

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
THURSDAY, JULY 16, 1970.

* * * *

The meeting was called to order by the presiding officer, Mayor W. W. McAllister, with the following members present: McALLISTER, CALDERON, BURKE, JAMES, HABERMAN, NIELSEN, TREVINO, HILL, TORRES; Absent: NONE.

- - -
70-31 The invocation was given by Reverend Christian Kehl, Jail Chaplain and Urban Minister.

- - -
The minutes of the meetings of July 2 and 9, 1970, were approved.

- - -
70-31 ZONING HEARINGS

a. CASE 3898 - to rezone Lot 54, Blk. 1, NCB 3720, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District, located on the west side of Bremen Avenue, 210' north of Glover Street; having 180' on Bremen Avenue and a depth of 95'.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Dr. Calderon, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by the passage of the following Ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 38,730

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 54, BLK. 1,
NCB 3720, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "R-3" MULTIPLE
FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

- - -
b. CASE 3907 S.R. - to rezone Lot 5, NCB 10838, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-1" Business District for a hospital, located on the south side of Southcross Boulevard, 2089.16' west of South W. W. White Road; having 451.18' on Southcross Boulevard and a maximum depth of 520.18'.

July 16, 1970
ky

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, on motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Dr. Nielsen, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by the passage of the following Ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSTAIN: Burke; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 38,731

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 5, NCB 10838, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT FOR A HOSPITAL.

* * * *

c. CASE 3935 - to rezone Lot 51, NCB 11875, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located on the east side of Broadway, approximately 622.86' north of Flamingo Drive; having 200' on Broadway and a maximum depth of 316.80'.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Dr. Calderon made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved provided that a six foot (6') solid screen fence be erected along the rear property line. The motion was seconded by Dr. Nielsen. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 38,732

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 51, NCB 11875, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT A SIX FOOT (6') SOLID SCREEN FENCE BE ERECTED ALONG THE REAR PROPERTY LINE.

* * * *

d. CASE 3940 - to rezone Lot 19, NCB 12100, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located on the northeast side of Crownhill Boulevard, 776.69' northwest of Loop 410 Expressway; having 152.66' on Crownhill Boulevard and a depth of 286.86'.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Trevino, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by the passage of the following Ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 38,733

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, NCB 12100,
FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT.

* * * *

e. CASE 3942 - to rezone Lot 3, NCB 13940, from Temporary "R-A" Residence-Agricultural District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located on the north side of Castroville Road, 1068.92' west of Acme Road; having 302.06' on Castroville Road and a maximum depth of 743.75'.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Trevino, seconded by Mr. Hill, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by the passage of the following Ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 38,734

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE
THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE
ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN
ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION
AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY
DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 3, NCB 13940,
FROM TEMPORARY "R-A" RESIDENCE-
AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT
INDUSTRY DISTRICT.

* * * *

f. CASE 3962 - to rezone Lot 3, Blk. 2, NCB 14043, from Temporary "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located on the northwest side of I. H. 35 Expressway, 909.79' southwest of Whirlwind Drive; having 150' on I. H. 35 and a depth of 150'.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, on motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mr. Hill, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by the passage of the following Ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 38,735

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 3, BLK. 2, NCB 14043, FROM TEMPORARY "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

- - -
70-31 Mayor McAllister was obliged to leave the meeting and Mayor Pro-Tem Calderon presided.
- - -

g. CASE 3967 - to rezone Lot 7, NCB 10757, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "R-2" Two Family Residential District, located on the north side of Rigsby Avenue (U. S. Highway 87), 505.92' west of the cutback to W. W. White Road; having 81.2' on Rigsby Avenue and a depth of 258.2'.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, on motion of Dr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Hill, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by the passage of the following Ordinance by the following vote: AYES: Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: McAllister.

AN ORDINANCE 38,736

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, NCB 10757,
FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
DISTRICT TO "R-2" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
DISTRICT.

* * * *

h. CASE 3968 - to rezone Lots 1, 3, 4, 5, Blk. 5, NCB 12815, from Temporary "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-1" Business District, located on the northwest side of Medical Drive, 1109.40' southwest of the intersection of Fredericksburg Road and Medical Drive; having a total frontage of 404.68' on Medical Drive and a maximum depth of 264.04'.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Dr. Nielsen, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by the passage of the following Ordinance by the following vote:
AYES: Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres;
NAYS: None; ABSENT: McAllister.

AN ORDINANCE 38,737

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE
THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE
ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN
ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION
AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY
DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOTS 1, 3, 4, 5,
BLK. 5, NCB 12815, FROM TEMPORARY "A"
SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO
"B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

70-31 Mayor McAllister returned to the meeting and presided.

j. CASE 3965 - to rezone the northwest 150' of the southwest 150' of Tract 5, Blk. H, NCB 8358, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located on the northeast side of Bandera Road, 388.85' southeast of East Ligustrum Drive; having 150' on Bandera and a depth of 150'.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

July 16, 1970
ky

-5-

After consideration, on motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Dr. Nielsen, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by the passage of the following Ordinance by the following vote:
AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 38,738

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 NORTHWEST 150' OF THE SOUTHWEST 150' OF TRACT 5, BLK. H, NCB 8358, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

k. CASE 3948 - to rezone Lots 1 and 2, Blk. 11, NCB 11331, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located southwest of the intersection of Calle Arteaga and Calle Allende; having 50' on Calle Arteaga and 111' on Calle Allende.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, on motion of Dr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Hill, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by the passage of the following Ordinance by the following vote:
AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 38,739

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOTS 1 AND 2, BLK. 11, NCB 11331, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

1. CASE 3946 - to rezone Lot 53, Blk. 18, NCB 1599, from "E" Office District to "B-2" Business District, located on the east side of South New Braunfels Avenue between Cooper Street and Aransas Avenue; having 118.18' on South New Braunfels Avenue, 100' on Cooper Street and 104.43' on Aransas Avenue.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Hill made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved provided that a six foot (6') solid screen fence be erected along the east property line. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trevino. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: Nielsen; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 38,740

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 53, BLK. 18, NCB 1599, FROM "E" OFFICE DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT A SIX FOOT (6') SOLID SCREEN FENCE BE ERECTED ALONG THE EAST PROPERTY LINE.

* * * *

m. CASE 3955 - to rezone Lot 31, Blk. 2, NCB 9793, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located on the north side of Basse Road, 228' west of Beacon Avenue; having 114.0' on Basse Road and a depth of 123.56'.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Dr. Calderon made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved provided that a six foot (6') solid screen fence be erected along the west, north and east property lines. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trevino. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Torres; NAYS: Hill; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 38,741

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 31, BLK. 2, NCB 9793, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL

DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT,
PROVIDED THAT A SIX FOOT (6') SOLID
SCREEN FENCE BE ERECTED ALONG THE
WEST, NORTH AND EAST PROPERTY LINES.

* * * *

n. CASE 3927 - to rezone Lot 5, NCB 10598 (11.929 acres), from Temporary "A" Single Family Residential District to "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District, located on the north side of Dietrich Road, 658.11' east of Springfield Road; having 605.73' on Dietrich Road and a depth of 862.96'.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Dr. Calderon, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by the passage of the following Ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Trevino.

AN ORDINANCE 38,742

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE
THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE
ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN
ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION
AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY
DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 5, NCB 10598
(11.929 ACRES), FROM TEMPORARY "A"
SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
TO "R-3" MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
DISTRICT.

* * * *

o. CASE 3824 S.R. - to rezone Lot 47, Blk. 43, NCB 1851, from "D" Apartment District to "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District for a day care center with over 20 children, located on the south side of West Woodlawn Avenue, 75' east of Michigan Avenue; having 50' on West Woodlawn Avenue and a depth of 130'.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Rev. James, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by the passage of the following Ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Hill; NAYS: Torres; ABSENT: Nielsen, Trevino.

AN ORDINANCE 38,743

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE
THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE
ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN
ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION
AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY
DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 47, BLK. 43,
NCB 1851, FROM "D" APARTMENT DISTRICT
TO "R-3" MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL
DISTRICT FOR A DAY CARE CENTER WITH
OVER 20 CHILDREN.

* * * *

p. CASE 3945 - to rezone Lots 6-A and 6-B, Blk. 2, NCB 2220, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located southwest of the intersection of North Elmendorf Street and Perez Street; having 51.36' on Perez Street and 159.8' on North Elmendorf Street.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained that the Planning Commission had recommended the rezoning be denied, because this is predominantly a residential area and there are no established business zones in the immediate vicinity. A change to business zone would be an encroachment on the residential area. He also explained that the proponent intended to use this property to develop a second hand clothing and furniture store, which would be operated out of the four vacant rooms in the rear of the existing dwelling. The Traffic Department had advised also that the lot does not provide adequate parking for the intended use.

The proponent in this case, Mr. Marcos Reyes, was not present.

Appearing in opposition was Mr. Louis Rodriguez, 2220 Perez Street. Mr. Rodriguez said that there actually had been a junk business operated out of this location for the last year. He said that it was noisy, dirty and created an undue amount of traffic and that he was thoroughly opposed to rezoning.

After consideration, Dr. Nielsen made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be upheld and the rezoning denied. The motion was seconded by Mr. Burke. On roll call, the motion prevailed by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Hill; NAYS: Trevino; ABSENT: Torres.

The Council asked Mr. Douthit to have this area checked to see if a violation has occurred.

q. CASE 3949 - to rezone Lots 7 through 19, Blk. 29, NCB 13919 and Lots 1 through 12, Blk. 3, NCB 14190, from "A" Single Family Residential District and Temporary "R-A" Residence-Agriculture District to "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District.

Lots 7 through 19 are located on the southwest side of Powhatan Drive, 648' southeast of Tioga Drive; having 1120.33' on Powhatan Drive and a maximum depth of 158.98'.

July 16, 1970
ky

-9-

Lots 1 through 12 are located on the east side of Northmoor Lane between Castledale Drive and Powhatan Drive; having 260' on Powhatan Drive, 119.21' on Castledale Drive and 876.79' on Northmoor Lane.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, stated that the Planning Commission recommended approval of Lots 1 through 12, NCB 14190, but recommended denial of a change in zoning from "R-A" to "R-3" on Lots 7 through 19, NCB 13919. The applicant, H. B. Zachry Properties, Inc., has appealed the decision to the City Council and it will require seven (7) affirmative votes to overrule the Planning Commission and rezone the entire property.

Mr. Jim Uptmore, representing H. B. Zachry Properties, explained that they propose to use the property for condominium-type construction. On Lots 7 through 19, there are 12 lots and they plan to construct 24 units. He presented a sketch of the type of construction and explained the difference between condominium and townhouses. "R-3" is requested, because it is the best suited zoning classification for them, since there is no definite classification, as "R-6" for townhouses. He suggested that a condominium-type zoning classification be created by the Council. He said there is a large drainage easement, which separates Lots 7 through 19 and the residences on Rock Creek Run. A meeting was held with property owners who are objecting to the rezoning, at which he presented a set of restrictions, which he has agreed to put on record. The restrictions assure that the property will be used for condominium construction; that they will build a six foot (6') fence along the rear property line; agreed not to place a swimming pool in this facility; and, further agreed not to claim any of the drainage ditch. He said that the restrictions were for the persons who own property abutting Lots 7 through 19.

