

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
THURSDAY, MAY 14, 1981

* * * *

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 p.m. by the presiding officer, Mayor Henry Cisneros, with the following members present: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Hasslocher, and Cisneros: ABSENT: Webb and Archer.

- - -
81-24 The Invocation was given by Rev. D.A. Watson, Highlands Assembly of God Church.

- - -
81-24 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

- - -
81-24 The minutes of the regular meetings of April 23 and April 31, 1981 were approved.

81-24 GROUP OF STUDENTS LA JOYA, TEXAS

Mayor Cisneros recognized a group of 31 students from La Joya, Texas who were present in the audience. These were seventh and eighth grade history students who were visiting the City of San Antonio.

81-24 YOUTH ORCHESTRA DAY

Mayor Cisneros asked Councilman Wing to read the following Proclamation:

PROCLAMATION

WHEREAS: Music plays an increasingly important role in our world today and is known to have a great influence in enriching the lives of all people, youth and adult alike, and

WHEREAS: the youth orchestras of San Antonio provide special opportunities for musical training in serious music for talented school musicians in metropolitan San Antonio, and

WHEREAS: The City of San Antonio recognizes the completion of the youth orchestra's fifth season and notes the growth of four orchestras serving fifteen school districts and four counties, and

WHEREAS: The City of San Antonio is proud of the growing interest in orchestral music for young people fostered by this organization,

NOW, THEREFORE, I, HENRY CISNEROS, Mayor of the City of San Antonio, in recognition thereof, do hereby proclaim May 18, 1981, to be

"YOUTH ORCHESTRA DAY"

in San Antonio, Texas, and extend best wishes for a most successful program at Parker Chapel, Trinity University.

* * * *

Mayor Cisneros accompanied by Mr. Wing and other Council members presented the Proclamation to representatives of the Youth Orchestra Symphony.

81-24

INVOCATION

Mayor Cisneros asked that each Council member give the names of their preference to the City Clerk for the weekly Invocation in order that each District of the City may be represented.

81-24 The Clerk read the following Resolution directing publication of notice of intention to issue City of San Antonio Prior Lien water system revenue bonds, directing advertisement of sale, and approving a notice of sale and official statement, in connection with said bonds.

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

The following discussion then took place:

APPLEWHITE PROJECT

MRS. HELEN DUTMER: I have a bit of a problem with the way this is set up. Is this the one you're asking for, the 15 million and 4 million to buy land for the Applewhite? There lies my problem. I would like to have a clarification of that statement. I read in the newspaper, Mr. Van Dyke, that there will not be a great deal of water in the Applewhite. Is that true, Mr. Van Dyke?

MR. ROBERT VAN DYKE, General Manager: There will be water in the reservoir much of the time. There will be some periods when there will be very little water.

MRS. DUTMER: Might I also ask your opinion as a hydrologist as to the ability for our Applewhite to hold water?

MR. VAN DYKE: The only engineering studies that have been made indicate that it will be a very excellent reservoir.

MRS. DUTMER: That isn't my question, Mr. Van Dyke.

MR. VAN DYKE: I think it would be also.

MRS. DUTMER: I asked you if you thought that the Applewhite would be capable of holding water all the time?

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes madam.

MRS. DUTMER: All right, I'd like to know predominately where you would get the water to put in the Applewhite.

MR. VAN DYKE: On the average, 53,000 acre feet of water would be available from the Medina River and in the future, if the City continues to grow and additional reservoirs are constructed, water would ultimately be piped into that reservoir from the Cibolo Reservoir and the Cuero Reservoir. It would act as a holding reservoir for the water that is brought in from the east. At this time, the level in the lake of the reservoir would be almost constant all the time because the water would be pumped in and would not be dependent upon the water flow of the Medina River.

MRS. DUTMER: Now when the Cibolo and Cuero come on board, will you have enough water to keep the water in the Applewhite strictly from the Medina River, particularly in the kinds of droughts when we are going to need the water?

MR. VAN DYKE: The concept of the operation of the Applewhite Reservoir is one of scalping and the idea ---inaudible-- when it is available, when it is not available we would rely upon the Edwards Aquifer. This concept is a little bit different than the operation of a normal reservoir. It would be dependent upon a firm supply. Our firm supply will be coming from the Edwards Aquifer.

MRS. DUTMER: Your principle will still be coming from the Edwards Aquifer, right? All right. Have you cleared all the hurdles to get your permit, i.e. the amount of water you can pump from the Medina, and all the people along it?

MR. VAN DYKE: No madam, we have filed an application with the Texas Water Rights Commission. I have been advised that the hearing on our permit will be at 10:00 o'clock on the 23rd day of June. And so, it's been a long time in getting that settled but we finally have received the order.

MRS. DUTMER: Is there water available from Canyon?

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes, Madam.

MRS. DUTMER: Because it was put out that the water from Canyon is no longer available to the City of San Antonio.

MR. VAN DYKE: No, I don't believe that's ever been put out.

MRS. DUTMER: It was in the papers.

MR. VAN DYKE: In 1976 they made a decision that they would not want water from Canyon and no serious effort was ever made to foresee that just because they turned it down. In the mean time, however, back in July of 1979 the Council directed me to make inquiries to see if those avenues were still open. I have done that and we have them resolved.

MRS. DUTMER: All right, thank you for clarifying that because I have the newspaper report that it was no longer available to the City of San Antonio. In fact, that 53,000 acre feet that they have for sale, is it not?

MR. VAN DYKE: No, madam, the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority has obtained the permit for 50,000 acre feet for Municipal and industrial usage. I don't have the very latest tally of the water that's remaining but, I believe it would be somewhere very close to 40,000 in accordance with the comments made by the General Manager, John on our tour.

MRS. DUTMER: About 40, I thought he said 50, but then you were there.

MR. VAN DYKE: It was a little less than 40.

MRS. DUTMER: Now in putting the Applewhite down there, will the Applewhite be used for recreational purposes?

MR. VAN DYKE: It could conceivably be available for recreational purposes at some time, but this project is primarily for our municipal water supply. That's why the Council authorized it and it would be basically for that purpose. If the reservoir were full and it were possible to have recreation over there, I'm sure that could be worked in. But that is not the primary reason why the reservoir is being built.

MRS. DUTMER: In other words, you don't see cabins all along the edge of it and boating and fishing and all the amenities of recreation?

MR. VAN DYKE: Those things may come madam but that's not the problem of why the Water Board nor the City is building the reservoir.

MRS. DUTMER: This is precisely, I know that, Mr. Van Dyke, thank you. This is primarily for drinking water for the people of San Antonio.

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes, ~~that's~~.

MRS. DUTMER: Right? All right, do you plan at any time, to use any portion of sewage effluent in that lake?

MR. VAN DYKE: No, madam I would comment however, that at the present time the Leon Creek Treatment Plant does empty out and gets into Leon Creek and some of that effluent would get down into the reservoir. As the City grows to the west, until treatment plants are either built, or until the sewage is piped down into the Dos Rios plant, which is the plant under the Public Works Department, there might be some that would come in there. Any water, however, would be in that reservoir, would be completely treated, and would be safe for human consumption, even though small amounts of waste water might get into the reservoir.

MRS. DUTMER: Well, where I'm having my problem and you and I have discussed this but, just to bring it out into the open for my colleagues here, I believe that the studies have shown that the aquifer has enough water in it with reasonable use to last to the year of 2020. Is that a correct statement?

MR. VAN DYKE: No, madam, the statement I think has to have some light shed upon it that the Edwards Aquifer has between 15 and 30 million acre feet of water in it, that's what we believe to be the total amount but it's in very porous rock and it would not be possible to get all of that out of the reservoir. The reservoir also serves an area that is approximately 175 miles long, from Bracketville to Kyle and at the present time over a million people depend upon this water for their life and their businesses. All of the studies that have been made by the State, by the Federal Government, by the Water Board, by the River Authorities and by the Edwards Underground Water District are based upon the fact that there will be a requirement to keep the springs blocked. San Marcos and at Comal Springs. That is the problem in a nutshell, because if you must maintain the spring flow in those springs, then we will not have adequate amount of water to take care of the million and a half people that we believe will be in San Antonio by the year 2020.

MRS. DUTMER: All right, now this is not to downgrade the City of San Antonio, but it's facing reality. We had predicted such a very large growth for the City of San Antonio when, in fact and in truth, we dropped from ninth or tenth to eleventh in the nation. That doesn't speak to me of a very rapid growth. Period. So, this is just nearly a speculative growth or is it a confirmed study growth pattern?

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes madam, these predictions have been made by the State, by the Federal Government, by our agency, by your own Planning Department, by the River Authority, by the Edwards Underground Water District, and any prediction that is to population growth is just that. It's based upon the facts and the trends that we see today. Certainly, something might occur that would stop the growth in San Antonio, but we have not seen that take place in any major City

in the Southwest. And it seems that that growth is going to continue. If the growth rate is slightly less than we believe it to be, that million and a half people would be sometime after 2020. If it accelerates, it may be before.

MRS. DUTMER: All right.

MR. VAN DYKE: It has been the policy of the City of San Antonio and its Chamber to try to entice new businesses to come here and certainly we cannot have that economic growth if we do not have people, power and water. Those are the three essential ingredients. The Water Board and the City of San Antonio are not in any danger of any water shortage at the present time. The Applewhite Project as are all of these long range surface water reservoirs that we are recommending to the Council, are planned to be built prior to the time that we have a crisis, so that we will not be in a panic, and so many other big cities have had a problem we hope by our planning that that will not take place. It takes approximately 25 years from the time you decide you want to have a reservoir until you have the water in it. And because of the problems that we face today, from legal constraints, environmental constraints, financial constraints, and I would say to the Council that we are not starting on the Applewhite Project any too soon.

MRS. DUTMER: All right. Is it true that you had the money at one time to build the Cibolo reservoir and did not act on it?

MR. VAN DYKE: No madam, we have never had the money to build any reservoir. In 1973, I went to Washington and appeared before the committee on the Cibolo Project and gave testimony that that should go. But no contract has ever been worked out, there has never been any federal money authorized for it, nor did the Water Board ever have the funds to build any surface reservoir until this time.

MRS. DUTMER: Well, I've just been wondering why then my information from Congressman Gonzalez's Office states that the money was there to build it and it was not acted upon.

MR. VAN DYKE: The authorization is federal money could have been made available had there been a contract between the Water Board and the San Antonio River Authority which was to be the local sponsor as the result of that 1973 authorization.

MRS. DUTMER: That's precisely my question. Why was it not acted upon, it could have been at that time done?

MR. VAN DYKE: At that particular time, we had no other alternatives. Subsequent to that, the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority did decide that they would like to sell water and we entered into negotiations and because of the cost saving, the Canyon Reservoir was so much cheaper and the water was in being that the decision was made to proceed with water from Canyon. And it was not until 1976 that the effort was stopped when the Council rejected the contract that was brought to them.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, well I think that should be clarified. It isn't that we didn't want Canyon water, but I think that the contract was not to our liking, is where the problem came in there. I'll ask you another question, if I might, and that is, do you plan to pump any of the water from Dos Rios Site up to the Applewhite or into the Cibolo to pump into the Applewhite?

MR. VAN DYKE: No madam.

MRS. DUTMER: All right, that will just merely flow into the San Antonio-Medina River and go to the sea. All right, I think that is about it, but I am still of the opinion that it's a little bit premature to vote four million dollars in bonds to buy up land when we don't even have a permit for the Applewhite, and you're not certain that you're going to get it.

MAY 14, 1981

MER

-5-

177

MR. VAN DYKE: I would answer that Mrs. Dutmer, that because of the very great cost of any surface water project we feel that it is prudent to put the money aside a little at a time, and not suddenly be faced with a very, very large bond issue that the citizens of San Antonio would have to issue at one time and then pay. As you know, we were setting aside one million dollars a year toward this out of our revenues until we were directed by the City Council that the financing of the reservoir would be 100% from bonds. So this is the second increment. The total land cost that we estimate to be will be about 13 million dollars. We issued 4 million dollars of bonds for the reservoir in the October, 1980 bond issue to replace the revenues that the Council authorized to be reallocated for construction. This is the second segment of that, and in 1982, when we come back to you requesting the third increment of the overall plan that you approved last fall, there will be 5 million dollars in that for surface water development. And that would complete the 13 million dollars that we anticipate will be required for the purchase of the land. As I pointed out, a hearing has been set before the Texas Water Rights Commission on the 23rd of June and we see no reason why the permit should not be granted.

MRS. DUTMER: All right. What's the overall estimated cost of the Applewhite?

MR. VAN DYKE: The Applewhite Project including the dam and reservoir, the pipelines to the treatment plant, and the pipelines that will bring the water from the treatment plant to the water distribution system of the City Water Board will be 106 million dollars.

MRS. DUTMER: 106 million. Does that include the treatment plant?

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes madam.

MRS. DUTMER: 106 million dollars. What will the Cibolo cost?

MR. VAN DYKE: I don't have any updated figure on that and on our tour I believe that Mr. Pfeiffer also said he did not have a current figure on it.

MRS. DUTMER: But there was a guesstimated figure.

MR. VAN DYKE: I don't know what that is madam.

MRS. DUTMER: All right. And of course, obviously the Cuero is much larger so it would be more than that even I should imagine.

MR. VAN DYKE: On the tour, if you'll recall, John guesstimated that it would be somewhere in the vicinity of 200 million or more.

MRS. DUTMER: Two hundred or more million dollars. All right. And will we have to enter into a contract then with Cuero for the water the same as we had to go to Canyon for water?

MR. VAN DYKE: If you want the water from the Guadalupe River it would be necessary for us to enter into a contract with the Guadalupe-Blanco River Authority.

MRS. DUTMER: All right. And that would be the Cuero reservoir?

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes, because that is on that river and that agency would be responsible for the construction of the reservoir.

