

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 16, 1978.

* * * *

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

78-7 The invocation was given by The Reverend J.M. Coindreau, St. Gregory's Catholic Church.

78-7 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

78-7 The Minutes of the meeting of February 9, 1978 were approved.

78-7 MAYOR PRO-TEM STEEN

Mayor Cockrell expressed her appreciation to Mayor Pro-Tem Steen for a job very well done during his tenure as Mayor Pro-Tem.

78-7 SWEARING-IN CEREMONY

Councilman Phil Pyndus was administered the Oath of Office as Mayor Pro-Tem by City Clerk, G.V. Jackson Jr. Mayor Pro-Tem Pyndus will serve during the period of February 20, 1978 through May 3, 1978.

78-7 ST. MARY'S HALL GOVERNMENT CLASS

Mayor Cockrell welcomed a class of twenty-eight government students from St. Mary's Hall. They were accompanied by their instructor, Mr. Hume Crowe.

78-7 ZONING HEARINGS

1. CASE 7166 - to rezone Lots 87 and 88, Block 34, NCB 13490, in the 8400 Block of Blanco Road, from "R-2" Two Family Residential District and "B-3" Business District to "B-2" Business District, located on the northeast side of Blanco Road, being 90' northwest of the intersection of Blanco Road and Patricia Drive; having 275.87' on Blanco Road and a maximum depth of 268.02'.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change which the Zoning Commission recommended be denied by the City Council. He also informed the Council that nine votes will be required to approve the rezoning due to 20 percent opposition.

Mr. Bob Jones, representing the applicants, Mr. and Mrs. Dever Tomerlin, stated that they have had numerous offers to lease or sell this piece of property; however, due to the "R-2" zoning, it has been very difficult to do anything with the property. The area commencing at the subject site all the way to West Avenue is zoned "B-3". The property directly across the street is the back entrance to the Handy Andy Supermarket. From the center of the subject property you can see the loading docks which makes it very undesirable for "R-2" development. He also stated that there are only about three residences facing onto Blanco Road in the immediate area. He also stated that the area west and east of West Avenue, is all "B-2" and "B-3" at this time. There is also a privacy fence on the east and south property line of the subject property which isolates it from residential property.

He then stated that they are now willing to compromise and amend their request as per staff recommendation and that is "B-2" on Lot 87 and "O-1" on Lot 88. In response to Mayor Cockrell's question, Mr. Jones described the possible office uses that they have in mind for the "O-1" office zoning and the possible commercial uses for the "B-2" zone.

Mr. Pyndus stated that he is familiar with the area and that any type of business would increase the traffic in the area. He also felt that the requested change in zone would remove the buffer between the residential and commercial area.

Mr. Hobart Kanatzar spoke of the number of times he has been before the City Council and the Zoning Commission in opposition. He spoke of the value of the homes in the area and stated that the commercial business zoning would encroach their neighborhood. He also spoke in opposition to the compromise requested by Mr. Jones for "O-1" zoning.

Mr. Ivie Klaeveman stated that this property is immediately adjacent to the property in question and also spoke in opposition to any commercial rezoning.

Mrs. Ivie Klaeveman also spoke in opposition because of the additional traffic that will be generated.

Mr. Clem Lyons, 819 Patricia, stated that any rezoning will remove the buffer which exists between the residential and commercial area, and stated that this is a case of spot zoning.

In response to Mr. Alderete, Mr. Gene Camargo, explained why the staff did not object to "O-1" on Lot 88 and "B-2" on Lot 87. They feel that the "B-2" classification would provide a transition away from the "B-3" business node.

Mr. Dean Walter, 823 Patricia Drive, also spoke in opposition and distributed photographs of the area to the Council. He spoke against the rezoning change.

The following groups of persons also spoke in opposition for the same reasons given by the previous speakers:

Mr. George Haile
Mrs. Dean Walter

* * * *

In rebuttal, Mr. Jones stated that there is a lot of foot traffic through the applicant's property and does not agree with the opponent's statements about spot zoning. He also stated that the proposed use would be the highest and best use for the subject property.

After discussion, Mr. Pyndus moved to uphold the recommendation of the Zoning Commission and deny the rezoning and stated that rezoning would encroach on the neighborhood. Mr. Wing seconded the motion.

Mrs. Dutmer spoke against the motion. She stated that the highest and best use of the subject property will be denied the applicants. She further stated that the subject property abutts the back of the neighbor's property and feels that "O-1" will provide a buffer. She also stated that she did not agree that this is a case of spot zoning.

Mr. Hartman spoke of the problems of converting these lots into residential use. He also expressed concern about curb cuts.

In response to a question by Mr. Hartman, Mr. Camargo stated that non-access easements can be imposed to address the matter of curb cuts.

After discussion of the matter of curb cuts, Mr. Hartman made a substitute motion to approve the recommendation of the Staff, that is, to approve the rezoning of Lot 87 to "B-2" and Lot 88 to "O-1" provided that single access to each lot be imposed. Mrs. Dutmer seconded the motion.

Councilmen Wing, Pyndus and Eureste spoke in opposition to the substitute motion.

In response to a question by Dr. Cisneros, the opponents stated that they are not agreeable to rezoning both lots for "O-1" use.

On roll call, the substitute motion failed to carry by the following vote: AYES: Dutmer, Hartman; NAYS: Cisneros, Webb, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Steen, Cockrell; ABSENT: None.

On roll call, the main motion to deny the request for rezoning carried by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Hartman, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

CASE 7166 was denied.

2. CASE 7153 - to rezone Lots 20 thru 27, Block 4, NCB 8179, in the 200 Block of Bexar Drive, from "R-2" Two Family Residential District to "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District, located southwest of the intersection of Bexar Drive and Evelyn Drive; having 518.02' on Bexar Drive and 135' on Evelyn Drive.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change which the Zoning Commission recommended be denied by the City Council.

Mr. Abe Ribak, representing the applicant, Mr. Morris Feingold, stated that the applicant would like the requested change in zone in order to develop Phase II of the existing apartments. He spoke of the need for housing in this area and stated that these apartments will provide more housing. The exterior of the proposed complex will match that of the existing structure and will add to the city's tax base. They are willing to accept any stipulations imposed by the Council. He also stated that there will be no on-street parking required.

Mr. Pete Cantu also stated that the highest and best use for the subject property would be apartments. Ingress and egress would be between the buildings and no access to the apartments on Bexar Drive. He stated that the owner of the subject property is willing to screen the property with a brick wall.

The following groups of citizens living on Bexar Drive then spoke in opposition to the requested change. They would not oppose the building of duplexes on the subject property but are opposed to apartments. They complained of the noise, off street parking and the additional traffic since the erection of the present apartments and stated that they are not in favor of the brick wall that is being proposed to serve as buffer. They also complained of the condition of the vacant lot. Those speaking were:

Mr. Ralph Gamber, 227 Bexar Drive
Mrs. Audrey Gamber, 227 Bexar Drive
Mr. Roger Garcia, 240 Bexar Drive
Mr. Arturo Villarreal, 223 Bexar Drive
Mrs. John Hernandez, 247 Bexar Drive
Mrs. Frances L. Perez, 219 Bexar Drive
Mrs. Bertha Hernandez, 247 Bexar Drive

* * * *

In rebuttal, Mr. Ribak stated that the applicant will be deprived of the use of his property and stated that a larger piece of property was recently rezoned just immediately to the north for apartments. He stated that this would be the highest and best use of the subject property. He asked Council to favorably consider their request.

After consideration, Mr. Alderete moved to uphold the recommendation of the Zoning Commission and deny the rezoning. Mr. Alderete also asked that the staff be directed to see that the vacant lot mentioned by the opponents be cleaned. Mr. Ortiz seconded the motion.

Mr. Ribak asked for a postponement of the case so that they may have an opportunity to speak to the opponents.

Mayor Cockrell stated that there is not much room for compromise between a "R-2" Two Family Residential District and "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District and did not see a postponement as being advantageous for a compromise.

On roll call, the motion to deny carried by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Hartman, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

CASE 7153 was denied.

3. CASE 7114 - to rezone Lot 71, Block 5, NCB 14002, 11118 Claypool Court, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "R-2" Two Family Residential District, located northeast of the intersection of Sugarhill Drive and Claypool Court; having 150' on Sugarhill Drive and 80' on Claypool Court.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change which the Zoning Commission recommended be denied by the City Council.

Mr. Joe Ross, representing the applicants, Mr. and Mrs. George H. Braun, stated that they are requesting a change in zone in order to build a duplex. He has attempted to speak to the neighbors but has been unsuccessful in his attempts.

In response to a question by Mr. Pyndus, Mr. Camargo stated that the staff had recommended denial because both Claypool Court and Sugarhill Drive serve the single family development in the area and it is their opinion that this should continue.

Mr. Pyndus stated that he has toured the area and concurs with the staff's comments.

Mr. Eric Steinfelt spoke in opposition to the requested change. He stated that the Brauns have been before the Council before in an attempt to rezone the subject property for use as an ice house. He asked Council to reject the request for rezoning.

In response to a question by Mr. Hartman, Mr. Camargo stated that the staff did not object to "R-2" across the street because of the traffic already on Sugarhill Drive.

Mr. Stanley Pawelek, 1110 Claypool Court, also spoke in opposition to the requested change.

In rebuttal, Mr. Ross stated that the highest and best use for the subject property is for use as a duplex and asked the Council to approve the request.

After discussion, Mr. Pyndus moved to uphold the recommendation of the Zoning Commission and deny the rezoning. Mr. Wing seconded the motion.

Dr. Cisneros then spoke about the proposed use and stated that he felt that a duplex would not be detrimental to the neighborhood. He then made a substitute motion to overrule the recommendation of the Zoning Commission and grant the rezoning. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

Mr. Pyndus and Mrs. Dutmer spoke against the substitute motion.

Mr. Eureste spoke in favor of the substitute motion.

Mayor Cockrell spoke against the substitute motion because she feels that there is a difference between single family dwellings and duplexes.