Mr. Hoyle Brazzell, 3615 Rock Creek Run, appeared in opposition and asked that the restrictive covenants be put on record prior to the rezoning. After discussing this, he withdrew his opposition.

Mrs. Maria Knicker, 3611 Rock Creek Run, and Mrs. T. T. Spellman spoke in opposition to the rezoning of Lots 7 through 19.

After a lengthy discussion of the merits of the case, Mr. Torres made a motion to uphold the recommendation of the Planning Commission by approving the rezoning of Lots 1 through 12 in NCB 14190 and denying the rezoning of Lots 7 through 19 in NCB 13919. The motion was seconded by Dr. Nielsen.

Dr. Calderon made a substitute motion to overrule the Planning Commission and rezone the property as requested in the application. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trevino. On roll call, the motion failed by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, Haberman, Trevino, Hill; NAYS: James, Nielsen, Torres; ABSENT: None.

After further discussion of the case, Mr. Torres withdrew his original motion.

Dr. Calderon then made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission, to grant the change in zone of Lots 1 through 12, Block 3, NCB 14190, to "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District, and to deny the change in zone from "R-A" to "R-3" on

July 16, 1970
ky

Lots 7 through 19, NCB 13919, be upheld. The motion was seconded by Dr. Nielsen. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 38,744

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOTS 1 THROUGH 12, BLK. 3, NCB 14190, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT AND TEMPORARY "R-A" RESIDENCE-AGRICULTURE DISTRICT TO "R-3" MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT.

* * * *

r. CASE 3956 - to rezone the south 140' of Lots 13 and 14, Blk. 6, NCB 8732, from "C" Apartment District to "B-1" Business District, located on the west side of Lyell Street, 150' south of Fay Avenue; having 140' on Lyell Street and a depth of 300'.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be denied by the City Council.

Mr. Louis F. Parra, the applicant, explained that he proposed to convert his garage and establish a beauty shop. He stated that the property is located near the New Laredo Highway and there is business property close by. The property to be rezoned is not near any of the residences. There are no objections on the part of the neighbors.

After consideration, Mr. Trevino made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be overruled and the rezoning granted. The motion was seconded by Dr. Nielsen. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 38,745

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 140' OF LOTS 13 AND 14, BLK. 6, NCB 8732, FROM "C" APARTMENT DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

341

s. CASE 3974 - to rezone Lots 73 through 76, NCB 7023, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located on the north side of Donaldson Avenue, approximately 460' west of Manor Drive; having 100' on Donaldson Avenue and a depth of 140.98'.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be denied by the City Council.

Mr. Harper MacFarlane, representing the applicant, City Public Service Board, spoke in favor of the rezoning. He distributed pictures of the property and pointed out the retail businesses in the area. He said the property was purchased in 1934 and used as a substation until 1956. The City Public Service Board wants to sell the property.

Mr. Ray Parker, Realtor and Appraiser, stated it was his opinion that the highest and best use of the property would be "B-2." However, should the Council not go along with "B-2," he asked that "O" Office zoning be granted.

Speaking in opposition were Mr. R. M. Lawson, 332 Meridith, and Mrs. Joseph Skidmore, 1061 Donaldson Avenue.

After consideration, Dr. Calderon made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission, to deny the rezoning, be upheld. The motion was seconded by Rev. James. On roll call, the motion prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Torres; NAYS: McAllister, Hill; ABSENT: None.

i. CASE 3928 - to rezone Lot 1, Blk. 57, NCB 12621, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located on the south side of Deely Place, between Barranca Avenue and South Flores Street; having 300' on Deely Place, 125' on Barranca Avenue and 394.78' on South Flores Street.

Planning Director, Steve Taylor, explained the proposed change, which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

Mr. Arthur M. McKenzie, representing the applicant, Regua Realty, stated that they would replat according to the Planning Commission's requirements. He understood there was some question about screening along the rear of the property to protect the residences on Deely and Barranca Streets.

He said he was agreeable to fencing and a non-access easement to prevent access from the property to Deely and Barranca Streets.

After consideration, Rev. James made a motion to uphold the recommendation of the Planning Commission and rezone the property, subject to replatting of the property to provide a five foot (5') vehicular non-access easement beginning at a point on the south line of Deely Place, which is an extension of the common lot line between Lots 3 through 6 and 8 through 13, NCB 2620, and

extending along the south line of Deely Place and along the east line of Barranca Avenue to the south end of Barranca Avenue, and provided that the described line is properly screened. The motion was seconded by Dr. Nielsen. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Hill; NAYS: None; ABSTAIN: McAllister; ABSENT: Trevino, Torres.

AN ORDINANCE 38,746

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 1, BLK. 57, NCB 12621, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT, SUBJECT TO REPLATTING OF THE PROPERTY TO PROVIDE A FIVE FOOT (5') VEHICULAR NON-ACCESS EASEMENT BEGINNING AT A POINT ON THE SOUTH LINE OF DEELY PLACE, WHICH IS AN EXTENSION OF THE COMMON LOT LINE BETWEEN LOTS 3 THROUGH 6 AND 8 THROUGH 13, NCB 2620, AND EXTENDING ALONG THE SOUTH LINE OF DEELY PLACE AND ALONG THE EAST LINE OF BARRANCA AVENUE TO THE SOUTH END OF BARRANCA AVENUE, AND PROVIDED THAT THE DESCRIBED LINE IS PROPERLY SCREENED.

* * * *

70-31 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 38,747

DECLARING THAT THE PUBLIC SHALL BE ADMITTED FREE TO HEMISFAIR PLAZA AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES ESTABLISHING CHARGES THEREFOR.

* * * *

On motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Torres, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, James, Haberman, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Burke, Nielsen.

70-31 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 38,748

AMENDING SECTION 18A-8 OF THE CITY CODE (ORDINANCE NO. 37812 KNOWN AS THE HOME IMPROVEMENT CONTRACTOR'S LICENSING ORDINANCE) BY PROVIDING FOR THE ISSUANCE OF TEMPORARY LICENSES FOR A PERIOD NOT EXCEEDING 90 DAYS

AND PROVIDING THAT ANY VIOLATION
HEREOF SHALL BE PUNISHED BY A FINE
NOT TO EXCEED \$200.00.

* * * *

Mr. M. C. Belden, Chairman of the Home Improvement Advisory Board, discussed the proposed amendment with the City Council and recommended that the Ordinance be passed. He introduced other members of the board, who were present.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Hill, seconded by Mr. Torres, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

70-31 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 38,749

ESTABLISHING TRUST FUND NO. 746 TO
HANDLE ACCOUNTING REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE SUMMER YOUTH PROGRAM; AUTHORIZING
124 ADDITIONAL EMPLOYEE POSITIONS;
AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF CONTRACTS
WITH VARIOUS ORGANIZATIONS TO IMPLEMENT
SAID PROGRAM AND APPROPRIATING
\$323,712.00 OUT OF SAID FUND.

* * * *

Mr. Ed Koplan, Youth Program Coordinator, explained this is a special summer program established by the Department of Labor. Very short notice was given to implement it. It is basically, therefore, the same type of program as operated last summer using the criteria used last year. The program terminates on August 29 and all unexpended funds must be returned to the Department of Labor. The ordinance provides funds for the Parks and Recreation Department to carry out expanded programs and authorizes the City Manager to enter into contracts with 16 agencies, who deal with youth programming and have demonstrated capability and can start on Monday, July 20. Locations of the program centers are basically the same as last year with the exception of four. There are three new neighborhood corporations included, as well as ten additional City recreation centers, which have opened. There are 90 centers provided for, as compared to 80 last summer and all are located in disadvantaged areas. He stated that the per center cost of operation is \$3,425 and presented to the Council a breakdown of the costs and proposed program administration. 18 of the 90 centers are located on the eastside.

City Manager Henckel advised that the time given to implement the program was inadequate and there is not any way to properly evaluate and administer a program of this magnitude. Undoubtedly there are other agencies who have the capability to operate centers and the staff would have no objection if the Council saw fit to reallocate some of the funds. He added that there were a number of organizations who desire to speak on the subject of allocations.

July 16, 1970
ky

Mrs. Dolores Bradley, Executive Director of the Ella Austin Community Center, asked for additional allocations for organizations on the eastside.

Mr. William Donahue, representing United Community Development Corporation, spoke of that agency's experience and qualifications to operate a summer program and felt the allocation for one center was insufficient for people in their area.

Mr. David Alvarado spoke in support of the summer program and the need to make as good use of the money as possible.

Mr. Ernest Gomez, representing Wesley Community Center, asked for additional allocations, saying they operated three centers last year and have been funded for one center this year.

Mr. Melvin Sance, Jr. supported Mrs. Bradley's plea for more funds for the eastside. He said SANYO was reported to have been funded for 20 centers and now find there will be 30. He could not understand why the eastside had been cut.

Mr. Tom Kirby, a director of the YMCA, stated two of their centers had been left out and are available for use, in addition to those funded.

Mr. Koplan advised they met with a SANYO representative on Wednesday afternoon. In a review of the projects, \$18,000 in excess funds were found, which were generated between a grant by the Department of Agriculture and money that was not expended for the City's insurance plan for children. In trying to determine the allocations, the staff went back to the original criteria for last year. The money was assigned to SANYO and the centers to be operated raised from 20 to 30.

Mrs. Minnie Williams, an employee of the Ella Austin Center, stated she crashed yesterday's meeting. She quoted Father Yanta as saying he would let the centers go if he could not get them all funded. Basically SANYO wanted more money and got it. She felt other centers could take up the slack, if SANYO did not operate their centers.

Mrs. Mamie Lopez spoke in behalf of additional allocation for Wesley Community Center in Columbia Heights. She claimed there are no centers on the southside.

Mrs. Johnny L. Parker spoke in behalf of all neighborhood centers.

Mr. Ramon Rodriguez stated he had donated five years time to SANYO and Alexander Hamilton Neighborhood Center. Their funds have been cut, but the center is operating. If bickering continues, the money will go back to Washington.

Mr. Ed Price, coordinator for Project Free, felt the eastside was shortchanged.

Dr. C. J. Roberts, Director of Human Resources, reviewed steps taken in arriving at their recommendation and said it was the best balanced program they could come up with.

July 16, 1970
ky

-15-

345
344

Mr. Torres offered, as a compromise, that the City Council approve the ordinance with the allocations as set out and at the same time provide funds out of the general fund for an additional 10 or 15 centers and authorize the City Manager to negotiate with three or four groups that have sought additional centers.