MRS. DUTMER: All right. Thank you sir. Thank you Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Yes madam. Just a point that occurred to me as you were speaking relative to that change. The City had been pushing for a long time to get surface water. And Congressman Gonzalez had been calling for a surface water program for many years. And it went full

tilt in the early 70's and got Congressional authorization for some 70 million dollars as I recall for the building of Cibolo. Later in about '73, the political philosophy locally changed related to the fact that water was now available from Canyon or could have been available from Canyon and Cibolo was allowed to slip. As it turns out, I understand Cibolo today would be much more expensive, even having the federal authorization, the cost would still be more to the local area. And thirdly, there is a sequencing that needs to exist anyway between Applewhite and Cibolo. For my own part I would just tell you that I support the Cibolo Project. I want to see the Cibolo Project developed. But we do have that problem of whether or not the authorization is ever going to be followed by an appropriation.

MRS. DUTMER: That's another question, Mr. Mayor, that was on my mind and that is we have to have the Cibolo in order to keep water in the Applewhite.

MAYOR CISNEROS: I'm not sure what the procedure is.

MRS. DUTMER: I think we're sort of going backwards.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Okay, we'll get that question answered for you. Mr. Thompson followed by Mr. Hasslocher followed by Mr. Eureste.

MR. BOB THOMPSON: Mr. Van Dyke, I have a couple of questions I would like to share with Mrs. Dutmer touched on some of the things I was concerned about. I would like for you to highlight the use of the bond money, (inaudible) that we would be approving today. The purpose of that question is not totally for my own edification but for those that are hearing what we are speaking of. They don't all have the information we do.

MR. VAN DYKE: Each of you was sent a copy of the water report that went to the board and this information is outlined on page 3. Our capital improvement program is 8 million, 15 thousand dollars. Of that, 1 million 824 thousand would be spent on structures, 1 million 530 for production equipment, and pump maintenance would be 4.661 million dollars. There is 4 million dollars included in the issue for the land, for the Applewhite water supply project, extensions and improvements would be a million 428 thousand; the Governmental replacement and relocations would be 956 thousand, and I might comment that on that particular item for the next year we would add to that 750 thousand dollars in revenues so that there would be a total expenditure of 1.7 million of bond and revenue funds for governmental replacement and relocation. On the annual replacement program there's 500,000 dollars included in the bond issue and a \$2,361,340 would come from revenues for a total expenditure of some 2.9 million of bonds and revenue funds for 1981-82. We also, because of the inflation, have included 101 thousand dollars as contingency amount and that's a rather small contingency on a 15 million dollar issue for a total allocation of 15 million dollars.

MR. THOMPSON: On the 1.28 million dollars for extension and improvements what kind of, what amount do we have on that extension working outside of our City, is that most of it outside of our City or are you working primarily inside, or 50/50 or how is that split?

MR. VAN DYKE: The projects that we have are almost entirely inside the City limits and they are for existing customers. Last year was the greatest year of pumpage that we have had historically at the Water Board. We pumped ~~some~~ 55 billion gallons of water, and was 10 billion more than the previous year and previous high, and we found that there were certain places in the system that suffered from low pressure, basically along the northeast, north central. And the monies that are I included in that 'pump' maintenance expenses are to correct those deficiencies in the storage and production to add wells that we need sorely and to add storage that will provide the pressure in those areas.

MR. THOMPSON: And that's in that north, northeast sector. Are you

tying any of those systems together up there?

MR. VAN DYKE: Our systems are basically, Mr. Thompson, are tied together in pressure service levels. As you know, there's roughly 1000 feet of elevation difference between the very southern part of our City to the northern part. And because of this we do have to have different service levels but we do try to see to it that our pump main system are tied together.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay, on the question I asked and the answer that you gave addressed the concern of spending the money inside the City limits of San Antonio and it is for that purpose this money's set aside, and directly benefits those of us who are paying the bills. The second point I wanted to make was about our Applewhite Project. I strongly supported that project. The 4 million dollars that you have received last October, has that been spent or are you accumulating a fund to go to the market place to buy all this at one time?

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes, that money has been set aside. However, certain amounts of money have been utilized for the engineering desing. I don't have the very current figure on that but it's a very small amount has been utilized. The money basically is intact ready to buy the land as soon as we have the permit authorizing the project.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. You haven't spent more than 1 million of that 4, have you?

MR. VAN DYKE: Approximately 100,000 dollars and so that would leave the whole 4 million intact. Prior to that time, we have been receiving 2% of the gross revenue from those people that we wholesale to. That money has been put into the fund. And so basically we are using funds other than the 4 million that is set aside for the pruchase of the land.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay. So with this we're going to have a total ready to go to purchase with.

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes sir.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you. The concluding remark that I have and it's not in the form of a question but it's in the form of a statement to the Council, my colleagues, is that I am as concerned as anyone certainly about our aquifer and its protection. But I think another very relevant argument is that we look at our water supply and see a single source situation. We must be very concerned about that. And since we do not have control of the single source, I think you must feel particularly in jeopardy or risk in relying solely upon that. This doesn't make good sense to me in either the short or long term planning posture to see ourselves in that particular predicament. And because of that, I think our timing starting on the Applewhite. is proper as you said a while ago, and we are not starting a day too soon. And with all of the rigarmarole and red tape you have to go through to get this done, I didn't know it took 25 years from the word go until you got any water out of the line. But that's a long, long time. We're going to be in 2000 before this thing is even ready, is that right?

MR. VAN DYKE: No, Mr. Thompson that's on average life. If you pick up a new reservoir today and we have been working on this one for a number of years.

MR. THOMPSON: When will it be finished if everything stays on schedule?

MR. VAN DYKE: We should get the construction underway which was scheduled to start in 1982, three years construction should be done in 1985 and then the pipelines and the plant so that we should have water on line in about 1986 or 1987. So the project has been in the mill for a long time.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay, of that 106 million dollars that you identified a while ago, we have own if this passes today, contributed 8 toward that 106. Is that right?

MR. VAN DYKE: Correct.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you very much.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Mr. Hasslocher.

MR JAMES C. HASSLOCHER: Some of my colleagues, since they hit their buttons faster than I did, you answered some previous questions that I had, but one question I have. I went back and tried to look at some articles that have been written in NEWSWEEK Magazine dated Feb. 23, across the front page, "we are running out of water", my question to you is, you talked about a few minutes ago, pumping 10 billion more this year than we did last year. Should we get in a problem and should agriculture have a problem since one of the charts that I'm looking at said nationwide, agriculture gets 87.7% of the water usage in America today, what problems do you see, for our part of this country?

MR. VAN DYKE: I don't see an immediate problem for San Antonio, because of agriculture. However, our community is very dependent upon the rural communities and agricultural efforts, products, livestock raising and a certain amount of foot farmers that does utilize water from the aquifer. Our efforts that we are proceeding on are basically the result of area wide coordination with the Three Rivers Authorities that are involved, the Nueces, the San Antonio and the Guadalupe plus the Edwards Underground Water District, and the State to try to work cooperatively so that we are not going to be placed in a point in the future where we are going to have the jeopardy that some other areas do. This long range planning and planning ahead that will enable us not to have the problems that have happened elsewhere.

MR. HASSLOCHER: Thank you Mr. Van Dyke.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Mr. Eureste.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE:: Yes Sir. The questions I had to ask really have been answered already as to the completion date, the cost of the project. I am an opponent of surface water, simply because I don't think that there is any convincing evidence that we need surface water. To say that we need surface water because we need a second source of water is the same argument that we used to get us into the nuclear project on electricity. And we still haven't seen all of the problems that have persisted over that particular project. Likewise with surface water, this is only one of a series of projects that are on line with regards to the master plan for surface water that has been developed by the Water Board. That includes Cuero one and Cuero two...

and Cibolo and Applewhite and Canyon lake water and heaven knows what else, But all toll the projects, I think they come out to a figure of over 1½ billion dollars cost by the year 2020, escalations and whatnot. And when you tie in the interest cost to that, you're talking about 3½ billion dollars worth of surface water projects. That if you truly believe what the master plan from City Water Board is saying that's what we would be into.

I don't feel we need one drop of that surface water. It is very expensive water to start off with and I just can't see how a lake or a reservoir can have water in the driest times of the year or during a drought spell where we could not draw aquifer water which is underground but we would be drawing surface water which has the highest evaporation rate of any water that is held in reserve. I just don't see how we would have any water to draw from. What you do though is that by having a second source of water, you make it possible for us to begin to count on that water and very likely begin to lax up on the protection of the aquifer. And there are several people that have spoken to this issue before and I just raise it again for those Council members who haven't heard this argument before. I'm not convinced whatsoever that we need surface water because it is a second source or another alternate source of water. We've been here as a City. This year we celebrated 250th birthday of civilian government in San Antonio and for all of those years the aquifer has been serving us. And prior to that very likely it served those people who first explored this service from the New World and I just don't know what was done with the aquifer before that time. But I'm sure that through the experience and whatnot that run throughout this area that the aquifer was serving the drinking

needs and the water needs of people who had to live in this area prior to the Europeans who came over. And all of this time we have done without surface water per se, we have had aquifer water to draw from. I don't think it's that easy to make the argument that we need surface water because it is a second source. Yet when you get down to it, it becomes a very expensive undertaking. For some of us, 106 billion dollars does not seem to be big money, say in comparison to the nuclear project that we are into. This is water, the other one is electricity. But when you consider the City Water Board, and its revenue, in comparison to the CPS, and its revenue base, the Applewhite Project could be put on a magnitude of the CPS's involvement with the STNP Project, the nuclear project. It is a big project and I think I'm going to ask Mr. Van Dyke a question perhaps that relates to this. Is this one of the larger projects of the Water Board, Mr. Van Dyke, in terms of the total cost?

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes sir, it is.

MR. EURESTE: Is it the largest?

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes sir.

MR. EURESTE: What do we have to compare, in terms of one of the larger types of projects undertaken by the Water Board, in terms of cost?

MR. VAN DYKE: You would not have anything that would come anywhere as near this at all.

MR. EURESTE: What might have been the larger project?

MR. VAN DYKE: A major pumping station, 3-6 million dollars.

MR. EURESTE: Okay Sir, thank you very much. I don't know exactly what and I'm sure that you went through the books here, we could find out the total revenue of City Water Board, but is not anywhere close to the 400 and something odd million dollars generated by CPS yearly. The Water Board's revenues probably represent perhaps 10 to 20 percent more or less of what CPS revenue generates to that Corporation to that board. So when you look at 106 million dollars although it doesn't appear to be significant in comparison to what the City Water Board has been involved in. It is a major undertaking. It is the largest undertaking of a capital project that the Water Board has been involved in. And it carries with it significant cost down the road also to do more surface water projects like this that are going to fall on the ratepayer of the Water Board. It's going to fall on the rate payer and it's very likely that the Water Board would be back here with request for more increases in the rate to deal with this cost that they are having to bear. And I'm talking about rate increases that will be of a significant magnitude that will be as controversial down the road as the rate increases that we today are having to approve for the City Public Service Board with regards to the electrical generating plants that it is constructing. I have no choice but to vote for the bond, though because it ties into it other developments of the Water Board. I, however, do not favor this particular part of the bond issue. I just support the other parts of the issue. And I have no choice but to vote for the bond and I'm not going to ask that you redo it when you come back because the majority of the Council does support the effort and I guess that they support also the strategy that is used in putting the package together. Thank you very much.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Thank you Mr. Eureste. Mrs. Berriozabal.

MRS. MARIA ANTONIETTA BERRIOZABAL: This is the first opportunity I am getting to vote on this particular matter and I recently won an election in a district where I campaigned very consistently and very strongly against surface water. And that is my stand. I do have some questions. I'm in somewhat of a difficult situation because the package was put together with some capital improvements

and some replacement of mains and so on and also the 4 million dollars for Applewhite. So I just want to state that matter and ask a question. Why was it put all together?

MR. VAN DYKE: Madam, the Applewhite Project as well as the total capital improvement program was considered by the City Council last fall and the Board was directed to carry out the program in accordance with the consultants recommendation. The proposal that is before you follows precisely that which was approved by the City Council and that is why it was put together the way it is.

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: Thank you. Number 2, on page 8 of this report that we got, the report, the one that you just -inaudible- it has a time table and the second item is dated May 7, 1981, and it was to brief the City Council on the issue at its "B" session. The next one was today's meeting the vote or approval as it's indicated here. Why did we not have it at our "B" session?

MR. VAN DYKE: The Board requested to brief you at the "B" session one week ago today and because of your apparent emergency with City Public Service Board we were told that was being cancelled and the matter would not be re-scheduled at a "B" session and that it would be taken up and voted upon at this hearing today.

MAYOR CISNEROS: That was my decision and the reason was because I didn't think that the Council would want to tackle both the CPS question that we did last Thursday and the water question at the same time. I knew that they had wanted to get it out by a certain time so I thought the Council would have the opportunity which you are having this afternoon at "A" session.

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: So I have some more questions. I just wish we could've done it.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Take all the time you need.

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: Okay, I notice that in the time table, that was attached to the letter that we got, we are running a bit late on the project on the Applewhite Project. And you mentioned that the total cost will be 106 million dollars? Does the delay also mean an increase in that cost?

MR. VAN DYKE: At this sitting I would say no. Hopefully, if the Texas Water Rights Commission does grant us the permit we can still get the project underway by 1982. All of the land does not have to be purchased initially. The land that is most crucial is where the dam would be physically. And so those efforts would commence and it was the intent of the original plan that the land would be purchased over a period of time and would not be done all in one lump. Nevertheless, the acquisition of the land can be speeded up and it can be done in a relatively short period of time if necessary.

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: So that's an additional 5 million dollars?

MR. VAN DYKE: No madam, there's no additional cost at all.

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: The cost of the land is 13 million?

MR. VAN DYKE: That's what we estimate it to be.