On roll call, the substitute motion failed to carry by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Eureste, Hartman, Steen; NAYS: Dutmer, Wing, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Cockrell; ABSENT: None.

On roll call, the main motion to deny the rezoning carried by the following vote: AYES: Dutmer, Wing, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Cockrell; NAYS: Cisneros, Webb, Eureste, Hartman, Steen; ABSENT: None.

CASE 7114 was denied.

78-7 The meeting was recessed at 3:35 P.M., and reconvened at 4:00 P.M.

78-7 SECRETARY OF STATE STEVEN C. OAKES

Mayor Cockrell welcomed the Honorable Steven C. Oakes, Secretary of State, to the Council meeting.

Mr. Steven C. Oakes greeted the Council and spoke of their efforts in voter registration. He said that there are approximately eight million eligible voters in Texas and only five million who are registered. In Bexar County, there are 219,000 eligible voters who are not registered. He then spoke of the new registration laws which have been passed. One of these provides for postage-free registration. He also stated that the new registration forms are now bi-lingual. He stated that the Secretary of State has a toll free number, 1-800-252-9333, which is available to anyone seeking voter registration information.

Mr. Oakes also explained some of the facts concerning the new yellow certificates which have been issued. He stated that the Blue Card is only good through June 30, 1978 and urged everyone who is not registered to vote to do so.

Several Council members then commended Mr. Oakes for his efforts in voter registration.

78-7 MRS. HELEN DUTMER

Councilwoman Helen Dutmer stated that she wished to announce publicly that there is no truth to the rumor that she will be resigning from the City Council.

78-7 ZONING HEARINGS (Continued)

4. CASE 7172 - to rezone a 2.494 acre tract of land out of NCB 14591, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk, in the 12500 Block of Nacogdoches Road, from "B-1" and "B-2" Business Districts to "B-3" Business District, located on the southeast side of Nacogdoches Road, being 195.07' southwest of the cutback between Nacogdoches Road and Leonhardt Road; having 125' on Nacogdoches Road and a maximum depth of 330'.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change, which the Zoning Commission recommended be denied by the City Council.

Mr. John Dodds, President of U-Haul Companies in San Antonio, stated that they are requesting the change in zone in order to build a mini-warehouse complex on the subject property. He stated that there has been no opposition from the neighborhood and feels this is a good use for the property.

No one spoke in opposition.

After discussion, Dr. Cisneros moved to overrule the recommendation of the Zoning Commission and grant the rezoning. Mr. Webb seconded the motion.

Councilmen Hartman and Steen spoke in favor of the motion.

Mrs. Dutmer and Mr. Pyndus each spoke in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Hartman asked Dr. Cisneros to include the stipulation that a six foot solid screen fence be erected and maintained adjacent to the single family dwellings. Dr. Cisneros agreed to include this stipulation as part of his motion to approve the rezoning.

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

AN ORDINANCE 49,051

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 2.494 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 14591, LOCATED ON THE SOUTHEAST SIDE OF NACOGDOCHES ROAD, BEING 195.07' SOUTHWEST OF THE CUTBACK BETWEEN NACOGDOCHES ROAD AND LEONHARDT ROAD; HAVING 125' ON NACOGDOCHES ROAD AND A MAXIMUM DEPTH OF 330', BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, IN THE 12500 BLOCK OF NACOGDOCHES ROAD, FROM "B-1" AND "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICTS TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERRECTED AND MAINTAINED ADJACENT TO THE SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING.

* * * *

5. CASE 7148 - to rezone Lot 6, the east 15' of Lot 5 and the west 18' of Lot 7, Block 37, NCB 1848, 1216 W. Mistletoe Avenue, from "B" Two Family Residential District and "J" Commercial District to "B-1" Business District, located on the southside of W. Mistletoe Avenue, being 157' west of the intersection of W. Mistletoe Avenue and Capitol Avenue; having 58' on W. Mistletoe Avenue and a depth of 125'.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change, which the Zoning Commission recommended be denied by the City Council.

Councilman Alderete stated that he had requested a postponement of this case and has had the opportunity to discuss the zoning change with the proponents and opponents of the Case. He will be recommending that the Council uphold the recommendation of the Zoning Commission and the staff to deny the request. He said Mr. Morris has already found another place to relocate his business and has requested a 120 day delay in order to have time to move the equipment already on the subject property. The opponents have also agreed to this 120 day delay.

Mr. David Morris, the applicant, then spoke to the Council. He stated that some equipment had been moved onto the subject property prior to becoming aware that a zoning change would be needed. This 120 day period will give him time to move this equipment without being in violation of the zoning code.

No one spoke in opposition.

The Council concurred with Mr. Alderete's recommendation that the zoning not be enforced for a period of 120 days.

Mr. Alderete then moved to deny the request for rezoning. Mr. Pyndus seconded the motion. On roll call, the main motion to deny the rezoning carried by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Hartman, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

CASE 7148 was denied.

The staff was instructed not to enforce the present zoning restrictions for a period of 120 days.

6. CASE 7157 p.p. - to rezone the remaining portions of Lots 12 and 13, Block 1, NCB 7185, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located west of the cutback between I.H. 10 Expressway and Sherwood Drive; having 219.1' on I.H. 10 Expressway, 204' on Sherwood Drive and 49' on the cutback between I.H. 10 Expressway and Sherwood Drive.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change, which the Zoning Commission recommended be denied by the City Council.

Mr. Henry W. Christopher, Jr., 4402 Vance Jackson, stated that he and Mr. Clyde E. Johnson are prospective purchasers of the subject property, subject to the rezoning. At the present time, the property is zoned for residential purposes. They displayed charts to the Council depicting the traffic patterns and uses in the area. He also stated that the property is not properly classified as a residential use due to the noise and generation of traffic on the expressway. The highest and best use of the subject property is for business use. He asked Council to approve the "B-2" as recommended by the Zoning Commission.

Mr. Ralph Smith, owner of the subject property at 207 Sherwood Drive, stated that the area is no longer conducive to residential use because of the traffic and noise of the expressway which is north of the subject property. He also stated that the area is transitioning to commercial.

Mr. Don Smith, son of the owner of the property, stated that he works at Southwest Research as a Senior Research Physicist in the Department of Applied Physics. Their specialty is in the field of noise and vibration levels. He stated that his father's house had to be moved 40 feet when the Expressway I.H. 10 was built and the house is now located only 80 feet from the first lane of I.H. 10. Traffic has increased from 59,197 vehicles in 1974 to 68,000 in 1977. It is estimated that this will be increased and by 1985, the figure will be 83,000. He stated that the noise factor makes it unacceptable for use as a residence.

Speaking in opposition, Mr. Bob Dulongish, 232 Sherwood, said that he has spoken to the residents of the area and they are very much opposed to the requested change in zone. He also stated that they are willing to speak to the proponents to discuss a comprehensive zoning plan for the area but are opposed to any "B" zoning being granted.

Mr. John O'Connell, 250 Sherwood, also spoke in opposition. He stated that this would be a case of spot zoning and is a piecemeal approach to the problem.

Mr. Hartman then spoke about the subject property and its location to the expressway.

Mr. Christopher then distributed some photographs of the subject area. He stated that a letter distributed by Mr. Dulongish was misleading in that uses for "B-3" were also listed for the subject property. He asked Council to approve the change in zoning.

After consideration, Mr. Eureste moved to approve the recommendation of the Zoning Commission and grant the rezoning. Mr. Alderete seconded the motion.

Mr. Pyndus spoke in opposition to the motion. Dr. Cisneros and Mr. Hartman, both, spoke in favor of the motion.

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

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 REMAINING PORTIONS OF
 LOTS 12 AND 13, BLOCK 1, NCB 7185, FROM "A" SINGLE
 FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS
 DISTRICT.

* * * *

7. CASE 7109 - to rezone the Southeast 342' of Lot 4, NCB 11268, 8003 Somerset Road, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located on the northwest side of Somerset Road, being 1799.7' northeast of the intersection of I.H. 35 South Expressway and Somerset Road; having 178' on Somerset Road and a maximum depth of 342'.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change which the Zoning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council. Mr. Camargo also stated that there was 20 percent opposition, so nine affirmative votes will be needed to grant the rezoning.

After consideration, Dr. Cisneros moved to approve the recommendation of the Zoning Commission and grant the rezoning. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

In response to Mr. Pyndus' question, Mr. Camargo explained that the staff had recommended denial of the requested change because of the immediate abutting residential development to the east, north and south of the subject property.

No one spoke in opposition.

On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote:

AN ORDINANCE 49,053

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 SOUTHEAST 342' OF LOT
 4, NCB 11268, 8003 SOMERSET ROAD, FROM "B" TWO
 FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS
 DISTRICT.

* * * *

8. CASE 7142 - to rezone Lots 43 & 69-A and the east 150' of Lots 71-C, 71-B, and the east 54.8' of 70-A, NCB 11882, 7900 Block of Teak Lane, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "O-1" Office District, located 55' northeast of the intersection of Sunset Road and Teak Lane, having 445' on Teak Lane and extending north 300' with a maximum depth of 150'; and Lots 44, 45, 46, 47-A, 48-A, and Lots 70-A, 71-C, 71-B, save and except the east 150', NCB 11882, 400 Block of W. Sunset Road from "A" Single Family Residential District to "I-1" Light Industrial District, located on the north side of Sunset Road, 610' northwest of the intersection of Sunset Road and Teak Lane, having 96' on Sunset Road a maximum depth of approximately 850'.

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

Dr. Cisneros moved to approve the recommendation of the Zoning Commission and grant the rezoning. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

In response to Mr. Hartman's question, Mr. Camargo stated that the staff had recommended approval with the stipulation that a six foot solid screen fence is erected along Teak Lane and adjacent to residential development to serve as a buffer.

Council discussed the staff's recommendation of the non-access easement and the recommendation made by the Zoning Commission.

Mr. John Killian, the applicant, then spoke to the Council and stated why in his opinion the recommendations made by the Zoning Commission on the non-access easement would be more acceptable.

