

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1978.

* * * *

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 P.M. by the presiding officer, Mayor Lila Cockrell, with the following members present: CISNEROS, WEBB, DUTMER, WING, EURESTE, ORTIZ, ALDERETE, PYNDUS, HARTMAN, STEEN, COCKRELL; Absent: NONE.

78-54 The invocation was given by The Reverend George Healy, St. Agnes Catholic Church.

78-54 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

78-54 The minutes of the meeting of November 22, 1978, were approved.

78-54 PRESENTATION BY MR. CHARLES KOMANOFF

Mayor Cockrell stated that it had been requested by a Council majority that Mr. Charles Komanoff of Komanoff Energy Associates make a presentation to the Council at this point of the meeting.

Mr. Komanoff stated that he had been invited by Citizens Concerned About Nuclear Power in Austin and had also been invited by Mr. Lanny Sinkin and Dr. Golfrey Connally to speak to the San Antonio City Council on the economics of nuclear energy and especially on the South Texas Nuclear Plant.

With the use of slides, he spoke about capital and construction costs of nuclear plants in the United States. Mr. Komanoff also distributed copies of a report entitled, "Capacity Expansion for Austin". (A copy of which is on file with the papers of this meeting.)

Mr. Komanoff also stated that escalating costs with nuclear plants are not only due to inflation, but these costs overruns are due to the fact that nuclear power is still not a mature technology for producing energy and is in a constant state of evolution such as design changes.

The following discussion took place:

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, now are there questions? First, let me call on Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PHIL PYNDUS: Thank you, Mayor. Mr. Komanoff, the economics are my first concern and according to your statement we couldn't afford the plant by ourselves. If we want 100% rather than 28%, in other words, if we choose nuclear, it would be better to be a partner, rather than to try on our own. Then as far as being there or having a share of a plant we are in a better position than facing these costs on a sole singular basis.

MR. KOMANOFF: Yes and no. Clearly you're better off than if you would try to bite off 2500 megawatts by yourself. So, what I've done here is simply allocate to CPSB, the 28%, the 700 megawatts, so that's already factored into the analysis.

MR. PYNDUS: There were two areas that you covered very thoroughly and that was the total nuclear cost of the 2.43 attributed to inflation. And there was a 1.52 contributed to design changes.

MR. KOMANOFF: Actually, sir, it was just the opposite.

MR. PYNDUS: As far as the inflationary cost is concerned, that should not be part of the argument at all, should it?

MR. KOMANOFF: Correct.

MR. PYNDUS: We cannot control inflation.

MR. KOMANOFF: Correct. And any coal alternative is also subject to the same 1.52.

MR. PYNDUS: Wouldn't the figures tend to be overrated if that is the case?

MR. KOMANOFF: I don't think so. Let me, if I don't understand the thrust of your question, please interrupt me. Again the 1.52 factor is inflation, coal suffers that as well, essentially anything suffers it. The 2.43 I call peculiar to nuclear power. Now, coal is suffering its own factor, and I'm doing, it's still in the works- grind out in the computer to find out what that factor has been. I can tell you that it's been alot less than 2.43, which is why you're better off, I think, with the coal alternative than with the nuclear.

MR. PYNDUS: Your presentation impresses me very much. I want to be sure that I have the correct information. And so I hesitate to put into the picture the 1.52 increase in cost. Then, if I could go to the other fact, I mean the 2.43, then going into the design changes of 1.52.

MR. KOMANOFF: No, the design changes are 2.43.

MR. PYNDUS: 2.43. And the remarks that you made that the agency did not listen to any pleas as to the construction costs they wanted the design safety in those plants, and, don't you agree that if we are to utilize this energy, and we have been doing it for 20 years, that we have to constantly improve on the safety factors and also we constantly must dig answers out on those 100 issues or items that we wonder what we should do about.

MR. KOMANOFF: I think you've just stated the crux of the problem and that as we dig out the answers to those 100, and actually it's 140, I said 100. That these things are going to add to cost and as more nuclear plants come on line. I think there are going to be more problems indicated with some of the components and systems. This is what's been happening to date which will further add to the costs. And I should also say that this list of 140 has been, it's been that size list for the past six years. Old items get resolved, new items get discovered. And so, I fear for the ability of nuclear power to compete economically and feel that it's really gotten past the point of where it's anymore and economical alternative for us.

MR. PYNDUS: If we then went beyond the economics, go to the bottom line. You had the difference of one cent, or one-tenth of one cent between coal and nuclear in 1985 and 2015.

MR. KOMANOFF: Just so we're on the same wave length. If you look at that page one. The worst case that I had was if you dropped out of the project and can't even recover any of your costs which is, hopefully, not the case. In that case, the two alternatives would be equal. A one percent difference, we're talking about such uncertainty that one percent means the same. But my sort of basic case had about a one-cent difference between about five and one half cents per kilowatt hour for the coal and six and one-half cents per kilowatt hour for the nuclear over that period over these 30 years.

MR. PYNDUS: Then, we can assume that you have no argument about the safety of the plant. We're talking about the economics, and at the bottom line there's very little difference. But, it will give this City some alternatives. It will give us an end to that nuclear plant plus the use of the coal facilities that we had.

MR. KOMANOFF: I tempted to just say yes, but I'm not totally sure that I understood the question.

MR. PYNDUS: Just that the bottom line- the figures were so close together it looked like we would gain very little, or lose very little in the long run between nuclear and coal.

MR. KOMANOFF: In a sense I'm saying more than that. I think that the figures are not that similar and that they are quite different in favor of giving up the nuclear and taking the coal instead.

MR. PYNDUS: Thank you very much.

MR. KOMANOFF: I should say to make sure that these differences between 14 percent, if it's Wyoming Coal and up to 38 percent if Texas lignite, that doesn't all translate to a customer level because nuclear is only whatever you do for the 700 megawatts is only part of your total capacity and then you've got distribution costs also. So, this is at the generating end which is probably about half of your total cost looking down the road.