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: So we've already, we're voting right now on 4 million.

MR. VAN DYKE: The second 4 million.

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: So there's five.

MR. VAN DYKE: So that would give you a total 8 and it's contemplated that in the 1982 bond issue there will be an additional 5 million dollars for that purpose.

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: And that's a set price. It won't go up?

MR. VAN DYKE: I can't guarantee that anything isn't going to go up now.

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: Okay now the other questions had to do with something that I'm very interested in and its the replacement of mains in some areas of the City. And I have some questions on the report here. Page A3 to A23 I think, is San Antonio City Water Board capital improvement program. And in the description you cite the type of pipe that you use such as 30" pipe, 24" pipe, 12" pipe, and the smallest that I see is 12" pipe. Okay, then when you go down to Appendix B, that's Governmental Relocation Projects, you just call them by the name of the particular project, like "I" Street Drainage Project, St. Hedwig Drainage Project, Zarzamora Street Reconstruction and so on. At that point, okay another thing, in this first section that I sited everytime in your little map that you show that some mains are going to be constructed, you have the indication of how thick the pipe is such as 36" or 16 or 12. When you get to the second part, you have don't have the type of the size of pipe that's going to be used. And I am interested in some of these projects. Many of them are in my district. I'm interested in the size of pipe that's going to be used. Let me tell you why this is, I'm very conscious of this. In the street where my parents live, and around the area where they live, the people there have been having alot of problems with broken water mains. And I went to meet with some of the residents and I was flabbergasted to see that some of the pipe that they had it's a black pipe, it's almost like plastic, and it's about this thick as this microphone right here, and it's the one to the house, right, and its extremely small. So I'm wondering what size pipes are being used in this? That's one question, why didn't we have pipes, why do we have the sizes listed in some of them and not in another one, and then two more questions. What do you mean by adjustments? and what do you mean by replacements? Like you say you're going to adjust a pipe. Does it mean you're just going to move the pipe somewhere the same one? Okay and replacement is completely new?

MR. VAN DYKE: I will be happy to answer those questions one at a time. Number one, 5 of the mains in the capital improvements program are major trunk mains that are used to convey water above the City. They are now just to your expressway systems, so they are large, they are moving water from one place of production to another place in the City and they are built very large to convey great quantities of water and not necessarily to provide service to anyone along it. As a by-product periodically to use to supply something to someone along there, but basically they are to use great quantities of water. The City of San Antonio has a water barren area. It has no water baring area on the south side of the City. Actually, it's on a diagonal to the City and we have no water supply on the extreme north. So water must be produced in this water baring strip that goes through the central part of the City and must be piped into those areas where there is no water, again the reason for the very large mains in the trunk main system.

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: What size do you use in residential areas? I think that is my question.

MR. VAN DYKE: The normal size that we have in the residential areas is 6" and that is more than adequate to take care of the average residential property plus the fire protection that is needed in a residential area.

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: And this is the size that is going to be used in these areas where there is no size indicated.

MR. VAN DYKE: Not necessarily.

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: That is the minimum?

MR. VAN DYKE: That would be the minimum size. There might also be a

8's or 12's or 16's in those areas, too. Now to go back to your second question about the relocation. The relocation monies are brought about because, for example, the City of San Antonio says we are going to have a drainage project. And we're going to tear up everything that is in the street and we're going to put a large box culvert right down the middle of the street to take care of the drainage problem in an area. When they do, something's got to move. And what does move is all of the other utilities. And they must be re-routed around the drainage project. Another example, for example, would be the San Antonio River Authority. If they are doing some changes in the San Antonio River. And there are mains or other utilities in the way, they will have to be moved. Another example is a highway project, where the State Highway Department comes in and says we're going to widen this street, we're going to put in an overpass or underpass or something. So those amounts of money that are included are to take care of the needs that are brought about by government. Somebody else besides us over which we have absolutely no control. As you probably realize, if the City of San Antonio says lower one of your mains so we can put a storm sewer in, we must pay for that. We have no idea what's going to take place until it's coordinated through the Public Works program. And so we allocate a certain amount of money available so that it will be there for those purposes. Under the new bond indenture, we set aside 5% of our revenues for that purpose but in many cases, that is insufficient. And so this money that comes from the bonds then supplements the money that we set aside out of our revenues. Now to go to the replacement program. The City of San Antonio has grown through the years. It started out in 1940 if my memory is correct, it was 6 miles square, in territory as the City annexed the territory, which the Water Board has taken over as the arm of the City for water. And because of that we do have a lot of small mains that were in the City that came about because of the annexation that took place. We have been steadily working on a replacement program to take out those small inadequate mains, and to install a minimum size of 6" so that we will have adequate fire protection for our citizens and an adequate water supply. This is a long term project and it has been going on since 1956. And we'll continue I presume as we annex territory and we get systems that are substandard. So, when we have a replacement program, if there was a small 2" main for example, in the ground, we would not replace it with a 2".

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: Okay that was my question.

MR. VAN DYKE: We would put a 6" main as a minimum and if it was in an area that needed a larger main, we might put an 8 or 12 or whatever is required, but that is called a betterment cost. But the replacement would not be any smaller than 6" as it takes its place. Now, in the particular projects that you pointed out, in the report, where it shows that there are a lot of mains in an area that need to be replaced, that has come about because of a breakage record and that we are having a serious number of breaks to the point that the maintenance of that system is no longer economical and therefore, we must go in and replace the mains and when we do we take the old pipes out of service. We don't actually normally put them out to dry

but we lay a main that is parallel to those mains that is of adequate size to provide the pressure, the water that is needed for domestic purposes and for fire protection in that particular area.

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: Thank you, I have several more questions but I think this is enough. I think I got most of my information.

MAYOR CISNEROS: This is a very important matter and you ought to be able to

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: What I do look forward to is working with the City Water Board in replacing a lot more of those mains, because some of those people are really having terrific problems on some streets in the area that I mentioned.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Okay.

MR. VAN DYKE: We are interested in that, too and if we had the money we would be replacing alot of them;

MRS. BERRIOZABAL: I understand that part of it, too, quite well.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. HELEN DUTMER: Mr. Van Dyke, just how crucial to the operation of the City Water Board from the business standpoint, is your capital improvements program, i.e. the housekeeping things other than the purchase of the water, the land?

MR. VAN DYKE: I believe that we are behind the power curve in having sufficient funds available for capital improvements because of the growth that is taking place in San Antonio. We probably would be able to stand a great deal more on capital improvements if it were available. But I think that's true of any governmental agency or any utility. There is always so much that needs to be done but we have tried to take care of those things that we feel are of crucial nature to our existing customers so that we will be able to provide adequate water pressure and fire protection.

MRS. DUTMER: All right. I want you to understand, it's not may aim to talk to either the City Water Board, but I am very concerned that perhaps we're going a little bit fast on land acquisition. And I also am concerned because, of course, I am the Council liaison between Planning and the City and when Mr. Dodds was at the head of the Planning Commission originally, this thing was going the other way. And then all of a sudden, when Mr. Dodds, was no longer there, Bob Ashcroft came on board and appointed a committee to study the water and it came down exactly the way CWB has theirs proposed. And, you know me, my mother should have named me Thomas and I should have been a boy because I doubt until shown. I also wonder if, and this was brought up or I would not even address it, the single source of water. We all know that Congressman Gonzalez was successful in his getting his legislation through that it is the single source of water supply for the City of San Antonio and therefore any governmental monies used, i.e. etc. There is a bill right now in Congress to where they're going to have to protect all underground water sources. I don't know exactly where it is right now but I do know that there definitely exists this bill. I am concerned also, what is this going to do to the bills of the people of San Antonio? How much is this going to add to them? These are revenue bonds. Obviously we have to raise the revenue. The revenue comes from the rate payers. So how much is this going to up their bills, would you anticipate?

MR. VAN DYKE: The issuance of this Bond Issue will require no increase in rates. The City Council authorized a 20% rate increase last October so that we would have sufficient funds to enable us to issue the first 15 million dollar of the bond issue and this issue. So we do have sufficient coverage to issue these bonds with no increase in rates. Now, I don't mean to duck the issue about increasing costs. We will have to have an additional increase in rates before we can issue bonds in 1982. And that would be the third increment of the bonds that the Council basically approved and are so programmed. If you will recall, our consulting engineers and we requested a 29% increase to carry us through 1982. It was the recommendation of the City Utilities Supervisor that that be done with a 20% increase last year and we pointed out to the Council that you would have an increase in the fall of 1981 of 10 or more percent. But we felt that it was better not to impose the full 29% increase at one time. And so the program that we have here again will not require any increase in rates to the rate payer, but you will have a rate increase before you will can issue any additional bonds.

MRS. DUTMER: All Right. And how many acres of agricultural land would you say the Applewhite would cover?

MAY 14, 1981

MER

MR. VAN DYKE: In simple, taking the conservation area will be 2500 acres plus or minus.

MRS. DUTMER: Then 2500 acres additional for the, to take care of the wildlife etc.

MR. VAN DYKE: I don't know that madam, but I suspect that before we're done there's going to be some litigation imposed upon us. But that is not in my control and that particular item is covered in our report to the City Council that we don't have any idea of what that imposition by the Federal Government is going to be and hopefully with the present administration trying to make acquisitions a little more logical, that will not be so good.

MRS. DUTMER: All Right. My other concern is that in time of drought the farmer draw down on that is going to be such that it will not have any available water from the Medina River. And really I'm not being facetious, but I can't see the difference between dying 60 days without water or 66 days without food. You know, you're dead either way.

MR. VAN DYKE: Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: If you got the Canyon Water would you still have to build the Applewhite reservoir?

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes madam.

MRS. DUTMER: All right.

MR. VAN DYKE: In the long run.

MRS. DUTMER: In the long run. How many years long run?

MR. VAN DYKE: I would say that we would not make that decision until we see that we need it. That's one of the beauties of the program that we have presented to the City Council. It's like the questions that were raised on population. They're based on speculation. So if we build one unit which would be the Applewhite, then we would not proceed on additional surface water acquisition until we see that there is a need in a reasonable length of time. And if the population growth does not take place, as we anticipate, then we are not out anything very much except for one reservoir. And it would be there and if inflation continues, it would be paid off with inflated dollars and would be a bargain. Who would have thought that a 5¢ Coke would cost 50¢ today? If we had only know, we could have brought an awful lot of 5¢ Cokes, and put them in our garage. And surface water is going to cost more and more and more as time goes on. The further we delay in time, the more it's going to cost. This Applewhite project in 1974, if my memory is correct, could have been built for 27 million dollars. And today, that was not including all the pumping plants and so forth, but again it gives you an idea of the escalation of inflation, over which you nor I have any control.

MAY 14, 1981
MER

-15-

MRS. DUTMER: Well, of course, when it costs \$27 million to build it and we didn't have \$27 million either because our salaries, our rates, everything was lower, too. So that is just in comparison, I never looked at that. But Applewhite is going to yield 53 thousand acre feet of water, average.

MR. VAN DYKE: Average.

MRS. DUTMER: All right. Canyon will yield 40 thousand acre feet, possibly?

MR. VAN DYKE: Canyon will yield in our opinion, approximately 100 thousand acre feet. Now, only 50 thousand of it is permitted to the GBRA.

MRS. DUTMER: All right, and that leaves another 50 thousand, right, allocated that could conceivably come to the City of San Antonio, right?

MR. VAN DYKE: No, I think you misunderstand what I'm saying. Let me try that again.

MRS. DUTMER: Apparently I do.

MR. VAN DYKE: The firm yield of the Canyon reservoir is approximately 100 thousand acre feet. The GBRA applied to the Department of Water Resources and obtained a permit for 50,000 acre feet for municipal and industrial purposes. As of this date, they have only sold or parceled out to users approximately 10 of that 50.

MRS. DUTMER: So that leaves 40.

MR. VAN DYKE: So there is approximately 50 that have never been allocated to anyone and there is approximately 40 that have been allocated to the GBRA but have not been reallocated to anyone.

MRS. DUTMER: Well, that's the point I'm trying to get to. Conceivably we could get at least 40 thousand acre feet from GBRA on contract, right?

MR. VAN DYKE: I think that by negotiating with them it would be possible to get approximately 50,000.

MRS. DUTMER: Would you say that 50,000 feet of Canyon water, and I'm playing right into your hand, could you see that 50,000 acre feet of water from GBRA would amount to \$103 million?

MR. VAN DYKE: The cost to the Water Board would have been considerably less.

MRS. DUTMER: Thank you, Mr. Van Dyke. I thought that is what you would say. Mr. Mayor, I wonder if at this time I can amend that motion to permit the City Water Board to sell their bonds less the \$4 million for land acquisition?

MAYOR CISNEROS: You certainly can make that amendment.

MR. EURESTE: I would second that.

MAYOR CISNEROS: There's a second. Mr. Thompson is next to speak.

MR. BOB THOMPSON: Not perceiving by any divine insight that that would be perceiving immediately, my turn to speak, the argument doesn't address that initially, but it will in its conclusion. The argument that was made a while ago, that we should be very cautious about going on a path of dual

supply because that is the same kind of vice or evil that has tricked us into the STNP project in that we should be very leery of using those same kind of thought processes to get there. I cannot for the life of me grasp the truth in those statements. I am in fact pleased with the argument and then being accused of being wrong in using it. I cannot for the life of me grasp that. I am in fact pleased to say that we would have two sources of water and you would serve us very handsomely to have that. Now whether that be from Canyon, GBRA, from another source, I don't know. That is a different set of circumstances to consider.

If we had a second source of water there seemingly are those that would state that we would have a lessening or there would be lessening of our concern and protection for the aquifer. I would submit that those that make those statements speak of their own want and concern and not of mine. I have the same desire and pledge to protect the aquifer as I've always had and if there's two sources it would not delete my concern but maybe even double it. So those that speak of dropping concerns speak of their own conscience and not of mine. I hear an argument that someone does not support surface water. I don't think that's true. I think what you're saying is you don't want to pay for it. Well, you aren't going to get extra water unless you pay for it. I don't see anything evil or wrong with surface water being from Oklahoma. That's all we had. It wasn't bad.