No one spoke in opposition.

The Council then concurred and agreed that the rezoning be granted, provided that proper platting is accomplished; and that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained along Teak Lane and adjacent to residential development; and that a one foot non-access easement is imposed along Teak Lane save and except the south 75' and the north 50'.

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

AN ORDINANCE 49,054

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOTS 43 & 69-A, AND THE EAST 150' OF LOTS 71-C, 71-B, AND THE EAST 54.8' OF 70-A, NCB 11882, 7900 BLOCK OF TEAK LANE, from "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "O-1" OFFICE DISTRICT AND LOTS 44, 45, 46, 47, 48-A, AND LOTS 70-A, 71-C, 71-B, SAVE AND EXCEPT THE EAST 150', NCB 11882, 400 BLOCK OF W. SUNSET ROAD, FROM "A" SINGLE RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED; AND THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG TEAK LANE AND ADJACENT TO RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT; AND THAT A ONE FOOT NON-ACCESS EASEMENT IS IMPOSED ALONG TEAK LANE, SAVE AND EXCEPT THE SOUTH SEVENTY-FIVE FEET AND THE NORTH FIFTY FEET.

* * * *

9. CASE 7156 - to rezone Lots 20 thru 25, the remaining portions of Lots 19 and 38, and the northeast 289.72' of Lot 39, Block 1, NCB 12811, in the 7500 and 7600 Block of Louis Pasteur Drive, from Temporary "A" Single Family Residential District and "D" Apartment District to "B-2" Business District; the remaining portion of Lot 38 and the northeast 289.72' of Lot 39 are located on the southeast side of Louis Pasteur Drive, being 255' northeast of the intersection of Louis Pasteur Drive and Babcock Road; having 637.27' on Louis Pasteur Dr. and a depth of 249.17'; lots 20 thru 25, and the remaining portion of Lot 19 are located on the northeast side of Salk Drive between Louis Pasteur Drive and Oak Manor Drive; having 249.57' on Salk Drive, 642.03' on Louis Pasteur Dr. and 672.35' on Oak Manor Drive; Lot 43, Block 1, NCB 12811, in the 7500 Block of Louis Pasteur Drive, from Temporary "A" Single Family Residential District and "D" Apartment District to "B-3" Business District, located on the southeast side of Louis Pasteur Drive, being 47.67' southwest of the intersection of Salk Drive and Louis Pasteur Drive; having 51.76' on Louis Pasteur Drive and extending 800' southeast.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Steen made a motion that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that proper platting is accomplished. Dr. Cisneros seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Hartman, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 49,055

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOTS 20 THRU 25, THE REMAINING PORTIONS OF LOTS 19 AND 38, AND THE NORTHEAST 289.72' OF LOT 39, BLOCK 1, NCB 12811, IN THE 7500 AND 7600 BLOCK OF LOUIS PASTEUR DRIVE FROM TEMPORARY "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND "D" APARTMENT DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT AND LOT 43, BLOCK 1, NCB 12811, IN THE 7500 BLOCK OF LOUIS PASTEUR DRIVE, FROM TEMPORARY "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND "D" APARTMENT DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

10. CASE 7168 - to rezone Lots 49 and 50, NCB 11304, 1909-1915 Quintana Road, from "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District to "R-4" Mobile Home District, located on the northwest side of Quintana Road, being 505' northeast of the intersection of Southcross Boulevard and Quintana Rd; having 200' on Quintana Road and a depth of 268'.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the proposed change, which the Zoning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council. Mr. Camargo also stated that there is 20 percent opposition, so nine affirmative votes will be needed to grant the rezoning.

Mr. Wayne Campbell, the applicant stated that they brought this property in question in 1969 at which time it was zoned "LL" Manufacturing. In 1970, they secured a permit for a mobile home park. However, due to lack of financial resources, they were unable to pursue this project. Also, at this time, there was limited access to Quintana Road. He was unaware the property had been rezoned to "R-3". When he began to proceed with the project again, he found out that he no longer could develop a mobile home park because of the zoning. It is their intention to maintain the property in good cleaning condition. At this time, they would like to place only one mobile home. His stepson and wife will be living in this mobile home so that he can take care of the property and the two duplexes on the property.

Mr. Tom Herrera spoke in opposition to the request for rezoning. He stated that this is a residential area and the neighborhood is very well maintained. He also stated that a mobile home is not suitable for the subject property and spoke of the traffic problem already present in the area.

Mr. Pyndus described the surrounding area and stated that he did not feel that the proposed use would be detrimental to the area.

Mrs. Evelyn Herrera, 2001 Quintana Road, then spoke to the Council stating that several residents did not receive the notices and that is why more

notices in opposition were not received. She also stated that more than one mobile home is planned for the area and the lot size is too small to accommodate the number of mobile homes allowed in the requested zone.

Mr. Wing stated that he has toured the area and in his opinion it is very congested. He stated that the City Code calls for three acres and the subject property is only 1.2 acres. He could not support a request for rezoning.

After discussion, Mr. Pyndus moved to approve the recommendation of the Zoning Commission and grant the rezoning. Mr. Steen seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion failed by the following vote:
AYES: Pyndus, Steen; NAYS: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Cockrell; ABSENT: Hartman.

CASE 7168 was denied.

42
11. CASE 7185 - to rezone Lot 19, Block 2, NCB 14675, 8561 Rochelle Road, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "R-2" Two Family Residential District, located on the west side of Rochelle Road, being southwest of the intersection of Rochelle Road and Whitby Road; having 365' on Rochelle Road and a maximum depth of 904'.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

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

AN ORDINANCE 49,056

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 19, BLOCK 2, NCB 14675, 8561 ROCHELLE ROAD, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "R-2" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

12. CASE 7141 - to rezone Lot 62, Block E, NCB 11543, 5042 Callaghan Road, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located southwest of the intersection of Callaghan Road and Parkway Drive; having 160' on Callaghan Road and 306.49' on Parkway Drive.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Steen made a motion that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that proper platting is accomplished. Mr. Webb seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Alderete, Pyndus, Hartman, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Ortiz.

AN ORDINANCE 49,057

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 62, BLOCK E, NCB 11543, 5042 CALLAGHAN ROAD, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

13. CASE 7154 - to rezone Lots 7, 8 and 9, NCB 12180, 2220 Austin Highway, from "A" Single Family Residential District and "H" Local Retail District to "B-3" Business District, located on the southeast side of Austin Highway being 900' northeast of the intersection of Lanark Drive and Austin Highway; having 240.5' on Austin Highway and a maximum depth of 823.7'.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Pyndus made a motion that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained along the fifteen foot alley abutting the residences fronting onto Ashland and along the east property line. Mr. Steen seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Alderete, Pyndus, Hartman, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Ortiz.

AN ORDINANCE 49,058

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOTS 7, 8 AND 9, NCB 12180, 2220 AUSTIN HIGHWAY, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND "H" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG THE FIFTEEN FOOT ALLEY ABUTTING THE RESIDENCES FRONTING ONTO ASHLAND AND ALONG THE EAST PROPERTY LINE.

* * * *

14. CASE 7169 - to rezone a 23.06 acre tract of land out of Block 3, NCB 15176, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk, in the 7700 Block of U.S. Highway 90 Expressway, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located southeast of the intersection of U.S. Highway 90 Expressway, S.W. Loop 410 Expressway, north of Ferncroft Drive and west of Springvale Drive, having 1156.85' on U.S. Highway 90 Expressway, 1239.8' on S.W. Loop 410 Expressway, 437.74' on Ferncroft Drive and 493.5' on Springvale Drive.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Steen made a motion that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that a one foot non-access easement and a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained along Cedarhurst Drive and along the north line of the requested "R-2" (North side of existing alley); and that proper platting is accomplished. Mr. Pyndus seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Alderete, Pyndus, Hartman, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Ortiz.

AN ORDINANCE 49,059

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 23.06 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF BLOCK 3, NCB 15176, LOCATED SOUTHEAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF U.S. HIGHWAY 90 EXPRESSWAY, S.W. LOOP 410 EXPRESSWAY, NORTH OF FERN-CROFT DRIVE AND WEST OF SPRINGVALE DRIVE, HAVING 1156.85' ON U.S. HIGHWAY 90 EXPRESSWAY, 1239.8' ON S.W. LOOP 410 EXPRESSWAY, 434.74' ON FERNCROFT DRIVE AND 493.5' ON SPRINGVALE DRIVE, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, IN THE 7700 BLOCK OF U.S. HWY. 90 EXPRESSWAY, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT,

44

PROVIDED THAT A ONE FOOT NON-ACCESS EASEMENT AND A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG CEDARHURST DRIVE AND ALONG THE NORTH LINE OF THE REQUESTED "R-2" (NORTH SIDE OF EXISTING ALLEY); AND THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

15. CASE 7170 - to rezone the southwest 215' and the north 130' of the remaining portion of Lot 2, Block 5, NCB 13476, 800 Block of W. Thompson Place and 3000 Block of Saturn Street from "D" Apartment District and "F" Local Retail District to "B-2" Business District, located on the southside of W. Thompson Place between Frio City Rd. and Saturn St.; having 310' on W. Thompson Pl. and 130' on Saturn St. and Frio City Road. The southwest 215' of the remaining portion of Lot 2 is located between Saturn and Frio City Rd. approximately 680' southwest of W. Thompson Place, having 215' on Saturn and Frio City Rd. with a width of 124.31'. And the remaining portion of Lot 2 save and except the north 130' and the southwest 215', Block 5, NCB 13476, 800 Block of W. Thompson Place and 3000 Block of Saturn Street, from "F" Local Retail District to "B-3" Business District, located between Saturn St. and Frio City Road approximately 130' south of W. Thompson Place, having 350' on Saturn St. and 520' on Frio City Road with a maximum width of 230'.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Webb made a motion that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that proper platting is accomplished and that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained and a one foot non-access easement is imposed along Saturn Street and Thompson Place. Mr. Steen seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Webb, Dutmer, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Hartman, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cisneros, Wing.

