.

76-7 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Tom Raffety, Director of Aviation, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Pyndus, seconded by Mr. Billa, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde, Teniente, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 46,306

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF \$10,650.00 FROM B. J. CAMPBELL, INC. OF SAN ANTONIO TO PERFORM REMODELING OF THE OFFICES OF SOUTHWEST AIRLINES IN THE TERMINAL BUILDING AT INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT FOR THE JOB, APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR PAYMENT OF THE CONTRACT AND PROVIDING FUNDS FOR PAYMENT OF CONTINGENT EXPENDITURES IN THE JOB.

* * * *

76-7 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Ron Darner, Director of Parks and Recreation, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Pyndus, seconded by Dr. Cisneros, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 46,307

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF \$9,618.00 FROM HILL COUNTRY WATER, INC. TO CONSTRUCT A WATER WELL IN CONNECTION WITH THE DEVELOPMENT OF FRIEDRICH PARK AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT WITH THE CONTRACTOR AND PAYMENT THEREOF; AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF \$13,200.00 TO L. K. TRAVIS & ASSOCIATES IN ARCHITECT FEES FOR PLANNING & DESIGNING PHASE II SITE DEVELOPMENT AT FRIEDRICH PARK AND AUTHORIZING A REVISION IN THE BUDGET OF THE FRIEDRICH PARK DEVELOPMENT PROJECT.

* * * *

Dr. Cisneros asked Mr. Darner to brief the Council on the switch from VHF to UHF radios by the Park Rangers.

Mr. Darner said the Police Department is going into a new UHF radio system. The Park Rangers are still on VHF. At the present time there is no direct radio communication between the two departments. The cost to upgrade the Park Rangers radio system to that of the Police Department is about \$50,000. It is hoped that a grant can be obtained to accomplish this.

Dr. Cisneros stressed the importance of making two radio systems compatible so that Park Rangers can obtain assistance in an emergency.

Mr. Darner said that the Park Ranger dispatcher also serves as disseminator of information for HemisFair and for the whole park system.

76-7 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 46,308

MANIFESTING AN AGREEMENT WITH PERRY SALINAS TO AMEND AND EXTEND FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD THE LEASE AGREEMENT FOR USE OF A PORTION OF THE BEAUTIFIED SECTION OF THE SAN ANTONIO RIVER IN CONJUNCTION WITH A RESTAURANT OPERATION.

* * * *

Mr. Ron Darner, Director of Parks and Recreation, explained the proposed ordinance. In response to Mr. Rohde's question, Mr. Darner said that this is a new lease with a new owner.

Mr. Rohde said he would like to insert a clause in the lease that no nudity shows or massage parlors be allowed.

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

76-7 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Chief of Police, Emil Peters, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Pyndus, seconded by Dr. Cisneros, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 46,309

AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION TO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE COUNCIL FOR A \$17,847.00 GRANT FOR FUNDING OF A PROJECT ENTITLED S.A.P.D. MICROFILM PROJECT.

* * * *

76-7

MICROFICHE PURCHASE

In response to Mr. Hartman's question, Mr. Carl White, Director of Finance, said that in addition to the microfilming that is done in-house, the City of San Antonio together with the City Water Board and the City Public Service Board is studying the feasibility of purchasing a microfiche machine instead of the present system of contracting that is done by these three agencies.

76-7 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Police Chief Emil Peters, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 46,310

ACCEPTING A SUPPLEMENTAL \$8,202.00 GRANT FROM THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE DIVISION OF THE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR TO BE USED FOR UPGRADING THE SWITCHER OPERATION IN THE POLICE DEPARTMENT, AND EXPANDING TRANSMISSION OF COMPUTERIZED POLICE INFORMATION TO THE SOUTH TEXAS COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEM NETWORK; APPROPRIATING FUNDS AND AUTHORIZING A REVISION IN THE PROJECT BUDGET.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,311

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION TO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE DIVISION FOR A GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$253,680.00 TO FUND THE SECOND PORTION OF A PROGRAM WHICH WILL IMPLEMENT COMPUTER ASSISTED DISPATCHING SYSTEM OF THE SAN ANTONIO POLICE DEPARTMENT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,312

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION TO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE DIVISION FOR A GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$115,324.00 FOR THE PURPOSE OF UPGRADING THE MESSAGE SWITCHER SYSTEM OF THE SAN ANTONIO POLICE DEPARTMENT.

* * * *

76-7 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. William Donahue, Director of Human Resources and Services, and after consideration, on motion of Dr. Cisneros, seconded by Mr. Hartman, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 46,313

REVISING THE PERSONNEL COMPLEMENT OF THE YOUTH SERVICES PROJECT - JUVENILE DELINQUENCY PREVENTION - THIRD YEAR BY AUTHORIZING TRANSFER OF EIGHTEEN YOUTH WORKER POSITIONS FOR THE PERIOD FEBRUARY 1 TO JUNE 30, 1976, AND APPROVING A REVISION IN THE BUDGET OF THE PROJECT.

* * * *

Mr. Pyndus asked Mr. Donahue if the youth in some of the projects such as in the previous ordinance might perhaps be utilized for clean-up jobs in the community.