I think that we will require surface water and the argument ultimately comes down to actual need vs perceived need. And those that say no, say the need doesn't exist. Well, you might be right, but when I'm thirsty and I can't get any water it's too late to ask you the question. So either you believe in the water theory or you don't believe in the projections, one of the two. Now I happen to believe that the projections are more right than wrong. And I do not believe in the water theory. So I think if we are true to the commitment that we have taken to uphold and support this City and its growth patterns and people that come after us to have an ample water supply it was always given when I came and I have accepted the burden of causing our citizens to pay for that water to provide additional supplies and I'm not willing to hide behind the "I cannot" syndrome in paying for this. I'll pay for it and I expect a good product. So we need it, and if we are going to provide those that come to this City in the next 10, 20, 30 years water then you're the ones right now to make the decisions. If you don't want it, then say so. But if you want it, let's pay for it and do it.

MAYOR CISNEROS: All right. Let's move to vote if we can. All those who have wanted to speak have spoken. We have an amendment on the table which would limit the passage of the bond issue to those items not involved with surface water. We have an original motion which would pass the item as it is.

Let me say, I want to speak strongly against the amendment and for the original motion. I believe this City needs surface water. Bottom line. I believe this City needs surface water. I believe that if our City is going to grow, Mrs. Dutmer made reference to the fact that we dropped from 10th or something to 11th. We didn't drop from 10th or anything else to 11th, all those were projections and speculations. The only official statistics that ever came out showed us 11th. That was from 16th to 11th and if you look at the latest issue of NEXT Magazine which is on the newsstands right now, which addresses cities that have grown since 1970, San Antonio is ranked 3rd in rate of growth with 20.5% rate of growth since 1970. That's second to, that's third only to a couple of other cities, one of which was 28 and one of which was 25%. That means since 1970 we have grown by almost 21% of the size of our City. If that rate of growth continues and I have every reason to expect that it will, as a matter of fact, I would expect that it would accelerate in terms of the sheer number of people. Just because we're making a stronger effort than were being made in 1970 because the sun belt movement is faster today than it was in 1970 because we're

trying to attract industry and we were not in 1970. If all of those things continue and we have, let us say 20% rate of growth between now and 1990 which is not alot. 20% would mean roughly 2% a year, I expect that we will be ahead of that. But let us say that it is only about 20%. That means we will have 200,000 more people in San Antonio in 1990 then we do today.

Now, are we going to be able to provide water or not? I don't know the answer to that question exactly. I do not know what the full yield of the aquifer will be in the year 1990. I don't know how much agricultural development is going to occur from here to Bracketville and Del Rio that is going to draw water from the aquifer that we draw water from. I don't know how many droughts we're going to have for how many summers between now and 1990. The only thing I know is that the safest way to proceed is to start developing a surface water supply, not only for San Antonio but for the development of South Texas as well.

Now, this City has been rife with factionalism, and strife on the question of surface water. Those who wanted Cibolo supported Cibolo and nothing else. Those who wanted Canyon supported Canyon and nothing else. As a result of that from the 1950's to the present when people have been working on surface water, no one has been able to put the votes together on the Council to do any kind of surface water supply at all until the last Council. The effort to get Cibolo got as far as getting the Congressional authorization for a bill that would fund Cibolo and getting some \$70 million allocated for that purpose. And then the political winds changed in San Antonio and Cibolo was no longer proceeded. Cibolo didn't go any further.

Then the next movement was Canyon and they got as far as 1976, brought it to the Council and the Council rejected that because nobody wanted, there wasn't sufficient votes to go with GBRA. So we've been fussing around on surface water all this time. And the fact of the matter is that this is the first time that we have gotten close to a project that has the votes to proceed. And now we're going to try to delay the Applewhite Project again and then we wonder why San Antonio lags behind other sun belt cities and quality of life in income, in rate of growth, and all the other aspects of it. We wonder why people talk about the political climate in San Antonio being unstable for the critical decisions related to growth. And this is an example. We know we need surface water and yet we cannot get a Council to put together the votes to go with a surface water program. It's pure and simple.

And so we will fail to pass the bonds again today, and as a result of that we will wait one week longer, one month longer, the cost of the project will continue to escalate and San Antonio will still be without a surface water supply. I would strongly urge that those who would oppose surface water, there is nothing I can do about that because if you oppose surface water then you just don't have the same view of the fact that we need it and that may be an honest disagreement. There is nothing I can do in the world about that if you honestly believe we don't need surface water, then we just have to agree to disagree. But those who would propose that we do need surface water but they want some other alternative then I would challenge them to provide the means, the resources, and the votes in order to move on another surface water program. I believe Mrs. Dutmer's main problem is that she doesn't want - she wants us to go with Cibolo and we have come up to the edge of Cibolo but the votes were not there for Cibolo and Cibolo is more expensive than Applewhite. Perhaps it is that she wants to go with Canyon. We got close to Canyon in 1976, and then there weren't the votes to go with Canyon. There are the votes on the Council, they may not be here today, but there are the votes that have favored and demonstrated in the last Council to go with the Applewhite project. And I would simply say that we have to begin to develop something

May 14, 1981

msv

like the consistent pattern of votes to go forward with the resources for the surface water program. And at the moment, the broadest consensus is for the Applewhite project. Now, if Mrs. Dutmer, if I have characterized your position wrong.

MRS. DUTMER: You have.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Being for something else, then I'd be happy to amend it when I hear your position. All I know is we're probably going to take a step today that results in no further action on surface water. And then we wonder, and we wonder, and we wonder why we can't proceed with development of growth in our City. Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: It simply isn't true, Mr. Mayor. You have characterized it wrong. At no time have I ever said that I want Cibolo first. I was asking about the feasibility of building Cibolo first, if Cibolo is needed to keep water in the Applewhite. Now that we have that question behind us, you also say it was merely projection that San Antonio was the 10th largest and why were we advertising, why was there such glee even on your part, when it was announced that San Antonio was the 10th largest city in the United States. At last we had made the top 10. This year we're 11th.

I do support surface water. I simply think there is a better way to get it. You have just heard Mr. Van Dyke and I'll admit that I was against the GBRA contract. It was a lousy contract. There was no assurance you were going to get the water after paying all the money. However, if you can draw up a very good concrete contract, I have never said that I would not go for the GBRA. I'll make judgement on my own judgement here, and I can see why you want the Applewhite over in the Southwest.

Today, you're going to have a petition from the Gateway Water Company for a raise in rates. And that's going to be a very interesting vote, to say the least. On this tour, was the Edwards Underground Water Authority, also was the GBRA, SARA; I talked with those various peoples and every one of them said they thought that Applewhite was the wrong place to start on surface water. Now be that as it may, whether it serves someone or not, if you have 40 possibly 50 thousand acre feet of water from the GBRA, Canyon Lake Reservoir, and a less amount of money to the rate payers of this City, and yet getting almost the same amount of water and you would be spending 106 million dolalrs, then it would be rather foolish, don't you think, to jump off and allocate money for land when you don't have a permit for it. Nothing is assured, and go ahead and spend that money and let the rate payers start paying it back, before you ever have any permits or anything else, for water. Now, so I would say that it's not the surface water question but the site of the Applewhite that is at stake here. And since you made judgements of me, I'll make judgements and if I'm wrong in my judgements and character evaluation as to the vote, then you can correct me also.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: Mr. Van Dyke, you said that you cannot come back to this Council with more bonds for the Applewhite, I would assume without also asking for a rate increase.

MR. VAN DYKE: That is correct.

MR. EURESTE: After this bond issue, how much do we have remaining that needs to be floated in terms of bonds to complete the Applewhite?

MR. VAN DYKE: 98 million dollars.

MR. EURESTE: What kind of rate increases would we need given your history of selling water and I don't mean that in a derogatory way, but we're in the business of pumping water and we have to have somebody pay for that--that is the rate payer. How many--what percentage of rate increase would we need on the current rate to finance the remaining 98 million dollars?

MR. VAN DYKE: I cannot answer that question, Mr. Eureste, because I don't know what the interest rate would be on the bonds that would be sold. And I would just not be in any position to answer your question.

MR. EURESTE: How much payback do we have on this 50 million that's going to be floated at what 9.5% or there about?

MR. VAN DYKE: We anticipate that the bond market will be approximately 9.5%.

MR. EURESTE: How much payback is that on 50 million, over the 25 years?

MR. VAN DYKE: I will have to call on my comptroller to give you that number.

MR. EURESTE: Does that work out to about 128% of the original?

MR. VAN DYKE: What is the amount we have pay back on interest, at 9 1/2%? 18 million dollars in interest - 128% roughly of the amount borrowed. It's high.

MR. EURESTE: Yes, okay. According to my calculations, that I have used in analyzing CPS and how CPS has gotten into the mess they're in, and forecasting that CPS, because of the STNP Project that we're involved in, would take a 100% increase in rates to pay back for that project. My calculations tells me that, to get into a 98 million dollar bond for the remaining part could take a possible 33 to 50% increase in water rates by the time we finish with this project. And that's just to deal with this one project, and not any other emergencies that might arise and I'm taking into account your normal capitol projects that you have in your programs. And that's just from you know, my fast analysis of what I see here. I normally, I would say that it takes about a million dollars of revenue to float 10 million, over 25 years. And that if you're floating close to 100 million, 98, that means that you need 10 million dollars to pay back 98 or 100 million over a 25 year period. That much per year. And 10 million, I'll say a total revenue that you bring in of 25 million represents 2/5 or at least 40% of that revenue. And that's in the ballpark figure.

What we're talking about today in conservative terms because we've got the future to deal with and it is very likely that this project is going to have escalators that are unforeseen at this point. And I'm just saying I think on the safe side we're talking about a figure of 40%. And I understand this because I understand that the size and the magnitude of this project in comparison to your revenue base and what you do as a corporation financially at least the rough understanding. I'm not a super expert in this field but knowing what I know about CPS and its revenue operations and knowing what I've been able to learn about yours, I'd say that we could be talking about a 40% increase in rates just to pay back for this one project.

MR. VAN DYKE: I don't think that sounds unreasonable.

MR. EURESTE: Okay.

MR. VAN DYKE: But again, without having any idea of what the future inflation rate and percentages will be is conjecture on my part and certainly on anyone's part.

MR. EURESTE: Well, I've been saying this about CPS and I'm just telling you that I think I can look at where you've been by looking at your flow from '71 through '80 and get a pretty good indication of where you've been at. It's been basically a constant or an

May 14, 1981

yl

escalation that is pretty consistent, with the exception that you mentioned the significant increase that you had, when you went, what from 55 billion, from 44 billion to 55 billion, is that gallons?

MR. VAN DYKE: Billion gallons.

MR. EURESTE: Gallons, yes that's right.

MR. VAN DYKE: In one year.

MR. EURESTE: Which is a 10th billion gallon increase, right?

MR. VAN DYKE: 10 billion gallon increase.

MR. EURESTE: Which is an exceptional year.

MR. VAN DYKE: Very exceptional.

MR. EURESTE: But, most of the other years, it's more or less a steady increase, and anyway, the other one, you can sit down Mr. Van Dyke. The point I want to make about you, about the City Water Board, now I want to take on the Mayor. The Mayor used some very harsh language, and not harsh perhaps, in terms of the words that were used, but I think in the interpretation of where some of us are at, with regards to this particular issue.

Mr. Mayor, and first time up, I come to address you like this, and a good debate, and maybe we'll get used to it, down the road. I do challenge or at least, I don't want to get into a long winded debate here, but I do seriously question the remarks that you made about why this city has not grown, or at least has not taken off. You mentioned that we've grown about 20% in population and maybe perhaps we've done that. Economically, I don't know if we've grown at that same rate; and I really don't know what the future holds for San Antonio. I would hope that San Antonio does continue to grow in every aspect, in terms of population, in terms of our economic base. But I think the thing that can do the most damage to the hope for growth is to attack and to blame somebody for what hasn't happened yet. The politics of '77 was blamed, '77-'79, was blamed, or at least was held responsible for the fact that people didn't want to come to San Antonio to do business. The reasons of the lack of electrical generated capacity has been used. The lack of water resources had been used. The lack of a shipping channel like Houston has, has been used. So some people thought that we could enlarge the San Antonio River and have ships and barges come up the river from the Gulf Coast as a way that we could stimulate growth in this area. And naturally the one that perhaps encapsules everything is the so called instability in government. We have gone out with, I think what is most needed in bringing people into the City and that is with a positive attitude. And I think you have done alot of that. You, Henry Cisneros, has gone out to sell San Antonio with nothing more that what we have. And nothing more that what we've had. And maybe you sell it on promises, I don't think you do that. I think you sell it on just the fact that San Antonio is a good city. And that there is a particular need that is identified that we will try to address it. San Antonio will never be able to have the type of industry that requires massive water. We can never have that. And Applewhite doesn't deal with the water needs of industry per se. Maybe the recycling of water out of the Dos Rios Plant, maybe that can produce as much water as the Applewhite will produce. We can recycle, that one and you know, everytime I flush my commode, at least I feel that I'm contributing to the economy. That could be direct connection to it.

All I'm trying to say, Mayor, is that you've gone out and you sold San Antonio with the CPS that we have, with the electricity that we have, and with the people that we have. And there's all kinds of ingredients that sells San Antonio, and not just one and there are some

industries that will not come here for one or another reason, you know. But I think something that has been lacking in San Antonio and that has changed over the past few years, is this very positive attitude about the City. And that hasn't cost us money. You know, a positive attitude doesn't cost you money. All you have to do is have that about you. And I think that's what I like about San Antonio today. You know, I drink water from the aquifer and I use electricity from what CPS can generate and the sources that they use to generate the electricity from, etc., etc., etc. And I feel comfortable about the City. But let's not try to make San Antonio something that it can never be. And I don't really know that I would want all the polluting industries, you know, that take alot of water to come into the City. You know, I prefer the computer corporations, and that kind of industry to come here. And I was just responding to the remarks you made. I think they were a little... Anyway, I'm going to vote for the motion Mrs. Dutmer made and that's what I would like to see happen here.