AN ORDINANCE 49,060

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 SOUTHWEST 215' AND THE NORTH 130' OF THE REMAINING PORTION OF LOT 2, BLOCK 5, NCB 13476, 800 BLOCK OF W. THOMPSON PLACE AND 3000 BLOCK OF SATURN STREET FROM "D" APARTMENT DISTRICT AND "F" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT AND THE REMAINING PORTION OF LOT 2 SAVE AND EXCEPT THE NORTH 130' AND THE SOUTHWEST 215', BLOCK 5, NCB 13476, 800 BLOCK OF W. THOMPSON PLACE AND 3000 BLOCK OF SATURN STREET, FROM "F" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED AND THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED AND A ONE FOOT NON-ACCESS EASEMENT IS IMPOSED ALONG SATURN STREET AND THOMPSON PLACE.

* * * *

16. CASE 7171 - to rezone the south 100' of Lots 28, 29 and 30, Block 2, NCB 8674, in the 8600 Block of Airport Boulevard, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located northwest of the intersection of Airport Boulevard and Parkridge Drive; having 100' on Airport Boulevard and 84.49' on Parkridge Drive.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

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

AN ORDINANCE 49,061

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS THE SOUTH 100' OF LOTS 28, 29 AND 30, BLOCK 2, NCB 8674, IN THE 8600 BLOCK OF AIRPORT BOULEVARD, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

17. CASE 7174 - to rezone all of Block 1, NCB 16660, Block 2, NCB 16661, and Block 3, NCB 16662, in the 9100 and 9200 Blocks of Serene Creek Drive, in the 3100 Block of Swandale Drive, in the 3100 Block of Twisted Creek Drive, in the 9200 Block of Bent Elm Creek Lane, in the 3100 Block of Alamo Creek Circle, in the 9200 Block of Standing Creek Lane, in the 9100 Block of Charter Creek Circle, from "A" Single Family Residential District and "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District to "R-1" Single Family Residential District, bounded by Stonehaven Drive on the southwest, Sinsonte Boulevard on the northwest, Minnesota Avenue on the northeast and Whitson Road on the southeast; having 1000.21' on Stonehaven Drive; 1067.51' on Sinsonite Boulevard, 1000' on Minnesota Avenue and 1067.50' on Whitson Road

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

No one spoke in opposition.

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

AN ORDINANCE 49,062

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 ALL OF BLOCK 1, NCB 16660, BLOCK 2, NCB 16661 AND BLOCK 3, NCB 16662, IN THE 9100 AND 9200 BLOCKS OF SERENE CREEK DRIVE, IN THE 3100 BLOCK OF SWANDALE DRIVE, IN THE 3100 BLOCK OF TWISTED CREEK DRIVE, IN THE 9200 BLOCK OF BENT ELM CREEK LANE, IN THE 3100 BLOCK OF ALAMO CREEK CIRCLE, IN THE 9200 BLOCK OF STANDING CREEK LANE, IN THE 9100 BLOCK OF CHARTER CREEK CIRCLE, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND "R-3" MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

45

18. CASE 7175 - to rezone Lot 7, Block 80, NCB 2798, 1630 W. Hildebrand Avenue, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-1" Business District, located on the southside of W. Hildebrand Avenue, being 300' east of the intersection of Brad Street and W. Hildebrand Avenue, having 50' on W. Hildebrand Avenue and a depth of 109.83'.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Steen made a motion that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that the property is replatted and that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained along the south property line.

AN ORDINANCE 49,063

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, BLOCK 80, NCB 2798, 1630 W. HILDEBRAND AVENUE, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT THE PROPERTY IS REPLATTED AND THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG THE SOUTH PROPERTY LINE.

* * * *

19. CASE 7176 - to rezone a 6.684 acre tract of land out of NCB 11300, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk from "B" Two Family Residential District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located on the southeast side of Quintana Road, being 770' northeast of the intersection of Plumnear Road and Quintana Road; having 1150' on Quintana Road and a maximum depth of 540'.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Dr. Cisneros made a motion that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that the proper platting is accomplished. Mr. Steen seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Hartman, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 49,064

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 6.684 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 11300, LOCATED ON THE SOUTHEAST SIDE OF QUINTANA ROAD, BEING 770' NORTHEAST OF THE INTERSECTION OF PLUMNEAR ROAD AND QUINTANA ROAD; HAVING 1150' ON QUINTANA ROAD AND A MAXIMUM DEPTH OF 540', BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

20. CASE 7177 - to rezone Lot 16, Block 13, NCB 11488, in the 4200 Block of Culebra Road, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located on the north side of Culebra Road, being 95' west of the intersection of Culebra Road and Brendell Street; having 50' on Culebra Raod and a depth of 150'.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Dr. Cisneros made a motion that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that proper platting is accomplished. Mr. Steen seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Hartman, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 49,065

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 16, BLOCK 13, NCB 11488, IN THE 4200 BLOCK OF CULEBRA ROAD, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

21. CASE 7183 - to rezone Lots 8 and 9, Block 8, NCB, 11312, 1505-1507 Cupples Road, from "B-1" Business District to "B-2" Business District, located southwest of the intersection of Pletz Avenue and Cupples Road; having 146.36' on Pletz Avenue and 109.55' on Cupples Road.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

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

AN ORDINANCE 49,066

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOTS 8 AND 9, BLOCK 8, NCB 11312, 1505-1507 CUPPLES ROAD, FROM "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT THE PROPERTY IS REPLATTED AND THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERRECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG THE WEST PROPERTY LINE.

* * * *

22. CASE 7186 - to rezone Lot 12, Block 78, NCB 2773, 1400 W. Hildebrand Avenue, from "F" Local Retail District to "B-3" Business District, located southwest of the intersection of Warner Avenue and Hildebrand Avenue; having 96.83' on Warner Avenue and 50' on Hildebrand Avenue.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

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

AN ORDINANCE 49,067

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 12, BLOCK 78, NCB 2773, 1400 W. HILDEBRAND AVENUE, FROM "F" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

78-7 The Clerk read the following Resolution:

A RESOLUTION
NO. 78-7-31

SUPPORTING THE REQUEST OF RADIO STATION WOAI TO SECURE THE NECESSARY EQUIPMENT TO PROVIDE PUBLIC SERVICE INFORMATION DURING EMERGENCIES.

* * * *

Mr. Pyndus moved to approve the Resolution. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

In response to Dr. Cisneros' question, Mr. Rolando Bono, Assistant to the City Manager, explained that WOAI, designated primary EBS Station for South Texas, transmits from a remote, unmanned site near Elmendorf. At the present time, in emergency situations, there is a time log of 35-45 minutes before the transmission site becomes manned and operational for EBS. Approval of the radio station's request will permit uninterrupted broadcast from the onset of any emergency for 14 consecutive days without dependency on CPS service. WOAI is proposing to accomplish this level of reliability by channeling initial emergency information from the Emergency Operations Center (EOC) through their studio until such a time as their main transmission site becomes manned. In order to accomplish this, the station has agreed to provide at their expense a permanent telephone loop between the EOC and their studios. There is no direct cost to the City as a result of this Resolution.

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

78-7 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration on motion of Mr. Alderete, seconded by Dr. Cisneros, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Ortiz, Alderete, Pyndus, Hartman, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 49,068

APPOINTING DR. R. MICHAEL STEVENS TO THE
ANNEXATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE. (Replacing
Wayne Nance)

* * * *

78-7

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDS
PROPOSED AMENDMENT

The Clerk read a proposed Ordinance which would amend Ordinance No. 49049 dated February 9, 1978, which adopted a budget for Community Development Block Grant Funds 4th Year.

Council members individually expressed their feelings concerning the proposed amendments. They also discussed their attitudes toward the capital improvements bond election which is scheduled for March 4, 1978, and commented on their intentions regarding the election.

Councilman Ortiz moved that the Ordinance be approved. The motion was seconded by Councilman Alderete and a roll call vote was taken:

MR. WEBB: Yes.

MRS. DUTMER: No.

MR. WING: They will have to get their pound of flesh somewhere else. No.

MR. EURESTE: Yes.

MR. ORTIZ: Yes.

MR. ALDERETE: Yes.

MR. PYNDUS: No.

MR. HARTMAN: Inasmuch as the projects have not gone through the process as was the original package I will abstain.

MR. STEEN: No.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Inasmuch as I think the symbolism is that this is offered in exchange for a vote and support of the bond election, I abstain.

DR. CISNEROS: Yes.

CITY CLERK: The motion failed.

(A transcript of the preceding conversation has been filed as an addendum to these minutes.)

78-7 The meeting was recessed at 7:25 P.M. and reconvened at 8:05 P.M.

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

MR. JEFF JACKSON

Mr. Jeff Jackson spoke to the Council regarding a change he proposes to the State Sales Tax. He stated that the State is operating on a

surplus budget and his proposal includes an increase of one cent more to the City's portion, that would result in three cents to the State and two cents to the City. He asked that the Council support him in his efforts.

Several Council members commended Mr. Jackson for this innovative idea.

Mrs. Dutmer suggested that the Legal Department review and report to the Council regarding any possible legal problems with this proposal.

Council concurred with Mrs. Dutmer's suggestion.

- - -
MR. RICK GREEN

Mr. Rick Green also spoke regarding the proposal made by Mr. Jeff Jackson and asked Council to support this plan.

Councilman Eureste suggested that the Legislative Liaison also review this proposal and give Council his analysis.

Mayor Cockrell stated that the Texas Municipal League has also been investigating this type of proposal and will check into this for the Council. She also asked that the City Attorney look into this and see if it would be subject to another referendum.

- - -
MR. E.L. RICHEY

Mr. E.L. Richey spoke to the Council regarding the problems he encountered in reporting a dog bite. He stated that the dog leash law should be enforced.

Mr. Eureste expressed his concern about this matter and the fact that the dog leash law seems to be unenforceable.

Mr. Hartman stated that this matter will be discussed in a "B" Session the second week in March.

