

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1975.

* * * *

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 A. M., by the presiding officer, Mayor Charles L. Becker, with the following members present: COCKRELL, SAN MARTIN, BECKER, BLACK, LACY, MORTON, O'CONNELL Absent: PADILLA.

75-8 The invocation was given by The Reverend G. Robert Grimes, Coker Methodist Church.

75-8 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

75-8 The minutes of the Special Meeting of January 24, 1975, and the Regular Meeting of January 30, 1975, were approved.

75-8 CLASS FROM MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL

Mayor Becker recognized a class of students from Memorial High School accompanied by their teacher, Miss Laura Adams. He welcomed them to the meeting and invited them to visit again.

75-8 COUNCILMAN CLAUDE BLACK

Mayor Becker welcomed Reverend Claude W. Black back to the Council after an absence of several weeks due to illness.

Reverend Black expressed his appreciation to the other Council members and the City staff for their many courtesies during his illness.

75-8 URBAN MASS TRANSPORTATION ACT

Acting City Manager Guerra asked that the scheduled briefing on the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1974 be postponed for one week. At that time the San Antonio Transit System will brief the Council on its role in the Mass Transit Act and the entire matter will be explained then.

75-8 MINUTES OF BOARDS

Dr. San Martin stated that just this week he had received a copy of the minutes of the City Public Service Board for its meeting of December 18, 1974. It had been received in the office of the City Clerk on January 29, 1975. Also received were the minutes of the Transit Board for December 19, 1974, which were received in the City Clerk's office on January 31, 1975.

February 6, 1975

nsr

In the minutes of the meeting of the Transit System on December 19th is an item that the top five people in the Transit System received a ten percent pay increase effective in November but which the Council knew nothing about.

Dr. San Martin stated he would like to receive minutes of the various Boards as soon as possible after they hold meetings.

Mrs. Cockrell stated that the probable reason is that the minutes of a meeting are held until after they are approved at the meeting the following month. She agreed, however, that the minutes should be received promptly and if any correction are made, they could be noted later.

Mayor Becker requested that the City Manager make the Council's wishes known to the Transit System management and that he obtain a detailed report this week concerning the wage increases.

Dr. San Martin moved that the Council go on record as requesting that minutes of the utility boards of the City be forwarded to the City Clerk for distribution to the City Council promptly even though they have not been officially approved. The motion was seconded by Mr. O'Connell and was passed and approved by the following roll call vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Morton, Padilla.

75-8

CITY PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Mrs. Cockrell stated that she wanted to commend the City Public Service Board for a recent action it took in requesting additional budget data particularly in justifying all of the pending budget requests. She said that she would like to recommend further to the Board that it might want to consider something the City Water Board did several years ago when it had a small task force of citizens who were persons skilled in business management. This task force sought areas in the Water Board where there was duplication of service or excess personnel. Such an effort would assure the public that there is no unnecessary expense in the operation.

Mayor Becker agreed with Mrs. Cockrell's suggestion and said that such an effort should also include the functions of the City. He then discussed the very severe problems being faced by cities across the country.

Rev. Black stated that while the community needs a group to deal with the matter of efficiency, it must address itself to the relationship of that efficiency to reducing the cost to the consumer. Unless this happens, it wouldn't really be doing the job that is to be done.

75-8

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 44,887

DESIGNATING THE MEDIAL ISLAND BETWEEN
THE TWO ROADWAYS OF NORTH NEW BRAUNFELS
AVENUE FROM PASO HONDO STREET TO DAWSON
STREET AS THE MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.
PLAZA.

* * * *

The Ordinance was explained by Mr. John Miller, Assistant Director of Traffic and Transportation, who said that in response to a petition filed by Reverend R. A. Callies and his organization, this plaza is being named in honor of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Reverend Black stated that he recognized the benevolence and spirit of Reverend Callies for assuming responsibility for the memorial to be placed on this plaza but he is also aware of the very limited resources available to properly develop the area and memorialize it. He expressed the hope that Council in the months to come will participate in providing a proper memorial.

In answer to Dr. San Martin's question, Mr. Miller stated that Reverend Callies' group has been planning improvements for the area, but this Ordinance does not provide for any improvements.

Acting City Manager Cipriano Guerra stated that the Economic Development Administration has asked the City to submit some projects for possible funding. These would be tied in with the Emergency Employment Act. A request for \$15,000 is being submitted for materials and supplies for the Martin Luther King memorial. The labor would come under the EEA Program.

After consideration, on motion of Rev. Black, seconded by Dr. San Martin, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Morton, Padilla.

Reverend R. A. Callies, Sr., accompanied by a large group of young people, thanked the Council for this expression of goodwill. He stated that he looked forward to being able to assist in bringing this project to completion.

