

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1966, 8:30 A.M.

* * * * *

The regular meeting of the City Council was called to order by the Presiding Officer, Mayor W. W. McAllister, with the following members present: McALLISTER, CALDERON, JONES, JAMES, COCKRELL, GATTI, TREVINO and PARKER; ABSENT: BREMER.

- - -
66-406 The invocation was given by Councilman S. H. James.

- - -
The minutes of the meeting of March 31, 1966, were approved.

- - -
66-407 Mayor McAllister recognized Mrs. Sadie R. Powell, Principal of David Crockett Elementary School, and read the following citation:

"In appreciation to Mrs. Sadie R. Powell, in grateful acknowledgment of valuable and distinguished service to the community in promoting citizenship and Americanism. Mrs. Powell has a deep interest in promoting our heritage, and as Principal of David Crockett Elementary School, she founded the Order of Davy Crockett, a junior citizenship group of students. Each member is proficient as a public speaker on Americanism, and seven are to receive recognition from the Freedom Foundation in Valley Forge, Pennsylvania. As a contribution to Mrs. Lyndon B. Johnson's recent visit to San Antonio, this group made the large flowers that decorated the river barges. For her work in this field, Mrs. Powell has been cited for having the outstanding Elementary student organization on Americanism in our city. Such dedication to this field merits the sincere thanks and appreciation of a grateful citizenry."

Mrs. Powell accepted the citation and thanked the Mayor and Members of the Council. She then introduced seven members of the Order of Davy Crockett who are students in her school as well as their sponsor, Mrs. Carroll.

66-408 The Mayor then recognized the presence of two students from foreign countries who are in San Antonio participating in the Foreign Exchange Student Program. They are Mr. Auke Kroondijk of Enschede, Netherlands, attending Robert E. Lee High School, and Miss Sue Griffith, Grahamstown, South Africa, attending McArthur High School.

Mayor Pro-Tem Gatti stated that he had served on the committee of evaluation to select from the San Antonio area two young high school students to go abroad during the coming school year in exchange for two high school students from foreign countries. He stated the two students from the San Antonio area in the audience.

Mayor McAllister then presented Alcalde certificates to Miss Griffith and Mr. Kroondijk, making them honorary alcaldes of the City of La Villita. He also thanked Mrs. Crawford Reeder and Mr. Hamrick, who were accompanying these students.

66-409 First zoning case heard was Case No. 2255, to rezone Lot 37, Block 7, NCB 3490, located on the Southeast corner of Harriman Road and I.&G.N. Railroad Track, from "B" Residence District to "B-2" Business District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Dr. Parker, seconded by Mr. Trevino, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino and Parker; NAYS: Calderon; ABSENT: Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,246

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 37, BLOCK 7, NCB 3490 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * * *

Ordinance No. 34,247 see Case No. 2686, pages 12 and 13.

66-410 Next heard was Case No. 2611, to rezone Lot 30, Block 3, NCB 3124, located between East Houston Street and Gulf Street and on the east side of Saint James Street, from "D" Apartment and "H" Local Retail Districts to "B-2" Business District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended by approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Trevino, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,248

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 30, BLOCK 3, NCB 3124 FROM "D" APARTMENT AND "H" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICTS TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-411 Next heard was Case No. 2629, to rezone Lot 25, Block 37, NCB 1848, located on the north side of West Woodlawn 50' east of Fredericksburg Road, from "D" Apartment District to "B-2" Business District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mr. James, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,249

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 25, BLOCK 37, NCB 1848 FROM "D" APARTMENT DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-412 Next heard was Case No. 2619, to rezone Lot 10, NCB 12103, located on the northeast side of Bitters Road 380' northwest of Nacogdoches Road, from "B" Residence District to "B-1" Business District; those parts of Lots 11 and 12, NCB 12103 not presently zoned "F" Local Retail save and except the 50' sanitary sewer and drainage easement along the northwest side of Lot 11, located east of the intersection of Nacogdoches Road and Astronaut Drive, from Temporary "A" and "B" Residence Districts to "B-2" Business District; and the 500' sanitary sewer and drainage easement out of the northwest part of Lot 11, NCB 12103, located on the northwest side of Bitters Road 480' northwest of Nacogdoches Road from "B" and Temporary "A" Residence District to "R-2" Two-Family Residence District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Mr. James, seconded by Dr. Calderon, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino and Parker; ABSENT: Bremer; NAYS: None.