MR. PYNDUS: Okay, Thank you.

MR. JOE ALDERETE: Yes, Madam Mayor. I want to thank the members of the City Council and also the audience for allowing the presentation to take place. I think what Mr. Komanoff has said, I think it's very relevant and significant information with respect to the large financial investments that the City of San Antonio is making in the South Texas Project. I think he's touched on some very excellent pertinent points with reference as to why the cost of the project will continue to go up and has based his figures on traditional patterns of other nuclear projects. They're not figures that are not substantiated, they are very well substantiated, and I think he's raised some very valid points, and this is the reason that I tried to seize upon the opportunity for him to be here. He made his presentation last night to the City of Austin. We were able to get his expenses paid down here to the City of San Antonio at no cost to the City of San Antonio, whatsoever, except for some of the citizens that paid for him to come down. And I think it was an opportune moment for the Council to listen in on what I thought what was very important points with reference to this project. I just wanted to state that because some of the members I, that didn't get a chance to reach and call them and ask them for this presentation, but this was the reason why we had done it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you.

MR. EURESTE: Yes, Madam. Part of the report that is titled the "South Texas Project Electric Generating Station", Task Force report of October 27, 1978, which talks about the recent escalation in price or in cost, cited the following basic causes that comes from the, in a report that was prepared by the Atomic Industrial Forum and they're citing this as some of the reasons why we had this recent cost overrun, and they cite expansion and instability of regulatory activities, increase complexity and scope of engineering changes, and the increased material quantities and field labor man-hours as a result of increased plant size and here the parenthesis "complexity", the increased "complexity" of the plant. And then they cite the quantity increases that STP had, from the 1973 estimate to the 1978 estimate and they cite structural which is steel in tons, 122 percent increase from well, I'm not going to cite the figures because I don't know if they're listing them in millions or whatever here but, concrete increased 83%, INAUDIBLE increased 125%, piping linear feet went from by 88%, wiring cable by 100%, terminations by 71%, cable trade by 116%, and conduit by 49%, and they they cite the direct labor man-hours, the combination of increase quantities and increased unit rates resulted in an estimated increase in direct labor man-hours for both units as follows: the 1973 estimate was placed at 11 million man-hours, the 1978 task force report was listed at 33 million man-hours which is what about 300 or 200 percent increase - a 200 percent increase and so part of the report that was given is verified in a report that this Council received from the Task Force that is involved with STP. The other one is that the projections that were listed that are based on these projections, assumptions, that are made about what is going to go up and whatnot are in line with what Mr. Connally had also reported on, and they're confirmed by projections that

I myself did, and it all falls in line. You can either go at 20% increase per year for the remaining years of this project and compound that on the base cost, or you can take all of your customers, both residential, commercial, and industrial, you can take them all together and what you get in a projection, is for each household in San Antonio, about 11 thousand dollars per household that each one of us will be paying back over a 25 year or thirty year life of those bonds. Those bonds each one of them, carried about a 129% interest cost that is a full-compounded cost of those bonds. So, if you're floating a million, you're paying back 2.29 billion dollars, those are the payments you're making in the end. It is a very expensive project, no doubt about it, and with the kind of escalation you've got, with this type of dollars, it's going to be felt, and it will be felt by the rate payer here in San Antonio. There are other questions that have to do with the rate of growth that CPSB has projected for San Antonio. Now what Houston projects for Houston is one thing, but I don't think that we can use the same projections that Houston is using for San Antonio. I think our own history, our own recent history, will tell us that our growth has been somewhat different than other communities.

The other things that we need to look at as far as the CPSB projections for kilowatt usage, is look at the recent history and not look at a long history of something like 11 or 12 years. You have to look at your last, at least 5 years to get down to where we are at today and where we are going to be going in the next few years. Those kinds of projections are much lower than what CPSB is projecting. So, from all aspects, there's a high cost and the cost continues to go up and everything is telling us that the cost escalation has not stopped. It's going to continue to be there.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Mr. Eureste. Mr. Hartman

MR. HARTMAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. The information that has been presented by Mr. Komanoff is exactly the type of information that we so desperately need to have provided to us and examined not only from this perspective that may wish to provide an input. This is the kind of critical review from an economic standpoint I think we have got to go through and be satisfied with before we can really make a final judgement about the South Texas Project.

I am happy to see us have this opportunity to hear Mr. Komanoff's figures and I also would hope that we would be able to have the information Mr. Komanoff has presented here today provided to the Energy Alternatives Task Force which this Council set into motion by ordinance at the beginning of November and which, Mayor, in your absence, I directed that it begin its meetings which it did last week and I believe had its second meeting today.

It's just this kind of review that I have been asking for based on facts and figures rather than either assumptions or out-dated figures which I think is what we have had too much of. I would certainly hope that the Energy Alternatives Task Force would ask for this kind of input and whatever other perspectives there may be, I hope they ask for those because what we are looking for here is very simply a critical review as to whether or not we can afford the South Texas Project or how much of it we can afford or whatever and what the alternatives are.

I am particularly concerned that despite the fact that you, Mayor, asked in August and I repeated the request in September, the City Public Service Board saw fit not to participate with the City in the Energy Alternatives Task Force. I would hope, again, at this juncture that perhaps the CPSB would see fit to join in this effort and lay out their side of the issue which I am sure differs in some respects to what Mr. Komanoff is saying.

All in the world we are looking for is just an open examination of what we have before us and what in our best judgement would be best for the future of San Antonio. I don't think there is anyone here that is particularly a coal proponent or a solar power proponent or whatever. My concern is just simply a comparison of what it is going to take. I would hope that this Council would be able to achieve consensus to request

that the Energy Alternatives Task Force ask for Mr. Komanoff's input and I think in that context, I would hope that we could also make some funding available to the Task Force to properly carry out its change from this Council. That would be in the form of a motion.