MRS. DUTMER: Council is going to make one to postpone.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Thank you very much, Mr. Eureste. Mr. Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: In light of this lecture that I received on what I would term, "Eureste Economics". It has to do with flushing your commode and making the City grow, I am not prepared to debate this anymore. I'm not prepared to vote on the issue today. I would move that we table this issue for one week.

MR. WING: I would second that.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Motion to postpone.

MR. THOMPSON: Or table.

MR. EURESTE: To what time, sir?

MR. THOMPSON: One week.

MR. WING: Not debatable.

MAYOR CISNEROS: The motion to table would not be debatable.

MR. EURESTE: Of the table?

MR. THOMPSON: For one week.

MAYOR CISNEROS: To postpone for a definite time, would be debatable, as to the merits of that time. You're making the motion to put it on the table. Is that correct?

MR. THOMPSON: That's correct.

MAYOR CISNEROS: And Mr. Eureste, you're seconding?

MR. EURESTE: No.

MAYOR CISNEROS: You cannot do that to a time certain, that is correct. The motion to table is just a motion to table. It would have to be untabled by a majority vote.

MR. THOMPSON: Then I would move to postpone for the time certain, that is one week.

MRS. DUTMER: And that is debatable.

MAYOR CISNEROS: And is debatable only as to the merits of the specific time. That's what's debatable. Mrs. Dutmer do you have a point on it?

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, Mr. Mayor I think that all of us can count and obviously we know why the motion to table, they should've pulled this out.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Do you have some points to be made on the specific time of one week? That's what's debatable on a motion of this ...

MRS. DUTMER: Specific time of one week, indeed I do and one week the full Council will be back here and that is why you want it because you cannot count your votes. I submit to you that if you knew you didn't have the votes here and some were going to be absent, you should have pulled the item. And I would suggest that we go ahead with the vote.

MAYOR CISNEROS: All right. Mr. Thompson, do you have a point?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, the considerations that I have for the full Council making the decision of this City, is sacred. And to invade that and to come in here, tell me you want seven people of this Council or eight people to make decisions I've got three colleagues to my right missing, Mr. Webb is missing and those that want certain things their way to ramroded through here today. I want the whole Council that represents this entire City, every district to be here, and make the decision.

MAYOR CISNEROS: All right.

MR. THOMPSON: Not in abstention. And I want it done next week.

MAYOR CISNEROS: All right. We will proceed with the vote. Did you have something Mrs. Dutmer on that? The Person of the Week?

MRS. DUTMER: Never mind. You don't have the votes anyhow.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Motion to postpone for a week. Those in favor, say I. Opposed NO. We better have a roll call vote.

CITY CLERK: Mr. Wing - Yes: Mr. Eureste - No: Mr. Thompson - Yes: Mr. Alderete -: Mr. Canavan -: Mr. Archer -: Mr. Hasslocher - Yes: Mayor Cisneros - Yes: Mrs. Berriozabal - No: Mr. Webb -: Mrs. Dutmer - No: The motion failed.

MAYOR CISNEROS: On the table now is the amendment which would pass all the bonds but the surface water bonds. Mr. Hasslocher.

MR. HASSLOCHER: Mr. Mayor, thank you. I want to say one thing. Everybody has talked about this problem today. We're at the same situation that one of our cities not too far away from here, today, also is voting on a major situation that will effect the economics, not only of their community, because the City Council would not get together and try to help this major company that provides some 4,000 jobs. Now Monday night, most of you who were at the Commander's Palace all discussed economic development for San Antonio and how critical it is. And yet, because of a situation not too far away from us, that Council can't get the votes to get a major company in there and then we wonder why we can't attract people to San Antonio. And I can assure you that, going back to this February 23rd article about America in trouble with water, pictures don't lie. They tell the truth. And I suggest to my colleagues, that if you don't think this country's facing some major water problems, then you hop on a plane and you go to the West Coast and you talk to those people last summer who could not have water for the yards, no water for the swimming pools, industry was faced with water problems, etc. And I don't want to see San Antonio, including the San Antonio River, be a dry river bed like the West Coast of this country. Thank you.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, Mr. Hasslocher. The San Antonio River and the Medina River were dry. If you were too young to remember it, well, it's not my fault. The economic development of this City does not depend on the Applewhite. You have just heard Mr. Van Dyke say that the water is already there, not as costly as Applewhite, in GBRA. That we can get 50,000 acre feet of water from GBRA and it will not cost you as much getting the 53,000, that's three thousand more, but that will be lost in evaporation and percolation and the rest of it. So, it does not resolve the economic development problems, simply by not going to GBRA or not building the Applewhite. We will have surface water.

I would say that the location of the Applewhite perhaps would direct some of the economic growth to the South. But that is not the purpose of the entire situation. The object is to get water, drinking water for the City of San Antonio. And I simply submit one more time, GBRA, Edwards Underground, SARA, the people that know about water agreed that it was wrong to start with the Applewhite. And whatever else, pure motivations we have and any other words that we can throw around here the fact still remains that the surface water is available. Simply not building the Appelwhite is not going to pull the string on the City of San Antonio and let it go down the tubes. So that argument is false, all the way through.

MAYOR CISNEROS: All right. We will proceed then with the vote. I think that Mr. Schaeffer had indicated as Chairman of the Water Board, that he had a word he wanted to add. Do you have something Mr. Schaeffer?

MR. JOHN SCHAEFFER: Yes, I'm John Schaeffer, Chairman of the City Water Board. I want to be very brief. I'd like to clarify some items that have been discussed here today. Mrs. Dutmer, as you mentioned, you voted yes to the GBRA contract some years ago.

MRS. DUTMER: No, I was out in the audience. I was not on the Council.

MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, you were opposed to it I should say then.

MRS. DUTMER: That's right.

MR. SCHAEFFER: And said there was a contract. I would like to just clear up for this Council that, at that time, the Water Board was instructed to enter into negotiations for a "better contract". I have written this Council, no less than half a dozen times, asking the Council to give me guidance as to what items in that contract, they disagreed with. I have yet to receive a plot reply from any of that correspondence. In the mean time, the concensus has been from the water experts, from the State of Texas, from GBRA, from San Antonio River Authority, from our own experts that any scheme of surface water, other than just the single source of Guadalupe-Blanco using Canyon water, would require the Applewhite reservoir. The Applewhite reservoir is a very integral part of the Cibolo, Cuero complex and is therefore the first priority because all of those later will flow into that as a holding reservoir as well as being a collecting reservoir. And I just wanted to clear those few items up that may be misunderstood by the Council. Thank you.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Mr. Eureste has a question I believe of Mr. Schaeffer.

MR. EURESTE: Well not really of Mr. Schaeffer, but it is directed at the Water Board and there's no response required. It is just a comment that, you know, the 4 million dollars that we're talking about that would be dedicated to the Applewhite out of this issue. I would vote for 4 million dollars if it were applied to dealing with the many, many, breaks your system has. I mean, unbelievable. I feel like an agent to the Water Board, in having to respond to the complaints from my constituents on breaks that they have all over the district, my district, the district that I represent. And I would feel so much better if you had the man-

power, which I think is a problem. I don't know that it is the material. I think it is more the manpower. And you all do, attempt to do the best you can. You categorize, you give priority to those that are producing the greater leaks, and perhaps effecting more of a neighborhood, but even at that, I cannot understand or at least begin to explain to people why it is that they have had to wait a week, two weeks, and three weeks and in some cases, four weeks, for a leak to be repaired that is creating real bad conditions in a neighborhood. In some cases, because of the elevation of the land, and the slope of the land, it creates close to a flooding situation for a neighborhood from leaks from the system that is maintained by the City Water Board. And really instead of being at Applewhite, and this is not your thing; it is the Council's thing really because they voted to go through the Applewhite. Instead of being at the Applewhite, I prefer it to be in over here on Chihuahua Street, and Merida Street and Chipinque Street and any number of those streets dealing with leaks, rather than being out there trying to dig another dry hole.

MR. SCHAEFFER: Well, Mr. Eureste, this last summer, as you know was the driest summer on record in the City of San Antonio. And with the soil that we have, it causes a great swelling and it cracks and so we had a tremendous number of leaks this summer. We used not only the City Water Board staff but we hired, under contract, outside people to handle this. And it was done as expeditiously as possible. I'm sorry there was any inconvenience, but it's a matter that we did everything within our power to bring in outside help as well as our own crew. These items are not related. It's really not a matter of whether you fix a leak.

MR. EURESTE: I understand.

MR. SCHAEFFER: They were fixed as fast as they could be fixed. The land for Applewhite is something that, and the reason that's the first item, is that we hope to be able to acquire this land in the state it is today, rather than to postpone this and, for instance, if you had subdivisions and development out there it would probably preclude the development of that reservoir, if you in fact, had to buy homes and so forth on the property. And that really is where the question lies. And it's a matter of prior planning. And I feel very strongly that prior planning will prevent possible panic.

MR. EURESTE: Thank you.

MAYOR CISNEROS: We'll proceed then with the vote on the amendment.

CITY CLERK: Mrs. Dutmer - Yes:

MAYOR CISNEROS: The amendment is to pass the bonds in question today with the exception of those related to the Applewhite Surface Water Project.

CITY CLERK: Mr. Wing - No: Mr. Eureste - Yes: Mr. Thompson - No: Mr. Alderete -: Mr. Canavan -: Mr. Archer -: Mr. Hassloch - No: Mayor Cisneros - No: Mrs. Berriozabal - Yes: Mr. Webb -: The motion failed on the amendment.

MAYOR CISNEROS: We'll go to the original motion which is to pass the full request that the Water Board has placed before us today. Mr. Thompson has a point.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes. In regards to this, if we could rest with any assurance that those who voted no, would vote for something else, I would have some degree of confidence. But let me say, that that is not the case. It's not either or; it's no here and it's no there, also. There is no implied vote that they'll vote for anything else, either. I am seriously disappointed. This is probably one of the biggest set backs I've suffered since I've been on this Council, to see the Council reverse itself, on surface water, and say no to this. I think it is a dastardly deed we

have done for the people that will be coming behind us, when we have denied them this surface water and what are we going to do now? Now we've got to chart a new course. Let those that say no be creative with the next step.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, I'm sorry you're very angry about it, but if you'll look up the record, you'll see that this Councilwoman has voted no from the inception of Applewhite reservoir, simply because I do not think that it's economically feasible. If you pass four million dollars in bonds today, you still don't own those lands, and until you do get those lands, those people can develop; they can do anything. So that doesn't hold water. That doesn't wash, as far as I'm concerned. I have repeatedly told you that there are other avenues of going for surface water. And it will postpone surface water way down the way. Perhaps you will need Applewhite way, way in the year 2000. I'm not going to have to worry about it.

MR. THOMPSON: But that doesn't mean we can't plan for it?

MAYOR CISNEROS: Mr. Thompson, if you would please, Mrs. Dutmer has the floor.

MRS. DUTMER: Mr. Thompson, you have your viewpoint, I have mine. I have entitled you to yours and I shall be entitled to mine. I still do not think Applewhite, at this time, is economically feasible. I still do not think the fact that you're going to pass four million dollars today to hold in escrow, so that you can purchase lands for the Applewhite is going to prevent those people, until you get that fee simple title in your hand. It is not going to prevent those people from doing anything they want to do to that property that they hold right now. So that argument just doesn't wash as far as I'm concerned. And I have repeatedly told you that I was willing to go a different source of water that is less expensive, is already there, and can be used by this City 'till well into the year 2000 in the century 2000.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Mrs. Dutmer, do I understand that you want us to begin then, the GBRA discussion again?

MRS. DUTMER: I was on the vote that asked for the City Water Board to go back and re-negotiate to see GBRA contract.

MAYOR CISNEROS: I see. We'll take a motion to that effect, as soon as this vote is completed.

MRS. DUTMER: That will be fine.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: Yes, I'm anti-surface water, so I wouldn't vote for GBRA or anything else that deals with surface water. And I ran on that issue in '79, and I was elected by the people from my district, with 68% of the vote. And I ran on the issue again, this year in '81 and was re-elected by 83% of the vote. And all I can say is that I have a mandate from my constituents that I represent to be anti-surface water. They are more concerned in that district, with the problems of an older neighborhood. We do have older mains. And as you will note, we have some funds that are going into the main replacement program. And as we do the streets to reconstruct the streets, to deal with drainage, there is a requirement to adjust the mains that run in the streets. And there is money set aside for that. That's what the people in my district are interested in. They want larger mains so they get at their homes and their place of business. And that's really what people are concerned with, where I come from. My district is not going to be

bringing in new industry, because this is mostly a developed area of town, a developed district. And, you know, I've spoken to that issue and I met with representatives of major organizations and particularly one major organization, that is all over District 5, and I don't know that they are for surface water.

How can I sit here and vote against the wishes of the constituents that I represent? I couldn't do it. And if I was going to do that, I might as well not be here. Might as well have somebody else sitting here. I think if there's anybody to be angry at for not voting, if that is the case, it should be at the people that aren't here. They have a responsibility to be here and vote. And if they are pro-surface water, and they are not here, well that's not my problem. And I came to this Council meeting to deal with the business that we have that comes before us and I'm here to vote.