75-8

MONTHLY REPORT OF CITY PUBLIC SERVICE BOARD

Mr. Don Thomas presented the regular monthly report of the City Public Service Board relating to current rates. He distributed prepared figures which show that the average electric and gas bill for the month of February will be \$1.31 less than in the month of January. He anticipated that March and April bills will be even lower. (A copy of Mr. Thomas' report is included with the papers of this meeting.)

75-8

The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Members of the Administrative Staff, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Morton, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 44,888

MANIFESTING AN AGREEMENT WITH J. R. VINSANT TO EXTEND FOR AN ADDITIONAL FIVE (5) YEAR TERM, LEASE NO. 612-A AT STINSON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT, ACCORDING TO RENTAL AS SET FORTH HEREIN.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,889

GRANTING PERMISSION TO THE OPTIMIST CLUB OF NORTHWEST SAN ANTONIO TO CONDUCT A BONFIRE AT 7:00 P. M., ON MARCH 1, 1975, AT PRUE ROAD, APPROXIMATELY ONE-QUARTER MILE WEST OF THE OLD FREDERICKSBURG ROAD HIGHWAY, UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF THE FIRE DEPARTMENT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,890

ACCEPTING A SIX-MONTH GRANT EXTENSION AND AN ADDITIONAL \$30,900.00 FROM THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF TRAFFIC SAFETY FOR THE SELECTIVE TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT PROJECT, PROVIDING A MATCHING CONTRIBUTION FROM THE GENERAL FUND, AND REVISING THE PROJECT BUDGET FOR EXPENDITURE OF THE ADDITIONAL FUNDS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,891

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$4,252.35 TO THE TEXAS CRIMINAL JUSTICE DIVISION OF THE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR IN PAYMENT OF THE CITY'S SHARE OF THE COST OF THE 1972/73 POLICE CRIME TASK FORCE PROJECT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,892

AUTHORIZING THE NAME CHANGE OF DOE DRIVE TO McNUTT DRIVE DUE TO DUPLICATION OF STREET NAMES.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,893

ACCEPTING A GRANT OF \$15,000.00 FROM THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF TRAFFIC SAFETY IN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION HIGHWAY SAFETY PROJECT FUNDS IN SUPPORT OF A PROJECT INVOLVING INSTALLATION OF 1970 SCHOOL CROSSING SIGNS IN THE CITY; APPROVING A BUDGET FOR THE PROJECT AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS.

* * * *

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 44,894

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO APPLY
TO THE DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION, FOR A TECHNICAL
ASSISTANCE GRANT.

* * * *

The Ordinance was explained by Mr. Frank Leach, Assistant Director of the Planning Department, who reminded the Council that this item had been postponed from last week. It authorized an application to the Economic Development Administration for a grant for a coal gasification study. Council had asked that a letter be obtained from the City Public Service Board saying they had no objections to such a study. The letter was received and copies distributed to the Council.

After consideration, on motion of Dr. San Martin, seconded by Mr. O'Connell, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Morton, Padilla.

75-8 Item No. 9 of the Agenda being a proposed ordinance authorizing a contract with Laventhol, Krekstein, Horwath and Horwath for a review of the HemisFair Plaza Hotel request for proposals was withdrawn from consideration at the request of the City Manager who explained that the amount involved did not require approval by formal Council action.

75-8 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Sam Dominguez, Director of the Manpower Planning Office, and after consideration, on motion of Dr. San Martin, seconded by Mr. Lacy, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Morton, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 44,895

ACCEPTING AN ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OF
\$1,710,089.00 FROM THE U. S.
DEPARTMENT OF LABOR FOR THE CITY'S
ONGOING CETA PROGRAM; APPROPRIATING
FUNDS; AUTHORIZING MODIFICATIONS TO
CONTRACTS WITH DELEGATE AGENCIES IN
THE PROGRAM, AND AUTHORIZING AN
AGREEMENT TO OPERATE PROJECT DETOUR
II.

* * * *

75-8 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Members of the Administrative Staff, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Morton, Padilla.

AN ORDINANCE 44,896

INCREASING THE MAXIMUM PRICES THAT MAY BE CHARGED FOR CERTAIN FOOD AND DRINK ITEMS BY CONCESSIONAIRES AT CITY HALL, CITY HALL ANNEX AND POLICE HEADQUARTERS BUILDING.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,897

APPOINTING MR. RAYMOND APOLLON TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ENERGY, FOR AN INDEFINITE TERM.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,898

APPOINTING MR. MILTON GUESS TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ENERGY, FOR AN INDEFINITE TERM.