City Manager Henckel stated that ending balances have been determined and any additional funding would have to come from the new budget, which would create problems. As a compromise, he stated that of the \$18,000 in question, these could be redistributed by putting \$9,000 on the eastside and \$9,000 on the westside.

After discussion, the Council agreed to postpone action until after the lunch recess.

After the lunch break, the Council again considered the distribution of funds to operate the summer recreation program.

Mrs. Haberman made a motion to amend the ordinance, so that from the \$18,000 in question, \$5,000 be allocated to SANYO; \$5,000 to agencies on the eastside; \$5,000 to agencies on the westside; and, \$3,000 to the agency on the southside that, in the judgment of the City Manager and his staff, can produce the best results and serve the largest number of people. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hill. After discussion, the motion prevailed by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Hill, Torres; NAYS: Calderon, Trevino; ABSENT: None.

Mr. Torres then made a motion that \$20,000 be allocated from next year's budget to meet the need of various summer programs that have been presented. The motion was seconded by Dr. Nielsen. After discussion, the motion failed by the following vote: AYES: Nielsen, Torres; NAYS: McAllister, Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Trevino, Hill; ABSENT: None.

Later in the meeting, the Clerk advised the Council the ordinance was amended as requested by the Council and that the \$18,000 in question was reallocated by reducing SANYO's allocation by \$13,000 to \$73,009; increasing from \$4,673 to \$7,173 the allocation for House of Neighborly Service; increasing from \$4,673 to \$7,673 the allocation for Wesley Community Center and Center South; increasing from \$4,673 to \$7,173 the allocation for Madonna Center; and, from \$4,673 to \$9,673 the allocation for Citizen Community of Action Development Corporation.

The City Manager stated the staff had met with the agencies concerned, namely Ella Austin Community Center and Project Free, and they had agreed to the reallocation.

On motion of Mr. Burke, seconded by Mr. Torres, the ordinance, as corrected, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Calderon, Burke, James, Haberman, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: McAllister.

DISCUSSION OF PROPOSED BOND ISSUE

EXPRESSWAY RIGHT OF WAY

W. S. CLARK: As you know, this program originally started with about \$14 million plus in the expressway right-of-way fund and it is pared down now to one million one. It consists mainly of two figures - one of them for \$500,000, which is a more or less token amount that is put into the bond program as a result of the Steering Committee's recommendation and the Highway Department's recommendations that we provide funds - some funds, at least token funds - to indicate to the State Highway Department that we are interested in them further engineering and developing a freeway to connect with I. H. 10. Now, admittedly, this \$500,000 will not buy any certain area, but it will indicate the City's intent to have the Highway Department complete or proceed with the development of that freeway, which ultimately would be a part of the Bandera Freeway. This would provide this good:

1. That in the revamping of the I. H. 10 Freeway, which, as you know, in this area of Culebra is very below standard and the Highway Department is intending and are working on plans, as I understand from Mr. Fischer's office, to expand the freeway in that area. If they do, in those plans I am sure that they would like to provide the necessary right-of-way and possibly the construction for a stub out wherever it is decided in the Culebra area for this future expressway. Secondly, if they do develop and come across with a plan that is suitable to everybody, then they could put a protective ordinance on the proposed freeway area and then we would have some funds available to us, which could be used in an emergency, such as someone that is under a hardship, because of the protective ordinance. We could then go in and appraise and purchase their property to relieve their hardship. Admittedly, this is not anything more than a token amount, because, actually, I think, the State gave us something like \$11 million, if I am not mistaken, for the freeway - the ultimate complete freeway right-of-way.

The second item is for \$600,000 and that is to provide funds for, mainly, three things. In connection with the North Expressway, there was a three-way contract entered into between the F.A.A., the City and the State back a few years ago, which provided that in the case that when the freeway was to be built, the light lane for Municipal Airport has to be revamped - that the State would not participate nor the Federal government would not participate in the realignment or the reconstruction, bridging, etc., of the light lanes for the east-west runway. As you know, those lights have been in there for several years and in order to put them in there, in the State right-of-way, the City agreed to this by Council action and entered into the contract. \$250,000 of that \$600,000 is to provide the funds, which will not be reimbursed from any other section for that purpose. The balance of that is split into two items - one is a small amount of it and I would rather not state the exact amount, because there is just one owner involved in two or three parcels and we have not completed the appraisal of the property - we have just made some estimates for this bond proposal. It might be erroneous one way or the other - too high or too low - but it is a small portion of the balance of this \$350,000. That is for Section C of Military Drive Southeast. This is probably a long forgotten item, but back years ago, we entered into a contract with the State Highway Department to develop Military Drive. As you know, the State has done all of the

July 16, 1970
ky

-17-

347

814

construction work, handled the drainage and did everything necessary to bring Military Drive South up to what it is today. All the way from the vicinity of Kelly Field up to Roosevelt. Now, Section C needs no right-of-way, as far as the Military Drive end of it is concerned, but it does need some right-of-way to connect in the vicinity of W. W. White Road on the east side to Loop 410. If you can picture that short stretch where Military Drive makes the turn in the southeast corner of the City, it comes within a very short distance of Loop 410 and there is a connection in this proposal for that right-of-way. The balance of it is that money that has been spoken to you, needed for the completion of the right-of-way for the U. S. 281 North Freeway.

MR. HILL: Are you talking of Southeast Military around Brooks Field?

W. S. CLARK: Correct.

MR. HILL: Where it goes under I. H. 37?

W. S. CLARK: Well, let's put it this way. There is no right-of-way needed in that particular section. They have the right-of-way and they are going to do the whole project sometime in the next year or two. They are funding it - the State is. And in connection with their development of Southeast Military Drive, from where it now narrows down at Goliad - from Goliad on east to W. W. White Road is Section C. In connection with that, we have this little spur that is going to connect Military Drive with Loop 410 at the corner.

DR. CALDERON: Are there any questions that the Council might have?

DR. NIELSEN: I just cannot understand at all design, planning - whatever you want to call it - why in the world, as you said, this is a token sort of a thing, that's \$500,000 in there for that I. H. 10 interchange. Why is that not all part at the time that the plan preparations are ready? Why is that not included?

W. S. CLARK: You mean five years from now or three years from now?

DR. NIELSEN: Or whenever, yes.

MR. TORRES: We have one expressway problem that has resulted, because of lack of comprehensive planning and here we are jumping into absolutely the same situation.

W. S. CLARK: Let me explain this. Let me answer Dr. Nielsen's question first. Doctor, I have no idea in the world why they decided on \$500,000. This was not a staff recommendation. This is the Steering Committee's recommendation. The amount as far as the amount is concerned, I'll try to give you the basic purposes behind setting some amount whether it be \$500,000 or \$1,000,000 or \$250,000, I think it's open to argument. The idea for it is the State indicated, local State Highway Department indicated, to the Bond Committee, that there should be, seeing as they had to pare all of the funds, rather than vote for the whole freeway, because if we couldn't do it in the context of the bond issue paying at 65, 66, 67 million dollars, they had to cut out 8 or 9 million dollars of freeway funds. Now, they said, "But we would, since we haven't got a route that is approved and a design that is completed and the engineering finished, we want some funds in there earmarked by the City in their bond program to

July 16, 1970
ky

prove to the State Highway Department that the City is actually interested in the Bandera Freeway or the I. H. 10 Interchange, which becomes a part of the Bandera Freeway in the vicinity of Culebra - number one. Number two - if those funds are in there for that purpose, they can be utilized in case the State, when they develop I. H. 10's widening or improvement or whatever you call it. As you know, it's very substandard now in the area of Culebra. In their design and development of that area to improve I. H. 10, they may want to come in there with a stub out and at the time they do the engineering and construction or reconstruction of I. H. 10 in this area, they hopefully will have a point of linkage with this other freeway. They would like to have funds available to buy the right-of-way necessary to stub out, so that they can construct and stub in just like they're doing with I. H. 37 right now at the interchange in front of Pearl Brewery.....stub out the actual future link for the future expressway.

DR. NIELSEN: That's all presupposing the fact in time at some point, we're going to have any kind of an expressway and at the moment, I just don't see that as a vital kind of an issue that people will buy, if they're going to approach it on anything in terms of some good faith. I'd suggest that they just relate it directly to the bottleneck that exists on I. H. 10.

W. S. CLARK: Doctor, let me rush on to say, there will be no funds available when they do the I. H. 10 construction. There are no funds needed from the City in order to do that, because it is part of the I. H. system. The I. H. system is provided 90% by Federal funds and 10% by State, without City participation to the tune of a dime. Now, the other freeway will be a 50-50 proposition, as was with Highway 90 West, as is our 281 North, and as is the proposed Bandera Freeway, where the funds will be 50-50, as far as right-of-way is concerned, with the State and the City providing the money and the construction will be, supposedly, 50-50, Federal and State. That is the reason funds have to be provided by the City for any necessary stub out in connection with the I. H. 10. In other words, it will not be out of I. H. 10 funds.

MR. TORRES: But, then, of course, the committee, the Steering Committee then had information, which even the Council isn't being given. Number 1 - it assumes, or better yet, it's making planning for a Bandera Expressway, where we don't even know the route. Secondly, it's in contravention to the desires of our CPPC, since the expressway or the existing routes or the routes that have been proposed, go through Model Cities area and our Model Cities people have already expressed an intent not to go along with that expressway route through the Model Cities area, so I don't see how we could be laying any planning or any groundwork.

W. S. CLARK: Mr. Torres, you put me on the position of defending the decision of the Steering Committee, which I can't do, because I wasn't in on the decision that they made. I was told that this was what they had to do and this was done for the purposes that I have explained to you. This was as they gave it to me. They originally, as you recall, had millions of dollars in here, for I think, three something, in the first five years or something like that and about 8 million in the second five years for the entire freeway for the public to vote on, as to whether they wanted it or not. Ofttimes, we vote bonds.....the I. H. 37 Expressway is a

July 16, 1970
ky

-19-

prime example. We vote bonds, not knowing the exact route of the expressway. It could be developed, as I say, we don't know that this is going to come off at Culebra even, the route that they finally settle on, which they submit to the public in public hearings and submit to the City for their approval may be in an altogether different location.

MR. TORRES: This is the problem we've run into in the past - that we start approving these things piecemeal and by the time that actually it comes down to the City knowing where the route is going to be, you know, the impression is left that all the planning has been done for this particular route. We've already spent so much money on it, based on votes that were previously taken and as a consequence.. we're, you know.....

W. S. CLARK: We don't spend any of these monies, Mr. Torres, until the route has been approved by the citizenry.

DR. CALDERON: My understanding, Pete, is the fact that in trying to set the amount for the interchange, we are not necessarily approving the location of the interchange.....

W. S. CLARK: Not at all.....

DR. CALDERON: Nor approving any sort of a route, it's merely the fact that an interchange will be required at some point and the money can be set aside for such time that the interchange will be required.....