Mr. Donahue said that this is not the kind of projects that the youth are usually involved in, but he would look into the possibilities.

76-7 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. William Donahue, Director of Human Resources and Services, and after consideration, on motion of Dr. Cisneros, seconded by Dr. Nielsen, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 46,314

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE
A CONTRACT BETWEEN THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
AND THE ALAMO AREA VOLUNTEER ADVOCATE
PROGRAM, INC.

* * * *

76-7 Mayor Cockrell returned to the meeting and presided.

76-7 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Dr. William R. Ross, Director of the Metropolitan Health District, and after consideration, on motion of Dr. Cisneros, seconded by Mr. Rohde, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente, Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 46,315

ACCEPTING A GRANT OF \$33,245.00 FROM THE
PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE OF THE U. S. DEPT.
OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE IN SUPPORT
OF THE CONTINUATION OF THE IMMUNIZATION
MAINTENANCE PROGRAM FOR ONE YEAR BEGINNING
JANUARY 1, 1976, APPROVING A BUDGET AND
PERSONNEL COMPLEMENT THEREFOR, AND APPRO-
PRIATING SAID SUM FOR EXPENDITURE IN THE
PROJECT.

* * * *

76-7 HEALTH PLANNING

Councilman Rohde stated that he was concerned about duplication of health services of the City and the County, and that a need for health planning exists.

Dr. Ross responded that he is very actively involved in health planning. He is currently involved with ACOG and their health planning and if the proposed El Camino Real does go into reality as a health systems agency, the City will have representation on that Board.

76-7

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 46,316

ADOPTING THE SAN ANTONIO LIBRARY MASTER PLAN OF OCTOBER, 1975, AS A COMPONENT OF THE MASTER PLAN FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO.

* * * *

Mr. Bob Hunter, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Development, explained that this ordinance formally adopts the Library Master Plan which the Council approved last week. Corrections have been made to the Plan as instructed by the Council.

In response to Mr. Hartman's question, Mr. Hunter said that the San Pedro Branch will be re-evaluated as to the parking problem and circulation of the books.

Councilman Pyndus said that a need for criteria for library sites exists.

City Manager Granata stated that the staff can set the priorities and if the Council formulates the bond issues, they can go by this set of priorities, and a citizens bond committee could possibly come up with an entirely different set of priorities.

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

76-7 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Carl White, Director of Finance, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Pyndus, seconded by Mr. Hartman, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente, Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 46,317

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF FIRST SOUTHWEST COMPANY FOR FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES RELATING TO THE OFFER AND SALE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, SERIES 1976.

* * * *

76-7 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Carl White, Finance Director, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Pyndus, seconded by Mr. Hartman, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Hartman, Rohde, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Black, Teniente, Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 46,318

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF DOBBINS, HOWARD & HARRIS, ATTORNEYS, TO ACT AS BOND ATTORNEYS FOR THE OFFER AND SALE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, SERIES 1976.

* * * *

76-7 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. W. S. Clark, Director of Land Acquisition and Right-of-Way, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Rohde, seconded by Mr. Pyndus, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Hartman, Rohde, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Black, Teniente, Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 46,319

APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$18,230.00 OUT OF VARIOUS FUNDS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING TITLE AND/OR EASEMENTS TO CERTAIN LANDS; ACCEPTING THE DEDICATION OF AN EASEMENT AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A QUITCLAIM DEED IN EXCHANGE FOR A CERTAIN TRACT OF LAND; ALL TO BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN RIGHT-OF-WAY PROJECTS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46, 320

CLOSING AND ABANDONING AN ALLEY ABUTTING LOTS 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 AND 21, BLOCK 25, NEW CITY BLOCK 508, AND AUTHORIZING A QUITCLAIM DEED TO FERNANDO M. GONZALES, ET UX, FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF \$470.00 AND A QUITCLAIM DEED TO SEARS, ROEBUCK AND COMPANY FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF \$3,335.00.

* * * *

76-7 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Members of the Administrative Staff, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Hartman, Rohde, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Black, Teniente, Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 46,321

DECLARING A PUBLIC NECESSITY FOR THE ACQUISITION OF THE FEE TITLE TO CERTAIN PRIVATELY OWNED REALTY IN SAN ANTONIO, BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS, FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES, IN CONNECTION WITH THE LOCATION, CONSTRUCTION, RELOCATION, OPERATION, RECONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENT, REPAIR, AND MAINTENANCE OF THE NEBRASKA STREET IMPROVEMENT PROJECT; AND DIRECTING THE CITY ATTORNEY TO INSTITUTE AND PROSECUTE TO CONCLUSION CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS TO ACQUIRE SO MUCH THEREOF AS CANNOT BE ACQUIRED THROUGH NEGOTIATION.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,322

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF VULCAN SIGNS & STAMPINGS, INC. TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH ALUMINUM SIGN BLANKS FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$6,169.00.