* * * *

75-8 SALE OF \$25,000,000 CITY OF SAN ANTONIO GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS, SERIES 1975.

At 10:00 A. M., the bids received for the sale of \$25,000,000 City of San Antonio General Obligation Bonds, Series 1975, were opened and read as follows:

FIRST CITY NATIONAL BANK OF HOUSTON
BANKERS TRUST COMPANY, NEW YORK

Total interest from March 1, 1975 to final maturity:	\$14,993,000.00
Less: Premium	128.00
Net Interest Cost:	<u>\$14,992,872.00</u>

Effective Interest Rate: 5.184257%

REPUBLIC NATIONAL BANK OF DALLAS
RAUSCHER PIERCE SECURITIES CORP.

Total interest from March 1, 1975 to final maturity:	\$15,065,600.00
Less: Premium	-0-
Net Interest Cost:	<u>\$15,065,600.00</u>

Effective Interest Rate: 5.2094%

THE NORTHERN TRUST COMPANY & ASSOCIATES

Total interest from March 1, 1975 to final maturity:	\$15,112,000.00
Less: Premium	501.00
Net Interest Cost:	<u>\$15,111,499.00</u>

Effective Interest Rate: 5.22527%

FIRST NATIONAL BANK IN DALLAS & ASSOCIATES

Total interest from March 1, 1975 to final maturity:	\$15,147,000.00
Less: Premium	1,162.00
Net Interest Cost:	<u>\$15,145,838.00</u>

Effective Interest Rate: 5.23715%

SALOMON BROTHERS AND ASSOCIATES

Total interest from March 1, 1975 to final maturity:	\$15,296,800.00
Less: Premium	882.00
Net Interest Cost:	<u>\$15,295,918.00</u>

Effective Interest Rate: 5.2890%

FIRST NATIONAL CITY BANK

MERRILL LYNCH, PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH, INC.

KUHN, LOEB & COMPANY

GOLDMAN, SACHS & COMPANY

Total interest from March 1, 1975 to final maturity:	\$15,309,400.00
Less: Premium	-0-
Net Interest Cost:	<u>\$15,309,400.00</u>

Effective Interest Rate: 5.2937%

* * * *

After verification of the bids, Mr. Laddie Janecek, representing First Southwest Company, advised the Council that the bid submitted by First City National Bank of Houston and Bankers Trust Company, New York, was the low bid with an effective interest rate of 5.184257 percent. Mr. Janecek stated that under present economic conditions he felt this was a good bid for the City and he recommended acceptance of the bid.

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 44,899

AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS. (\$25,000,000 SERIES 1975, SOLD TO FIRST CITY NATIONAL BANK OF HOUSTON AND BANKERS TRUST COMPANY, NEW YORK.)

* * * *

After consideration, on motion of Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Dr. San Martin, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Lacy, Morton, O'Connell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Black, Padilla.

February 6, 1975
nsr

-7-

75-8 SALE OF \$10,000,000 CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SEWER SYSTEM REVENUE
BONDS, SERIES 1975.

Also at 10:00 A. M., the bids received for the sale of \$10,000,000 City of San Antonio Sewer System Revenue Bonds, Series 1975, were opened and read as follows:

THE FIRST BOSTON CORPORATION

Total interest from March 1, 1975 to final maturity:	\$9,671,662.50
Less: Premium	1,138.00
Net Interest Cost:	<u>\$9,670,524.50</u>

Effective Interest Rate: 5.9620%

WHITE, WELD & COMPANY, INC.
UNDERWOOD, NEUHAUS & COMPANY, INC.
ROTAN, MOSLE, INC. & ASSOCIATES
MERRILL LYNCH PIERCE, FENNER & SMITH
GOLDMAN, SACHS & COMPANY

Total interest from March 1, 1975 to final maturity:	\$9,724,000.00
Less: Premium	-0-
Net Interest Cost:	<u>\$9,724,000.00</u>

Effective Interest Rate: 5.9950%

BLYTH EASTMAN DILLON & COMPANY, INC.
A. G. BECKER & COMPANY, INC.
E. F. HUTTON & COMPANY, INC.

Total interest from March 1, 1975 to final maturity:	\$9,811,975.00
Less: Premium	1,995.00
Net Interest Cost:	<u>\$9,809,980.00</u>

Effective Interest Rate: 6.048076%

HALSEY, STUART & COMPANY, INC.

Total interest from March 1, 1975 to final maturity:	\$9,813,650.00
Less: Premium	800.00
Net Interest Cost:	<u>\$9,812,850.00</u>

Effective Interest Rate: 6.0498%

* * * *

After verification of the bids, Mr. Laddie Janecek, representing First Southwest Company, advised the Council that the bid submitted by The First Boston Corporation was the low bid with an effective interest rate of 5.9620 percent. He said that he felt this was a very good bid and recommended acceptance of the bid.