AN ORDINANCE 34,250

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 10, NCB 12103 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT; THOSE PARTS OF LOTS 11 AND 12, NCB 12103 NOT PRESENTLY

ZONED "F" LOCAL RETAIL SAVE AND EXCEPT THE 50' SANITARY SEWER AND DRAINAGE EASEMENT ALONG THE NORTHWEST SIDE OF LOT 11, FROM TEMPORARY "A" AND "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICTS TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT; AND THE 50' SANITARY SEWER AND DRAINAGE EASEMENT OUT OF THE NORTHWEST PART OF LOT 11, NCB 12103 FROM "B" AND TEMPORARY "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "R-2" TWO-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-413 Next heard was Case No. 2649, to rezone Lot 70, NCB 8949, located northeast of the intersection of S. W. Military Drive and Commercial Avenue, from "E" Office District to "B-2" Business District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Dr. Parker, seconded by Mr. Trevino, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Trevino and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Gatti and Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,251

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 70, NCB 8949 FROM "E" OFFICE DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-414 Next heard was Case No. 2662, to rezone Tract A-1, NCB 1720, located southeast of the intersection of E. French Place and McCullough Avenue, from "D" Apartment District to "B-1" Business District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Dr. Parker, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Trevino and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Gatti and Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,252

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 TRACT A-1, NCB 1720 FROM "D" APARTMENT DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-415 Next heard was case No. 2663, to rezone Lot 35, NCB 8679, located between Parkridge Drive and I. H. 410, 208.15' east of Skyway Boulevard, from "A" Residence District to I-1" Light Industry District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Mr. Trevino, seconded by Dr. Parker, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Trevino and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Gatti and Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,253

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, NCB 8679

FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "I-1"
LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-416 Next heard was Case No. 2665, to rezone Lot 1, Block 1, NCB 13934, located on the south side of Loop 410 and on the southeast side of Callaghan Road, from "A" Residence District to "B-3" Business District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Mr. Jones, seconded by Mrs. Cockrell, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Trevino and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Gatti and Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,254

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 1, BLOCK 1, NCB 13934 FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-417 Next heard was Case No. 2669, to rezone Lot 45, NCB 8409, irregular in shape, property is located on the west side of Vance Jackson Road being 719.82' south of Gardina Street, from "B" Residence District to "R-3" Multiple-Family Residence District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mr. James, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the

following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Trevino and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Gatti and Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,255

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 45, NCB 8409
FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "R-3"
MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-418 Next heard was Case No. 2670, to rezone that portion of Lot 2, Block 11, NCB 12726 not presently zoned "R-3", located between Jackson Keller Road and Orland Park Drive, from "B" Residence District to "R-3" Multiple-Family Residence District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

Mr. Sam Fogiel, applicant, explained he was planning to build 120 apartment units on the property with approximately 20 units on each acre. These would be luxury type apartments.

Mr. Leroy Mensler, representing Faith Cumberland Presbyterian Church adjoining the subject property, stated the Church was not actually in opposition to the change, however, he was present to see if Mr. Fogiel would put a masonry fence across the portion which adjoins the church property in order to eliminate the back entrance view of the apartments and also to create a screening so that noise from occupants in the apartments would not disrupt church services.

Mr. Fogiel explained that he had not planned to place a fence between the two properties as they had planned to have a driveway from Orland Park to Jackson-Keller Road, thus eliminating garbage pickups and delivery service adjacent to the church. He said he was agreeable to erecting a barrier that would eliminate any type of noise created by the apartment dwellers.

After further discussion, on motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mr. Trevino, the recommendation of the Planning Commission to rezone the property was approved, carrying with it passage of the following ordinance, by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,256

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 THAT PORTION OF LOT 2, BLOCK 11, NCB 12726 NOT PRESENTLY ZONED "R-3" FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "R-3" MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-419 Next heard was Case No. 2671, to rezone Lots 9, 10 and 11, NCB 10101, located on the west side of San Pedro, 107.47' south of Veda Mae, from "B" Residence and "E" Office Districts to "B-1" Business District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

Mr. Seymour Dreyfus, applicant representing Dreyfus and Kost Realty, stated they owned Lot 10, and he also represented the owners of Lots 9 and 11. He explained that since all their interests were the same they had joined together to request "B-1" Business District, although they felt that even "B-2" Business District would be proper zoning for the property.

Mr. Richard J. Woods, representing owners of Lots 3, 5 and 6, opposed any change in zone, stating that the Planning Commission should not have heard this case since the Council had denied rezoning of this property less than a year ago.

In answer to a question from the Mayor, City Attorney Sam Wolf ruled that the time limit of one year was not in effect at the time of the previous hearing.

Dr. Calderon asked if Mr. Dreyfus was agreeable to placing a six-foot fence along the rear of the property as a screening. Mr. Dreyfus was agreeable to erecting a six-foot fence.

The Mayor explained a protest petition had been filed by owners of Lots 1, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 2, and that seven affirmative votes would be required for passing an ordinance to rezone the property.

On motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mr. Jones, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,257

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 LOTS 9, 10 AND 11, NCB 10101, FROM "B" RESIDENCE AND "E" OFFICE DISTRICTS TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-420 Next heard was Case No. 2678, to rezone Lot 47, Block 3, NCB 8675, located on the south side of Halm Boulevard approximately 169' east of Slavin, from "F" Local Retail District to "I-1" Light Industry District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Mr. Gatti, seconded by Mr. Trevino, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Gatti, Trevino and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,258

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 47, BLOCK 3, NCB 8675 FROM "F" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-421 Next heard was Case No. 2683, to rezone 0.091 acres out of Tract H, NCB 12190 out of Gertrude Rodriguez Survey No. 132, San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas and being more particularly described by field notes in the proposed ordinance, generally located southeast of the intersection of I. H. 35 Expressway and the cutback to Walzem Road, from "A" Residence District to "B-3" Business District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Mr. James, seconded by Dr. Calderon, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, James, Gatti, Trevino and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Jones, Cockrell and Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,259

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 0.091 ACRES OUT OF TRACT H, NCB 12190 OUT OF GERTRUDE RODRIGUEZ SURVEY NO. 132, SAN ANTONIO, BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-422 Case No. 2685 was heard next, to rezone Lots 1, 2 and 3, Block 1, NCB 13869, located east of the intersection of Mayfair Drive and Bitters Road, from "B" Residence District to "B-1" Business District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mr. James, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, James, Gatti, Trevino and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, Jones and Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,260

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 LOTS 1, 2 AND 3, BLOCK 1, NCB 13869 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-423 At the request of the applicant, Case No. 2686 was heard after Case No. 2255 (Ordinance No. 34,246), to rezone part of Lots 21 and 22, Block 1, NCB 11254, located southeast of the intersection of S. W. Military Drive and Bynum Avenue, from "B" Residence District to "B-3" Business District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Dr. Parker, seconded by Mr. Trevino, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino and Parker; NAYS: Calderon; ABSENT: Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,247

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 LOTS 21 AND 22, BLOCK 1, NCB 11254 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-424 Next heard was Case No. 2655, to rezone Lot 28, Block 6, NCB 13296 from "B" Residence District to "B-2" Business District and Lot 29, Block 6, NCB 13296 from "B" Residence District to "B-3" Business District, located southeast of the intersection of Bitters Road and Broadway.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence briefed the Council on the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Mr. Gatti, seconded by Dr. Parker, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, James, Gatti, Trevino and Parker; ABSTAINED: Jones; ABSENT: Cockrell and Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,261

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 28, BLOCK 6, NCB 13296 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT AND LOT 29, BLOCK 6, NCB 13296 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-425 Next heard was Case No. 2681, to rezone Lot 17, Block 64, NCB 7194, located on the north side of Fresno 150' east of Capitol, from "B" Residence District to "B-3"

Business District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Dr. Parker, seconded by Mr. Gatti, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Gatti, Trevino and Parker; ABSENT: Cockrell and Bremer; NAYS: None.

AN ORDINANCE 34,262

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 17, BLOCK 64, NCB 7194 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * * *

- - -

66-426 Last case heard was Case No. 2664, to rezone Lot 26, Block 1, NCB 13528, located on the east side of Broadway 263.22' south of E. Terra Alta Road, from "A" Residence District to "B-1" Business District.

Assistant Planning Director Burt Lawrence explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council. He stated that the recommendation was for "B-1" Business District, however, under the new Zoning Code, this particular property "O-1" Office District was the proper zoning classification and this was agreeable to the applicant.

No one spoke in opposition to the change.

On motion of Dr. Parker, seconded by Mr. Gatti, the subject property was rezoned from "A" Residence District to "O-1" Office District, by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Gatti, Trevino, and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell and Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,263

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 26, BLOCK 1,
NCB 13528 FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT
TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * * *

66-427 The Mayor declared the hearing to be open on the appeal of Mr. George Ortega from the refusal of the Chief of Police to grant a license to operate three billiard tables at the George Ortega Drive Inn, 2221 Colima Street.

Mr. Abe San Miguel, attorney representing Mr. Ortega, introduced Mr. and Mrs. Ortega to the Council. He explained that his client did not realize that it was against the law to have teenagers working in the billiard hall. He reviewed Mr. Ortega's military record and his thirteen years experience as an operator of the ice house. He also stated this was Mr. Ortega's first arrest by the Police Department and requested the Council to grant Mr. Ortega a license to operate billiard tables. Mr. San Miguel presented the Council with numerous letters signed by citizens living in the area of the drive-inn in favor of granting Mr. Ortega a license to operate three billiard tables.

Mr. Ortega corrected his attorney and reviewed three previous arrests over a period of 13 years.