MR. ALDERETE: I second the motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I will first state the motion and that is that the Council will direct the Energy Alternatives Task Force to request the input and contribution of Mr. Komanoff and that you would also wish to have funds made available for that purpose.

MR. HARTMAN: Yes, Madam Mayor, as you may recall, at the time we passed the ordinance we did state at that time that there may be a need for some sort of funding to provide assistance to the task force and I don't think we have discussed it since that ordinance was passed. I don't view this as any astronomical amount. A reasonably modest sum that can get the input from any and all perspectives that are available to us. I'm not saying just yet, Mr. Komanoff's input. I'm saying let's get some real good hard data that we can look at so that when the Energy Alternatives Task Force is finished, they will be in a position to delineate a new program, if you will, for the energy needs for the future of San Antonio that will be based upon this critical review.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I would ask a question for clarification. I notice there is a member of the Task Force who is here. I have not had a report as of today as to whether or not the Energy Alternatives Task Force had set up an opportunity for a hearing or a visit with Mr. Komanoff. Mr. Connally, can you, Mr. Golfrey Connally is a member of that committee, would you just advise us as to that?

MR. CONNALLY: Thank you, Madam Mayor, yes I'm a member and I do not know, I'm still waiting to see whether we're going to be invited at 3:30, Mr. Komanoff will be invited to attend.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I see. Does the Committee meet at 3:30 today? I see, I had heard something about it and I simply had not heard the final information as to what had been decided.

MR. CONNALLY: I suppose we would have to see Mr. O'Connell. Some idea or a resolution from the Council, or words from the Council might possibly help.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, sir. The motion and the second is for the Council to direct or request the task force, apparently that involves, are you talking about the 3:30 meeting today?

MR. HARTMAN: If that could work out, if that can be within the schedule, I see we could take advantage of this opportunity that Mr. Komanoff is here, thanks to the City of Austin for footing the bill. I'm glad that Austin is giving us this gift.

MAYOR COCKRELL: May I ask the staff, some of our city staff has been providing staff assistance to the Committee it has met.

MR. HUEBNER: Bill Arnett.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I wonder if he is available, if we could find out just what stage perhaps in checking with the chairman of the Committee, I'm a little bit hesitant if the committee has already made the decision to hear then I would be a little hesitant to pass a motion to direct them to do it after the fact. I would just kind of like to know where they are. If they've already agreed to extend the invitation, then we can just simply concur in their invitation at that point.

MR. HUEBNER: We're checking on that at this moment.

MR. HARTMAN: I would put it this way, Madam Mayor, that if they haven't concurred, we would urge them to and if they have, we would say, good show.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine, Mr. Webb. May we just hold that motion without voting for a few minutes and we'll get to it, in just a minute then, Mr. Webb.

MR. WEBB: Thank you. Mr. Komanoff, one real important thing that hasn't been stated here today, and early on I've been opposed to the Nuclear Power Plant, and simply because I think that is a real great risk as far as safety is concerned for people. I would like to ask if, in fact, any of the 140 complexities had any great bearing as far as, I know that the cost overrun, the waste disposal, I think your report says 12% into the cost of building this nuclear power plant, but where do you put on the scale the risk or the safety factor?

MR. KOMANOFF: In a sense, it's there and it's not there. It's there the safety factor, in the sense that what's making the plant more expensive is the changes that are intended to make the new plant safer and more fool proof than the earlier plant. I suspect that that is being achieved although, the rate that it's being achieved, is something that I don't know that. The fact that there are still so many unresolved safety questions in the minds of the nuclear regulatory commission which seems to indicate that nobody there is prepared to conclude whether the technology has arrived and is now sufficiently safe, that we don't have to worry about the possibility of an accident, a serious accident, the cost could get into thousands of lives and billions of dollars and that, of course, is not in my numbers. My numbers are only what the rate payers would be paying directly for electricity but in fairness, we should all recognize as we probably do that the immediate alternative of coal also has human health and safety and consequences less dramatic than nuclear but certainly ongoing and very deadly for the people who mind coal and for those of us who breathe the air which does get polluted to a greater extent with coal fired ignitions. What makes me more somewhat optimistic about coal, than about nuclear in terms of cost, and I would say that 6 years ago, I wrote a study on for the Council on Economic Priority called the "Price of Power". It dealt with the pollution and cost of fuel plants, primarily coal. So I come from a place of great concern about coal, what it does to the human health and what it does to the pristine environment that still exists in some parts of the country. I think the major investment to clean up coal fired plants are already being made and those are factored into my coal fired cost but that the investments to make the nuclear plants safer and safer are always going to be made because there is always going to be the discovery of new things that could be done to make these plants safer. As long as the technology as the power to enter so many people as things do go wrong, I think there is going to be understandable pressure to try to improve that technology at greater and greater cost so you have this paradoxical the situation, the plants are probably getting safer but they're not getting 100% safe and the cost is getting much greater.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: I know you're a professional man and work for a living like most of us and your time is your money. You're not appearing here free of charge today, are you?

MR. KOMANOFF: Yes, I am.

MR. STEEN: You are?

MR. KOMANOFF: Yes.

MR. STEEN: Well, I appreciate that also, I thought maybe, I heard Mr. Hartman say that you were appearing thanks to Austin. You know, you were there last night.

MR. KOMANOFF: Austin brought me down and paid not only my travel they gave me a fee, but

MR. STEEN: You came on down here for free of charge, so to speak. I appreciate that very much myself. I do appreciate your figures. I just wonder what is the final situation in Austin. What's the latest word on their interest in the project? Did they say anything before you left?