MR. TORRES: I understand.....

W. S. CLARK: And as an indication to the Highway Department that we're not dropping the idea just because we're not voting 11 million dollars worth of bonds to build a freeway, we are indicating to the Highway Department, this being a substantial amount of money that "Highway Department, we don't want you to drop your plans." We want you to keep on with your engineering and try to determine a route that is feasible, that will suit the citizenry, suit the staff of the City and the Highway Department and submit it to the public and then there would have to be a future vote definitely for the funds.

DR. NIELSEN: It seems to me that the good faith is being asked is so predicated on so much postulation that the best good faith would be what has been demonstrated in the past and to speculate on a stub out or whatever just.....I just can't see that.....

W. S. CLARK: I won't contend the point, Doctor. This is a policy decision, it certainly is up to you people to decide.

MR. TORRES: Okay, my colleagues on the Council, if there is justification for this, it certainly hasn't been presented here and if we're going to talk about good faith - Highway Department, then we could ask the Highway Department for their good faith by them letting us in on their planning and what has transpired, insofar as the route for a Bandera Expressway.

W. S. CLARK: Mr. Fischer possibly can show some light on this. He's been, I'm sure, in contact with the State, as far as the routing is

concerned, as far as the development of the plans is concerned. Whereas, I haven't. Stewart, do you have anything that you would like to throw in?

STEWART FISCHER: I don't know of anything more to add, other than the fact that the Highway Department has done no planning with regards to Bandera Freeway. All the planning has been done with that has come out of my office. What we know is that there is going to be a need for another freeway in the general northwest section of the City. There's also going to be a need to improve present Interstate Highway 10. There's a need today to do this. We know these facts. There has been no particular planning. We have attempted, through the work with the Model Cities, to find some corridors through the Model neighborhood into the northwest area. There have been several presented there and they have been voted down by the CPPC. It is possible to build the so-called Bandera Freeway without going into the neighborhood area. It has problems just like they all do and there must be a great deal more planning before we have any answers.

DR. NIELSEN: Let me ask you, what happens concerning the master plan of 18-20 years ago to the Zarzamora bypass? Now, that's the one thing that was planned back in those days that has been dropped, which indicates to me that somewhere along the line there was some shifting. That's why I'm concerned to stick our neck out like this.

STEWART FISCHER: As a part of the 1964 Urban Transportation Study, that required SABCUTS, right. SABCUTS was based on the 1956 OD study that you're aware of. As a part of SABCUT, we made computer runs on quite a large number of facilities to try to resolve the traffic problem. As a result of the computer run, the bypass along Zarzamora did not relieve the problem, because of the increased growth to the northwest part of the City. This did not even take off the Interstate 10 flow, but again, depending upon where they started and where they first ended. If you will look at a map, incidentally, that Zarzamora area is a tremendously densely residential neighborhood. We would have real problems trying to clear right-of-way along Zarzamora for a freeway.

DR. CALDERON: It's true, will the I. H. 10 Bypass terminate at this particular interchange? In other words, is the interchange part of the I. H. 10 Bypass or is it not?

STEWART FISCHER: Doctor, we cannot answer the question, because we don't even know where the interchange is going yet. But, essentially, the intent of the I. H. 10 Bypass is to at a point in the vicinity of Fredericksburg Road and again, it's just very general, because there's been no design at this point, simply because north of Fredericksburg Road we have the section, which has considerably more capacity than that south. From this general neighborhood we need an increased facility to go south to at least Highway 90 West. Now, how we will get from Point A to Point B, this we don't yet know.

DR. NIELSEN: We're just moving the Zarzamora Bypass further east. What you said about these houses, the whole bit, that same question could be raised about Bandera Road.

STEWART FISCHER: That's correct. This is why I say, we don't have answers to this thing. All we know is that we've got a problem out there and it's going to take some real careful and intense study to be able to come up with answers that will do the least amount of harm to the community.

July 16, 1970
ky

-21-

1351

DR. NIELSEN: Are you convinced that \$500,000 "good faith" item is really that critical?

STEWART FISCHER: Yes, sir, for the simple reason that the Highway Commission's policy is that they will do no planning on Interstate 10 Bypass unless we do show our good faith. So, nothing will happen.

DR. NIELSEN: Well, you just said this doesn't directly have anything to do with Interstate 10 Bypass.

STEWART FISCHER: No, no, no. If I said that, I misinformed you. There has to be, somewhere along the Interstate 10 Bypass, an interchange to the freeway that must be built.....

DR. NIELSEN: Must be built.....might be built, well, must be built, if we're going to handle the problem.

STEWART FISCHER: I'm assuming that we're interested in handling the traffic problems in San Antonio. If this assumption is valid.....

DR. NIELSEN: It can include something more than expressways.....

STEWART FISCHER: It can. However, there is nothing in the cards that's feasible for San Antonio at this particular time.

DR. NIELSEN: Now, I'm not going to argue with you.....

MR. TORRES: You have existing right-of-way that we have never looked to toward widening, with the idea of solving I. H. 10.....

STEWART FISCHER: Yes, sir, we have looked at every right-of-way that's carrying traffic, Mr. Torres, and if we are going to widen them, we are going to be buying houses along one side of them.

DR. NIELSEN: That's exactly what some other communities have done.

STEWART FISCHER: And let me point out that this is also a part of our master plan. But, certainly, we don't expect to be able to handle all of the traffic of San Antonio by merely widening I. H. 10, building the North Expressway and building the Northwest Expressway. This will not do it. There will have to be a great deal of work done on existing arteries if we are going to handle our traffic problems. If we are talking about a new means of transportation, I want to point out to you that San Francisco is about 1.2 billion dollars into subway systems, if this is what we want to consider.

DR. CALDERON: As to the I. H. 10 Bypass, who would pay for both the acquisition of the land and construction of the bypass?

STEWART FISCHER: On the bypass itself, it would all be Interstate funds paid for 90% Federal, 10% State - no City funds involved, either right-of-way or construction.

DR. CALDERON: In other words, you further understand though, that this bypass will not become a reality in the absence of an interchange commitment on our part.

STEWART FISCHER: That's correct, sir.

DR. NIELSEN: I can't see it either, but this is the way they work.

DR. CALDERON: Any other questions?

MR. TORRES: I don't understand.

STEWART FISCHER: I don't understand either, sir, but it boils down to the fact that there will be no progress on the Interstate 10 Bypass unless the City has some funds to participate in whatever right-of-way cost.....

MR. TORRES: Is that specifically, excuse my trying to oversimplify this thing, I just want to be sure I understand what you're saying. When you talk about the Interstate 10 Bypass, what exactly are you talking about?

STEWART FISCHER: A facility to relieve the traffic congestion on I. H. 10.

MR. TORRES: To run parallel with.....

STEWART FISCHER: Either parallel, over it, under it, we don't know, sir.

MR. TORRES: I see. And before then again, what you're saying, before we can get into this.....this is a good.....(several people talking at the same time)

DR. CALDERON: Let me ask you this, what is the estimated cost of that interchange, of that bypass?

STEWART FISCHER: I have no idea, sir. I don't think there are figures on it. We haven't gotten that far.

MR. TORRES: Expenditure of this \$500,000 or the commitment to spend it for this particular purpose is not committed to any particular Northwest or Bandera Expressway route?

STEWART FISCHER: No, sir, none whatsoever. Besides on either one, either the bypass or the Bandera Freeway, it is required that there be two public hearings. One, which is called a corridor hearing, this is before there's any decision on a location or we must have a public hearing, 1500 feet wide an area. This is what we've been working with Model Cities on. Only these wide corridors where it's possible trying to avoid those things that you know the schools, the churches, the parks, the things that must be avoided. Trying to find a band through the area. There must be a public hearing held on this and then after, whatever the results of this are transmitted to the Department of Transportation for review, if they approve the corridor location, then a design will begin. Before a design is finalized, there must be a second public hearing. Certainly, the City will have ample protection and the citizens will have ample opportunity to know. Now, I'm not suggesting that everyone out there is going to welcome this thing with open arms. I think we've had enough experience to know better than that. But, there will be ample opportunity to be heard.

MR. TORRES: I'm sure they won't be welcomed with open arms, but quite the contrary.

July 16, 1970
ky

-23-

DR. NIELSEN: I'm sold to the point that if what you're saying is valid, that Interstate 10 Bypass is directly related to this good faith, I say, let's get after it. But, that has not been clear to this point.

STEWART FISCHER: I can only give you my word that this is the way the Highway Commission operates.

DR. NIELSEN: I don't like it, but I understand it a little better.

W. S. CLARK: Just one other point that I'd like to bring out in connection with the bond program. There was an item in there of 2½ million dollars on the part of the City for the I. H. 10 - 410 Interchange. Now, we've had that interchange under protective ordinance for.....I'm sorry that's 281-410, I'm going nuts here!

MR. TORRES: Wouldn't it be nice if we could go back to simple times, when we used to have names for these.....

W. S. CLARK: Yes, it sure would, it sure would. However, if you're going across country and you don't know the name, it's nice to have those I. H. signs up there. I want to point that out that the money has been withdrawn from the bond issue to cover that procurement. It's not in there, because in the clearing, down to the feasible sale price, they had to cut those funds.

DR. CALDERON: Will the Council be agreeable, insofar as there being, as it is now, two right-of-way items to get them together into one right-of-way category. In other words, like in terms of bringing together a related items, particularly of simplicity and clarity, and consolidate both of these right-of-way items into one category, as both items relate to.....

DR. NIELSEN:land acquisition?

DR. CALDERON: Okay. Let's take now Library. We covered that last time didn't we?

CITY COUNCIL: No.

DR. CALDERON: Oh, I'm sorry, Mike. We're ready for a rebuttal from you then.

MIKE SEXTON: I am going to be talking about two items that total 58 cents per capita or \$400,000 total. To refresh your memory, you have each received a map showing the existing library system. We have the main library, the main library annex, eight branch libraries. Our proposal, in the bond issue, as submitted by the Steering Committee, includes expansion of the Westfall Branch, which serves the northwest sector of the City. This building is now lending - last month they topped their all-time loan record of 52,000 items for one month. This is more than double the maximum for which the branch was initially planned. We are proposing funds, in the amount of \$125,000, to expand that by approximately 3,500 feet. Also, to increase the parking lot and take certain other corrective actions that are needed in that area. You will notice that this library is in the vicinity of the Texas University site, thus, hopefully, it will be able to absorb additional use, once the university is operative in that area.

July 16, 1970
ky

The second item - you will note that I have marked on this map the old Carver Library. The Carver Library is located within one mile of the new main library building. It is away from the population center that now exists on the eastside of the City. We are proposing moving out, roughly in the vicinity of Commerce and New Braunfels, with a new Carver Library. We propose \$275,000 for this complex. Hopefully, we can go to a size of approximately 7,000 square feet, but realistically taking inflation into account, we feel like we can guarantee a branch comparable to McCreless, Las Palmas, the present Westfall and the Pan American Library. We feel that it is important to adequately serve this segment of the City. Currently the Carver Library is totally ineffective.