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 44,900

AUTHORIZING THE ISSUANCE OF SEWER
SYSTEM REVENUE BONDS. (\$10,000,000
SERIES 1975, SOLD TO THE FIRST BOSTON
CORPORATION.)

* * * *

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Lacy, seconded by Dr. San Martin, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Lacy, Morton, O'Connell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Black, Padilla.

Mr. Carl White, Director of Finance, introduced Mr. Paul Horton, Bond Attorney for the City of San Antonio.

Mr. Horton stated that the City had received excellent bids and everything is in proper legal order.

75-8

BOYS CLUBS OF SAN ANTONIO

Mr. John Rinehart, Operations Manager for Monitoring and Evaluation, introduced these representatives of Boys Clubs of San Antonio, Inc.:

Mr. Clement Jilek, President
Mr. Ed Narro, Executive Director
Mr. Manuel Calderon, National Board of Directors
Mr. Sam Jorrie, Vice President

Mr. Jilek stated that they were appearing before the Council to seek funds to supplement United Way funding to make it possible to reopen the Southside Boys Club branch and to again operate the Eastside Branch full time and to keep in operation the Westside Branch in the San Juan Homes area. He reviewed the history and purposes of Boys Clubs and explained that United Way failed to reach its quota for 1975 which meant that Boys Club did not receive but half of the money needed to operate. The Southside Branch closed December 31, 1974 for lack of funds. He said that the organization needs \$201,815 to operate in 1975.

In answer to Mayor Becker's questions, Mr. Sam Jorrie stated that every effort has been made to raise funds by donations and has used every means to curtail expenses. He spoke of the great good done by Boys Clubs in combatting juvenile delinquency and urged the Council to help as much as possible.

Mr. Calderon also spoke concerning Boys Clubs and their urgent need for funding. He displayed maps to pinpoint locations of the existing clubs.

Reverend Black stated that Boys Club is doing a great job on the Eastside of San Antonio, and he looks forward to the expansion of that program.

Mayor Becker and Mrs. Cockrell both expressed opposition to taking funds from the allocation for a Boys Club facility on the Eastside as that has already been committed. Mrs. Cockrell said that there is money available to start on the facility, and she would not want to take any of it. She said that the Southside Boys Club should be re-examined as to its inadequacy. It may be possible to re-program revenue sharing funds to get something started there.

February 6, 1975
nsr

-9-

Mrs. Cockrell said that there might be a problem in making any kind of an on-going commitment toward the regular annual budget. There are other community organizations that are also in the same financial straits and there just isn't enough money to go around.

Mrs. Cockrell stated that she was very pleased to note that plans are being made to accommodate girls in this program.

After discussion, Mr. O'Connell made a motion that the Council follow the staff's recommendation by approving a cash outlay not to exceed \$105,000 plus utilization of personnel from the Parks and Recreation Department as well as any other department of the City as well as personnel employed in the CETA program. The motion was seconded by Dr. San Martin and was passed and approved by the following roll call vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Lacy, Morton, O'Connell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Black, Padilla.

75-8

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

FIESTA CARNIVAL

Mr. Jack Leon, representing his client, Mr. E. V. Love, again spoke to the Council concerning Mr. Love's application for a permit to have a carnival operation during Fiesta Week. An offer was made to the City of \$103,500.00 in advance at the time of the granting of a permit.

Mr. Leon distributed copies of an article taken from "Amusement Business," a trade publication for fairs and carnival operators, which stated that the carnival concession had been given to Alamo Concessions again. Mr. Leon said that is not what staff had told him. He had been told that a site had not been selected. He asked that Council set this matter for discussion and that it be put out for formal bids in accordance with Charter provisions.

Acting City Manager Guerra said that he was not well acquainted with this problem and since Mr. Stewart Fischer is out of the City he would be prepared to discuss it next week.

Mayor Becker asked that the matter be included in next week's agenda for discussion.

MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ

Mr. Raul Rodriguez, 719 Delgado, said that he had checked the record on the Food Stamp Program, and stated that he could not find where Mrs. Cockrell fought for the program before it was passed on. She did vote for the program after it was approved.

Mrs. Cockrell reiterated the statement she had made last week that she was absent on one occasion when a vote on food stamps was taken but had voted for six other ordinances related to the program.

MR. HENRY MUNOZ, JR.

Mr. Henry Munoz, Jr., complained that the City Water Board is doing away with jobs held by long time employees by contracting for work to be done. He asked the City Council to find some way to stop this practice and to save these jobs.