MR. KOMANOFF: No, what they're doing, and you probably know, is they are having a series of 4 meetings. Last night, which was mine, dealt with economics. I was debating an articulate advocate for the side that says stay with the project and next week there will be 3 other discussions, safety, waste disposal, and plant operation and engineering.

MR. STEEN: They're going to have a public vote? In January? Your only objection to the South Texas Project is economics.

MR. KOMANOFF: My professional concern with the project is economics.

MR. STEEN: You're a mathematician more or less, by trade, but I mean you have the real liability of that type of energy, safety, or any of that does not have anything to do with your presentation, you're just interested in cold figures.

MR. KOMANOFF: That's correct. Personally, I'm troubled by the impact of both coal and nuclear on what I call the societal burden, the safety, the health, the potential impact on proliferation of nuclear weapons which is a concern of nuclear, conversely the build-up of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere which is a global problem connected with coal, these things trouble me. For the long term, I hope that our society begins making the transition to a more energy efficient society, which I think will be economically to our advantage because it's getting expensive to waste all the energy that we're wasting and ultimately to solar energy but those are personal feelings that are not, I hope, in my cold analysis.

MR. STEEN: I see, of course, I've always been very much in favor of the South Texas Project and I think among many other things, we're going to need that source energy one of these days. I think it's a very clean type of energy, as little as I know about it. I am interested in your figures because I think you're apparently a very well-qualified mathematician I do appreciate the fact that you've come down here to talk to us today. I would be very interested in Mr. Hartman's motion, however, I would like to put a monetary limit on it because I keep thinking about the Metcalf-Eddy people and what they started out with and what we're still paying them. That's the water people and I still haven't seen a report from them after a couple of years of what ever has been going on but if we can put some kind of monetary amount in your motion. Mr. Hartman, I would be very much in favor of it because I think the committee ought to have all the input that they can possibly get and I think this man must be very important to the committee.

MR. HARTMAN: Mayor, in response to Mr. Steen's point, I think he has a very, very valid point. I don't want to see any princely sum. What I'm saying I recognize it's going to cost something, perhaps somewhere along the line, again and stress from all sides CPSB has a counter point. I want that brought in too. I'm not saying just for one side. I'm saying what I want to be is all points, input and with regard to the limitation of the funding what, perhaps, would be the way to proceed would be to ask the staff to contact the Energy Alternatives Task Force and get a feel from them as to what it may cost and not to exceed maybe a thousand, whatever. I don't want to get into big figures, I realize we paid 17 thousand to the Touche-Ross Study and I wish there was some way we could recover that but I'm not talking in terms of that size figure. I'm talking about austere figures that the Task Force could get by with and I would hope to where, we could work it to where the staff would check with the task force and come back to us, say perhaps next week with a report and suggest a figure.

MR. STEEN: One other thing that I want to say about this project is the fact that we've always been told and I know this for a fact anytime we wanted to sell our interests, the City of Houston would be more than willing to buy that interest. So, I've always thought that even if we got into the situation a little bit deep financially that we had a ready buyer. What bothers me is that Houston might end up buying our interest and then reselling us some of that energy at a much higher price later on.

MR. HARTMAN: Let me just point out that the fact that I have a written quotation from Mr. Parsons from Houston Lighting and Power which says in effect, "I hope that San Antonio stays in the project because after all, if they stay in the project we can buy any excess power that they have cheaper from them than we could if we had to build the plant to generate the power ourselves." I do think that it would be well to check with them and see if they would be willing to, at that point, to INAUDIBLE . . . where we would discuss selling it to them.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Was that letter in reference to building a new plant for that capacity?

MR. HARTMAN: The question was asked of Mr. Parsons of Houston Lighting and Power is to prospects of San Antonio selling out and the notion was stated I hope they stay in because as long as they stay in we can buy any excess power they have from them cheaper than we could build our own plant and generate it ourselves. Which upsets me just a bit because that's using San Antonio's capital money for the betterment of Houston Lighting and Power customers.

MAYOR COCKRELL: May I ask that the staff, have you gotten any feedback yet from the committee?

CITY MANAGER HUEBNER: We've been trying to locate Mr. Arnett, he was not quite ready to respond.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, we have two other speakers and I might point out we have used up nearly the full 60 minutes so we will try to wind it up now.

MR. ALDERETE: Madam Mayor, I think the way, just a couple of things, I think the way Councilman Hartman phrased his motion or rephrased his motion would be a safe motion for us to make irregardless of what the status may be with the Energy Task Force Committee. I think Councilman Hartman's last points were very relevant just to simplify it, that Houston is taking the City of San Antonio for a ride. It's being acknowledged by them. The other thing, Madam Mayor, I would like to ask for the staff to give us a report back on the total bonded indebtedness of the City of San Antonio as well as the County of Bexar just to see what kinds of issuance or issues we have, a bond to school districts - to the City, to River Authority, to the County, just to have an accurate figure on hand as to what the real bonded indebtedness is of this City so we can better analyze the economic impact of the South Texas Project because many business groups are speaking about surface water. When we speak about surface water we talk about bonds. If we are getting to the limit of our credit, our line of credit, I think that needs to be thoroughly examined because everybody, every tax entity, those residents here and we can only tax them so much. If we can have a report back, Madam Mayor, or if I could ask staff how long it would take to get a bonded indebtedness study of the City of San Antonio as well as Bexar County.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I would just think they could assemble that information by just checking with each of the agencies. May I ask the Manager to respond to the question.

MR. FOX: That information is certainly available and each perspective is submitted for bond via public agency has a schedule of overlapping debt. One of the problems that we will encounter is the situation where we have a publicly owned utility compared with a City with a privately owned utility and that would not be reflected in the overlapping debt figures. . . I think that should be pointed out that the debt accumulated by CPSB is not comparable to Houston where it is provided by a private utility.