Now to Mr. Hasslocher, and that's not a direct statement at him, but he did make a statement that was directed at the opponents of this issue, and I am one of those. You know, I have consistently or at least continuously stated that and I agree with Mrs. Dutmer, the Applewhite is not the doing or the undoing of economic development for San Antonio. And that's not what it's about. And if somebody could tell me how it is going to play a role in the water needs of this City, I would be more than glad to listen. But I bet you that even the proponents don't have a clear understanding of how it's going to work. What are the rates going to be with surface water? How does water that comes out the Applewhite, how will that compare with water that comes out of the aquifer, in terms of cost? Applewhite water will have to be treated. And I will grant you that the treatment is going to be three to four times the cost that's involved in the perveying or the word that's used, of aquifer water right now. And that's for the time being. The long run is that it could be between seven and nine times that cost. Because what you've got basically is water that is open to contamination, unlike aquifer water, which is somewhat protected at least by the limestone. You got water that's sitting right in the open. When it rains, the chemical rains that fall right into that reservoir. And when the rivers flow or the streams flow, they're dumping right into that reservoir; water that is contaminated. And it has to be cleaned. That's a very costly operation.

And I think you need to look at that and you need to explain that to the people of San Antonio that that's what you're getting for them. And I don't think there's been a real clear decision made as to how that water is going to be mixed, and where it will be distributed. Will it be mixed with the rest of the aquifer system or is it going to be distributed to certain neighborhoods? Are certain neighborhoods going to get that water? Just what's in line to how the Applewhite is going to be utilized down the road? And I'll grant you that once we have processed Dos Rios water, after we're going to give it all the treatments we're going to give it, that that might be water that's perhaps more ready for use than Applewhite water. We need to think about that. And there's a lot of water that's going to be available out of the Dos Rios Plant. I can't buy the argument and I don't believe that it is going to be the undoing of this City and I won't believe that there is a, that the vote was so much a vote for surface water as it was to get away, or at least do away with the question, once and for all, about surface water. You know, there are some I feel that there were some people that just said let's go and get this behind us and let's move on, because if we committed to surface water, then we will have been committed to surface water in terms of a total strategy that involved Cibolo, that involves GBRA, that involves Cuero one and Cuero two and involves any number of the other resources that have been identified by the Water Board in their master plan. But this Council didn't do that. They just went with Applewhite.

Probably, as Mr. Van Dyke has said, or has not said, or as Mrs. Dutmer has said, probably the least logical of the places to go. The least logical. The one that perhaps produces the shallowest of the reservoirs, that could have been gotten. And then to rely on a system that somehow or another is connected to the flow of water that comes from the aquifer. To tie into that system that's going to be feeding this reservoir and in times of drought, it just isn't going to be there. I don't know. It's a 106 million dollars for an empty hole. That's a lot of money.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Call the roll, please on the main motion.

CITY CLERK: Mr. Webb -: Mrs. Dutmer -

MRS. DUTMER: Wait a minute. The main motion.

MAYOR CISNEROS: The motion to pass the bonds,

MRS. DUTMER: No.

CITY CLERK: Mr. Wing - Yes: Mr. Eureste - No: Mr. Thompson - (couldn't hear how he voted): Mr. Alderete -: Mr. Canavan -: Mr. Archer -: Mr. Hasslocher - Yes: Mayor Cisneros - Yes: Mrs. Berriozabal - No. The motion failed to pass the main motion.

MAYOR CISNEROS: The amendment and main motion both failed. OK we'll move on to the next item, which is the 2 o'clock public hearing on.

MRS. DUTMER: Mr. Mayor?

MAYOR CISNEROS: Yes madam?

MRS. DUTMER: I had my light on if you will please, sir.

MAYOR CISNEROS: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

MRS. DUTMER: All right. At this time, I would like to move that the City Water Board start re-negotiations with the GBRA Authority and that they supply us with the ultimate amount, the largest amount of water that we can negotiate from that source. And if I get a second, I would like to speak to it please.

MAYOR CISNEROS: Motion has seemed to die for lack of a second. We'll move on to the 2 o'clock item, which is the public hearing on consideration of an Ordinance.

The Clerk read the following Ordinance reconvening a public hearing for final determination of the application of Gateway Water Corporation to increase water and sewer rates.

Mayor Cisneros declared open the public hearing on this issue.

Mr. Roger Ibarra, Supervisor of Public Utilities, gave the background history of the petition. The Gateway Water Supply Corp. had filed a petition on July 8, 1980 requesting an overall rate increase of 82.2%. On August 21, 1980, the City Council adopted rules of procedure for public utility rate hearings (Ord. 52662), suspended any action on Gateway's request and designated the Supervisor of Public Utilities to continue the hearing on this application (Ord. 52663).

As a result of the December 2, 1980 hearing on their application, the garbage collection issue was separated from the petition and is being resolved separately. And this Office's recommendation on the water and sewer rates as contained in the Examiner's Report was held up pending clarification and correction of the legal status of Gateway. Under the original articles of incorporation, Gateway Water Supply Corporation was a non-profit entity and therefore not a public utility. Gateway Water Corp. has been correctly incorporated and is a public utility. Gateway refiled their application in March, 1981. By Ordinance No. 53626, April 9, 1981, Council directed this Office to continue the hearing on the merits of their refiling. At the hearing of April 28, 1981, no new evidence or any amendment to the petition was presented by any of the parties to the proceedings. Thus, the issues and positions thereon of all the parties remained the same as those discussed at the hearing of December 2, 1980.

In summary he recommends that:

- 1) allow Gateway to increase its water and sewer revenue by 44.6%, its water revenue by 21.8% and sewer revenue by 85.4%.
- 2) require Gateway to make the necessary system improvements. A report on its plan for compliance will have to be filed with the City within 90 days of the effective date of the ordinance.
- 3) require Gateway to pay interest on deposits.
- 4) do not allow Gateway to discontinue water and sewer service for non-payment of garbage collection fees.
- 5) for water service, the minimum residential bill will increase from \$2.60 to \$3.75 per month and the average residential bill will increase from \$6.80 to \$8.55 per month.
- 6) For sewer service the residential flat rate will increase from \$3.50 to \$6.80 per month.

* * * *

Mr. Thompson stated that he felt the proposed rate increase was too much.

In response to Mr. Thompson's question about the failure of the City to approve this request, Mr. Ibarra felt that the Public Utility Commission on appeal could possibly grant a higher increase than he recommended.

Mr. Thompson expressed concern that the residents of this area must pay a private company for garbage pick-up.

Mr. Nelson Clare, Assistant City Attorney stated that the City of San Antonio is involved in a lawsuit over the matter of a private company operating a garbage pick-up service without a franchise authorized by the City of San Antonio.

Mr. Thompson expressed concern over the proposed rate increases and the garbage pick-up charge they must pay since the City of San Antonio does not provide this service.

Mr. Clare stated that one of the powers of a franchise is to regulate rates and service. Under the Public Utility Commission, garbage is not recognized as a utility.

A discussion then took place about the pending lawsuit in the courts with BFI.

Mr. Thompson stated that he will not vote for this Ordinance until the City can resolve the matter of the garbage pick-up service. He said he would like to postpone this matter until the issue of garbage pick-up is cleared up in court.

No citizen appeared to speak.

Mr. Thompson stated he spoke with Mr. Ralph Rich who had expressed the same concerns.

Mr. Ibarra stated that if the City Council does not act within 120 days from the date the request was made, they can appeal to the Public Utilities Commission.

Mayor Cisneros declared the hearing closed.

Mr. Thompson moved to postpone this item until the matters of water, sewer and garbage services and cost ascertainment is made. Mrs. Dutmer seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion to postpone the Ordinance prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Hasslocher and Cisneros; NAYS: none; ABSENT: Webb, Alderete, Canavan and Archer.

This item was postponed.

81-25

CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Eureste moved items 5-22, constituting the consent agenda be approved, with the exception of items 5, 11, 16, and 18, which were considered individually. Mr. Wing seconded the motion.

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

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 53,746

ACCEPTING THE LOW BIDS OF WHITE PLAINS ELECTRIC COMPANY AND SUMMERS ELECTRIC COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH SIGNAL CABLE AND WIRE FOR A TOTAL OF \$16,385.76.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 53,747

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF FIELD ALTERNATION NO. 2 TO THE CONTRACT FOR THE SAN MARTIN DE PORRES STREET PROJECT, IN THE SUM OF \$36,952, AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 53,748

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF J.R. RAMON & SONS, INC., IN THE SUM OF \$220,618 TO CONSTRUCT THE CHESTERHILL DRAINAGE PROJECT; AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A STANDARD PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACT; APPROPRIATING \$242,818.00 FROM 1980 DRAINAGE AND FLOOD CONTROL GENERAL OBLIGATION BOND FUNDS; AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENTS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 53,749

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF HEATH & DUBOSE, INC., IN THE SUM OF \$49,586.50 TO CONSTRUCT THE ALSBROOK LIFT STATION PROJECT; AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A STANDARD PUBLIC WORKS CONTRACT; APPROPRIATING \$52,186.50 FROM 1980 SEWER REVENUE BOND FUNDS; AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENTS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 53,750

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF FIELD ALTERATION NO. 6 IN THE SUM OF \$13,263.28 TO THE CONTRACT FOR EASTSIDE STREET IMPROVEMENTS - NORTH PROJECT; REVISING THE BUDGET; AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 53,751

APPROVING THE PRICE AND CONDITIONS OF THE SALE BY THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO OF A PORTION OF DISPOSITION PARCEL 7308-R-2, CONTAINING APPROXIMATELY 5,000 SQUARE FEET, LOCATED WITHIN THE KENWOOD NORTH PROJECT, TEX. R-136 TO JESSE D. GONZALES AND WIFE JOSE GONZALES AND JESSE S. GONZALES A SINGLE MAN FOR THE SUM OF \$2,000.00.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 52,752

REPEALING SECTION 1, SUB-SECTION A OF ORDINANCE NO. 53,068 PASSED AND APPROVED ON NOVEMBER 26, 1980, AND ACCEPTING A REFUND FROM FIRST AMERICAN TITLE COMPANY IN THE AMOUNT OF \$810.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 53,753

AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURE OF THE SUM OF \$1,130.00 OUT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING AN EASEMENT TO CERTAIN LANDS IN CONNECTION WITH THE ELKS STREET REHABILITATION PROJECT.

* * * *

A RESOLUTION
NO. 81-25-51

REQUESTING THE STATE HIGHWAY AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION COMMISSION TO DECLARE A CERTAIN PORTION OF AN EXISTING DRAINAGE CHANNEL EASE-

MENT APPURTENANT TO FARM TO MARKET ROAD
2696 IN THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SURPLUS
TO THE NEEDS OF THE STATE OF TEXAS AND
TO EFFECT THE RELEASE OF SAID PORTION TO
THE OWNER OF THE FEE IN THE LAND.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 53,754

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

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 53,755

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT FROM THE GENERAL FUND
TO THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS
FOR MEMBERSHIP DUES FOR THE PERIOD ENDING
JUNE 30, 1982.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 53,756

AUTHORIZING FIRE & EXTENDED COVERAGE INSUR-
ANCE COVERING ALL CURRENTLY INSURED CITY
OWNED PROPERTIES FOR THREE YEARS EFFECTIVE
MARCH 1, 1981.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 53,757

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF REFUNDS TO PERSONS
MAKING OVERPAYMENTS OR DOUBLE PAYMENTS ON
39 TAX ACCOUNTS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 53,758

ACCEPTING THE HIGH BIDS RECEIVED IN
CONNECTION WITH \$2,000,000.00 IN CITY FUNDS
AVAILABLE FOR DEPOSIT IN INTEREST-BEARING
CERTIFICATES OF DEPOSIT.

* * * *

81-25

The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,759

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF RESEARCH
TECHNOLOGY INTERNATIONAL TO FURNISH THE CITY
WITH A FILM INSPECTION MACHINE FOR A TOTAL
OF \$5,170.00.

* * * *

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

Mrs. Dutmer stated that there were two bids submitted by this one company and asked why the City was paying the higher cost.

Mr. John Brooks, Director of Purchasing, stated that the low bid was for the standard machine, and technically that machine did not qualify. The higher cost met all specifications.

Mrs. Dutmer said she had no problem with this as explained by Mr. Brooks.

After discussion, the motion, carrying with the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Hasslocher and Cisneros; NAYS: none; ABSENT: Webb, Alderete, Canavan, and Archer.

81-25 The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,760

APPROVING THE PRICE AND CONDITIONS OF THE PROPOSED SALE BY THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO OF DISPOSITION PARCEL 2313-1, LOCATED WITHIN THE URBAN RENEWAL SACRED HEART ELDERLY HOUSING PROJECT TO EITHER THE MEXICAN AMERICAN UNITY COUNCIL OR S.A. HOGAR, INC., WHICHEVER BIDDER SUCCESSFULLY SECURES THE NECESSARY SECTION 202 FUNDING FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

* * * *

Sister Lynn Stewart, stated she represents S.A. Hogar, Inc., and stated that they have a long history of hard work in this matter and asked that the City Council approve them as the agency to receive the designation, however if the City Council accepts the recommendation of the San Antonio Development Agency, then they will work with this group in order to secure the project.

In response to Mayor Cisneros, Mr. Efrain Garcia, Manager of Planning and Project Management of SADA, stated two bidders submitted a bid. The San Antonio Development Agency authorized the sale to either of the two and to await receipt of the HUD action and award the bid to whoever receives the necessary 202 HUD funding. The deadline for applications is Friday noon.

Mayor Cisneros stated that he would recommend that SA Hogar be awarded the bid since they have worked very hard in this issue.

Mr. Thompson stated that another group is also interested in this project.

In response to Mr. Wing, Mr. Garcia stated that the applications need to be signed in order to be forwarded to HUD.

City Attorney Jane Macon stated that the Ordinance states that whoever receives the funds receives the designation. As far as preference of one over another, she would need to check the regulation on this matter.