July 16, 1970
ky

-25-

355

324

DR. NIELSEN: You don't have a specific site at all, do you? You're generally moving it further toward. . .

MIKE SEXTON: Yes, approximately a mile or mile and a quarter closer to the center of the population group as it now is.

DR. NIELSEN: Out of the original request, the one way out further West has just been dropped. Is that correct?

MIKE SEXTON: Yes, we proposed a branch due north because there is a strong buildup of population in that area. It was dropped with the reluctant approval of the Library Board on the basis that this is basically a two car family area and people are able to get to Westfall or down to Landa or San Pedro Branches. Incidentally, on the original proposal we were including eliminating San Pedro and moving out to the North.

DR. NIELSEN: I thought you had one way out further West somewhere.

MIKE SEXTON: No, actually the only other item was the branch out between Blanco and San Pedro quite far north and then we also have a proposal to separate heat and air conditioning in the old main library annex in order to make it fully functional for other uses of the City in addition to library uses.

DR. NIELSEN: This map has been circled incorrectly. They've circled the north-central instead of Westfall as the two items.

MIKE SEXTON: Yes, Westfall should be circled. . . yes, this is the old map. The map that you have here. . . the two items \$400,000-58¢ per capita.

DR. CALDERON: No further questions?

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: How about the Farmer's Market, so we can get Winston Martin while he is here.

DR. CALDERON: All right.

WINSTON MARTIN: The Farmer's Market I don't know exactly how it ended up with this but I'm very pleased to present this. I think it's something that's quite exciting in concept. The Rosa Verde Project has as one of its goals the redevelopment or the expansion of Farmer's Market. The idea being of course to keep what we had there that is colorful and attractive but make it much more reasonable and expect that it can remain. To do this we're starting at Military Plaza here at City Hall and starting what we call "Freedom Walk" which will begin at this point and all the way down to the market. There will be rehabilitation of the structures that are there. We're going to try to restore the area to what it had been on Hay Day from the standpoint of the architecture and all that is there to give it some distinct character so it can compete or it cannot compete with our shopping malls and thing that we have that are away from the centralization of downtown San Antonio. One of the problems when we redevelop the market, of course, is what do you do with those interests in the market that are so low in income producing means that they're not really supportable unless they're subsidized by some of the property around it. Of course, here we're talking about the truck stalls for \$1.50 a day for the farmers who come in with their produce and sell off from the back of the truck and that type of thing. The amount of money that you have proposed in the bond issue will build a parking structure at the most western end of the market next to the expressway. It will not only provide badly needed parking for that entire commercial area including the market but would also provide the first level of that structure for the truck sale. The architecture would, of course, be in keeping with the Spanish feeling or Mexican feeling of the market. It would be something that would be public in the sense that the parking would be controlled by the City so that you would not have the problem of excessive parking rates to contend with and it would be possible then as we're doing now to make this space available at a very minimum charge to those people who will be selling, as I say, from the trucks as they come in from the

produce area around San Antonio. The rest of the rehabilitation, the site design, the work of helping the property owners get rehabilitation money to fix their buildings up will come from Urban Renewal. There's no way in the Urban Renewal Program that we can build on this structure that we're speaking of and this is why we agree with the Chamber of Commerce and your Bond Committee felt that it should be a bond item.

DR. CALDERON: And you recommend it highly.

WINSTON MARTIN: Yes, sir.

DR. NIELSEN: I think it's got great potentials.

DR. CALDERON: Okay, thank you, Winston. Well, we'll take Health then.

DR. WM. ROSS: This represents the first time that the Health Department has had an opportunity to have any considerations for Capital Improvements in a Bond Issue in San Antonio. A number of the items presented in Capital Improvements annual reports and at such times we had included a number of the items in the 10 year proposal which later was cut to a five year program with the request from the Bond Steering Committee for us to place these in certain priorities and then report from the Bond Steering Committee which was submitted to you. The Steering Committee felt that in order to reduce the total amount of the Bond Issue to the amount that could be provided that it would be necessary to give consideration to choice between a central facility versus those that could be called service facilities, that is, out into the neighborhoods. They felt, also, that it would be easier to sell service than with the central facility and although recognizing the need for such, they went with the service facilities in their recommendation. This included two branch buildings and five small clinic buildings and then the further recommendation to you was for possible deletion of one of the branch buildings. In the brochure that was distributed last week you do have a map similar to this showing the locations where we do operate clinic facilities and this is just simply a review of that particular information. This is an attempt to show you the different types of services that are provided at each of the locations that are utilized. Also, your information does identify the fact that we are utilizing facilities owned and operated by other groups. Your information shows that there is only one city-owned facility. This is the facility at the Zarzamora Service Center area. We are using locations in the Housing Authority and then we're also using a large number of the clinic facilities and the equipment of neighborhood centers. These are all identified for you in your brochure. The types of facilities do vary. Some are very excellent. Some are very run down. We know, too, that we have had and do have even at this time a disparity--a difference, a vast difference between locations on the East versus the West. The difficulty on the East, of course, is an attempt to find locations. In regards to the five small clinic operations, some of these should be replacements and I don't mean necessarily by moving because the need is still there. For example, on the East Side, we do have two facilities that are very poor for clinic operations. One is at Sutton Homes, one at Wheatley Courts and these facilities do need to be improved. This would be two possible replacement types by a small clinic facility being utilized. There are others we could very well, within the five year program, use all five of those building as replacements rather than as new or additional. On the other hand, it could also be that they could be split so that some of them are replacements and some are locations of new facilities in the areas of high need which are not now served. The branch operation that is in management's recommendation, is that in the southwest area and, as previously mentioned, it is seen that the need would fall somewhere just east of Kelly Field area in that southwest portion of the city being a branch operation, again, covering all operations of the department so that people would not necessarily have to come to the central facility. It would house staff of sanitarians and nurses that would work out of that into their respective areas and save the mileage that they now lose coming back to the central location--at the same time have sufficient, adequate facilities for clinic operations in it. So you have a joint situation when we speak of a branch operation. I believe if you have any questions, I'll try to explain.

July 16, 1970
kh

-27-

357

DR. NIELSEN: What you're saying is the \$900,000 structure is the one we're talking about. . .

DR. WM. ROSS: Yes, the branch operation and this would not be the mini operation that we went to on the East Side which can be expanded as the need proves itself. This would give us a facility that should be of adequate size for a long time to come so we won't have to go back in and expand. Also, we'll have adequate facility for parking around it.

DR. NIELSEN: How do you justify \$900,000 for this kind of structure, Dr. Ross?

DR. WM. ROSS: Well, we have a problem in our department. We're not equipped with a planning section. We wish we were, but we do rely on information from the Planning Department of the City and we're dealing with a nebulous type of thing as far as specific location and value of property. This was started about a month ago, looking at that point and not knowing just exactly when this might, if ever, come about. We don't know the actual cost of land but knowing the size of the building based on experience we've had in our other clinic operations, based on the size of the facility for the staff that would be operating there plus parking, this should be an adequate piece of property and we don't know this. On the footage of the building, this is based on an attempt of utilizing the information that I have having adequate demonstration rooms in the building also for the staff to use in working with the people in the clinics thinking in terms of future programs that would be possible. It's just a simple multiplication of some of the square footage we have in what we call now nursing substations.

DR. NIELSEN: If a neighborhood--what we call clinic is 125,000 are you saying, in essence, you're going to have over 6 clinic type capability in that particular structure?

DR. WM. ROSS: Yes sir. Branch operation would include, for example, a multi-chair dental clinic whereas the little small clinic buildings would not. These are satellite type clinic operation and then the branch operations would.

DR. NIELSEN: You're saying, generally speaking, with the major facility you have 6 times that many--18 so to speak.

DR. WM. ROSS: No, anywhere from 4 to 6 or eight depending--now there's been a lot of discussion on this and with some of the developments with the dental school coming in there fashions that are still pretty mature. We've had some discussions with them. This could go as high as ten, Dr. Nielsen, using the para-dental personnel along with full time dentists in this operation.

DR. NIELSEN: How many treatment rooms, just roughly, are you talking about?

DR. WM. ROSS: In the larger facilities? From 12-- around 10 or 12 examining and treatment room plus conference rooms or interview rooms and a larger demonstration room area.

DR. NIELSEN: In your planning are you in multiple or adequate health care structure looking down the road to find that we have more comprehensive services available in this kind of structure.

DR. WM. ROSS: This would lend itself to it, yes sir. If everything went backward, it would still be on the general type of preventive measures. It would very well fit into the question that you ask.

DR. NIELSEN: You know, million dollars for a comprehensive neighborhood health center is an adequate structure for that sort of thing. (Inaudible)

DR. WM. ROSS: No sir, there would not be, this would also include a small size laboratory, not a little dinky laboratory, but a sizable laboratory.

July 16, 1970
kh

DR. NIELSEN: Usually a small laboratory. (Inaudible)

DR. WM. ROSS: No, not for small clinic facilities.

DR. NIELSEN: You wouldn't haveat all?

DR. WM. ROSS: No, they could not, sir. One hundred twenty-five is just basic--small waiting room with two examining rooms area, no dental facility, probably a maximum around 5,000 square feet, sir.

DR. NIELSEN: I thought the \$125,000 structure would also have a room for dental clinic.

DR. WM. ROSS: You're thinking of the East Side Branch. The East Side Branch is \$153,000 matched with \$153,000 Hill-Burton, which would make it \$306,000 structure.

DR. NIELSEN: A service center is that what you call it--what do you call one that's a lot smaller than--health clinics?

DR. WM. ROSS: Just clinic facilities for lack of a better name.

DR. NIELSEN: (Inaudible)

DR. WM. ROSS: No, sir, there would not be and I say this loosely because again when we're speaking of a figure such as this, they would possibly work out after depending on what the cost of the construction or first of all the cost to the site is going to be. Now what is left for the building, this could possibly be done because I'm thinking in terms of the one at Zarzamora location, Dr. Nielsen. Where we were able to take in a portion of the waiting room and we actually have space for three chairs. We just lack the installation of the third chair. The third chair, if funds were available for it, it's ready, the connections are there to tow it in. So that we might possibly be--this determines again as to what the cost of the site is from. . . .

DR. NIELSEN: What was your planning--up to \$125,000 structure?

DR. WM. ROSS: With no final determination, let me make this point clear, I may have been misleading. There is no final determination to delete the dental aspects at any of those clinic facilities. We hoped that we could but we have to say if we can depending on the funds available for the building after the site. Certainly, we want further expansion. We have to have further expansion into the dental health facility. This has to be utilized, though, where we can get the most mileage out of the expensive personnel.