- - -
MR. KARL WURZ

Mr. Karl Wurz read a prepared statement to the Council regarding the Bond Election scheduled for March 4, 1978. (A copy of Mr. Wurz' statement is on file with the papers of this meeting.) He also distributed sample ballots to each Council member and stated that these sample ballots do not reflect the interest costs or the relocation costs of utilities.

Mr. Wurz also spoke of the benefits from a pay-as-you-go plan versus the issuance of bonds for capital improvement projects.

After discussion by Council of the pay-as-you-go plan versus bond issues, Dr. Cisneros asked that staff prepare a report on the possibility of pay-as-you-go financing of capital improvements including how it could be done and what amount of improvements could be undertaken annually.

- - -
MR. ROY RUIZ

Mr. Roy Ruiz, 475 Oak Knoll, spoke to the Council regarding the problems he has encountered in getting the electricity and gas turned on at his new house. He stated that he did receive a permit to move the house on the subject property; however, it has now been discovered that the property is in a flood plain area. He stated that he has been greatly inconvenienced.

Mr. Joe Madison, Executive Assistant in the City Manager's Office, stated that he has been working on this matter with the Public Works Director and the City Attorney. An Engineering study is scheduled to be made and a report should be forthcoming in about two weeks.

Mayor Cockrell asked them to proceed as expeditiously as possible.

KUDOS TO MR. JOE MADISON

Dr. Cisneros made the following comments:

"Mayor, I just want to compliment Joe. I've watched Joe work now for the better part of three years, first under the former City Manager and now under these circumstances and Joe is one of those persons that does one heck of a lot of work and is around all the time, and one of the unsung heroes, and I just want to personally compliment him."

MR. LANNY SINKIN

Mr. Lanny Sinkin spoke to the Council regarding a public hearing concerning the City's participation in the South Texas Nuclear Power Plant. He stated that he has discussed the hearing with several people and suggested the date of April 11, 1978 as a good time.

Mr. Rolando Bono, Assistant to the City Manager, stated that Assistant City Manager Louis Fox has been in contact with the firm of Touche, Ross regarding an economic and environment analysis of nuclear power plants.

Mayor Cockrell stated that the Council is considering the public hearing but is not going to set a date at this meeting.

Dr. Cisneros suggested that Mr. Fox make a status report to Council at next week's "B" Session.

SISTERS KATERI AND MAUREEN LARKIN

Sisters Kateri and Maureen Larkin spoke to the Council regarding the importance of communication.

MS. LUCY JACOBI

Ms. Lucy Jacobi, representing the Youth of Holy Family Catholic Church, challenged the City Council to a basketball game on Saturday, March 11, 1978 at 7:00 P.M. She stated that the proceeds will enable some of these youths to visit Six Flags over Texas.

The Council agreed to meet the challenge.

February 13, 1978

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

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

February 13, 1978

Petition submitted by Mr. Raymond D. Lopez, Jr., requesting permission to retain a six foot fence with three strands of barbed wire located at 1770 Rigsby.

/s/ G.V. JACKSON, JR.
City Clerk

* * * *

51

February 16, 1978
mm

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at 9:05 P.M.

A P P R O V E D

Lila Cockrell

M A Y O R

ATTEST:

G. V. Jackson Jr.
C I T Y C L E R K

ADDENDUM TO THE MINUTES OF

FEBRUARY 16, 1978

DISCUSSION ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS

The Clerk read a proposed Ordinance approving a revised \$18,377,000 Community Development Application under Title I of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, and authorizing submission of same to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

The following discussion then took place:

MR. RUDY ORTIZ: I move that the Ordinance be adopted.

MR. JOE ALDERETE: I second the motion.

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: Alright, it's been moved and seconded. Is there any discussion? Mr. Ortiz.

MR. RUDY ORTIZ: Yes, Madam Mayor. In keeping with the address that I made to the City Council last night, and the appeal to reconsider the decision that was made considering-concerning the Community Development Block Grant and the particular dissatisfaction that surfaced with concern to two particular items, the Coliseum Road, I'm sorry, the Inner Loop Project and the GSA Motorpool Purchase, I am recommending to this Council that we go ahead and address these two particular items by putting them back on the Community Development Block Grant formula, that application that will be submitted. This is meant to be a conciliatory move. It is meant to be a gesture of good faith that's been extended to those members who might have been offended or that might have put such a high priority on these two particular projects that it has caused quite a bit of a division in this particular City Council at this very critical time.

It is, in effect, the extension of a hand of friendship to each and every one of you that has been offended and has been upset and that has been critical of the decision that was made. This hand of friendship is extended in good faith and as a friend I would extend it to each and every one of you, Mrs. Dutmer, Mayor Cockrell, Mr. Steen, Mr. Hartman, Mr. Pyndus, the hand extended in good meaning and a gesture of conciliation. I hope that we can reason together and we can start the healing process. We have a lot of problems in this community that need to be addressed and we need to start working together. I would be very proud and very happy if you take my hand in friendship, but it's up to you to accept it or reject it tonight. That's all I have to say, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you very much. Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. HELEN DUTMER: Yes, I'm sorry that, I will take your hand in friendship, but I cannot vote for either CD package as revised or the Bond Issue. And as you know, I have not changed my position. I voted against both of them in the beginning. Now you propose to delete the Coliseum Rd. Project for \$850,000, the GSA Project for \$250,000 and up that \$500,000, the housing is deleted \$500,000. You want to add on \$1.1 million Inner Loop money and \$500,000 GSA money. I'll point out that \$500,000 will come back into the fund in a very short time to again be applied to the housing. The Housing Authority has already entered a package in the amount of \$4 million. You left in the default loan consultation money and EODC already has a project set up for the consultation project for people who have defaulted on their loans. So this would be an overlapping service. Furthermore, as I've stated before, even if we accept your proposal, we will pass an \$18 million program with no way to process it because we did not include the staff \$200,000 for Budget and Research in order to process this CD funding program. So for those reasons I just cannot go along with it.

February 16, 1978

mm

MR. PHIL PYNDUS: First of all, I appreciate, Mr. Ortiz, your proposing to meet the Council members half way that were offended. My position with reference to the Bond Issue is separate and apart from the Community Development Block Grant. I would accept your hand gladly whether or not we accept this package tonight. But I would say that last week, I felt that the process that was followed by the members that voted for the package made a mockery of the Public Hearing and the staff recommendations that were given to this Council. I would say that if you really want to set things right, that you would take the package as recommended by City Staff and present it to this Council, so we could vote on it. I would ask you to do that if you were sincere. The package as presented by staff after public hearing, if you would present that package to this Council.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. I have somewhat similar observations to what Mr. Pyndus has made. I have here before me the, first of all, the CDA package that was put together after a great deal of work, after Public Hearings, Planning Commission, through the Manager and his Staff, Public Hearings for the citizens in January and Public Hearing last week. A very laboriously developed package with specific line items considered very carefully by each of those review authorities which was presented here to the Council last week, last Thursday. Then I have here the package which was eventually passed by the majority of this Council, which the latter portions of which some 12, 13 projects, not one single one of them had ever been reviewed by any of the various and sundry entities that developed this package. Not the Planning Commission, not the Manager. These are projects that were added last Thursday. While I recognize the extended hand of friendship, my concern continues to be not so much with what was done last Thursday, but rather how it was done. We have a governmental system that bides by a certain process by which things would be done. We have a Planning Commission to deal with certain matters pertinent to Planning, we have a Manager and staff that serve as a second major element of advice to the City Council. And that process is established for a purpose, to insure that we go about decision making process in an orderly fashion. Yet the substituted item here has, as I say, these projects that have not been dealt with by any of these review authorities.

My question, I guess is simply this, if there was logic from the standpoint of the item or if there is logic tonight, for the inclusion of these items back in the CD package then they were certainly the same logic last week. And, conversely, if there was a reason to delete them last week, there would be reason to leave them out this week. My point simply is, that we cannot afford to do what I would term run the local government by trial and error. Try this, if it doesn't work, let's try that, if that doesn't work, let's try this. I think the citizens of this city would have every reason in the world to lose confidence in such a non-process of government because it makes for uncertainty, it makes for no overall scheme, but rather it makes for day to day ad hoc decision making and that simply is not good. That is the reason I have stated the issue that we're facing now, is the issue that must be taken to the people. Give them an opportunity to give a vote of confidence or no confidence in this government. I might just add in closing, I recognize this offer is being made in recognition of the futility of the action that was taken last week. I might just observe it is awfully difficult to reverse a decision on suicide after one has leaped off the ledge. Thank you, Madam Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Wing.

FRANK WING: Earlier, this year when the downtown business people had a seminar, they did not say that the Inner Loop to them was a priority. I still say that CDA funds are specifically designated to go to blighted areas. I have no problem with the CDA package the way it stands. If the Inner Loop is really the issue, then there's other funds to fund it. You're going to sell the Transit System the first of March, is that such a big item with you, we can always have money from there. There's always UMPTA funds, but the Inner Loop is not really the issue. Earlier this year and last year both Mrs. Cockrell and Mr. Hartman promised the citizens of San Antonio that they would support a hundred million dollar bond issue without reservation, and if you want to question integrity and trial and error, what happened to

the promises that were made to those citizen of San Antonio. And if you want to talk about deceit and political climate, who has injected politics into a city-wide bond package with putting their lives, safety, and personal property of San Antonians in return for testing of political waters for some candidate in 1979. I say that a situation has been fabricating and you're using a big lie technique in which the only losers will be the citizens of San Antonio if this bond issue fails. Democracy dictates that a bond issue be put to the voters strictly on the merits. Let's do that. Let those who want to be county judge, excuse me, mayor this time pay for their own political polls.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Alright, Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Madam Mayor. Mr. Ortiz, I appreciate your gesture of friendship and let's shake hands and make up. I think that's very nice of you to do that. I do have to tell you that I'll vote no on your resolution because I think it's a little bit late. We started absentee voting on Monday and most of the citizens are pretty set in their ways as to whether they're going to vote yes or no on the Bond Issue. Even before a week ago, in going out to my particular district which is District 10, I found that it was about a fifty-fifty change of whether or not the Bond Issue would pass, even at that time. But, after last Thursday, a week ago, every call I've received has been very negative with reference to the Bond Issue. So, I would have no choice but to vote no because I don't think it has a chance at this time of passing.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: I'll pass for right now.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Webb.