Mr. Garcia explained what had transpired at the San Antonio Development Agency meeting with regard to this item.

Mr. Thompson stated that the Bethel group in his district had requested this same type of funds for a senior citizens center.

Ms. Rhea Korsh, Operations Manager, stated that this Ordinance is to allow both organizations to submit the applications to HUD.

Mrs. Dutmer stated she feels that the Mexican American Unity Council should withdraw from this project since S.A. Hogar, Inc., had already done much preliminary work in this matter.

In response to Mr. Hasslocher, Sister Lynn Stewart stated that they were not aware that MAUC was interested in this project until the bids were submitted.

Mr. Mike Garcia, representing the Mexican American Unity Council, stated that they are two blocks away from the area and have been revitalizing the housing in this area for years. They are interested in seeing housing for the elderly secured in this area.

Mrs. Berriozabal agreed with Mayor Cisneros and the work of S.A. Hogar, Inc. She would vote to have S.A. Hogar, Inc. endorsed.

Mr. Eureste stated that if the Council approves the San Antonio Development Agency's recommendation, it gives the community two choices of seeing this project funded. He feels both groups are well prepared.

Mr. Eureste then moved to approve the Ordinance as written. Mr. Wing seconded the motion.

Mrs. Dutmer feels that this matter has caused a deep split in the community. She will go along with this Ordinance.

Mayor Cisneros stated that any Council member wishing to do so could write HUD of their own personal preference.

Mr. Eureste feels it would be best not to get involved at all, in fear of jeopardizing the project.

On roll call the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Hasslocher and Cisneros; NAYS: Thompson; ABSENT: Webb, Alderete, Canavan and Archer.

81-25 The Clerk read the following Ordinance authorizing the name change of Piedmont Avenue to P.S. Wilkinson Avenue in the honor of the late Dr. P.S. Wilkinson.

Mrs. Dutmer moved to deny the street name change and follow the staff's recommendation. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion.

Mrs. Dutmer stated that 80% of the area is opposed to the street name change. She referred to Mr. George Vann's memo and urged the Council not to change the name.

Mr. George Vann, Director of Building Inspections, spoke of the many persons opposed after they were surveyed.

On roll call, the motion to deny the street name change, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Hasslocher, and Cisneros; NAYS: none; ABSENT: Webb, Alderete, Canavan, and Archer.

81-25 The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,761

WAIVING THE PROVISIONS OF ORDINANCE NO. 52865
PROHIBITING COLLECTION OF FUNDS ON PUBLIC STREETS
SO THAT SALES AGENTS OF THE ELECTRONIC REALTY
ASSOCIATION IN SAN ANTONIO CAN COLLECT FUNDS FROM
NOON TO 5:00 P.M. ON MAY 17, 1981 FOR THE MUSCULAR
DYSTROPHY ASSOCIATION.

* * * *

Mr. Thompson moved the Ordinance be approved. Mr. Hasslocher seconded the motion.

Mrs. Dutmer stated she voted against this Ordinance because of the law.

On roll call, the motion, carrying with the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Hasslocher and Cisneros; NAYS: Dutmer; ABSENT: Webb, Alderete, Canavan and Archer.

81-24

ZONING HEARINGS

23. CASE 8471 - to rezone a 0.458 acre tract of land out of NCB 18012, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of City Clerk, in the 15350 Block of N.W. Military Highway, located northeast of the intersection of Hunters Green Drive and N.W. Military Highway, having 120' on N.W. Military Highway and 160.55' on Hunters Green, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District, to "O-1" Office District; a 0.417 acre tract of land out of NCB 18012, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of City Clerk, in the 13800 Block of Hunters Green Drive, located on the north side of Hunters Green Drive, being 160.55' northeast of the intersection of N.W. Military Highway and Hunters Green Drive, having 153.41' on Hunters Green Drive and a maximum depth of 123.59', from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District, to "R-6" Townhouse District; a 3.681 acre tract of land out NCB 18012, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of City Clerk, in the 15350 Block of N.W. Military Highway, located southeast of the Intersection of Vantage Hill Drive and N.W. Military Highway, having 264.68' on Vantage Hill Drive and 566.23' on N.W. Military Highway, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District, to "R-5" Single Family Residential District; a 2.880 acre tract of land out of NCB 18033, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of City Clerk, in the 15340 Block of N.W. Military Highway, located on the north side of N.W. Military Highway, being 120' southeast of the intersection of Hunters Green Drive and N.W. Military Highway, having 649.57' on N.W. Military Highway and depth of 200' from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District, to "B-2" Business District; a 4.924 acre tract of land out of NCB 18033, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of City Clerk, in the 13800 Block of Hunters Green Drive, located on the south side of Hunters Green Drive, being 200.63' northeast of the intersection of N.W. Military Highway and Hunters Green Drive, having 234.57' on Hunters Green Drive and a maximum depth of 976.29', from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District; a 3.549 acre tract of land out of NCB 18033, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of City Clerk, in the 13800 Block of Hunters Green Drive; located on the south side of Hunters Green Drive, being 435.20' northeast of the intersection of N.W. Military Highway and Hunters Green Drive, having 204.32' on Hunters Green Drive, and a maximum depth of 832.93', from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District, to "B-1" Business District.

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

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mrs. Dutmer moved to approve the recommendation of the Zoning Commission for the request of rezoning, provided that proper platting is accomplished and a 6 foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained on the northeast property lines of both tracts. It is further stipulated that a non-access easement and fencing requirement is placed along Hunters Green Drive, save and except the 60' adjacent to the strip center in the corner of N.W. Military Highway and Hunters Green Drive. Mr. Wing seconded the motion. On roll call, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Hasslocher, and Cisneros; NAYS: none; ABSENT: Webb, Alderete, Canavan and Archer.

May 14, 1981
SY

AN ORDINANCE 53,762

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 0.458 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 18012, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF CITY CLERK IN THE 15350 BLOCK OF N.W. MILITARY HIGHWAY, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "O-1" OFFICE DISTRICT; A 0.417 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 18012, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF CITY CLERK IN THE 13800 BLOCK OF HUNTERS GREEN DRIVE, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "R-6" TOWNHOUSE DISTRICT; A 3.681 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 18012, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF CITY CLERK, IN THE 15350 BLOCK OF N.W. MILITARY HIGHWAY, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, TO "R-5" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT; A 2.880 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 18033, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF CITY CLERK, IN THE 15340 BLOCK OF N.W. MILITARY HIGHWAY, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT; A 4.924 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 18033, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF CITY CLERK IN THE 13800 BLOCK OF HUNTERS GREEN DRIVE, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT; A 3.549 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 18033, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF CITY CLERK, IN THE 13800 BLOCK OF HUNTERS GREEN DRIVE, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED AND A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ON THE NORTH-EAST PROPERTY LINES OF BOTH TRACTS. IT IS FURTHER STIPULATED THAT A NON-ACCESS EASEMENT AND FENCING REQUIREMENT IS PLACED ALONG HUNTERS GREEN DRIVE, SAVE AND EXCEPT THE 60' ADJACENT TO THE STRIP CENTER ON THE CORNER OF N.W. MILITARY HIGHWAY AND HUNTERS GREEN DRIVE.

* * * *

24. CASE NO. 8457 - to rezone Lot 7, save and except the east 8.04', Block 2, NCB 9829 in the 100 Block of Parchman Street, located on the north side of Parchman Street, being 200' east of the intersection of S. Flores Street and Parchman Street, having 60' on Parchman Street and 135' of depth, from "A" Single Family Residential District, to "B-1" Business District.

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

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mrs. Dutmer moved to approve the recommendation of the Zoning Commission for the request of rezoning, provided that proper platting is accomplished and a 6' solid screen fence is erected and maintained in the north and east property lines adjacent to the single family residences. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Hasslocher, and Cisneros; NAYS: none; ABSENT: Webb, Alderete, Canavan, and Archer.

AN ORDINANCE 53,763

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 7, SAVE AND EXCEPT THE EAST 8.04', BLOCK 2, NCB 9829, IN THE 100 BLOCK OF PARCHMAN ROAD, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED AND A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ON THE NORTH AND EAST PROPERTY LINES ADJACENT TO THE SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES.

* * * *

25. CASE 8450 - to rezone a 1.8 acre tract of land out of NCB 8683, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of City Clerk, in the 9000 Block of Jones Maltzberger Road, located northeast of the intersection of 281 North Expressway and Jones Maltzberger Road, having 148.42' on Jones Maltzberger Road and 168.30' on 281 North Expressway, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District.

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

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Thompson moved to approve the recommendation of the Zoning Commission for the request of rezoning, provided that proper platting is accomplished. Mrs. Dutmer seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Hasslocher and Cisneros; NAYS: none; ABSENT: Webb, Alderete, Canavan and Archer.

AN ORDINANCE 53,764

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS A 1.8 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 8683, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF CITY CLERK, IN THE 9000 BLOCK OF JONES MALTSBERGER, FROM "A", SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

26. CASE 8470 - to rezone Lot 5, Block A, NCB 11025, in the 2400 Block of E. Southcross Blvd. located southwest of the intersection of Southcross Blvd., and Hillje Street, having 120.23' on E. Southcross Blvd. and 195.5' on Hillje Street, from "B-2" Business District, to "B-3R" Restrictive Business District.

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

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mrs. Dutmer moved to approve the recommendation of the Zoning Commission for the request of rezoning, provided that the applicant work with Traffic for proper street dedication and a 6' solid screen fence is erected and maintained on the south property line. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Hasslocher, and Cisneros; NAYS: none; ABSENT: Webb, Alderete, Canavan, and Archer.

AN ORDINANCE 53,765

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 A, NCB 11025, IN THE 2400 BLOCK OF E. SOUTHCROSS BLVD., FROM "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT, TO "B-3R" RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT THE APPLICANT WORK WITH TRAFFIC FOR PROPER STREET DEDICATION AND A 6' SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ON THE SOUTH PROPERTY LINE.

* * * *

27. CASE 8466 - to rezone tracts 6B and 6C, NCB 12098 on 2969 Nacogdoches Road, located on the northwest side of Nacogdoches Road, being 425' southwest of the setback between Nacogdoches Road and Bitters Road, having 218.5' on Nacogdoches Road and a maximum depth of 230.3' from "B" Two Family Residential District to "O-1" Office District.

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

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mrs. Dutmer moved to approve the recommendation of the Zoning Commission for the request of rezoning, provided that proper platting is accomplished. Mr. Wing seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Hasslocher, and Cisneros; NAYS: Thompson; ABSENT: Webb, Alderete, Canavan and Archer.

AN ORDINANCE 53,766

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 TRACTS 6B AND 6C, NCB 12098, 2969 NACOGDOCHES ROAD, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "O-1" OFFICE DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

28. CASE 8463 - to rezone Lot 3, NCB 14165, in the 2900 Block of Majestic Drive, located on the west side of Majestic Drive, being 300.08' north of the intersection of Ingram Road and Majestic Drive, having 81.8' on Majestic Drive and a maximum depth of 120', from "R-2" Two Family Residential District, to "B-1" Business District; Lot 4, NCB 14165 in the 2900 Block of Majestic Drive, located on the west side of Majestic Drive being 381.88' north of the intersection of Ingram Road and Majestic Drive, having 75' on Majestic Drive and a depth of 120', from "R-2" Two Family Residential District to "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District.

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

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mrs. Dutmer moved to approve the recommendation of the Zoning Commission for the request of rezoning, provided that proper platting is accomplished. Mr. Hasslocher seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Hasslocher and Cisneros; NAYS: none; ABSENT: Webb, Canavan and Archer.

AN ORDINANCE 53,767

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 3, NCB 14165, IN THE 2900 BLOCK OF MAJESTIC DRIVE, FROM "R-2" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT; LOT 4, NCB 14165, IN THE 2900 BLOCK OF MAJESTIC DRIVE, FROM "R-2" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, TO "R-3" MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

29. CASE 8464 - to rezone the northeast 277.5' on the southwest 137.5' of Lot 23-C NCB 11529, 2001-2029 Bandera Road, located 140' southwest of Bandera Road and 178.77' southeast of Sherri Brook Road, having a length of 452.93' and a width of 137.5', from "B-2" Business District, to "B-3R" Restrictive Business District.

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

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Alderete moved to approve the recommendation of the Zoning Commission for the request of rezoning, provided that proper platting is accomplished. Mrs. Berriozabal seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Hasslocher and Cisneros; NAYS: none; ABSENT: Webb, Canavan and Archer.

AN ORDINANCE 53,768

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 NORTHEAST 277.5' ON THE SOUTHWEST 137.5' OF LOT 23-C NCB 11529, 2001-2029 BANDERA ROAD, FROM "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT TO "B-3R" RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

30. CASE 8468 - to rezone Lot 44, Block 7, NCB 11971, 527 Mathilde Drive, located on the north side of Mathilde Drive, being 285' southeast of the intersection of Isom Road and Mathilde Drive, having 97.5' on Mathilde Drive and a maximum depth of 200', from "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District.

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

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Thompson moved to approve the recommendation on the Zoning Commission for the request of rezoning, provided that stipulated right-of-way is granted if necessary. Mrs. Dutmer seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Hasslocher and Cisneros; NAYS: none; ABSENT: Webb, Canavan and Archer.

AN ORDINANCE 53,769

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 44, BLOCK 7, NCB 11971, 527 MATHILDE DRIVE, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT, TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT STIPULATED RIGHT-OF-WAY IS GRANTED IF NECESSARY.

* * * *

81-24 The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,770

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE TWO STANDARD PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACTS WITH WILLIAM E. PARRISH, ARCHITECT, INC., AND BREIG & ASSOCIATE, ARCHITECTS FOR ARCHITECTURAL AND CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT SERVICES NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT THE 2ND YEAR OF THE MULTI-YEAR PLAN TO MODIFY EXISTING CITY FACILITIES FOR HANDICAP ACCESS.