* * * *

76-7 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. John Brooks, Director of Purchasing, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Hartman, Rohde, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Black, Teniente, Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 46,323

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BIDS OF ECONOLITE AND TRAFFIC SIGNAL EQUIPMENT, INC. TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH TRAFFIC SIGNAL EQUIPMENT FOR A TOTAL OF \$11,898.00.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 46,324

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BIDS OF CHEMICAL AND TURF SPECIALTY CO., INC., OCCIDENTAL CHEMICAL COMPANY AND WATSON DISTRIBUTING INC. TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH FERTILIZERS FOR A TOTAL AMOUNT OF \$18,736.44.

* * * *

76-7 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. John Brooks, Director of Purchasing, and after consideration, on motion of Dr. Cisneros, seconded by Mr. Billa, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente, Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 46,325

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF COMMERCIAL BODY CORPORATION TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH A MOBILE AERIAL TOWER FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$32,247.00.

* * * *

76-7 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Councilman Henry Cisneros, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Billa, seconded by Dr. Cisneros, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Teniente, Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 46,326

AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 46270 OF JANUARY 29, 1976 BY PROVIDING FOR COOPERATION BY THE CITY DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION WITH THE SADA AND THE YWCA IN PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTING IMPROVEMENTS AT FAIRCHILD PARK.

* * * *

Mayor Cockrell asked City Manager Granata if a report on the Comprehensive Bond Program in terms of recommended schedules and so on had been prepared.

City Manager Granata said that Finance Director Carl White is preparing this report and is listed for a future "B" Session.

Mayor Cockrell said that she would like this report scheduled at the City Manager's earliest convenience.

76-7

A RESOLUTION ENDORSING THE CONCEPT OF A THERAPEUTIC AND RESIDENTIAL CENTER.

Councilman Henry Cisneros stated that a coalition of nine agencies working with the handicapped have been working with the Central Labor Council to form a housing rehabilitation center for the handicapped. They would like a resolution from the City Council endorsing this concept so it may be submitted to HUD together with their grant application. He requested concurrence of the Council to have a resolution for consideration at the next Council meeting.

The Council concurred in Dr. Cisneros' request.

76-7

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Councilman Cisneros said that the subcommittee on Economic Development has been meeting and two reports are now ready to be presented to the whole Council. He asked concurrence of the Council to have a "B" Session scheduled for these reports. The City Manager has advised that this could be placed on the February 26th "B" Session if the Council concurred.

The Council concurred in Dr. Cisneros' request.

76-7

CITY PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD NOMINATION

Mr. Rohde asked Mayor Cockrell about the status of the City Public Service Board of Trustee member nomination.

Mayor Cockrell said that the City Public Service Board has not yet had an Executive Session and are still receiving suggestions. As soon as there is something to report, she will bring in a report to the Council.

76-7

PLANNING AND POLICY OBJECTIVES COMMITTEE

Councilman Hartman stated that the Planning and Policy Objectives Committee over the past six months has been reviewing the City Water Board's policy with regards to rate-making and main extensions. They hope to have a "B" Session scheduled in the near future in order to present a final report to the Council.

76-7

CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

Councilman Billa said that he had met with a member of military personnel, and they had suggested that perhaps civilian personnel could be recognized by the Council for their achievements.

Councilman Cisneros said that he had spoken before a group of civil service personnel managers, and that an important chain of command exists in the civilian hierarchy and they wanted some recognition. They would like to be involved and consulted on matters relating to the bases.

76-7

TAX RATE DATE

Mayor Cockrell asked the City Manager what the date was for setting the tax rate.

City Manager Granata said that it is scheduled for or about March 18. The rate must be set before April 1, 1976.

76-7

NEW CHARTER FOR COMBINED CITY-COUNTY
TAX APPRAISAL PROJECT

Councilman Pyndus stated that Commissioners' Court will be considering the new Charter for the combined City-County Tax Appraisal Project on Friday, February 13. Assuming it will be approved, he together with Councilman Billa will bring it to the Council next week for consideration.

Councilman Cisneros suggested that it be scheduled as a "B" Session item.

Mayor Cockrell said that it could possibly be discussed at the informal session on Monday, February 16, prior to the Council's formal session on February 19, 1976.

76-7

The Clerk read the following letter:

February 6, 1976

Honorable Mayor and Members of the City Council
City of San Antonio, Texas

The following petitions were received by my office and forwarded to the City Manager for investigation and report to the City Council.

February 4, 1976

Petition submitted by Mr. Richard J. Francis on behalf of the Northwest Optimist Club of San Antonio, requesting permission to conduct a ceremonial bonfire at 7:30 P.M., Saturday, February 21, 1976, at their Annual Coon Hunt and Weiner Roast, to be held one half mile west of Fredericksburg Road on Prue Road.

February 6, 1976

Petition submitted by Mr. Gerlad Dowdy, L & H Packing Company, requesting permission to erect an eight (8) foot cedar board fence along the property located at 3313-3325 Mission Road.

February 12, 1976
img

February 6, 1976

Petition of San Antonio Independent School District requesting permission to erect a fence to be located at Margil Elementary School on City property.

G. V. JACKSON, JR.
City Clerk

* * * *

76-7 There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at 4:00 P.M.

A P P R O V E D

Lila Cochell

M A Y O R

ATTEST:

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

February 12, 1976
img

-51-