Police Chief Bichsel stated they have no objections to Mr. Ortega operating his beer drive-inn as they had no complaint against such operation, however Mr. Ortega did employ a juvenile to rack the billiard balls which is a violation of the law and it is the duty of the Police Department to enforce the law. Their intention was not to jeopardize Mr. Ortega's personal character. He therefore strongly urged the Council to deny the request of Mr. Ortega for a license to operate three billiard tables.

Dr. Calderon made a motion to take exception in this case, and grant the license to Mr. Ortega to operate three billiard tables. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trevino.

Mayor McAllister, at this time informed Mr. Ortega that if the Council voted to approve issuance of the license there would be no other chance if he stepped out of line.

After further discussion, and on roll call, the appeal of Mr. Ortega to grant a license to operate three billiard tables at the George Ortega Drive Inn failed to pass due to the lack of five affirmative votes necessary to grant approval, by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, James and Trevino; NAYS: Gatti and Parker; ABSENT: Jones and Bremer; ABSTAINED: Cockrell.

The Mayor then declared the hearing closed.

- - -
66-428 Mayor McAllister declared the public hearing open on the proposed annexation of 0.175 square miles of land (Beacon Circle West Industrial Subdivision); and on proposed annexation of a 111.797 acre tract of land (Colonies North Subdivision-Market Place Unit 3); and on proposed annexation of a 100.562 acre tract of land (Remainder of Strauss, Ticonderoga to Vance Jackson), all three at the request of the applicant, H. B. Zachry Properties, Inc.

Mr. Steve Taylor briefed the Council on the request of the H. B. Zachry Properties, Inc. to annex the subject property.

No one asked to be heard.

The Mayor then declared the hearing closed and the first reading of the proposed annexation ordinances was set for April 21, 1966.

The Mayor then declared the hearing closed.

- - -
66-429 Mr. Joe White, a Plumber, asked the Council for clarification of the City's policy in making the individual property owner maintain the sewer line between the main connection and the property. He said he had inquired in the City Attorney's Office and found the City is not responsible for the maintenance. He has checked with other cities and their policies are that the citizen pays approximately \$35.00 for the sewer connection and from then on the individual city is responsible for any breaks between the connection and the property itself. He further stated this has worked a hardship on home owners who are not able to afford to repair breaks in the sewer line itself. He said, for example he knew for

a fact the sewer line is broken, and has been broken for some time and the property owner cannot afford to have it fixed.

Assistant City Manager Dave Harner stated that several days ago Mr. Bremer had asked for a report and the Staff's recommendation on this matter. He said the report will be ready in a few days.

66-430 Mr. Clayton Russell informed the Council he was starting a class in Portuguese at the Urban Renewal Headquarters and invited the Council to come in for a visit.

66-431 The following ordinance was explained by Assistant City Manager Dave Harner, and on motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mr. Trevino, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti and Trevino; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Parker and Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,264

AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 34099 AUTHORIZING A CONTRACT WITH DARRAGH & LYDA AND H. A. LOTT, INC., FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE CONVENTION CENTER BY INCLUDING THEREIN CONTRACTORS' ALTERNATE PROPOSAL NO. 1 THAT PROVIDES FOR THE EXCAVATION NECESSARY FOR THE CONTINUANCE OF THE RIVER CHANNEL EXTENSION THROUGH THE BOAT BASIN AREA; APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$50,000 OUT OF COMMUNITY AND CONVENTION CENTER BONDS, SERIES 1964, FOR SAID ADDITIONAL WORK; AND AUTHORIZING A TRANSFER OF FUNDS.

* * * * *

66-432 The following ordinance was explained by City Attorney Sam Wolf, and on motion of Mr. Trevino, seconded by Mrs. Cockrell, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, James, Cockrell, Gatti and Trevino; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Jones, Parker and Bremer.

APR 7 1966

AN ORDINANCE 34,265

APPROPRIATING \$1,000.00 OUT OF HIGHWAY 90 WEST EXPRESSWAY BONDS, FUND #479-16 PAYABLE TO THE COUNTY CLERK OF BEXAR COUNTY SUBJECT TO THE ORDER OF DAVE W. BENAVIDES, ET AL, AS THEIR INTERESTS MAY APPEAR, SAID AMOUNT BEING IN SATISFACTION OF A JUDGMENT ENTERED IN CONDEMNATION CAUSE #C-356 FOR THE ACQUISITION OF 0.5235 OF AN ACRE OF IMPROVED LAND OUT OF AND A PART OF LOTS 6 AND 7, NEW CITY BLOCK 8670, IDA MUNK SUBDIVISION IN THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS.

* * * * *

66-433 The following ordinance was explained by City Attorney Sam Wolf, and on motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mr. Gatti, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, James, Cockrell, Gatti and Parker; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Jones, Parker and Bremer.