MR. JOE WEBB: I stated I'm the first one to state when the CD package was presented to this Council as you recall I blew up sitting right here in my seat, when I found the package that was being passed along to this Council. And the reason for my blowing up was because that there was not enough items addressed to District Two. The area of our City that I feel has the greatest needs. I pointed that out to my fellow Council members to the right and to the left. I began to look around me and try to find someone who was sensitive to the needs of the District, and many times I fail to find support for the problems that we address in our area. But, I want to say this, that no, the problem is not the urban loop. No, the problem is not the CD package. I don't have to be on one side or the other, I'm the only Black Council Member on this chamber. And let me tell you when I vote I make sure that you don't forget me and my district. And I also look out for the good and the benefit and the welfare of all the citizens as much as I can, whether it be zoning or whether it be any other kind of case. I want to state to this press and to the whole City of San Antonio, that the voters must go to the polls and vote in favor of the \$98 million dollar bond package. Because this Council voted to give the citizens the items identified in the bond package, drainage, streets, etc. The Mayor and eight of the ten Council members worked to arrive at the present package, via a twenty-two member Bond Steering Committee. The Mayor at the last minute, at the last minute, pulled out her support for the bond package, because, as she stated, of the urban loop, which was not funded in the Community Development Package. The real issue seems to be if we were all serious in the needs of this City and this community, we spent time and effort, and we've placed it on the ballot. My concerns were to get the bond issue out of the political arena. By that, I mean next year is City Election, And I personally think that we would mix the two together which is not fair to this City. What I feel that is presently being done and what I know is to put politics back into the Bond Issue by the Mayor and her cronies. I have no axe to grind with no one of any segment of the City. But, I do think that this kind of approach is ridiculous. At the last minute, needless, to say fair play in any kind of ball game.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Ladies and gentlemen, let me first thank Mr. Ortiz. I appreciate the fact that he began this meeting by offering a hand of friendship it was not extended all around. But I do appreciate Mr. Ortiz very much and let me just say thank you for that hand of friendship.

But I do appreciate Mr. Ortiz very much and let me just say thank you for that hand of friendship. Regardless of the outcome of many other things, certainly, on that point many of us agree that we need to speak to this point. And at this point, I would like to say regarding to Mr. Webb, who has departed from the Chamber. He may recall that at the time he made his comments about the Community Development Fund Package being inadequate on the east side. That I too agree with him. I had several meetings with residents of the east side, and made suggestions for changes in the Community Development package. In fairness to my fellow Council members I made those in written memorandums with my recommendations that they be added. And I suggested the funds from which they could be taken, and the projects that were funded both in Community Development and the proposed bond package. So, I did work with him in order to try to help get additional projects for the east side put in the proposed Community Development package. I think there's been a lot of statement and restatement of positions. And while I most certainly appreciate the expression of friendship I will state that I think simply restoring the funding at this point is not going to solve this whole problem. Public confidence in the good intentions of the City Council was shattered. Not only by what was done but how it was done. The controversy cannot now be settled with simply adding some funds back in at this late date. You may recall last Friday when I made my position clear with several of the members of the Council. I made what I meant to be a very sincere recommendation. But in view of the lack of confidence and distrust that have been created that we all simply agreed to postpone the election, cancel the date and look forward with sincere hope to being able to reschedule it. Because it was my hope not to have to oppose the Bond Issue, that we could agree to call it off at that moment and reschedule it. As you recall, I did receive a unanimous "no" from the six members to this suggestion. I have previously outlined my efforts at meeting over the weekend and as you recall on Sunday evening, I did receive the answer that the efforts at conciliation were not going to be accepted. This is unfortunate, but at any rate, we are here today, and I wanted to state my position very firmly.

Members of the community have come to me with questions like this, in view of the actions of the City Council one week changing five million dollars of funds around; the next week possibly putting some of it back. How can we count on what this City Council will do. What assurances do we have that the City Council majority would adhere to the recommended schedule for the bond sales that were proposed by the Finance Director. They are saying remember that the tax increase, the no tax increase was predicted on the fact that the bond schedule would be followed. How do we know that the Council would not speed this in order to fund the projects sooner. This would mean that the taxes would have to be raised. They're also asking questions about how the priorities are going to be established, they say they realize that the resolution that sets out these projects in fact, you might consider a contract with the voters. But it doesn't establish the priorities. And when a Council is not working together in unity and with mutual confidence, they're asking what priorities are going to be established as the first priorities and who's are going to be last. Again, the Council credibility I think is simply on the line. There have been instances before in this Council term when the public has looked with a considerable amount of skepticism at actions taken by this Council. I've worked very hard to speak positively and affirmatively about this Council. I was prepared to do my dead-level best to try to sell this Bond Issue.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I do not deny or try to move away from the fact that I did say that I would make every effort to get the Bond Issue passed, but I regret to say that under the present circumstances, which I don't feel are yet corrected, that I can go and ask the voters to vote now. So, I'm going to have to be voting no; I'm going to have to be inviting the citizens who would accept my advice to vote no; and it would be my sincere hope that before the Council term is over, we would have been able to re-establish an atmosphere of confidence, mutual trust among the Council members and with the community where we could go back and if this Bond Issue should be defeated, ask for a second chance with the voter.

MR. ORTIZ: Madam Mayor, I was afraid this is what was going to happen, but whenever one extends a gesture of good faith or a gesture of friendship there's always that risk that it will be rejected. Let the record reflect

that there was an effort made at a conciliation, and it was rejected. I was perhaps naive in believing that we were talking about the Inner Loop, that we were talking about the GSA and these were particular projects that were of importance to the individuals that are objecting. Apparently, it is alot more; I 'm sorry that I even brought it up. I assure you that this will be my last attempt at any of this kind of gesture, if we can have the vote now?

MAYOR COCKRELL: There are two other persons that are signed to speak, Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS DUTMER: Rudy, I'm really sorry you feel that way, if it is alot more with the other members, I do not know that. I do want to point out that at the time that we passed these ordinances, I pointed out that these ordinances were not binding as far as this Bond Issue was concerned. And I thank you today, Mayor, for lending credence to my thoughts on it. The first ordinance did not set priorities; it was not binding. The second ordinance says that we will give consideration to the Councilmanic districts; it did not say we had to do it. If you'll add up we are now in bonded indebtedness of 103 million dollars; we add 98 million to that, we come to 201 million dollars. I think you'll find most budgetary people will advise you not to go more than 10 percent of your income into debt. At this rate, we would have to have a tax rate, a tax income of over \$20 billion dollars in this City in order to meet our bonded indebtedness. I think it puts the City in a very, very precarious position. I do not think the City of San Antonio can afford it and that is why I voted in the beginning no and have to stick with no. It's just common sense, I am not rejecting your hand of friendship, it is just dollars and cents, common sense.

DR. CISNEROS: Madam Mayor, you and I have not had a chance to talk about any of these issues this week. I must say that I'm not interested in talking because I was personally very upset about the direction that things had taken last Friday. I didn't see any usefulness in a session, although I know discussions were going on with other members of the Council.

I just want to make a couple of what I hope are factual points. One of them is that the decision last week on the Community Development Package revolved around the Community Development Package. There seems to be a lot of misapprehension in the community that the Council somehow affected the bond package last week. I do not know whether this is something that has been stated, or is just a misapprehension, or a misunderstanding, but the fact is that the decision last week and the insertion of the Inner Loop today deals with the CDA Package which is different, different from the Bond Issue.

The Bond Issue had already been settled, the package was wrapped up and ready to go to the polls, and just as a factual point, I think the people of San Antonio need to understand that because a lot of the reporting on it has confused people to suggest that these two are connected. They are not.

The other point I would like to make is that I understand the rhetoric now that this is a vote of confidence, if you will, in the Council. We all know what that intended to be; it's intended to be a vote of confidence in the six members of the Council who continue to support the bond package. It's very clear that the strategy emerging is to try to take all the anger in the community and make a lightning rod out of the Bond Issue. If there's anger in the community against the COPS organization, then this Bond Issue is to be the lightning rod. If there's anger in the community about any other factor, then this Bond Issue is intended to be the lightning rod, and I can see how it would make sense from a political point of view, strictly political point of view. To jump, skip, and let those who would continue to support it and back it, be lightning rods along with the Bond Issue. That's fine, I have no difficulty with that, I think it's a stand of principle and I personally am prepared to stand behind the Bond Issue because I think it is necessary for the City. To use Mr. Hartman's logic on him if the Bond Issue was necessary a week ago, and if it was sufficient for Mr. Hartman to have called it the best Bond Issue the City has ever put together and the most balanced, and I think it's still the same thing today because the Bond Issue hasn't been touched.

I have one practical question that I want to put to the people of San Antonio via the media and via those members of the Council present and that is this, what is accomplished by defeating the bond issue. I know that the rhetoric is that the bond issue can be used quote "to teach them a lesson." The Bond Issue can be used to quote "put people in their place", but I don't think that that is a good purpose for the leadership of the community to engage in or to submit a Bond Issue or to structure, stage a Bond Issue. If the Bond Issue is defeated I wonder, is that going to suddenly weaken the will or the temperament of these Council members who are supporting it, I doubt it. If the Bond Issue is defeated, I wonder does that suddenly show the old power brokers in San Antonio that in fact they still maintain control, I doubt it. If the Bond Issue is defeated what I expect will happen is that the division in the City will be just as clear and the anger will be just as great, and I don't think we will have accomplished anything. I would say that if people are serious about bridging gaps and divisions; if people are serious about trying to deal with the real problems of this community, then the way to deal with them is to really work hard, both in the leadership of this Council, this group of eleven people in the community and the posture that's put forward and on tough issues like this Bond Issue which Mr. Steen says he can't support because it wasn't going to pass well that's a heck of a note of leadership. If the divisions in this community are going to be bridged; then it's going to be bridged because we deal with the problems like the drainage, streets and the sidewalks, and the economy. That's what's going to bridge the gaps in this community and not a powerful, vindictive show of strength designed to blow out the aspirations of the people of this community, whether they be black or brown or white. I just think that is a poor indication of leadership, when the strategy becomes to cut off your nose to spite your face when the strategy is to throw the baby out with the bath water. I hope that the people of San Antonio can see through it, and that they will deal with the Bond Issue as a Bond Issue. They will not deal with this lightning rod strategy; they will see the Bond Issue for 98 million dollars worth of necessary projects in every part of this community because that's what that is. The Bond Issue and that's what we're voting on March 4.