MR. PYNDUS: Mayor, our conversation was rambling and I didn't want to call a point of order. With reference to staying with the motion and I think we drifted from the motion and I would like to get back to the motion if I may.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the reason that we had done that Mr. Pyndus, is that we were trying to get information as to exactly what the status of the committee was, whether they had already extended the invitation or were pending or what. So that was the only reason we had left it sort of on the table just for a moment. But we could take it up right now in advance of the information.

MR. PYNDUS: I'd like to speak to the motion if I may.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Certainly.

MR. PYNDUS: First of all the Council has appointed a task force, that's correct.

MAYOR COCKRELL: That's correct.

MR. PYNDUS: We have a very complex report from Mr. Komanoff which will need a lot of concentration and absorption which I think we should hand to the task force. But to direct them, to expend funds at this point, I think is premature. To direct them to utilize Mr. Komanoff I think, is a presumption of their job. I would like to have this report given to them Glen, and ask that they review it and come to the Council and ask us what they would recommend rather than redirect them after we have appointed them and given them power to review the work before they could make that decision.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Hartman would you clarify . . .

MR. HARTMAN: I'm not by any means Phil, implying that we should direct the task force to spend money, I'm not saying that. I'm saying that we should recognize there will be some expenditures somewhere and we should, in all fairness to the task force make some amount available realizing that they will probably need it. With regard to Mr. Komanoff's input I'm just merely saying that this is one input that I think is pertinent. There are many others, I am sure. I'm sure that there are opposing views that I not only welcome, but would insist upon, that the task force get so that we can lay these things side by side and once and for all come to a conclusion. That's the thrust of the motion.

MR. PYNDUS: But there's no dollar amount connected, okay.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, I do have a question but I want you to understand in the beginning, it's not in anyway meant to be derogatory. I am not familiar with Mr. Komanoff and I was wondering are you're figures recognized by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission or any official agency that's connected with energy other than your own associates?

MR. KOMANOFF: I think that's a fair and important question. Let me start by saying that at this point, I have done consultant work for not only Internal Accounting office and Government agencies in seven different states but also several municipalities that are involved in similar situations. And also for another public utility, a small rural electric . . . in Vermont. Much of my input has been in regulatory situations in which decisions had to be made as to whether to proceed with the project or to not proceed with the project. In some of these instances, the recommendations that I have made have been adopted. Perhaps in part because of my - - who knows exactly, but presumably, I contributed to that outcome. In other instances the outcome has been directly counter to what I proposed. So there is a mixed record, obviously, my arguments do not necessarily carry the day everywhere they go. But in terms of what I've presented here I think the most important thing that I've brought to you is the capital costs discussion. The capacity factor is important, the cost of coal, fuel is important. But the really overriding factor is total cost. If this plant could be stabilized at under a thousand dollars a kilowatt we'd not be standing here before you and saying that if I were in your shoes, I would abandon it. Conversely, if it goes up to fifteen

hundred thirty dollars or thereabout level that I think it will then - if I were in your shoes, I would be voting to get out. This analysis of mine is a relatively new analysis and it has not yet been reviewed by people such as the Nuclear Regulatory Commission whose reactions I think that you ought to get. Now as it happens, about two months ago, I met with the cost benefit analysis staff of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and presented this analysis the same size and the same report precisely because I would like them to comment on it because I think it's a more cogent analysis than their own cost analysis. So they are sitting with us and we have had only perfunctory contacts since then. So they have not said we have adopted or rejected. But I think it might be a good idea if you get that far for the task force to contact the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and ask for a reaction. And similarly, two weeks ago, I initiated contact with the Department of Energy who says their own analysis also of capital costs and I said the same thing. I want your feedback, I want you to tell me either that this is really better than what we've been saying and if not why not and this has just . . . I haven't heard from them yet. But I think it would be good for you to go to these sources and get their reaction to my work because I don't think it would be at all proper for me to say here is this work, accept it without actually anybody else. I appreciate your question.

MRS. DUTMER: Thank you, so much.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you very much. First, we have the motion pending by Mr. Hartman. And Mr. Hartman would you state your motion at this time?

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, the essence of the motion is first of all that we would encourage the Energy Alternative Task Force to get input such as that presented by Mr. Komanoff's today. That if they already have done so, then this would merely be a pat on the back. Also, the motion would ask that the staff dealing with the alternative task force, come with a figure, an amount of money that should be identified in an appropriate ordinance for use by the Energy Alternative Task Force in its deliberations.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is there any further discussion on that, if not, those in favor please say "Aye". The vote was unanimous in favor of the motion.

78-54 CONSENT AGENDA

Councilman Steen moved that Items 6 thru 22 constituting the consent agenda be approved. Mr. Eureste seconded the motion.

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

AN ORDINANCE 50,104

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF DU-MOR ENTERPRISES IN THE AMOUNT OF \$50,742.76 FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE DENTON-LAPHAM SUBDIVISION OFF-SITE SANITARY SEWER MAIN, AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT, APPROPRIATING FUNDS AND APPROPRIATING PAYMENT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,105

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF FIELD ALTERATION NO. 1 TO THE CONTRACT FOR THE BRIGGS AND SOMERSET SANITARY SEWER RELIEF MAINS (PROPER BEDDING FOR PIPE WHERE WATER IS ENCOUNTERED IN THE EXCAVATION).

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,106

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF FIELD ALTERATIONS NO. 17 AND 18 TO THE CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE SAN ANTONIO BOTANICAL CENTER (CONSTRUCTION OF SOUTHWEST TEXAS ADOBE-PALISADE-SOTOL DEMONSTRATION STRUCTURES; DISMANTLING AND HAULING "AULD" BUILDINGS TO THE SITE; PLUS PURCHASING AND PLANTING NATIVE PLANTS).

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,107

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF FIELD ALTERATION NO. 16 TO THE CONTRACT FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE SAN ANTONIO BOTANICAL CENTER (PURCHASE AND INSTALLATION OF SPECIFIED EQUIPMENT).