AN ORDINANCE 34,266

APPROVING THE ASSIGNMENT BY BORDER AVIATION CO. TO TRADEWINDS AVIATION, INC. OF A LEASE OF SPACE AT SAN ANTONIO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT, AND MANIFESTING AN AMENDMENT THERETO TO PROVIDE THAT TERM OF THE LEASE OF CERTAIN PREMISES SHALL BE EXTENDED TO DECEMBER 31, 1984, AND CONSENTING TO PLEDGES IN THE FORM OF DEED OF TRUST MORTGAGES FROM TRADEWINDS AVIATION, INC. TO SHELL OIL COMPANT AND BORDER AVIATION CO.

* * * * *

66-434 The following proceedings concerning the fluoridation of the water supply took place.

The Mayor asked if any citizens wished to be heard.

Dr. Thomas Romo made the following statement:

"I am a member of the Bexar County Health District and Bexar County Medical Society, and I come before you today to take just a moment of your time. We are well aware of the pros and cons and the overwhelming evidence in favor of the fluoridation of water of the City of San Antonio. I do not intend to take too much of your time and turn this hearing into a circus and I come here before you to plead for your support by voting in favor of fluoridating the water of this community. Thank you."

Councilman Gatti stated: "Mr. Mayor, we have been wrestling with this problem for a number of weeks, and I should like to move that the City Council, at this time, register a vote for the fluoridation of the City water supply."

Councilman Parker: "I second the motion."

Mayor McAllister: "You are aware of the fact that we made a statement that votes would be taken when we had a full Council. I am making that as a statement of explanation, and in no wise objecting to it."

Councilman Gatti: "Mr. Bremer is out of town and I don't think it is ever going to be possible to get us all together in one meeting, at least in the next few meetings. And Mr. Bremer's sentiments are in favor of calling this thing to a vote, at the earliest possible time, and I would like to do it right now."

Councilwoman Cockrell: "Mr. Mayor, when our City Charter was adopted, the writers provided that when the Council should, in its wisdom, decide that any issue was of such a nature that the citizenry should have the right to vote on it, the Council would have the privilege and the right of initiating the process of referendum. In the three years that I have served on the City Council I have never before advocated putting any other issue to a referendum. However, I feel that on this particular issue, the people in our community, many of the people, do feel very strongly on it, and I would like very much to see them have the right and privilege to have a vote on a referendum. I will have to vote against the motion for the Council of its own volition and decision to place the fluoride in the water."

In addition to the desire for having a referendum, I feel a responsibility to call the attention of the Council to certain aspects of the feasibility study that was found by our own City Water Board. In 1963, when the matter was first presented to the City Council, and when a request was made to have fluoride added to the water supply, we asked the City Water Board to do a feasibility study from an engineering and from a practical point

APR 7 1966

-20-

208

of view of fluoridating the water supply. Now I have studied this report very carefully and I will say that I have great confidence in the engineers in our Water Department. However, I want to call attention to certain wording in this report as follows: "It is believed (the emphasis is mine) that the San Antonio water supply can be fluoridated. San Antonio has a unique water supply system which presents many particular problems and considerations whenever a discussion of fluoridation begins. A system which operates 38 widely scattered plumbing stations, at 5 separate surface levels, it is bound to create problems in obtaining a constant dosage level throughout over 1600 miles of distribution system." I am not quoting from the anti-fluoridation literature, I am quoting from the feasibility study of our Water Board.

Those cities which are now fluoridated and which are major cities, in the population bracket comparable to ours, all have a surface water supply system. The City of Chicago, for example, operates nine water processing plants. The City of San Francisco operates three water processing plants. The City of San Antonio, however, is dependent upon a well supply. It would be necessary to add fluoride at thirty different stations in order to fluoride the water system. Now in studying where these fluorides will be added, one of the pumping stations which pumps the largest quantity of water is the Market Street Station, and I would like to read what the feasibility report said about adding fluoride at the Market Street Station. "At Market Street, site limitations would not permit a large ground storage tank. As a result, the well collector lines and suction headers are interconnected. No method of controlling the rate of chemical feeding exists, other than the present flow measurement devices on each individual house service pump. In this case it is proposed to inject the acid (referring to fluorisolific, which was the type of fluoride advocated) in the vertical piping on the suction side of the pump. The situation is further complicated by the variable discharge in some of the units. It is recommended that two duplex type solution feeders be employed."

I call your attention to this. "Although it may become necessary to later modify the installations to one of four variable rate solution feeders." It seems to me that what they are saying is that if the first method doesn't work, and if they are not able to control the measure of dosage, then they will have to try other means at this particular pumping station. The Market Street Station is important because it pumps the largest amount of water of any of the stations in our system.