MR. KARL WURZ

Mr. Karl Wurz, 820 Florida Street, criticized the Parks and Recreation Department for the manner that Sweet Gum trees were planted at HemisFair Plaza. He said that no thought was given to the treatment of the soil and the trees died immediately after they were planted.

75-8 The meeting recessed for lunch at 12:45 P. M., and reconvened at 2:20 P. M.

75-8

FINAL PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED
FISCAL 1975 BUDGET FOR THE EXPENDITURE
OF \$17,904,000 PROVIDED UNDER THE
HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT
OF 1974.

* * * *

The following conversation took place:

ACTING CITY MANAGER CIPRIANO GUERRA: This is what we propose to be the final public hearing on the proposed Community Development Act funding. Most of the attention is focused on the allocation of the money. However, as part of the application, there are two other things that have to go in with it and I'd like to discuss them for a minute and then we'll get on the allocation of the money.

One of them is the Citizen Participation Plan, which we have included in your package a couple of times and generally we're following this format. We're suggesting that to meet the citizen participation requirements over the coming years, that we structure a committee made up of nine people, five of which would come from four sectors of the City, the four quadrants and the central sector, selected by the people themselves through neighborhoods organizing into a sector committee and the sector committee in turn selecting someone to represent them on this five-man committee - five-member committee. The Council would then appoint four persons to this committee. We have presented this at our public hearings and have not received any negative reaction to it, so that's what we're proposing to use for citizen participation unless the Council directs us to do otherwise.

With regard to the Housing Plan, there has to be a Housing Assistance Plan to go forward with the application. We also brought that up at citizens' meetings and got very low response, so we have developed what we hope is a first draft of a five-year plan for the City that deals with low income requirements, assisted housing requirements, some rehabilitation of private homes. Out of that, we have structured a three-year set of goals to go along with this application. Since you have not had a chance to formally review the five-year plan as you would any other plan we might develop, whether thoroughfares or sewers or water plan, we realize that the Housing Plan may have to be updated or changed in the next few months, but we have met the requirement of developing the plan and of extracting from it those things that'll set the goals for the first, second and third years, particularly the first year, to meet the Community Development Act requirements.

With that, we'll turn to the money. I think Roy has just handed you a letter that says that HUD has recomputed the allocation to us and it's gone up slightly by about \$21,000. It was a letter addressed to you, Mayor, that you may not have seen yet because I understand it went out yesterday, but we have a copy of it. So there's an additional \$21,000 we'll be considering today. The package we're considering today is the same one we presented to you two weeks ago tomorrow - on a Friday. We have not made any major changes on it. We asked for your comments on it. We received some comments from Mrs. Cockrell, some from Councilman San Martin, and we've tried to address them in some material I have with me today, if the questions come up in those areas. With that, we can either review the package or you can listen to the citizens and then we'll review the package. Expecting changes from you, we have, as we did with Revenue Sharing, we have a blackboard over there so we can work any changes you may wish to have us address today. You do not have to pass this today. I would recommend to you, if you can see your way clear, to approving this package for us today, I would ask you that you do. Amendments can be made in it after it gets submitted. I also want to point out that every single project listed here will come back in a more definitive form. We'll have to develop budgets. We'll have to scrub down the administrative costs. We'll have to look at the scheduling. In

February 6, 1975
el

-12-

many areas, we're going to be looking at probable material delays. In some areas, we may be looking for a drainage solution to be completed before we do a street solution. We're going to run into these kind of details, as we go along with this plan.

MAYOR CHARLES BECKER: Well, I would like to say this - on this whole matter, I think that having this hearing today is fine. I, for one, would not really be able to give you an intelligent appraisal of this total situation today. I think after listening to all these various citizens here and their comments and remarks, then my suggestion would be, and I think perhaps there are others that have a similar feeling about it, that then we would have scheduled some day next week perhaps one day where we could consider it a work session.

MR. GUERRA: All right, sir.

MAYOR BECKER: And go over this thing with a fine-tooth comb because we try to rush helter-skelter and pell-mell into something approving \$17 million, you know, is really kind of a, I think it's a, expecting an awful lot out of that little amount of time span. So, as important as this is, I know we have enough meetings and enough time spent in various and sundry City business but even so, that's the only way I could logically make a conclusion.

MR. GUERRA: All right, sir.

MAYOR BECKER: Rationally and intelligently on all these different matters that we're trying to make an assessment of. Now, anyone else care to express themselves on that, I'd be happy for them to do so. You think that's agreeable, Lila?

MRS. LILA COCKRELL: Yes, sir.

REV. CLAUDE W. BLACK: It's agreeable with me.

MAYOR BECKER: Reverend.

REVEREND BLACK: I'd appreciate that.