* * * *

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

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

81-24 The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,771

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH ROUTH & COMPANY FOR BROKERAGE SERVICES FOR THE COMMERCIAL LEASE SPACE IN THE RIVER BEND PARKING GARAGE.

* * * *

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

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

81-24 The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,772

SETTING A DATE, TIME, AND PLACE FOR A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED ANNEXATION OF APPROXIMATELY 32± ACRES OF LAND KNOWN AS THE EASTSIDE MIDDLE SCHOOL SUBDIVISION BY THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO; AND AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO PUBLISH NOTICE OF SUCH PUBLIC HEARING.

* * * *

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

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

81-24 The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,773

SETTING A DATE, TIME AND PLACE FOR A PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED ANNEXATION OF APPROXIMATELY 75.33 ACRES OF LAND KNOWN AS THE GANAHL WALKER, JR. TRACT BY THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO: AND AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER TO PUBLISH NOTICE OF SUCH PUBLIC HEARING.

* * * *

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

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

81-24 The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,774

REQUESTING THE ZONING COMMISSION TO EVALUATE THE PRESENT ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS OF PROPERTY BOUNDED BY BABCOCK ROAD ON THE NORTH, ST. CLOUD ROAD ON THE WEST, WOODLAWN AVENUE ON THE SOUTH, AND LOTS FRONTING ON FREDERICKSBURG ROAD ON THE EAST, AND TO HOLD HEARINGS AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL RELATIVE TO ANY REZONINGS WHICH ARE DEEMED PROPER.

* * * *

Mr. Alderete moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion.

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

81-24 The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,775

REQUESTING THE ZONING COMMISSION TO EVALUATE THE PRESENT ZONING CLASSIFICATIONS OF PROPERTY BOUNDED BY ACME ROAD ON THE WEST, COMMERCE STREET ON THE NORTH, THE EAST BOUNDARY OF CITY COUNCIL DISTRICT 6 ON THE EAST, AND KELLY AIR FORCE BASE ON THE SOUTH, AND TO HOLD HEARINGS AND MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COUNCIL RELATIVE TO ANY REZONINGS WHICH ARE DEEMED PROPER.

* * * *

Mr. Thompson moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Alderete seconded the motion.

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

81-24

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

There was no report on the Legislative Program.

81-24

The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,776

APPOINTING COUNCILMEMBERS HELEN DUTMER, JOE WEBB, AND BERNARDO EURESTE TO SERVE AS THE CITY'S REPRESENTATIVES ON THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY (SAN ANTONIO DEVELOPMENT AGENCY) FOR A TERM TO EXPIRE APRIL 30, 1983.

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

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

81-24

The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,777

APPOINTING COUNCILMEMBERS GENE CANAVAN, BERNARDO EURESTE, JOE ALDERETE, TO SERVE AS THE CITY'S REPRESENTATIVES ON THE ALAMO AREA COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS (AACOG) EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE FOR A TERM TO EXPIRE APRIL 30, 1983.

* * * *

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

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

81-24

The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,778

REAPPOINTING COUNCILMEMBER HELEN DUTMER TO SERVE AS AN EX-OFFICIO MEMBER OF THE SAN ANTONIO PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A TERM TO EXPIRE APRIL 30, 1983.

* * * *

Mr. Thompson moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Alderete seconded the motion.

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

81-24 The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,779

AMENDING ORDINANCE NO. 50984 WHICH ESTABLISHED RULES, TIMES,
AND PROCEDURES FOR CONDUCTING COUNCIL MEETINGS.

* * * *

Mr. Alderete moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Hasslocher seconded the motion.

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

81-24 The Clerk read the following Ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 53,780

AUTHORIZING EXPENDITURE OF THE SUM OF \$37,035.00
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.

* * * *

Mrs. Dutmer moved to approve the Ordinance. Mrs. Berriozabal seconded the motion.

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

81-24

HELOTES ISSUE

The following Resolution was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on the motion of Mrs. Dutmer, seconded by Mrs. Berriozabal, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Hasslocher and Cisneros; NAYS: Thompson, Alderete, and Canavan; ABSENT: Webb, and Archer.

A RESOLUTION
NO. 81-25-52

EXPRESSING THE SAN ANTONIO CITY COUNCIL'S INTENT
TO ALLOW A CERTAIN AREA IN THE CITY'S ETJ TO IN-
CORPORATE UPON THE FINALIZATION OF CERTAIN DOCU-
MENTS.

* * * *

Mr. Roland Lozano, Director of Planning, explained the three different alternatives which were discussed by Helotes representatives and staff members. He explained that Proposal C is the staff's recommendation if the Council so desires incorporation for Helotes.

Mr. Hasslocher stated that he has received many calls on this issue and has been told that the Helotes representatives are desiring Proposal A. He stated that if the City of San Antonio cannot provide full services to this area, he expressed concern about annexation.

Mr. Alderete made reference to a letter from H. Kyle Seal in opposition to his property being incorporated in the town of Helotes. (His letter is on file with the papers of this meeting.)

In response to Mr. Alderete, Mr. Lozano stated that after the City of San Antonio gives permission to Helotes for them to incorporate, an election must be held for the people to approve or disapprove the incorporation.

In response to Mr. Thompson about the number of households, Mr. Lozano stated that in Proposal B, 396 homes are listed and in Proposal C, 359 homes are listed.

Mr. Canavan stated that the matter is of tax base in the future, whether it will be San Antonio's or Helotes'. He stated that he is deeply concerned and spoke about recommendations made by the Staff and Planning Commission against incorporation.

Mrs. Dutmer explained why she favors Proposal B. She said that if Mr. Seals is against incorporation then delete that section. She said Helotes is a community and San Antonio can grow around it.

Those citizens speaking for Helotes Incorporation were:

Reverend Bill Henderson stated that they have had discussions with staff on their request for incorporation. He explained how they have compromised from nine square miles to 2.8 square miles. He spoke in favor of Proposal B, and also urged consideration of the tract known as Evans Valley.

Mr. Jim Saunders, attorney representing the City of Helotes, spoke about the tax base in Evans Valley.

In response to Mrs. Dutmer about possible litigation, Mr. Saunders stated that they will be willing to negotiate with Mr. Seals on this matter.

Col. Tom Beatty urged the City Council to approve Proposal B and the tract known as Evans Valley.

Dr. Bob Demski urged the City Council to approve the incorporation of Helotes.

Mr. Eureste moved to approve Plan A. The motion failed for lack of a second.

In response to Mr. Alderete, Mr. Saunders stated that in Plan B, there are two people other than Mr. Seals who do not want to be incorporated. They are included because of the manner in which the lines need to be drawn.

Rev. Henderson stated that they spoke with Mr. Seals about this matter and have assured him of their interest to negotiate with him. Rev. Henderson stated that Mr. Seals does not live in this area. Rev. Henderson stated that a public meeting was held and everyone had an opportunity to speak for or against annexation. He said there is never unanimous support for any one item.

Mrs. Dutmer spoke about recent annexation which took place in several Council member's districts.

Mr. Canavan asked Rev. Henderson about tax base in Plan B to provide adequate fire and policy protection to the residents in the area.

Rev. Henderson responded that they are sure that they can provide it.

In response to Mr. Hasslocher, Rev. Henderson spoke in favor of Proposal B. They have not had adequate time to study Proposal C.

In response to Mr. Thompson, Rev. Henderson spoke about \$400,000 in property taxes, the total approximately \$500,000.

81-24

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

Mr. Alderete moved to hear all COPS speakers, regardless of time, to speak during the Citizens to be Heard. Mr. Eureste seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Hasslocher and Cisneros; NAYS: Canavan; ABSENT: Webb and Archer.

Mr. Alderete then moved to have all COPS speakers speak at one time. Mr. Wing seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Hasslocher and Cisneros; NAYS: none; ABSENT: Webb and Archer.

MRS. BEATRICE CORTEZ

Mrs. Beatrice Cortez, COPS, stated that they have been to City Council about the cost overruns in connection with the South Texas Nuclear Project for many years. She expressed concern about the City's financial condition and the percentage increases approved by the City Council at its "B" Session meeting last week. They commended those Council members voting against the rate increases at last week's meeting.

MR. JOE PERALES

Mr. Joe Perales, Quadrant II Vice President, stated that they are five members of his family. He spoke about the increases in his utility bill and the sacrifices they have made due to these increases.

MR. MIKE GARZA

Mr. Mike Garza, stated that there is a three member family on a fixed income and spoke about their sacrifices due to high utility bills. He asked that the City Council put a ceiling on the South Texas Nuclear Project.

REV. CHARLES PUGH

Rev. Charles Pugh, Pastor of St. Patrick's Church, spoke about utility expanding bills and their need to close their cafeteria this summer. He presented petitions signed by residents of different parishes against the South Texas Nuclear Project.

MRS. FELIZ VASQUEZ

Mrs. Feliz Vasquez spoke about her sacrifices due to the high utility bills due to the South Texas Nuclear Project.

MRS. ANTONIA PANIAQUA

Mrs. Antonia Paniaqua stated that she is on a fixed income and impose a ceiling on the South Texas Nuclear Project.

SISTER CAROLINE LOPEZ

Sister Caroline Lopez, representing Project Energy Care, spoke about their organization and their energy assistance program geared to the handicapped and low-income families. She spoke of the dire need of many families in the City who do not receive any assistance. She said that the citizens can not afford to pay those bills.

MR. AND MRS. TRIAL

Mr. and Mrs. Trial representing the Archdiocese Senior Clerks, also spoke against the proposed CPS rate increase.

MR. ENRIQUE BARRERA

Mr. Enrique Barrera, Vice President of the Edgewood Independent School District, spoke against the CPSB rate increase. He spoke about Edgewood's poor tax base and their inability to pay the utility bills.

MRS. BEATRICE CORTEZ

Mrs. Cortez again spoke to the Council about the matters which have been addressed to the City Council. She urged the City Council to disapprove the rate increases and stated that the City Council should impose a ceiling on the South Texas Nuclear Project.

Mrs. Dutmer stated that the South Texas Nuclear Project is not the only thing that is escalating the costs. The Federal cuts will also affect the citizens. She also spoke about the CPS move to a new building.

* * * *

MR. JAIME MARTINEZ

Mr. Jaime Martinez, representing the International Union of Electrical Employees, AFL-CIO, spoke about their concern for human rights. He spoke about harrassment they have encountered from Police Officers when they began to strike at the TAMPC Manufacturing Company on May 8.

He spoke about an incident when an officer threatened the picketers to dismantle their signs by threatening to call the Immigration Department. He spoke about the hundred years of struggles the Labor Movement has been through.

He stated that the Police Officers acted irresponsibly.

Mayor Cisneros asked Mr. Louis Fox, Deputy City Manager, about the compoment of Police Officers during strike situations. He stated that Chief Heuck is in the audience to respond to this matter.

Chief Heuck stated that the policy is that officers are to follow a neutral position. They are there only to see that no one is hurt. He stated that Traffic Division was first alerted to the company about traffic being blocked. The officers were advising the picketers that they could not block sidewalks or the streets. During this period of time, Mr. Martinez told the Officer that they preferred Spanish Speaking Officers, and this is when remarks were made and the actions that took place. The Patrol Division has been, since that time, patrolling the area and have not witnessed any disturbances. He stated that the statements made by the Officers were unprofessional and they have been reprimanded for their actions.

In response to Mr. Alderete, Chief Heuck stated that these two officers were orally reprimanded.

Mr. Alderete stated that overall performance of the Officers should be reviewed when cases of this nature are brought up.

Chief Heuck stated that record of these oral reprimands were placed in their personnel files.

Mr. Eureste stated that he has a grave concern about the behavior of police officers. He asked the Chief to take a hard look at their attitudes.

Mayor Cisneros spoke about Chief Heuck's statement about police neutrality in these type of cases, and the fact that notations have been made in the officers involved personnel files.

Mr. Martinez stated he would like to see the written notations and said that these are certain officers whose attitudes are contrary to their rights. He wants City Council to be responsive to their concern. He asked about a police car parked inside the company's parking lot.

- - -

MRS. MARGARITA ORTIZ

Mrs. Margarita Ortiz stated that the Police Chief Heuck should resign because he is incompetent to handle police matters.

- - -

MRS. LUPE TORRES VENEMA

Mrs. Lupe Torres Venema, Bexar County Mental Health/Mental Retardation Board, spoke about the waiving of the fee for the use of Pablo's Grove on May 16.

Mr. Alderete moved to co-sponsor the event and thus waive the fee. Mrs. Berriozabal seconded the motion.

Mr. Ron Darmer, Director of Parks & Recreation, spoke about the fee and the costs incurred by the City.

Mr. Thompson stated that he has advised his district constituents that they have to pay the fee and would not vote to approve this waiver.

On roll call, the motion to waive the fee for the Mental Health/Mental Retardation event at Pablo's Grove, passed by the following vote:
AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Alderete, Hasslocher and Cisneros;
NAYS: Thompson; ABSENT: Webb, Eureste, Canavan and Archer.

Mrs. Venema stated that she will be recruiting volunteers to help clean up the park.

81-24

MUNICIPAL COURT

Mr. Alderete stated he does not care about receiving information in the packet about the number of tickets being dismissed. Mr. Thompson seconded the motion.

Mr. Canavan stated that he wants to see weekly reports on vacant lots, junked cars, and zoning violations.

On roll call, the substitute motion to have weekly reports on vacant lot citations, parking violations, zoning violations, and traffic violations, carried by the following vote: AYES: Berriozabal, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Alderete, Canavan, Hasslocher, and Cisneros; NAYS: Thompson; ABSENT: Webb and Archer.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE CITY COUNCIL, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 7:00 P.M.

A P P R O V E D

Henry Cisneros
M A Y O R

ATTEST: *Norma S. Rodriguez*
C I T Y C L E R K