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,108

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF STANDARD PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS WITH VARIOUS ENGINEERING FIRMS FOR PROFESSIONAL SERVICES AND PREPARATION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR SPECIFIED CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROJECTS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,109

APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$121,930.00 OUT OF VARIOUS FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING TITLE AND/OR EASEMENTS TO CERTAIN LANDS; ACCEPTING THE DEDICATION OF EASEMENTS TO CERTAIN LANDS; ALL TO BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN RIGHT-OF-WAY PROJECTS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,110

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF HILDEBRAND MUSIC COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY WITH STEREO SOUND EQUIPMENT FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$4,478.00.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,111

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF PLAINS MACHINERY COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY WITH A CHIPPER FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$7,453.00.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,112

APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR, AND AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF FOUR (4) SEWAGE LIFT STATIONS FROM CRANE SUPPLY COMPANY FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$37,492.00.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,113

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AN AGREEMENT WITH CARLOS C. CAZARES FOR LEASE OF BUILDING 620 AT STINSON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,114

AMENDING THE FEES AND CHARGES FOR COMMERCIAL AIR TRANSPORTATION ACTIVITIES NOT OPERATING UNDER LEASE OR CONTRACT AT INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,115

APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF SIX THOUSAND AND NO/100 (\$6,000.00) DOLLARS OUT OF FUND NO. 62-009, INDEX NO. 500512 IN FULL AND FINAL SETTLEMENT OF PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS AGAINST THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO IN DAMAGE SUIT CAUSE NO. 73CI-9765 IN THE 45TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT OF BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS, STYLED ESIQUIEL F. MEDINA, ET. AL. VS. CITY OF SAN ANTONIO.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,116

AMENDING CHAPTER 38 (TRAFFIC REGULATIONS) OF THE CITY CODE SETTING FORTH LOCATIONS AT WHICH ELECTRIC TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNALS ARE IN FULL OPERATION: DESIGNATING STOP SIGN LOCATIONS: DESIGNATING YIELD RIGHT-OF-WAY LOCATIONS: SETTING MAXIMUM SPEED LIMITS ON CERTAIN STREETS: ESTABLISHING PARKING METER ZONES: PROHIBITING PARKING AT ALL TIMES ON CERTAIN STREETS: AND PROVIDING THAT VIOLATION HEREOF BE PUNISHABLE BY A FINE OF NOT LESS THAN \$1.00 NOR MORE THAN \$200.00.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,117

CLOSING AND ABANDONING PORTIONS OF BELKNAP, HORACE, REX AND HOWARD STREETS IN NCB'S 7292, 7310, 7311, 7318 and 7320 AND AUTHORIZING A QUITCLAIM DEED TO SAN ANTONIO DEVELOPMENT AGENCY FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF \$1.00.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,118

GRANTING A LICENSE TO TAMPO MANUFACTURING COMPANY TO INSTALL COMPUTER CABLE ACROSS AND ABOVE LOMBRANO STREET WHICH IS A PUBLIC PROPERTY AND MANIFESTING AN AGREEMENT IN CONNECTION THEREWITH.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,119

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A SPECIAL WARRANTY DEED CONVEYING A TRACT OF SURPLUS CITY-OWNED PROPERTY TO C.H. GLADWIN FOR A CONSIDERATION OF \$1,220.00.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,120

CLOSING AND ABANDONING A NARROW STRIP OF LAND ADJACENT TO NEW CITY BLOCK 997 AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A QUITCLAIM DEED TO TEXAS SHADE FACTORS, INC., FOR A CONSIDERATION OF \$1.00 AND THE DEDICATION OF A TURNING RADIUS.

* * * *

78-54

MR. DAN WING

Mayor Cockrell expressed the sympathy of the Council to Councilman Frank Wing on the death of his father, Mr. Dan Wing.

* * * *

78-54

ZONING HEARING

23. CASE 7511 - to rezone a 4.19 acre tract of land out of NCB 15148, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk, 4917 Ravenswood Drive, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District, located on the southwest side of Ravenswood Dr. approximately 132' southeast of the intersection of Ravenswood and Harrow Dr., having 807.07' on Ravenswood Dr. and a maximum depth of 1173.08'; to rezone a 16.19 acre tract of land out of NCB 15148, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk, 4917 Ravenswood Drive from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-1" Business District, located on the southwest side of Ravenswood Dr. approximately 182' southeast of the intersection of Ravenswood and Harrow Dr., being 50' off of Ravenswood Drive with a maximum width of 760.72' and maximum depth of 1040'.

Mr. Andy Guerrero, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change which the Zoning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

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

AN ORDINANCE 50,121

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS A 4.19 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 15148, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY

FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 4917 RAVENSWOOD DRIVE, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "R-3" MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND A 16.19 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 15148, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, 4917 RAVENSWOOD DRIVE FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED AND THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG THE NORTHWEST PROPERTY LINE.

* * * *

24. CASE 7517 - to rezone Lot 5, Block 1, NCB 7645, 514 Kendalia Avenue from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-3R" Restrictive Business District, located on the southside of Kendalia Avenue, being 147.8' west of the intersection of Kendalia Avenue and Pleasanton Road having 50' on Kendalia Avenue and a depth of 185'.

Mr. Andy Guerrero, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change which the Zoning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Steen moved that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained along the west and north property lines, and that a non-access easement is imposed along Kendalia Avenue. Mr. Pyndus seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Ortiz, Pyndus, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Eureste, Alderete, Hartman.

AN ORDINANCE 50,122

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 5, BLOCK 1, NCB 7645, 514 KENDALIA AVENUE, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3R" RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG THE WEST AND NORTH PROPERTY LINES AND THAT A NON-ACCESS EASEMENT IS IMPOSED ALONG KENDALIA AVENUE.