MR. CLIFFORD MORTON: All right. Reverend Black has been ill. He was not here for the original briefing and we spent going over the staff's recommendations a total of maybe 45 minutes and the rest of the time was spent listening to requests from citizens. I think he deserves special attention.

MAYOR BECKER: Yes.

MR. GUERRA: On any particular day, do you want to address that later or would you care to.....

MAYOR BECKER: No, we can do that later I think, Cipriano.

MR. GUERRA: All right.

MAYOR BECKER: And so, now that we have, you know, why don't we start off, if it's appropriate or else Roy's going to - do you need to make any review or comments or anything?

MR. ROY MONTEZ: Just one observation, Mr. Mayor. What we had hoped for was that you would today establish the budget in those areas with full knowledge, as Mr. Guerra has pointed out, that each one of these projects still must get a very strict budget scrubdown at which time we would either reduce or keep at that level and establish the kind of a budget for an effort - drainage - and then the staff works within those limits and this is how the thing would operate. But, we can do it either way.

MR. GUERRA: Now, this isn't intended to be an appropriation exercise at this time.

MAYOR BECKER: No, we understand.

MR. MORTON: No, but I think you raise a lot of false hopes.

MRS. COCKRELL: There are a couple of things that are indicated as proposed to be funded that I'm not really sold on completely yet and I would like to have them discussed, too, because I might, you know, want to recommend deleting them. I want to listen again to the justification too that I'm having some troubles with are the sewer proposals and also the water proposals. I know this is a different channel for funds for those two activities and I would like to hear them reviewed since we have the staff here.

MR. GUERRA: Right.

MAYOR BECKER: Okay. All right, then, shall we start with the first lady, Mrs. Norva Hill. Generally speaking, if the remarks of the various people could be presented in five minutes or something like that, we would appreciate it. Of course, if you run over your time, well, we understand that too. So we have sixteen people signed up on this sheet and.....

MR. GUERRA: Right now there's only two more signed up on the sheet that's outside.

MAYOR BECKER: We don't want you to short yourself or not be able to present your story.

MRS. NORVA HILL: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council. I am somewhat at a disadvantage in talking to you because I expected to hear a little more out of Roy as to why he put out of the budget. He didn't give it to me.

MAYOR BECKER: I notice you're walking on a cane today. Is the.....

MR. MONTEZ: That's to go after Roy.

MAYOR BECKER: I'd suggest a thicker one because he has a hard head.

MRS. HILL: You're telling me.

MAYOR BECKER: You're telling me. You know him then.

MRS. HILL: Okay, first of all, Council and Mr. Mayor, maybe I had the wrong conception of what CD funding was all about. Just as Mrs. Cockrell has said, there are some questions about public works and what that's taking up funding that not too very often does the community have an opportunity to say to the Council and to the City of the needs that are out there that we deal with on a daily basis. I counted up the amount of money that went into developing one proposal that everybody within Bexar County have more or less seen and reviewed and said it was a good proposal. Only to have my dear boy out here to go out there and tell me that he passed by the building and he didn't think it was a good project. Now, I'm a little bit concerned when a single person from your staff can say that a project is not worth funding. Now that's one of my questions and the other one way why were we paraded as a community in the various quadrants before this committee. We brought our people out, we spent a lot of money to get them out there to participate, if they were not going to be listened to. So this is one of the concerns that I have and the other one is, Roy, if you cut me completely out of it, you are going to get something. I'm feeling that the one project that I am concerned with is the renovation project for the old Fannin school. If I don't get the funding out of here, I'm going to get it from somewhere and I must prefer that you consider that because that is a project that we have had considered from all angles and there is a very high possibility that

(inaudible) funding is going to do it - going to give us the money for the program. But since we have had all the surveys made for the Fannin school by all of these groups and some of the evaluators that have come out from State and from Washington that that particular project was needed in that area. I certainly would like for you to reconsider on that \$322,000 project.

I read some projects in here in the last two weeks that were not on the priority list. It is my concern as to whether or not those projects were even drawn up at the time. Now we went and we did a lot of work, the City, and I think we're due more consideration than this. And as a federal project, I want you to know I am very much unhappy with having cut out a project that everybody has considered needed in this area. The police department and your sheriff's department and everybody else knows that we need a prevention juvenile program and that's what I'm after. I'm going to get it from somewhere.

MAYOR BECKER: Norva, let me say this to you. Appreciate, if you will, the fact that much of this work was done preliminarily by the staff and I don't mean to be disparaging of their efforts because after all, they have considerable knowledge of what's needed in San Antonio. By the same token, however, some of us, as Councilmen, feel like we have a little information and insight into some of these problems ourselves so we're not entirely finished, you know, and that's one reason why we want this work session.