DR. NIELSEN: Just one more thing, would your plans be flexible also to in terms of this multi-service concept that's coming, I think anyway, would it be flexible enough to have small legal aid or small welfare office, you know, that sort of thing. Any plans along that line at all?

DR. WM. ROSS: As far as servicing--the multi-service center, no sir. Yes and no if I may say this, as far as going outside of services of the department--no, because it is not felt that this would be adequate to do the things that we have already talked about here and if we go into the comprehensive type but, selfishly, we--the Welfare Division, I mean a department of the City is a division of the Health Department. Now, officially I cannot plan a multi-service center showing other services other than health in a building where we may put an application in for Hill-Burton funds so we have to watch ourselves on this, no sir.

DR. NIELSEN: Is there a possibility of applying for Hill-Burton or something like that?

July 16, 1970
kh

DR. WM. ROSS: The Hill-Burton Bill, Congress overruled the President's veto and there are new aspects to the Hill-Burton funds of which I'm not certain as yet nor is the State Health Department fully aware of all of them because they're studying it at the present time. But the Hill-Burton Bill has been extended for three years with the beginning date as of July 1 this year. So our timetable and utilization if the bond election were to go. . .--also whether we get in on the Hill-Burton we'll have to recognize that the fact that we want Hill-Burton funds doesn't necessarily get them. We are competing with hospitals and other facilities although public health centers do have No. 1 priority and the Board of Health has to make the determination. They always have a request totaling many many millions of dollars more than the funds that are available. So we go into a complication type of thing with other areas but I would think our chances would be very good.

DR. NIELSEN: Are you involved with multi-service planning for the Model Neighborhood parks out there?

DR. WM. ROSS: We were way back. Not since the final plans were made and we are anxiously awaiting this because here's an area, for example, we have clinic operations in Lincoln Courts which are most inadequate.

DR. NIELSEN: But you have not been involved in these.

DR. WM. ROSS: No, we're waiting to hear from them and to see what phase was actually finally approved for health. We have submitted a picture for the health facilities which the staff threw up its hands and said you want as much as we can possibly build with the funds that are available. So, we had to reduce as did all other agencies.

PARKS

DR. CALDERON: Thank you, Dr. Ross. If Council concurs, I would suggest that we take up the Parks Department. In view of the fact that there is some thinking as to possible changes as far as the parks package is concerned I know that Bob has send us a memorandum with regards to possible suggestions here.

MR. FRAZER: I am open to suggestions, Mr. Mayor, unless you want me to go over the entire proposal as submitted by the subcommittee, in other words to conserve your time. . . .

DR. NIELSEN: Just address yourself to the suggested changes here in light of the smaller parks and that sort of thing.

MR. FRAZER: Well, basically, our problem in increasing our number of park acquisitions and bringing them into the built-up areas is a matter of there simply isn't available open space that will fall within the frame work of the fiscal considerations as we simply don't have the money to go into the densely populated areas and do away with houses or displace people and construct parks. This should have been in process and should have been done over the years but hasn't been done. We are proposing primarily to go into the new neighborhoods--not totally new at all--but into areas where land is available in accordance with--we're sticking right with the master plan. I have it out in the hall if you would like to see it. In all of our acquisitions, we will stick very closely to the long range master plan.

We feel like this is all we can do within the ceiling that is imposed upon us. We have to look at \$12 to \$15 million actually to acquire inner city parks. Now we are doing a good job in the Model Cities area. This doesn't mean if land is available in these particular inner areas of the city that we can't get it because you cannot pinpoint the land--it is almost impossible to pinpoint sites in situations of this nature. If you do, you're in trouble.

DR. CALDERON: How much area, how many acres will one block provide?

MR. FRAZER: A square acre is 208 feet by 208 feet. That is the dimension of an acre. And that won't quite accommodate a ball diamond.

DR. CALDERON: I'm talking in terms of one entire block.

MR. FRAZER: One entire block is about four acres, however, you know our blocks in town. We have some parks-Palm Heights being one-it is on a square block but it is only a little over two acres. It is extremely crowded.

MR. TORRES: Well, the substance of what you said in your memo of July 7th is Item No. 5, I believe, where you indicated to carry out the desires of the Council to increase the number of parks, you make two suggestions. Number 1, you say that four community parks be purchased, one in each quadrant of the City with a minimum of 35 acres and possibly increasing that to 50 acres. Number 2, that the remaining parks should be the neighborhood type being 25 acres or less. Now, how many remaining parks are we talking about?

MR. FRAZER: Mr. Torres, I could only guess, Sir. I wouldn't know simply because I'm not expert in land prices and this thing is such a tremendous problem. I would say possibly in the neighborhood of eight to twelve.

MR. TORRES: If you had the authority to go with four parks of a 35 acre minimum you would be thinking in terms of 8 to 12 additional?

MR. FRAZER: That is right, Sir. And maybe more than that depending on how our funding fell together, depending entirely on how much cooperation-- how much money we can get out of the Government, depending on the availability of vacant land.

MR. TORRES: I realize that there are a lot of contingencies. I realize that we have problems. Now, on the 25 acre or less size park you say that you can provide athletic areas and playground facilities without supervised programs. Now why is it that on a 25 acre park that you cannot come up with a supervised program?

MR. FRAZER: Sir, if I led you to believe that I certainly didn't intend to. We have supervised programs on areas as small as one quarter of an acre. One of the best programs we have is at John Tobin. I might be defeating my purpose here but it is most unsatisfactory. It is because we have to do it that we do but we would like to have sufficient space to have some real meaningful activities on these areas even to having a Little League Field there which the Little League people will want a portion to do their program with. It is difficult to get the necessary facilities to serve a community on anything less than 25 acres and you have really got to crowd it to do that. I have a good example of a 50 acre park--Monterrey out in the hall to show you what a site plan could look like on about 50 acres. If you'd like to see it.

DR. CALDERON: You asked for it, Bob.

MR. FRAZER: This is a very schematic or diagramatic type of thing we prepared for you to show you what a park on 50 acres might look like. I will grant you now that this part here is a wooded area. There is a drainage way through there and, generally, we are going to have to contend with drainage ways in any parks that we have because that's about the only kind of property that we can really afford.

MR. HILL: Yes, but in most of these cases you are planning on putting picnic tables and things like that.

MR. FRAZER: That's correct. It will be thoroughly utilized. It will be a natural area. But there is a park with a baseball diamond. You've got to have parking. You cannot depend on street parking. You simply can't do it. You create too much nuisance in an area. You've got to have a certain amount of buffering. You've got to pull these facilities that create crowds back where they can be sufficiently buffered. And it is pretty difficult really to have--we actually need to carry on a real meaningful program to get a lot of youngsters involved--and adults too--without sufficient space to do it.

MR. TREVINO: How would you compare that with Tobin--with the area.

MR. FRAZER: Oh, my gracious, Tobin would fit in almost right in here.

MR. HILL: Okay, what else have you got on there, Bob?

MR. FRAZER: Well, I've got a soccer field, baseball, and softball...got a swimming pool complex. We have parking. We have a building and tennis courts.

MR. HILL: Those three in the middle. Is that ball diamonds?

MR. FRAZER: This is a complex of three soft ball diamonds and a rest room. This actually exists.

DR. NIELSEN: Then, in substance, you are saying that instead of nine community parks of 35 to 50 acres each, you're suggesting now four such parks.

MR. FRAZER: This is offered to the Council as some sort of consideration for a compromise.

DR. NIELSEN: This \$6 million is closer to 50-50 in terms of major 35-50 acre sites in relationship to the smaller sites.

MR. FRAZER: It could, yes, Sir. The larger sites have so much more possibility to do meaningful things with them. I'm talking about having programs such as we have now on the larger areas where we can actually get these kids involved and be with them. It is difficult to do it on small areas.

MR. TORRES: I think in view of Mr. Frazer's proposal memo of July 7th we ought to ask him to proceed with the planning for inclusion of that kind of a proposal in the bond issue, that is, the four 50 acre parks and the, I believe he said twelve 25 acre parks with organized recreation.

MR. FRAZER: Or even more than that because just recently Rev. James and others dedicated a park that we bought for \$500 an acre. Now we are hunting for land like that and we might be real lucky.

MR. TORRES: How big was that, Sam.

REV. JAMES: Twelve acres.

MR. TORRES: Are you going to have organized recreation programs out there?

MR. FRAZER: No, Sir. There will not be an organized program out there as such.

MR. TORRES: Why?

MR. FRAZER: Simply because most of the land is subject to flooding and we cannot build a building there. It is more suited to a neighborhood type of thing. There is not enough contiguous land area to do what we would like to do. We could have a John Tobin thing there but we don't want to continue that sort of thing. This is a neighborhood facility primarily, Mr. Torres.

MR. HILL: What we are doing is changing these nine major parks to four 50 acre parks and the rest will be in 25 acres or less parks.

July 16, 1970
ac

-33-

MR. FRAZER: We have studied the areas of the city designating them Northeast Planning Area, Southeast Planning Area, Northwest Planning Area and Southwest Planning Area. We've driven them. We've walked them in certain cases. We halfway know where vacant spots are. And we have suggested....you can see here in the planning area commensurate with what you already have acreagewise and trying to bring you a balanced program we are suggesting acquisition of about--starting down at your lower right 125 acres more or less plus or minus as much as we can get. . say 115 acres up in the northwest with 150 acres more or less in the northeast planning area, 105 acres in accordance with the master plan evolved by the Planning Department.

MR. TORRES: This is land that you would have to acquire?

MR. FRAZER: This is what we are talking to and one fifty-acre site possibly or something in that neighborhood.

MR. TORRES: Generally, Bob, how much in each area do we have in terms of land that is dedicated for park use that we at one time or another we acquired for park use and has not been developed into a park?

MR. FRAZER: We have about 310 acres not counting Olmos Basin and Southside Lions that are not developed. Most of our parks are almost totally developed as you remember. If you will think about them other than Southside Hi-Lions Park, the Olmos Basin area and, of course, our Northeast Preserve which never will be developed. But to try to answer your question, most of our parks other than those I named are rather intensely developed.

MR. TORRES: Where is most of this 300 acres that you are talking about that we have not developed?

MR. FRAZER: Most of it pretty equally distributed.

MR. TORRES: Throughout the four areas?

MR. FRAZER: Yes, Sir.

DR. NIELSEN: That doesn't include the Northeast Preserve.

MR. FRAZER: I said it did not, Sir, nor the Southside Lions Park or Olmos Basin.

MR. TORRES: Just give me an example of a tract of land that we own in the southwest or northwest and is owned by the Parks Department which we have not developed.

MR. FRAZER: Well, Padre Park is a good one which is in the southeast part of the City very close to San Jose Mission. There is about 43 acres there off of Padre Drive.

DR. NIELSEN: Can we do something about that?