* * * *

25. CASE 7515 - to rezone the south 125' of Lot 10 and the north 250' of the east 370.3' of Lot 11, NCB 8190, from "C" Apartment District to "R-4" Mobile Home District, located 200' east of S.W. 27th Street and 195' north of Reilly Street; having a width of 375' and a maximum depth of 370.3'.

Mr. Andy Guerrero, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change which the Zoning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

AN ORDINANCE 50,123

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS THE SOUTH 125' OF LOT 10 AND THE NORTH 250' OF THE EAST 370.3' OF LOT 11, NCB 8190 FROM "C" APARTMENT DISTRICT TO "R-4" MOBILE HOME DISTRICT.

* * * *

26. CASE 7521 - to rezone Lot 35, Block K, NCB 11562, in the 100 Block of Skyview Drive from "B-1" Business District to "B-2" Business District, located east of the intersection of Skyview Drive and Bandera Road, having 122.1' on Skyview Drive and 220' on Bandera Road.

Mr. Andy Guerrero, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change which the Zoning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

Mr. Guerrero said that written opposition had been recessed by owners of more than 20 percent of the property with 200 feet of subject property and therefore, in order to rezone 9 affirmative votes would be required.

Mrs. Gloria Salvatierra, daughter of the applicant said that the building on this property had been erected by her father over the last year. Mrs. Arispe is depending on rental income to sustain herself since Mr. Arispe recently died. Present zoning is "B-1" but rental would be much easier if it were zoned "B-2". She said that there is no desire to have liquor by the drink on the premises.

Mr. Guerrero verified that only "Beer to Go" sales are permitted in "B-2" zoning.

Mr. Joseph F. Talerico, 112 Skyview, spoke in opposition. He claimed that a fish market is being operated in the building now in violation of the zoning code. He opposed any change in zoning.

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

AN ORDINANCE 50,132

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 35, BLOCK K, NCB 11562, IN THE 100 BLOCK OF SKYVIEW DRIVE FROM "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG THE NORTHEAST PROPERTY LINE AND THAT STREET DEDICATION IS ACCOMPLISHED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MAJOR THOROUGHFARE PLAN AND THE TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT'S RECOMMENDATION.

* * * *

78-54 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Pyndus, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Ortiz, Alderete, Hartman.

AN ORDINANCE 50,124

AMENDING THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION'S GRANT AGREEMENT PROJECT NO. 6-48-0192-08 FOR THE SAN ANTONIO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT AND AUTHORIZING BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 50,125

821

ACCEPTING A GRANT OF \$326,250.00 FROM THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT ACCESS ROAD; ESTABLISHING A FUND AND ACCOUNTS; ADOPTING A BUDGET; AND PROVIDING FOR A CONTRIBUTION OF \$108,750.00 FROM THE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT REVENUE FUND.

* * * *

78-54 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Steen, seconded by Mr. Wing, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Alderete, Eureste, Pyndus, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Ortiz, Hartman.

AN ORDINANCE 50,126

EXTENDING THE EXISTING CONTRACT WITH AERIAL TRANSPORTATION, INC., FOR OPERATION OF AN ELEVATED SKYRIDE IN BRACKENRIDGE AND KOEHLER PARKS.

* * * *

78-54 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mrs. Dutmer, seconded by Mr. Steen, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Pyndus, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Alderete, Hartman.

AN ORDINANCE 50,127

AMENDING AND EXTENDING FOR AN ADDITIONAL TWO YEAR PERIOD THE AGREEMENTS WITH JACK H. CARNEY, WILLIAM BOUBLE, FRANK W. WARD AND GRANVILLE B. HUMPHRIES FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF CITY-OWNED GOLF COURSES.

* * * *

78-54 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Steen, seconded by Mr. Pyndus, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Hartman.

AN ORDINANCE 50,128

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A JOINT USE AGREEMENT WITH EDGEWOOD INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT FOR DISTRICT USE OF RECREATION FACILITIES PROPOSED TO BE CONSTRUCTED ON PROPERTY TO BE CONVEYED TO THE CITY BY SAID DISTRICT.

* * * *

78-54 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Pyndus, seconded by Mr. Steen, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Hartman.

AN ORDINANCE 50,129

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF \$22,352.02 FROM THE GENERAL FUND FOR CERTAIN PARTICIPANT COSTS IN THE CETA TITLE II PROGRAM PURSUANT TO AN AUDIT OF THE CETA PROGRAM BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

* * * *

78-54 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Steen, seconded by Mr. Pyndus, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Hartman.

AN ORDINANCE 50,130

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF THE SAN ANTONIO RIVER AUTHORITY FOR A JOINT EFFORT TO IMPLEMENT THE PROGRAMMING AND PRELIMINARY DESIGN OF CHANNEL IMPROVEMENTS FOR THE SAN ANTONIO RIVER FROM SOUTH ALAMO STREET TO HILDEBRAND AVENUE.

* * * *

78-54 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration on motion of Mrs. Dutmer, seconded by Mr. Steen, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Hartman.

AN ORDINANCE 50,131

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT WITH AMERICAN CITY CORPORATION IN THE AMOUNT OF \$39,875 TO CONDUCT AN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT SURVEY AND ANALYSIS FOR A DOWNTOWN RETAIL CENTER IN SAN ANTONIO.

* * * *

78-54 The following Resolution was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Steen, seconded by Mr. Pyndus was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, ORTIZ, Alderete, Pyndus, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Hartman.

A RESOLUTION
NO.78-54-160

MANIFESTING THE DETERMINATION OF THE CITY COUNCIL THAT MR. EDWARD L. PIGOTT, JR., HAS VESTED RIGHTS UNDER ARTICLE THREE OF ORDINANCE NO. 48484.