MR. EURESTE: Yes, Madam Mayor, the amendment that was being proposed by Mr. Ortiz had to do with the Urban Loop and GSA move particularly the Urban Loop because that became a symbol of a division in this Council and a symbol in the division of the San Antonio community and the upcoming Bond election and possibly in the future. I think that if we could talk about what actually divided the City of San Antonio, we can say it is the Urban Loop. Those that raised it on Friday as the issue for their withdrawal or the reason for their withdrawal of support I guess can take credit in the future for having a nicely divided City, a City where the hatred that perhaps we had within ourselves will come to the surface. I think this is a very sorry note for the leadership of our City, and particularly the leadership and leader of this Council.

I think that as a sincere individual, you would not have called the two o'clock press conference on Friday and issued the statement that was issued. And a statement that was very strong, that was almost ir retractable without some type of warning. It's been done before. You've called us into our office before; you've called me, personally, to your office before. You reached out to us, but not this time. So, if you were really sincere, of saving something, you that command all the authority that is vested in the position of Mayor, you could have reached out, but you don't reach out. You strike out, you withdraw your support on an item that none of us knew was that significant to you or was that significant to those friends and supporters of yours who put you up to this most evil tactic. I wish you could have told me that you were that concerned about it. I know that if I am about to jump off the Tower of the Americas, that I'd like to tell somebody about it before I do it. Maybe they'd come and rescue me. I wish you could have told me that you were about to take this giant step that would have a tremendous impact on the Bond Issue. That you could have told me so I could have at least reached out to you and told you, well, maybe I've got a compromise. Even after you took this most drastic action, I came to City Hall on Saturday and sat in the office of the Commercial Recorder just by sheer coincidence, and we made a phone call from that office to Mr. Hartman and Mr. Hartman met with me and Mr. McDaniel

on that Saturday afternoon, and we called your house that Saturday afternoon trying to reach some sort of agreement or at least an agreement to meet. And we came here to this City Hall on Sunday afternoon at four-thirty in the evening and met in your office myself, Mr. Hartman, Mr. Alderete Mr. McDaniel. And we sat there and talked about what was possible, and when we left that meeting, you wrote down on a piece of paper in your own handwriting much of what we are talking about here today. And I went home, and I told you we would keep back in touch, and I couldn't get a consensus that was comfortable. I got a three-three type of vote. I hadn't checked out three members. In the morning, Mr. Alderete, on Monday morning that after our 9:30 press conference, Mr. Alderete approached you and at that point he indicated to you that this item would be brought to the Council on Wednesday afternoon. And you assured him that the matter was still open, that you would come over and lend your support. Well, on Tuesday morning, the whole thing had changed. By Wednesday morning, the whole thing had changed. And now all of a sudden, it's no longer the GSA; it's no longer the inner loop. All of a sudden, it becomes the credibility of the Council. It becomes whether or not this Council can be trusted to keep its work or to keep its commitment. It becomes a matter of whether or not this Council is going to be raising taxes on the Bond Issue that won't be floated until sometime in 1979 or 1980. When some of us might not be around; you don't even know what the make-up of the future Council is going to be. And already you're threatening and scaring people that this Council or the Council of the future is not to be trusted. And, I think that-putting something, putting the mark of something that 's out there in the future, that you just can't identify yet, and you know that, you confuse the voters when you say that. Before the Friday two o'clock p.m. meeting, there was no question of credibility; there was no question of whether or not this Council would raise taxes, no questions whatsoever and there was no questions whether or not this Bond Issue was going to be made the Bond Issue testing the political proponents of the upcoming 1979 Mayoral election. Well, all of a sudden this also becomes a Mayoral case affair and it's injected by the opponents of the Bond Issue. Not one item of your discussion deals with the merits. It has to do not with substance but with imagery, imagery of leadership. And this is a sad day because your imagery isn't worth a pot of beans, what you lack, what you lack is the substance that makes for leadership, that's what you lack.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, Mr. Eureste, I will go ahead if I may and answer some of the comments that have been made.

MR. PYNDUS: I would like to state Mayor, I think Mr. Eureste is out of order with an attack on the Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: May I just go ahead and answer first, if I may. I feel that in these circumstances, I did not rule it out of order and I certainly respect his right to say it, and I would like to respond to several of the points you made. Because, quite obviously, we see it from something of a different perspective.

The fact that I held a press conference at two o'clock on Friday was out of feelings that are strong as I recall having had in this Council term. But, even then it was not irretrievable. That was the reason why, Mr. Eureste, I met with you and Mr. Alderete on Sunday. And it is certainly true that we discussed whether or not there would be any possibility even at that late day of trying to get something together. If you remember one of the things, however, that I stressed, was the fact that with absentee balloting starting on Monday, that if there was any hope for salvaging the Bond Issue I felt that one of the most important things was for action to take place quickly. For the whole Council to come together quickly in a called meeting and if it was agreed to, you know, by at least a substantial majority of the Council to take the action that we could do whatever corrective things might seem indicative and that then we could come forward with strong expressions of our feelings and our desire to work together. I pointed out Monday in particular because the absentee balloting was starting Monday. I waited after that meeting till 6:30. I waited till about 11:00 and I had not heard, at that point I called you and my understanding of your remarks was that it just couldn't be gotten together. The next morning it is certainly correct that Mr. Alderete came in after the press conference and I might say if there was a real wanting to get together it would seem to me that rather than to proceed with the press conference, it would have been better, to see if

we were going to get together so that we could all be a part to take or as many as possible saying that we would then go forward together. Instead I was approached, but I was approached with the fact that not all but at least enough of the members of the six, were willing to try to reach some compromise agreement, but that they were willing to meet on Monday. They were unwilling even to have it discussed publicly until Wednesday. That nothing could be done until Thursday. And my recollection of what I said to Mr. Alderete was I will take this back to the others and discuss it with my associates. I did discuss it with my associates; it did not come through to us again our own perception as being nothing we could expect in sincere reaching out on both sides. Quite obviously, there is division. And it was quite obviously we each see things from a different perspective.

Several people, two people have mentioned something about mayoral politics. I might make a brief comment on that score. At this point, I have not made any decisions about candidacy. I have not opened a campaign office, I have not appointed a campaign manager. I have not appointed a campaign treasurer. I do not have a precinct chairman working for me. I just think those do indicate that so far as I'm concerned there's a long time before another mayoral race. I agree it should be kept completely out of this election. I think it should have nothing to do, it has been mentioned speculatively, perhaps, in the media, but as far as I'm concerned I will just keep it out.

But, in terms of how we see it, we do see it differently, and I think we could just simply each of us lay out our own understanding and perspectives and respect at least the others to the extent that they are sincere in their point of view. Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PHIL PYNDUS: I would like to state to each of you that when districting was voted into this community, I was the one that did not agree with districting and I fought it. But each of us pledged to make it work. I'm not convinced at this time the districting plan has, as we have adopted it for this City will work. And it's because of the lack of leadership that this Council has provided. And you are as guilty as, perhaps I am. Maybe all of us are guilty, but everytime we have attempted to do something on the Council, we have had ethnic differences come across, to the point that it obscures objectivity. But it brings the ethnic differences that our districts divide us into. Ethnically, by income, by neighborhoods similarities, we are so divided. But, we have an obligation to this whole community that subordinates these differences that exist between us. And, so you have to use extra care to make it work. And you owe respect to each other and last Thursday with the votes, anyway you wanted the votes to go with any project you wanted to go, you failed to show the respect that another elected official should receive. You could've had the courtesy of saying this is what we would like, here is our list, but some back room somewhere the list was prepared, and it was sprung on this Council and that was a lack of respect and that does not contribute leadership, and we're all taking about what happened afterward, and I would like to talk about why it happened and now we're going to have to pick up the pieces and I think whether we are a successful Council or not depends upon our behavior.

I don't think the Bond Issue is a good one, and I intend to go out and prove that point to the citizens. It has nothing to do with the fight that is before this Council now, so I would say to you if you have a sincere desire to work for this community and to handle the drainage problems that have been so eloquently put forth by your people and also Mr. Webb. Then, you should take a look at the programs that you've included in this Community Development Funds, because they're not urgent; they don't have high priority. And we have spent the community's money on it. So, I think we ought to take a re-appraisal of ourselves and that includes me and that includes you, but I don't think if we are going to sit here and accuse each other and name call we're going to settle a thing and I would like to call the question.

MRS. DUTMER: Well, one thing I've learned today, it seems to me there was a heck of alot of meetings going on between certain persons on this Council, and I sort of resent this. Are you inferring the rest of us don't have enough sense to come to some agreement with you in a meeting? No one sitting

up around this horseshoe has my vote in their pocket, nor do they have the right to speak for me. For a group of Council people to throw out various accusations at each other doesn't seem very mature to me. Wall Street is watching San Antonio today, believe me. God only knows what our ratings will be by the time this Bond Issue does get passed. You are fully aware, every one of you are fully aware of the issues on the day of the CD package. I have consistently pointed out to you several discrepancies in your package. You're still ignoring those issues of the package. I think that day that the issues were brought to you and they were ignored then, I've not yet taken a side in the discussion as far as the politics are concerned. I voted against it, and I am still against it I haven't changed my position. As far as politics are concerned, not I'm going to speak my peace. I know there are several persons on the Council here who have political aspirations, and I feel very sad that you're not honest in your statements today. You have whitewashed your motives. The simple truth is that the majority vote on this Council tried a power play. It backfired. Now, you see your Bond Issue going down the tube had not these actions taken place, you would, in truth, and in fact, had gone merrily about your way on your assertion of power play without regard of who you were going to step on. And, this is a very, very simple truth had you gotten away with this play, it would have been a farce sitting around this table because the vote would have been consistently been a 6-5 vote regardless of the merit or the issue at hand. And that 's the very simple truth put out on the table for every one, the citizens of San Antonio to see.