MR. FRAZER: We have that in the program. This is in the development and improvement program. We have approximately \$1,955,000 for land acquisition and \$4,244,000 for capital improvements.

MR. TREVINO: Bob, how much do we have developed at Pablo's Grove and how much undeveloped?

MR. FRAZER: At Pablo's Grove, I don't mean to be evasive but it depends on how you want to take it. Now, we own a good deal property.

MR. TREVINO: Let's take it the way we are using it.

MR. FRAZER: The usable property is primarily developed if you want to call an area for parking automobiles as a developed area.

MR. TREVINO: Do we have a potential there? Do we own some land?

MR. FRAZER: Yes, we have potential there as soon as we get our sanitary land fills completed.

MR. TORRES: Can't you get some signs, Bob, with directions to Pablo's Grove?

MR. FRAZER: I'm working on that, Sir. The big thing is with the Highway Department. If we could just tell you to get off at the right place... this is not easily done but we hope we can do it.

MR. TORRES: When a City Councilman gets lost going out to a westside park, you know. . .

MR. FRAZER: That's embarrassing, isn't it.

MR. HILL: Bob, did you get a copy of this from the S. A. Softball Association? It calls for a softball diamond at Pablo's Grove and a couple of more suggestions that they have.

MR. FRAZER: We are going to try to satisfy these people--certainly put a good many softball fields in. In your booklet that I prepared for you everything that your committee approved is in here detailed down to the last dollar.

MR. HILL: I know but I didn't compare this against the book.

MR. FRAZER: Well, I haven't either, Sir, because I haven't seen this. We can have a softball field out there. I wouldn't propose anything other than an informal softball field because it is a picnic area.

MR. HILL: I think about ninety percent of the time there is a ball game going on out there.

MR. FRAZER: Yes, but is is a put together one. You know what I mean. I wouldn't want it for league play.

DR. NIELSEN: What is in the proposal in the area around South W. W. White and Rigsby? What do you recall that we have got in this area?

MR. FRAZER: That's not too far from one of our badly needed community parks with all of its facilities.

DR. NIELSEN: You are saying in some sense. . .

MR. FRASER: Somewhere in that area. Let's say to serve the Sam Houston High School area. We hope to have a rather sophisticated type community park there because we've really got the kiddos. We'd like to have a center. We'd like to have all of these things that we could really do some fine programming with. That's what we plan there. And I think we can get fifty acres in that area.

July 16, 1970

-35-

ac

304

365

DR. NIELSEN: Without having to pay something exorbitant?

MR. FRAZER: Yes, without having to pay something exorbitant.

DR. CALDERON: Well, then Bob, with regards to your number 2 recommendation insofar as the disposition of acreage beyond the four community parks you will then strive to find sites that are within range 12 to 25 acres-- is this correct?

MR. FRAZER: Something like that. We would even take less than that, Dr. Calderon. It depends entirely upon our need and what we can find.

MR. TORRES: We are redirecting the recommendations of the Steering Committee and you will abide by the recommendations of the Council, of course.

MR. FRAZER: You bet your boots, I will...to the best of my ability. If I can't I'll come back and tell you I can't do it, Mr. Torres.

DR. CALDERON: Well, we'll tell you.

MR. FRAZER: I am hoping you will, Sir. That's what you are paid for.

DR. CALDERON: The thing that I want to be sure of is the fact that in an effort to provide maximum of facilities, really disqualify communities that are entitled to 12 acre playgrounds. In other words, we should strive for the ultimate insofar as playground development even in so doing we are going to exclude communities where we cannot get in there because of the high cost of land. I don't find ourselves in a position to say to people over there in certain areas "we want the best for you but if we can't find it we're not going to give it to you". You see, in other words, to provide some form of playground facilities in every highly dense area.

MR. FRAZER: Yes, Sir. I understand exactly your philosophy.

MR. HILL: Bob, do you know just off hand just how many acres are involved in Comanche Park?

MR. FRAZER: I've heard--I thought it's around 105 acres. Does that sound right? There's more land there than you might think but some of it is low bottom land along the Salado. That doesn't sound right?

MR. TORRES: It seems to me like it's more than 105 acres.

MR. FRAZER: I don't really know, Sir. I did know but I deal in acreage so much that I begin to get confused about it.

MR. TORRES: I believe there is something in the bond proposal on correcting the parking problem there at Brackenridge Park. Is there not?

MR. FRAZER: We have a kind of a mess there pedestrian wise and traffic wise. The old park was never really designed to accommodate the number of vehicles that we are trying to accommodate and also we have a lot of just simply drive back and forth type of thing and it's really very difficult to stop since you have no legal way of stopping it. We are

going to take a hard look, we already have, and bring it to our Manager some thinking on redoing to some extent the circulation pattern in Brackenridge Park. I'd like to see you come and put your car in a parking lot under the surveillance of a Park Ranger and walk to a good many places because it's not that big. So we are hoping that we will have some money which is in this issue to redirect some of the automotive traffic particularly and turn a little bit more of the park back to the pedestrian.

MR. HILL: You wouldn't object if we parked our car and rode the train, would you?

MR. FRAZER: We'd be delighted to have you do that because the more you ride it the more money your city makes. But we are considering that--using it as a mode of transportation and now you can do that.

MR. TORRES: Why don't you send us a layout of your proposal for the manner in which you intend to redirect traffic assuming that we spend the money we have to there.

MR. FRAZER: Sir, I would certainly submit all of this to the City Manager's office prior to all we have at this time and I don't believe the Manager has seen it--I haven't bothered him with it. Our schematics, possibilities we've worked with Stewart Fischer's office. We have schematics, several approaches to it. But certainly before we would do anything we'd certainly bring it to the Manager and I'm certain that he'd want to bring it to you in a B Session and let us explain it thoroughly to you. Now, we can bring you all of our scribblings so to speak. The maps that we work with and the ideas that we've advanced in moving people which is all free hand stuff. Until we felt like that we just didn't have the money to do all of the planning that has to go into it and estimating until we are pretty sure we can get the money to do it with because we don't have that kind of staff time.

MR. TORRES: Well, to get this down to something concrete, Jerry, I should think that with the real bad problem we have there particularly on weekends that we ought to look at it and study it to see what we can do to come up as fast as possible with making some improvements over there because we do have a real bad situation at Brackenridge Park.

MR. FRAZER: We've got a real bad situation if you're in a hurry. If you're patient and don't mind taking quite a bit of time to get through the park, there's no problem. Traffic just moves very very slowly.

DR. CALDERON: Another item I'm finding it hard really to be sold on this Mahncke Park botanical garden item over here--\$265,000. In terms of priorities, in terms of great need for park acquisition and expansion of existing parks and so forth to send a quarter million dollars on a botanical garden. I'm finding it hard to justify.

DR. NIELSEN: The thing itself you see on it is as a real tourist supplemental attraction. We've been in several cities and I remember in Hawaii one of the things that drew our interest was a botanical garden. Maybe it wouldn't measure up to that here, I don't know.

July 16, 1970

-37-

ac

367

367

MR. FRAZER: Ultimately, it will. It will be a good one. We're the only major city in the whole southwest without one. This is a tremendously valuable educational tool, Doctor, particularly with the university coming here. This is a place where one could observe all types of plants that are indigenous or imported. It's comparable to a museum in a way. It's a highly educational sort of thing. It's a thing that involves most of the women in San Antonio in that they are involved in garden club work which certainly enhances our entire community and this is a place from which all of the women can come with their garden club problems and with their horticultural problems and we're just trying to do something that San Antonio should have done possibly 35 or 40 years ago.

MR. TORRES: I think, though, what we're talking is in terms of about so many of the other needs which seem to take a precedence \$265,000 seems like a lot of money. Of course, we're already putting money into the San Antonio Zoo. We're putting a lot of money into our libraries, into our museum operations so that you can't say that we're not putting funds into cultural endeavors but \$265,000 seems to be out of line in view of some of our other needs.

DR. CALDERON: I also want to take note of the fact that you indicated in your blue brochure that there's an unfunded amount, \$124,000 with regards to a botanical garden. Where is this money coming from?

MR. FRAZER: I didn't really hear you, Sir.

DR. CALDERON: One hundred thirty four thousand dollar figure is an amount unfunded for the development of a botanical garden.

DR. NIELSEN: That's where they had to cut.

MR. FRAZER: Oh, we cut that much out of it, out of our second proposal. This is something that I don't know as far as priorities are concerned, it is something that's going to be exceedingly appealing, in my opinion, very appealing to educational circles as well as a lot of other people. It's something that I think will be a very meaningful thing. It's something that will not deteriorate. It'll be good a hundred years from now. Maybe community parks in certain places will be displaced by industry. It's one of those things that you try to build to from year to year. It's one of those great institutions that most of our cities have that's tied in certainly with our environmental considerations and our out of doors. All kinds of experimental work will go on here. We have halfway committed A & M College to doing some work here in lawn grass, disease controls and all this type of thing. It'll help all the homeowners in observing some of the things that they can do with and can't do with. It's strictly an educational facility as well as an attractive sort of thing that will be, I think, an asset to our tourist package--great site for it.

DR. CALDERON: What will be the operating cost?

MR. FRAZER: The operating cost will run approximately \$30,000 for the first year and will increase in accordance with the Council's desires.

July 16, 1970
ac

This money is primarily going to be utilized in a master plan for certain greenhouses, horticultural activities. We're faced with the problem of having to move our greenhouses and our growing area. You'll notice that we grow hundreds of thousands of plants over the city and we have all of our areas planted with it. This will have to be ultimately moved to make room for channeling flood improvement of flood control work. Our greenhouses now are far insufficient to do our work and this is the sort of thing that will occur over there. People can visit these areas and see all of this sort of thing being done.

MR. HILL: Why don't we ask A & M if they would like to help us on this?

BOB FRAZER: Sir, I'm quite positive having worked for A & M at one time the only help they can give us is technical assistance and experimental work through their extension service. As far as capital funds, we couldn't get anything from the A & M System. I'm positive of that.

DR. NIELSEN: The Hemisfair site--would it pretty much not lend itself to this botanical concept?

BOB FRAZER: Doctor, you could put a botanical garden there. You'd have to take some of your buildings out because botanical gardens actually take space. You have a rose garden, you have a garden for the blind, you have a fragrant garden, you have a garden showing all the herbs that you use in different types of spices and condiments. You have an area dedicated to foundation plantings, different types of hollies and various types of plants that you utilize in your home landscaping. You have trees, nice street trees, things of that nature. Native materials we like to show off. Yes sir, they're all labeled and many classes come here, your biology classes, your classes with ecology may come here. I feel certain the University will use it extensively. It's a very educational element of your system as well as just being placed to enjoy beauty.

MR. TORRES: How soon will we start-getting on another subject now--will we start getting our money for the parks in the Model Cities area.

BOB FRAZER: How soon will we start getting our money?

MR. TORRES: On our Federal application.