MRS. HILL: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I'd like you to have the work session. I would also like to have an opportunity to review the project with you because as I understand it, it was not reviewed. Thank you.

MAYOR BECKER: Thank you. Raul Rodriguez.

MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ: I don't have anything specific prepared but I have - I'm asking that you do not give any money at all to Urban Renewal. The Regent House, a very beautiful house on the corner of North Frio and West Travis Streets, which was built there several years ago by some person who built a beautiful house right in the middle of the ghetto, the barrio, making it better, making it something worth admiring. Everytime I pass by, I enjoy just looking at it. Now, the whole thing is getting torn down around it. Only a few houses are left and this house is slated for destruction. Now if Urban Renewal funds are intended to uplift the neighborhood, there is no sense to tear down this house, which already has uplifted the neighborhood for ten, fifteen years. The house is worth about \$30,000 - \$20 or \$30,000. So as the plan is to tear this down, Urban Renewal has torn down substantial brick buildings, two stories, three stories which should have been conserved and used because they were valuable. The Urban Renewal has shown very little respect for conserving things which were useful as tax base and which were a credit to our neighborhood. I have from time to time years past heard stories and rumors of thievery going on in Urban Renewal. I have not been able, for several reasons, to investigate them thoroughly but I plan as soon as I can, I've got all the people all thinking this to investigate Urban Renewal and find out why they have spent \$60,000,000 with a building that's single, low income resident in Urban Renewal area, as Henry B. Gonzalez charged about two months ago. Surely, anybody who has so little sense and whose planning is so defective should not be entrusted any more money. I'm concerned the money that is given to them will all be used to continue to destroy neighborhoods. Cliques have formed, the people have turned to parasites and instead of helping, they damage and they hurt and they degrade the whole community. They form lobby groups which have power and they have money and they know where to go to get more money and this condition should be changed. I urge you again not to give Urban Renewal any money at all.

MAYOR BECKER: Thank you, Raul. Karl Wurz.

MR. KARL WURZ: Good afternoon, Mayor and Council, my name is Karl Wurz. I live at 820 Florida. Mr. Cipriano Guerra is a fine-looking, distinguished gentleman of proven worth to our country as his military record no doubt indicates. I will concede that he is a better man than I am. Mr. Guerra has a good mind and he is highly intelligent but he committed a serious error in scheduling the public hearings as he did. If he actually didn't do it himself, he was ill-advised. Time was wasted and as a result, the final project recommendations are now presented to the public at the last minute. Councilman Morton, as per newspaper report, said, "as a result of the public hearing on the 24th of January, sweeping changes were indicated". I'm not quoting him word for word. If any sweeping changes were made, I have yet to see them and I'm disappointed that the public hasn't had another chance to see if there are any final drafted plans and that they were not distributed to us here at this meeting as we came in.

On another occasion, I asked who had requested some of the projects in this program. If I was not specific enough then to get an answer at this time, I request a written reply as to who the public spirited citizens were that asked for the following items as per the January 24, 1975 public hearing list of staff recommended projects. The operating agency is Urban Renewal and the items are numbers 8, 36, 37, 38, 39 and 41 and I would appreciate if I had a list of the citizens that recommended these projects.

MAYOR BECKER: What were they - 8, 36, 37, 38, 39, 41, is that correct?

MR. WURZ: Yes, Mayor Becker, that's right.

MAYOR BECKER: All right, sir.

MR. WURZ: Yesterday, I was in the City Clerk's office and I noticed that the public record shows that I am opposed to proposed project to be funded by Community Development funds. This is not true. I wish this to be corrected because even before anyone said anything on this program, I was the first to say that San Antonio deserves these monies and that is on record. The record will show that I am opposed to some Urban Renewal projects proposed and for good reason. Thank you very much.

MAYOR BECKER: Thank you, Karl. Jose Olivares.

MR. JOSE OLIVARES: Good afternoon. I believe that the Clerk has given to each of the members of the Council a copy of a letter I have filed with City Clerk, is that correct? I wish to say, first of all, Mr. Mayor, I left this morning shortly after you had made the remark about being in New York or going to New York and finding areas there that reminded you of Berlin and other parts of Europe shortly after the war. May I say that next time you want to see that kind of specter, you don't have to go that far. Two blocks west of here, we have quite a bit of demolished areas.

MAYOR BECKER: I've made note of that on previous occasions, I think. I just want to.....