* * * *

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE GRANTING
OF TAXICAB PERMITS

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 50,133

GRANTING ANNUAL PERMITS TO OPERATE A TAXICAB
SERVICE IN THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO TO THE
FOLLOWING OPERATORS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE
PROVISIONS OF ORDINANCE NO. 49566: HERBERT
WILLIAMS, MANUEL REYES HERNANDEZ, BENNY
MEDINA RAMIREZ, YSIDORO P. SEGOVIA, TERESO
M. CASTILLO, JUAN JUAREZ LOPEZ AND MIKE SERDA.

* * * *

The Ordinance was explained by Mr. Louis Garcia, Assistant City Attorney, who said that the hearing is held in accordance with the new taxicab regulations passed by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

Mr. Jim Fisher, owner of the Yellow Cab Company, said that anyone wishing to get in the taxicab business could lease a cab from his company. He would provide all maintenance and service.

Mayor Cockrell declared the hearing closed.

After consideration, on motion of Dr. Cisneros, seconded by Mr. Eureste, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Hartman, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Wing.

- - -

78-54 The meeting recessed at 3:30 P.M. and reconvened at 4:50 P.M.

78-54 CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

MR. GEORGE OLIVERA

Mr. George Olivera, representing the San Antonio Jaycee's, spoke to the Council seeking funds to provide transportation for the Annual Orphan's Christmas Shopping Tour. He sought \$300.00. Several individual Council members volunteered to donate.

MR. RICK GREENE

Mr. Rick Greene said that he had heard a rumor that funds had been withdrawn from the Amphitheatre on the east side and the project would not be completed.

Mr. George Noe, Administrative Assistant to the City Manager, said that no funds have been allocated for construction of the Amphitheatre and the architect was advised to hold up work after the preliminary design is completed.

MR. MARIO SALAS

Mr. Mario Salas asked if staff has yet made a study of funds to be reprogrammed on the East side.

Assistant City Manager, Louis Fox, said that staff would soon make a study.

Mr. Salas then said that a 4-way stop sign has been requested for the intersection of Burleson and Pine Streets. The Department of Traffic and Transportation had advised him that it would take about 4 months to have a study made and the signs installed but Mr. Salas said that the signs are urgently needed now.

Assistant City Manager Louis Fox, said that he would ask staff to come in with a report on it next week.

MR. T.C. CALVERT

Mr. T.C. Calvert, representing the organization United for Eastside Development, spoke of the need to have Community Development funds allocated to Eastside projects. He also urged installation of stop signs at Burleson and Pine Streets.

INMAN CHRISTIAN CENTER

Mr. Robert Diaz De Leon, President of the Board of Inman Christian Center, at the corner of Colima and San Jacinto, spoke of a program called Parent-Child Development Center. The Texas Department of Community Affairs has approved a grant of \$25,000 for the project but it is necessary for the City of San Antonio to make an official request on behalf of Inman to the Texas Department of Community Affairs for the funds.

The Council concurred in directing the staff to take whatever steps are necessary in this matter.

REVEREND R.A. CALLIES, SR.

The Reverend R.A. Callies, Sr., addressed the Council protesting the fact that a site for the new branch of Texas A & M University was located on the Southside and not the Eastside. He asked for reasons for the selection.

Councilman Cisneros described the sites being considered and the criteria used for selection. The actual selection was made by the University on a cost-free basis.

Mr. Hartman advised Reverend Callies that a five year capital improvement program is being worked on.

Reverend Callies expressed his deep concern that the Eastside is continually neglected and put off. He reviewed the need for all types of public improvements.

Mr. Fox said that the Department of Public Works will prepare a schedule for construction of streets on the Eastside for which funds have been set aside.

REVEREND S. CLIFTON BYRD

Reverend S. Clifton Byrd inquired of the Council regarding the status of the Citizens' Commission of Public Utilities.

Mayor Cockrell advised Reverend Byrd that a revision to ordinance No. 48973 had been prepared for Council consideration at this meeting. Appointment of members to the Commission will probably come at the next Council meeting.

At the Mayor's request, the Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 48973 OF JANUARY 26, 1978, WHICH ESTABLISHED THE CITIZENS' COMMISSION OF PUBLIC UTILITIES SO AS TO DELETE REFERENCES TO THE METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY AND SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY.

* * * *

The ordinance removed the Metropolitan Transit Authority and the Bell Telephone Company from the ordinance because they do not come under the City's jurisdiction.

The Council's debate centered around the word, "oversee" in the ordinance. No alternative wording was agreed on, however.

After consideration, Mr. Webb moved that the Ordinance be approved. Dr. Cisneros seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete; NAYS: Dutmer, Pyndus, Hartman, Steen, Cockrell; ABSENT: None.

78-54

MRS. SUSANNE HILDEBRAND

Mrs. Susanne Hildebrand, wife of a San Antonio Police Officer asked the Council to support Councilman Pyndus' suggestion that Council adopt a resolution calling for greater penalties for persons found guilty of killing a police officer. She described the statewide campaign she has launched in an effort to get State Legislation enacted on the subject.

Councilman Pyndus said that his resolution would be on next week's Council agenda.

Councilman Steen suggested that Mrs. Hildebrand contact the 100 Club for possible monetary assistance in her effort.

The Council agreed to the placing of Mr. Pyndus' resolution on the agenda for December 7.

78-54

SAN ANTONIO MISSIONS NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK

Councilman Cisneros recalled that Council had agreed to discuss the problems of the citizens in the Mission Park area. He said he simply wished to remind Council that the subject will come up in next week's "B" Session and those knowing of interested parties should invite them to be present.

The Council instructed staff to be sure to see that all interested groups be advised.

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting was adjourned at 6:35 P.M.

A P P R O V E D

Lela Cockrell
M A Y O R

ATTEST: *Germa S. Rodriguez*
Asst. City Clerk

November 30, 1978
md