BOB FRAZER: Oh, they've all been approved, Mr. Torres, the first year's action and we're opening bids now.

MR. TORRES: You are opening bids?

BOB FRAZER: Now this is a reimbursable program and as we spend, start incurring them, they send an inspector down to assure themselves that we have spent that and we send in a voucher and ask them for payments all along.

MR. TREVINO: Is any of that acreage that you have outlined out there in the southwestern section, does that include all land that is land for Model Cities?

BOB FRAZER: No sir, this does not include on this particular map Model Cities. We have added, as you remember, \$80,000 and we can hopefully get some matching money and do whatever the plan that's evolved, the land use plan that we hope will soon be off the press will dictate.

DR. CALDERON: Okay, any other questions? If not, thank you, Bob.

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: You want me to give a quick recap now of where we are? . . .on the total bond.

July 16, 1970
kh

MR. TORRES: Send a memo.

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: We do need to wrap this up. I had one other item on the bonds that Stewart Fischer was to present very briefly and that was a need for a Centralized traffic facility which would be a municipal facility. We're talking about \$350,000. Stu, you want to get that one very quickly in about two minutes.

STEWART FISCHER: About two minutes. We have some maps but we can get them if we need them. Fundamentally, I have a small department but it's divided into four different locations. We operate a signs and marking shop out at Stinson Homes in a 1940 World War II temporary building. I operate a traffic signal shop at a building that was abandoned for the Roosevelt Library. I have a parking meter shop over on the police property that has four people in it. With this diverse operation it's difficult to supervise the operation properly. First and, secondly, the inventory problems are quite sizable so we are proposing to abandon all three of these facilities combine the people into one location that is the map that you are looking at. If it were approved, we would suggest that we move to this location which is between Nolan and Dawson on Live Oak. This is just adjacent to IH 37 Expressway--an elevated portion. We would propose that we buy about two acres there if you notice and by so doing, we would be able to use the area under the expressway about 4½ acres, part of it would be used for our outdoor storage and parking of vehicles and about two and a half acres of it could be used for a police pound which we need very badly by building into our particular building an office for the police pound. Then this could be a location for the towing of vehicles from the downtown area. We think, first of all, the four and a half acres on the expressway would not cost the city anything. We think we have, first of all, a bargain in making use of joint use of this land. Secondly, it would improve the efficiency of our department immeasurably to put it all together first of all. Secondly to bring it in to the downtown or near downtown area because we work all over town. Now, most of our people have to go from Stinson Homes which is deep Southside. It's a long pull for those people to be working on other parts of the city.

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: The reason I had him add this is because in our discussion here a week ago or two weeks ago, when the Council questioned whether we should have an additional police substation, I recommended at that time that I would like to throw in two rather than one police substations and then the other recommendations that I made which includes the airport and the \$80,000 in the Model Cities & Parks area, half a million to the Fire Department and and Northwest Service Center. All told, including the items of Stewart's and the additional substations when we talk about adding \$2,000,830 to the recommendation of the committee of 65,016 that we took out from 930,000 on the multi-service health center coupled with Hill-Burton funds. So we'll end up an additional net at 1.9 million which would give us a total issue of 66,916,000 and I'll send you a resume on that with all the additional recommendations.

REV. JAMES: (Inaudible)

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: Yes sir. I'll get the information to you with any other changes that you want if you'll get them to me tomorrow I'll have it ready Monday and get it to you so you can take action next week.

MR. TORRES: There's another item that I think the Council ought to consider next week and this is if we're going to hire a consultant on the telephone rates increase. I should think that in view of the shortage of consultants as indicated by Mr. Henckel in his memorandum of June 26, I should think that we ought to get busy on that next week and of course I'd like to see this as an agenda item next week to determine if we are going to hire a consultant.

July 16, 1970
kh

Frankly, I've indicated to the Council I think we should go along with it. The fact that they are scarce at this time should not deter us from immediatly hiring a consultant.

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: I might add that my memorandum to you was the indication at that time that the earliest we could get one so of course this means because we've delayed two or three weeks it's going to be additonal time so I do need an answer from the Council as to whether or not you want to hire a consultant. Also, the company has requested that we have their proposal on the 30th rather than next week. A week ago, we set it up for two weeks so that way if it's alright with the Council we'll have it on the 30th and not next week. Does that meet with your approval?

MR. BURKE: Have you all checked the qualifications of any of your staff people to handle this?

DR. NIELSEN: I've checked with the Finance Department.

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: Yes sir, I'll give you what the people we have with what their qualifications are. I doubt if we are, we really have the capacity. . . .

DR. NIELSEN: The general response they've given me. . . .

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: I've heard some additional--an additional consultant since my memorandum but I have not had the opportunity to talk details with him and I'll also have that for you.

MR. TORRES: This is a specialized field also, in terms of consultants, Mr. Henckel, we still have not hired an industrial safety consultant. The Council put this on the substance of industrial safety ordinance.

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: I have a proposal for your consideration from the San Antonio Safety Council, but since I received the proposal, the gentleman who they had employed to run their office here, who was capable of doing such a study, is not here any longer, so I'm going to have to recontact them to see if they can still bring him back in to do that study, should you decide.

DR. CALDERON: On this bond issue, are we all agreed to finalize this bond issue next week?

MRS. HABERMAN: I have, on my list, that we're going to consider all the budget items next Thursday.

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: Next week is the public hearing on the budget.

MR. HILL: We're supposed to have a preliminary look at the budget before the meeting next Thursday.

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: I've sent you information on your request on disparity in the Fire Department on the pension fund regarding fire and police men and as well as other employees. I'm ready to discuss that. I have been a couple of weeks, any time you're ready, because if we are going to make changes in the budget, you need to tell me what changes you want, where you want them, so that we can make those changes next week and, of course, if any citizens appear and you make any changes, as a result of that. I might add, we have not had too good an interest from citizens, as far as checking out copies of the budget here, either at City Hall or checking them out at the library. At this time, I might ask the press, if they would mention that again, too, in their news articles, that the budget is available at City Hall, as well as the Main Library and the Branch Libraries, and has been on file for three weeks. If you have any particular items that you would like to discuss, please feel free to contact the staff or myself by Thursday, because Thursday is the day you have the public hearing - it's not the last date - you can adopt the 27th. That would be the date required, the last day under the law. However, we usually adopt it the Thursday before that date. So, this would be the last Thursday unless you want to have a special meeting.

MR. TORRES: Well, we ought to have a special meeting, I should think, on Tuesday afternoon, on the matter of the budget. I'd like to suggest to the Council that preliminary to a public hearing, I should think the Council should discuss matters like the matter of disparity and changes that are going to have to be made. I'd like to suggest to you this afternoon.

MR. TREVINO: Mr. Mayor, may I bring another matter to the attention of the Council?

MR. TORRES: We haven't solved this one yet, Felix.

MR. TREVINO: No, but it's on the same subject, because there's another deadline that we have to meet. Here I'm talking about the reappointment or appointment of new people to the EODC Board. There is a meeting coming up next Tuesday and if the people are not reappointed, then no committees can be made.

REV. JAMES: Let's meet Monday.

MR. TREVINO: Okay, but we have to meet that deadline somehow.

MR. TORRES: Has the County made their appointments, Jerry?

MR. TREVINO: No, sir, they usually wait.....

MR. TORRES: Why don't we get Mr. Henckel to contact the County tomorrow and see whose names they're going to recommend and then we can come up with our names on Monday and have a special meeting on Monday.

DR. CALDERON: You mean Monday, for both the budget and reappointments to EODC?

MR. TORRES: Monday for both the budget and the reappointments to EODC and we can each come up with our names on the appointments to EODC.

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: Two o'clock Monday?

DR. NIELSEN: Just one thing, did I hear you correctly say, Mr. Henckel, in the thing here, that you are proposing a second substation or.....

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: Yes, I'm going to include all the things we talked about.

DR. NIELSEN: In particular.....west, or where?

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: There would be - one east and one west, instead of just one west.

MR. TORRES: Come again.

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: The second police substation will be on the eastside. So, there will be one east and one west. In the issue it just proposes the one in the northwest, well, actually, the north central. In the discussion with the committee, they requested it be at the airport property, but because of the addition of the university and the proposed annexation, I would recommend that it go on the northwest to cover the westside and then one go east. We'll need two of them.

DR. CALDERON: Will Monday at 1:30 be all right?

CITY COUNCIL: All right.

MR. HILL: Herb, I've got one question, going back to the bond thing. You recall last week on this airport - I recommended and strongly recommended that they lay this out timewise, because they have not convinced me that they can't get to 1973 on \$3 million, instead of \$4.2 million and I think this is something we ought to look at real hard.

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: Whatever you all decide.

MR. HILL: Jerry, what I suggested last week, was if you put down your milestones in reality, as to the bond issue and when you sell the bonds and this, that and the other, I'm still sticking with my position that you can get to 1973 on 3 million dollars.

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: Well, I think that's entirely possible, however, there's other factors in my thinking maybe, I might be over concerned, but if we are going to purchase this property, we've got to have the funds to purchase all of it. I'm concerned as to whether or not we're going to be able to refund bonds to 1973, because those bonds, I think the average interest rate is 4.3%. We can't refund at a higher interest rate unless we get legislative action. So, then again, the X factor of not knowing what the F.A.A. participation is going to be, as far as the airport operation is concerned. So, I'm really just trying to provide for any disaster in the future and then again, I might be overly concerned.

MR. HILL: Well, I'm not going to rehash it, because I said everything I had to say last week, but I still would like to see this laid out.

MR. TORRES: Be nice to them, you don't want to see them fighting this bond issue. You might have Ed Hill leading the opposition with Sam Granata and Jeff Duffield.

DR. CALDERON: The City Clerk has an ordinance that.....

CITY CLERK: This is the ordinance on the Summer Youth Program. The money has been redistributed, as directed and SANYO has been reduced from \$86,000 to \$73,009. The House of Neighborly Service has been increased from \$4,673 to \$7,173. The Wesly Community Center and the Center South has been increased from \$4,673 to \$7,673. Madonna Center has been increased from \$4,673 to \$7,173 and the Citizens Committee of Action Development Corporation increased from \$4,673 to \$9,673. That redistributes the \$18,000 that you're talking about. I'd like to get it passed as changed.

DR. CALDERON: Any discussion? Any questions, Carol?

MRS. HABERMAN: I'm thinking about Ella Austin and Project Free.

CITY MANAGER HENCKEL: We've met with all of the parties and this was the agreement with all of the parties.

MR. TREVINO: Do all the corporations decide.....

(Discussion between Councilmen)

MR. HILL: Question.

AYES: Burke, James, Nielsen, Trevino, Hill, Torres, Calderon, Haberman.

NAYS: None

ABSENT: McAllister.

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

A P P R O V E D

Dr. Robert Calderon
M A Y O R
P R O T E M

ATTEST: *JH. Savelman*
C i t y C l e r k