The initial cost of fluoridation in operation for the first year will be about \$76,000.00. After that it will mean an expenditure of \$50,000.00 for the maintenance and for the fluoride chemicals and for the depreciation costs as the equipment must be replaced every three years. Before going into a program of this type, and with, in my mind at least, a little question as to whether or not we can safely maintain the recommended dosage, it seems to me that the cost of \$15,000.00 for a referendum is not an unreasonable cost, and therefore, I urge that instead of putting the fluoride in the water by Council action, that we instead call a referendum."

Councilman Gatti: "I think that it is only fair to add to Mrs. Cockrell's statement which was taken to a great degree out of context, is that the overall recommendation of the Water Board was to fluoride the water; that it could be done; and that it is technically possible to be done. Obviously, in an engineering report of this kind, there are going to be many problems that arise. Now I have the utmost faith and confidence in the technical people in the Water Board to do this. I think that I would like to add further that this thing doesn't change if you had a referendum for it; you would still have these problems so I don't think that is germane to the situation. I also feel that the City Council is elected to arrive at, and make, decisions which they think in their judgment are good for the greatest number of people. Again I say we have talked about this and we could talk from now until the end of the world and I don't think that we are going to get everyone to agree to something like this that is so controversial.

It is also implied that the people who oppose this have no recourse. There is written in the law an opportunity for those people who feel that this should be called to a referendum to obtain a certain number of petitions, I believe ten per cent (10%) and if they get ten per cent (10%) of the qualified voters of the City, they can petition the City Council to call a referendum. If there is sufficient opposition, and they can do it, fine, let's do it."

Councilman Calderon: "I also feel the same way, Mayor. Again, I would repeat what John Gatti said. I feel that I was elected to use my best judgment as to what is best for the people in San Antonio. Now then, if I am wrong, then the Charter provides that the people in San Antonio have recourse. There are three powers that the people have. Power of recall, power of initiative and power of referendum. These were built into the Charter to safeguard the best interest of the people of San Antonio. Therefore, it is my position that I should exercise my responsibility to act on this matter, and if I am wrong, then I welcome the exercise of the power of referendum."

APR 7 1968

-22-

Councilman Trevino: "May I add, Mr. Mayor, that I also feel like that. We do have the legal authority to vote on any one issue, but I also think that we also should look at the moral authority. I know that I would drink fluoridated water for myself. But I know that drinking the water myself would not effect even my children, so, therefore, I think it is a matter of individual choice. Therefore I will go with Mrs. Cockrell. I feel that the people should make the decision. I will have to vote no."

Mayor McAllister: "Is there anyone else that cares to make a statement, any member of the Council."

Councilman James: "Mr. Mayor, I would like to make a statement on this issue. I have given myself a great deal of concern at this point. I have listened to friends who have come and talked about it, the pros and the cons, and after a great deal of deliberation, a great deal of study, the emphasis of the medical societies, the emphasis of the dental societies, the emphasis of the public health services, even after all the concern pro and con, I am at the point that I feel that I will cast me vote in line with the thinking of the scientific evidence, from the point of view of the mental, the dental, and the public health services."

Mayor McAllister: "Mr. Wolf, I want to ask a question now so that everyone will understand. What are the time requirements? First, suppose that the Council passes the motion today. Then, and of course, we are just talking about an ordinance, we are saying nothing specific about what the ordinance will say, there are a good many things that have to be put into it. But just what is the time limit in regard to the referendum and a vote and so on."

City Attorney Sam Wolf: "The City Charter provides for certain actual periods and for various steps once an ordinance is adopted. After an ordinance is adopted, the persons who desire to request a referendum file a petition with the City Clerk. He has forty (40) days in which to do that. That petition, as mentioned previously, must have the names of ten per cent (10%) of the roll of the regular electors of the last city election. The City Clerk, then, has twenty (20) days in which to determine the sufficiency of the petition. If he arrives at the conclusion that the petition is sufficient, he certifies the result to the City Council at the next Council meeting. If the City Clerk finds the petition insufficient, then he notifies the City Council of that effect and also notifies the petitioner, specifically listing the insufficiencies found."

The petitioner then has twenty (20) days to amend the petition by making sufficient the insufficiencies that have been called to his attention. Then the City Clerk has ten (10) days thereafter to determine the sufficiency of the amended petition. When the City Council receives the certification by the City Clerk that the petition is sufficient, then the Council has thirty (30) days from that time to pass an ordinance calling an election."

Councilman Jones: "I would like to make a statement. I have sat through two sessions on the matter of fluoridation two years ago, as well as the buildup to where we are today. I have studied religiously every pamphlet, tract, letter, magazine, article and everything I could find that was offered to me on the matter of fluoridation. I believe I have given it greater study than the average citizen in the City of San Antonio. Frankly, it has personally caused me more anxiety and I have given more study than any other matter that I have been confronted with since I have been on the Council. I have come to the conclusion that since I have been elected to represent the people of San Antonio, and since I have made this study, I feel I can intelligently vote on this question, and that is what I propose to do."