DR. CISNEROS: Madam Mayor, I just want to get back to the motion at here which is the Inner Loop discussion and the GSA discussion. What is being proposed today by Mr. Ortiz is an effort to reinstate those two into the CDA package. Now, when Councilman Ortiz and I have talked about this I know he's talked to the other members of the Council. It was not anticipated that it would generate the support from the other members of the Council - the five of you who have indicated opposition to the Bond package because your position is on record, and it's a difficult position to back off from, so, it was not intended to try to get support for the Bond Issue, but it was intended to try to deal with that which has become a symbol of distrust, lack of commitment, inability to fulfill projects and if it stands as a symbol of those things then the passage was our feeling, would stand as a symbol of intent to finish projects once they're started, once they're committed and once they are a Bond Issue. But, let's talk just for a moment about the merits of the inner loop on its face now. If, it really did have merit to the degree that it was enough to scuttle the whole Bond Issue and I understand the point about the how being important as the what, but let's just deal with the what. If the inner loop was that important, then it is that important now. We don't have the votes to pass the inner loop. Councilman Wing is not interested in passing this change and I'm telling you that honestly. The votes are not there. I hope the others who have tended this gesture as Councilman Ortiz suggested with an open hand of goodwill, etc. will vote for it. That makes it one vote short. So, I would ask you and whoever else might not to reconsider your position on the Bond Issue, I think that's very clear, but we're talking about reinstatement of a project that you said is pretty important. Now, I heard, I read your statement of yesterday when you said they're going to throw us a bone. This week it's a bone, last week it was sufficient to cause you to scuttle or at least suggest that we scuttle the \$98 million Bond Issue. So, I would just say we're prepared to vote five and try to reinstate it and go down 5 + 0. But if it's important, it's important, the GSA property is important, it's important. Jack Devore is here, who is an advocate of the GSA, and others who I've talked to this week. It's just a question of whether it's important - quite apart from the Bond Issue. If it was enough last week to cause the brouhaha that it did, then it ought to be sufficient to pass it now. The other thing, the other point I think is that everything here is boiled down to a question of timing. A compromise could have been possible on Sunday, but it's not possible on Wednesday or Thursday. And now the Inner Loop was important last week and it's not important now. So it's a matter of timing and I suppose we have to be honest with ourselves with pride, with macho, with who backs off first, who backs down, all those are sorts of things. This is a gesture. As to the how I'll be the first to admit that in the future, the how will have to be different. We're going

to have to find a way to ask everybody's opinion about projects, and it may well be that it will boil down to the same thing. It may well be that even if everyone had been consulted that the outcome would've been the same, perhaps not. I think there's some substantive things we have to do as a group to deal with that question of how just to relate better at a personal level for whatever that's worth. But, I would ask you on this matter before us, the inner loop, forget the symbolism for a moment, forget the political jockeying and everything else and if the Urban Loop was that important last week, then we need an extra vote.

MR. HARTMAN: Just to deal very briefly with the how. This represents the package that was put together after many weeks of discussion by the Planning Commission, by Public Hearing, by the Manager and the Staff, by Public Hearing of the Council, and yet another Public Hearing of this Council. That is the package that was put together, that is the process by which the package gets put together. This is the package that resulted from last week. These projects, all of them were added last week; none of them had been through Planning Commission, none of them had been through management, and they suddenly arose last week. The process, the how is here. This is not the process. Tonight we have yet another proposal that says take these line items out, take Coliseum Rd. out, take the revolving fund down and add these things - words of process, the process is here, that's the how, not the let's try this and if that doesn't work, let's try that. I think we need to get away from trial and error government and get back to the process that was established.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: I'd like to say a few words, Madam Mayor, after I finish somebody else can speak out. I'm not going to close anybody off, I think that's the problem, Mr. Hartman, you don't deal with facts, you deal with things that you think should be, might be, etc., and not with the facts. You know full well that there is a process involved. The items that you mentioned that were added are items that went through various channels of government, and I'm talking about the different committees or commissions that they have to go through. As a matter of fact some of them went through extra committees, more so than others. The San Juan Homes came from the for 650,000 dollars, came from the San Antonio Housing Authority. It went through the various levels. These items appear in the packets that are provided by the Manager of the City when he made his recommendations. Some of the items that were included in this amendment are items that appeared in his packet. To say that none of these items went through any process, is to do what you do when you get mean and nasty and that is to mislead the public. And as far, and I resent that, Mr. Hartman. You have made some statements that are totally incorrect. You have tried to put the blame on the master minding of this CD package on Dr. Cisneros, and I think that's totally unfair. If you want to blame anybody you ought to blame Bernardo Eureste. I'll take the blame, I'll take the responsibility. And it's no different than what other Council members do here and you know that. That we ask each other for support of a particular project that we're concerned with, for a vote of a particular item that we're concerned with. So, there's no difference. The only thing that happened on Thursday is that you came out on the losing side, and you got mad about it and you take it out on the people of San Antonio. Maybe you should have taken it out on me. So, let's not lie about the process, Mr. Hartman. Let's not lie and confuse the public about the process. I think that if you were to check it out with the Manager, that he knew about those items. Even the smallest Acme Park for \$15,000 dollars is on the records with Parks and Recreation, was an item that was included as a departmental request from Parks and Recreation to the Manager, and it is an item that was not funded by the Manager. Now, we have to remember that this City Council has two Public Hearings. The two Public Hearings for the Council is to help the Council arrive at a final decision. And the Council arrived at a final decision. We made the final decision. Just because we have a recommendation from the Manager doesn't mean that we have to take it in toto, okay. And let's all I'm asking for, Mr. Hartman is honesty. Don't confuse, don't try to confuse people. And, particularly, do not try to confuse me, because you won't get away with it, Okay.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Just a moment May I just urge, I think we're beginning to all repeat now and two or three times and so, sooner or later we have to get down to the bottom line. I think, we obviously, see where everyone's position is.

MR. ORTIZ: Call for the question, Madam Mayor.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, let me just as a matter of confusion.

MR. WING: Second.

MAYOR: We have had a motion and a second for the question.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Alright, I have to take the vote, I'm sorry Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: I'll speak after it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Those in favor of the motion to close debate, please say Aye, Any oppose No. The motion failed. Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, just one simple statement. Let me just show you how much of a process we have. The package that was put together last week rather hurriedly says interior modernization of San Juan Homes. The records of the Planning Commission will prove that that was presented as exterior modernization of San Juan Homes. Let me just state that for the record.

MR. EURESTE: Mr. Hartman, that was clarified here and you know that. It was clarified

MR. HARTMAN: The point is that it is on this sheet right here.

MR. EURESTE: Sir, it was clarified in here, and Mr. Ortiz explained it to you.

MR. HARTMAN: My case rests.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Alright, gentlemen. We have, alright we have two more that would like to speak now.

MR. EURESTE: I'm going to get to the bottom of this. If he persists, let me just tell you. If he persists in putting out something that is not factual, correct, I have a responsibility to try to bring this man to the truth. Now, \$770,000 was the first request for exterior modernization of San Juan Homes. Then it was reduced to \$660,000 because we were told here, in chamber, that the San Antonio Housing Authority had told us that the interior was going to require \$660,000. I don't change things automatically. I don't change things automatically just because I happen to like them. That is the request that came from the San Antonio Housing Authority and if you want another record, another statement, we'll get it. But don't say that this what's recorded over here or over there.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Alright, Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Madam Mayor, Jack Devore from the Planning Commission indicated by waving that he would like to speak on this motion. This concerns the project that he's been working on, and I'd like to get Council consensus that he address the project.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Let me just say, that if we open it now to a consensus we will have quite a few that will want to be heard.

DR. CISNEROS: I think he will want to speak with expertise on the motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Let me first recognize Mr. Hartman who has light on and then I will recognize Mr. Devore.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor in the interest of time, I will pass.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Alright, Mr. Devore.

MR. JACK DEVORE: Madam Mayor and members of the Council, each of us view these issues so to speak in different ways. To me, the action that was taken last week was disappointing to me because a thing that all of this City should be united in is the development in the future of our inner City. If there's anything amidst all the polarity and differences of opinions and needs and so forth, that stands out as an item or an area where there could be solidarity, it makes sense that it will be in the future development of our City, our inner City and its environs. And my disappointment was in the fact that the support of the inner City projects did not carry the unanimity that I felt they deserved. And, I want to bring this out at this point, because I think tonight, we have different viewpoints again, but I would call on the Council as a citizen, not as a member of the Planning Commission, strictly individually and as a citizen to again consider these projects on their merits. If substitute projects other than those that have been offered for deletion are desired, let's proceed in that manner, perhaps. But let's all support the future and development of our inner City. Thank you Madam and Members of the Council.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Clerk will call the roll.

MR. WEBB: Yes.

MRS. DUTMER: No.

MR. WING: They'll have to get their pound of flesh somewhere else - No.

MR. EURESTE: Yes.

MR. ORTIZ: Yes.

MR. ALDERETE: Yes.

MR. PYNDUS: No.

MR. HARTMAN: Inasmuch as the matter - the projects have not gone through the process as was the original package. I will abstain.

MR. STEEN: No.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Inasmuch as I think the symbolism is that this is offered in exchange for a vote in support of the Bond Election - I abstain.

DR. CISNEROS: Yes.

CLERK: The motion failed.