Mayor McAllister: "Would the members of the Council care to hear from any citizen in connection with this proposed vote?"

Mrs. Doerr: "I am Mrs. Robert E. Doerr, President of the San Antonio Council of the Parents and Teachers. I have not appeared before you before because I didn't want to take up your time. Our Council is composed of 81 local units in the San Antonio Independent School District. On March 22, 1966, at our regular Council meeting, a recommendation was unanimously passed that we back the effort of the Dental Association in their efforts to have the water supply fluoridated in San Antonio. One of the objects of the P.T.A. is to promote the welfare of the children and youth. I feel that you, as members of the City Council have been elected and have the ability and the qualifications, and have also had sufficient time to study the issues to make a most intelligent decision. I urge that you take a position as soon as possible and we hope that the stand will be for fluoridation so that our children will no longer be deprived of this benefit. Thank you."

Mayor McAllister: "Now we have heard from you a good many times. I will give you just a few moments Mr. Harvasty."

Mr. Stephen Harvasty: "Mr. Mayor, Members of the City Council. One thing that occurs to me as I listen to your expressions, that there seems to be some sort of

urgency to this thing. There seems to be some sort of epidemic going on where people are falling dead. We have got to have this in tomorrow. We disagree with this. We think that this matter of tooth decay is a personal matter and there is no epidemic, there is no emergency and then there is no reason why it has to be put into the water.

Let me put an idea into your mind. Supposing the City Council today passes this fluoridated water. You know in advance that we are going to get this before the people. We are going to get our petitions out and we are going to get enough signatures and we are going to put it on the ballot. If it takes one year, if it takes two years, we are going to get on the ballot. Now, what position will you be in if we win? This equipment and all this effort that you are putting in now is going to be scrapped. We are going to have to take it out of the water; you are going to have to get rid of all that equipment and all that taxpayers money is going to be wasted.

Now there is one way you can solve this. Give the people a chance to vote on it. They are not only the ones that are going to drink the water, they are the ones that are going to have to pay for it. And don't tell me that this new water rate that you are considering considers that. You are going to have to have additional money to buy fluoride and all the equipment. So if we are going to pay for it, if we are going to drink it, give us a chance to pass on it. We are going to pass on it sooner or later and I am confident that we are going to win.

Let me say further that we have heard from various organizations, P.T.A.'s; I am going to bring out the P.T.A.'s. Would you fluoridate the water on the basis of this P.T.A. recommendation? Or on the Mexican Chamber of Commerce, who have also endorsed this? The LULAC's Council? With all due respect to these organizations, would you people fluoridate the water of this city on their recommendations?

I have been here before you and I have mentioned a Hugo Pheorell, who is a Nobel Prize Winner in enzyme chemistry. This man is a world expert in fluoride, and he is opposed to it. He is Swedish. He has told the Stockholm Parliament not to fluoridate. It seems to me that this sort of thing ought to carry some weight, instead of what we call scientists and authorities here. Dentists are not authorities. They have not done any original research in this. Gerald Cox, who is the head man in the Dental Division of the United States Public Health Service, lives in Pittsburg. Pittsburg is

fluoridated. Mr. Cox drinks bottled water. How many of our poor people will have a chance to buy bottled water? With the fear in their minds that this is unsafe. They can't go out and buy bottled water. Let them drink it and take the consequences. Give them a chance to say whether they want this or not. It has been spoken up here before that one tenth of one per cent of this water will go to children. One tenth of one per cent. This means for every five thousand dollars you put into the fluoridation program, one dollar will go to the various people who are going to benefit from it. Does this make sense? Does this make any sense? It doesn't make any sense. This is a give away program bigger than anything the New Deal or the Great Society ever thought about.

Councilman Gatti mentioned that the Water Board has said that it is feasible and possible. Of course, it is possible. They could put anything in the water. Anything is possible. But is it good? So I urge upon you today to vote to give the people a chance to express their opinions on this. We know what the scientific evidence is. It is divided. They may have more people on their side, but does the majority make a bad thing right? So one man may be right out of the whole thing. So give us a chance to vote on this. I think that you will be glad you did. Thank you."

Councilman Gatti: "Now we have listened to these arguments pro and con for three years. I don't see any reason to listen anymore."

Mayor McAllister: "All right."

Dr. Harvasty: "I am a wife, a mother, and a grandmother. I must do what I can to preserve the integrity of our persons and our freedom of choice to maintain the sanctity of our own bodies. You have no right to put anything in our water. Cancer is killing more children today than any other disease. Dr. Wilhelm C. Huber, former Chief of the National Cancer Institute, in April, 1961, Archives of Pathology, points out that fluorides are costing us heavy.

It is cancer causing, gentlemen, and lady. Do you want more children to die of cancer? Birth defects are increasing. According to the national foundation, one baby in every sixteen is born today with a birth defect, and medical authorities say that this ratio is probably low. Mongoloid births occur more often in fluoridated than in non-fluoridated areas. These unfortunate retarded children have good teeth, but they die young. Will you torture more of them. Do not be lulled by the small ratio of seven-tenths part per million. Years ago our parents had difficulty conceiving of harm from mirco organisms so small that millions

APR 7 1966

-26-

of them could be accommodated on the head of a pin. If the dentists have their way, you might be forced to boot-leg your water to the patient. Have you ever had a serious illness in one of your dear ones? Have you racked your brain to find someone, something, some way to help him reach the turning point toward health? Have you not tried to fathom what kind of food or drink might have harmed your loved ones? And have you not tried to eliminate even a tiny noise that might disturb and sap precious strength? If you permit fluoridation of your water and one of your loved ones becomes ill, perhaps from this very poison, will you not reproach yourself at that time?

They tried to fluoridate even bottled water in Connecticut. They might even try it in Texas. Do you want to be a party to such coercion? How do you think Americans will feel while they see the United States spend millions abroad to further democracy while they witness their own democracy going down the drain? My wish is to have this City Council resist fluoridation altogether. Failing that, a pill program would be more sensible economically, and would give the individual the right of choice which he is most certainly entitled. At the very least, give the people a chance to decide for themselves, whether to put this poison into their water or to keep it out. Thank you."

Mayor McAllister: "I think that we have had enough discussion on this. Thank you. The Council seems to be ready to vote."

Mrs. Myrtle Hance: "You people have made your minds up, but I certainly believe that it is a bad day Sir, when we are denied our privilege and our civil rights as American citizens, taxpayers and property owners, to vote on medication. Even President Johnson said that we should have the right to choose. I certainly do think that it is a terribly sad day indeed."

Councilman Gatti: "Mr. Mayor, I want to say one other thing. The Supreme Courts in twenty (20) states has held that fluoridation is not mass medication. The Supreme Court in the United States a number of times, has refused to review these cases. We ought to get on with this, if we don't have enough votes to win, then we will lose."

Mayor McAllister: "O.K. The motion is that fluoride be added to the water. Here is an ordinance."

The Clerk read the following ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 34,267

AUTHORIZING THE FLUORIDATION OF THE CITY PUBLIC WATER SUPPLY OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO PROVIDING FOR THE REGULATION OF SUCH FLUORIDATION, AND DIRECTING THAT SAID FLUORIDATION BE PLACED INTO OPERATION AS SOON AS FEASIBLE.

* * * * *

On motion of Mr. Gatti, seconded by Dr. Parker, the ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Calderon, Jones, James, Gatti, and Parker; NAYS: McAllister, Cockrell and Trevino; ABSENT: Bremer.

Mayor McAllister: "The motion prevailed, ladies and gentlemen, and I want to say this to you who are opposed. This will not be put into effect if there is a movement on foot to avail yourselves of the right of referendum.

The requirement with regard to a referendum election is that the eligible voters, from this time here, the petitioners have forty (40) days in which to file a petition, and then the Clerk has **twenty (20)** days in which to check the petition. If the petition was found lacking, in other words if the petition had 11,400 names on it, and you were to find that **twenty (20)** names were unqualified, then you would have an additional **twenty (20)** days to amend or bring up your petition to the full number. After that the Clerk would have ten days in which to check the petition. After the Council receives the petition, the Council has thirty (30) days in which to either act on the petition or to reject its own motion. Any questions about this matter? "

Dr. Terry Downs: "Mayor McAllister, I am Dr. Downs; I won't take a lot of your time. On behalf of the San Antonio District Dental Society, I want to thank you for your indulgence. I want to thank the members who voted for this for doing so. If the dental society has not carried the message across to the ones who voted against it, we hope that we can get that message across to you. Thank you for your time and indulgence."

Mayor McAllister: "Any other citizen to come before the Council? The hearing is declared closed."

APR 7 1966

66-435

The Clerk read the following letter:

April 7, 1966

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

Gentlemen and Madam:

The following petition was received and forwarded to the City Manager for investigation and report to the City Council.

3-31-66 Petition of South San Antonio Appliance Company requesting relief from the parking restrictions in the 700 block of Dwight Street.

Sincerely,

/s/ J. H. Inselmann
City Clerk

- - -
There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned.
- - -

A P P R O V E D :

Mr. McCallister
M A Y O R

ATTEST: *J. H. Inselmann*
City Clerk