MR. OLIVARES: I'm sorry I wasn't present then but we do have - I think appears that we do have our own blitz squad locally and it is really to that that I would like to address myself and address Council first of all, and it has to do with the danger of monies - federal monies being used in the future, immediate future or any time in the future in a continued pattern of demolition and destruction of what we have. I think that all that needs to be said is that these monies should be used for positive construction, some reconstruction, planning, some really concrete evidence to the people of San Antonio that we do have the ability and the integrity, the dedication to do what needs to be done. I will, as I set out here in this letter, do whatever I think is necessary to resist anything to the contrary and I certainly would hope that nothing would compel me - that no action taken by the Council would

compel me to do that and I think that all of you are sympathetic to that because we need to stop the demolition in our area. Thank you.

MAYOR BECKER: Thank you.

MR. LOU ROSENBERG: Sir, pardon me for being tardy. I was talking with one of your staff members about San Pedro Creek, one of my favorite subjects. I only have two observations to make and I want to be brief about them. We provided last week to the Council a little brochure that's been termed by some a primer on downtown development. I'm not sure it qualifies for that. But in connection with your Community Development funds, the statute provides that it's the duty of the recipient agency to set forth a summary of three-year Community Development plan which identifies the Community Development needs, demonstrates the comprehensive strategy for meeting these needs and defines both short and long term Community Development goals, etc., and I won't read the rest. The problem that I foresee in what we're attempting to do today and I think you probably pre-empted all of what I wanted to say when you first started off by saying we'd like to take a little more time to look at this is from the citizens' point of view as relating this to what was discussed last week in terms of a bond issue, in terms of your unspent prior bond issues in terms of the thing that I've talked about once before, the Parking Authority which you're authorized to get into and so forth, that is how to integrate all this stuff and get something that will function for downtown. I really don't have anything more to say than the fact that right now we're talking about how to divy up a bunch of money to a bunch of people like myself who are here saying, well, I want so much and yet we're only looking to CDA funds and we're not looking at them as a part of your entire annual budget and it's kind of hard to determine and I propose for example in that little brochure that we have of comprehensive inter-agency committee consisting of yourself, the county judge, Mr. Herder from the River Authority and Mrs. Banker from the Renewal Agency to focus just on San Pedro Creek commitment. It is hard even for that committee to be told what to do until you know what funds are available from each agency and you've got a chance to pull them together. To me, it seems like the staff work that's done today is excellent except it doesn't tie with what you've got going elsewhere. In that connection, I'd like to say that it seems like we need to pull the package together and, of course, my principal interest is the downtown area. One old building that we bought into we didn't realize how much we bought into in the way of a problem area. So we're looking at solutions or hoping for solutions to a lot of area around one little investment downtown and in that final conclusion, I'd like to ask for the Council to consider as part of its comprehensive solution at least a temporary moratorium on the additional destruction of structures downtown. It seems to me I counted this morning eleven structures that I have personal knowledge of that either have recently been issued a building permit for destruction or are now in the process of being negotiated for destruction. If eleven structures is accurate, and I can name them off if the record requires it, with eleven structures within say a period of two months and another eleven in subsequent months, there's really not going to be enough down here worth our investment coming downtown or your investment trying to set up a committee to raise bond issues for the next ten years. So somehow we've got to put a halt to the existing blight that we're creating rather than solving. Those are basically my remarks and I'd like, if the Council would consider it appropriate, to continue to work with your staff and members of the Council as however we might be helpful.

MRS. COCKRELL: Mr. Mayor, may I just ask a question? This point I think is interesting and that is, I would like to ask the City Attorney, I don't know if he'd give me an off-the-cuff opinion or whether it would take research. What is the Council's legal authority in regard to the private demolition of buildings downtown? Is it legally possible for the Council, for example, to see to the request that we put some kind of a halt on demolition?

February 6, 1975
el

-17-

ASST. CITY ATTORNEY TOM FINLAY: No, I don't think there is. There is a way you can prevent it happening until it's been reviewed. I mean, you have, for example, in the historic structures ordinance, any building, for example, in King William cannot be altered or demolished until it's been reviewed and you have to wait til that review period is over. But on private property, you can't prevent it from happening, you can only buy yourself some time so you can offer to buy it yourself or do something like that.

MR. ROSENBERG: In this connection, if I might just respond to that, what I suggested is two conditions and basically, they relate very much to what your Attorney just stated is that you put a review process on which basically would condition tear down upon some kind or replacement and that's basically what my concern is. You've got over half of downtown now in the form of one structure, one story parking lots and they're uneconomic in the sense of the all - why should we build San Pedro Creek to sustain parking lots. Who cares if cars get flooded as far as I'm personally concerned, if that's all downtown is going to consist of is parking lots. So my point to you is is you can condition a review of a historic structure that the owner uses in historic fashion, then I think there is some authority and if you don't have it, we ought to ask the legislature for it to condition the tear down of a structure upon either the replacement of that structure with another structure that earns tax revenue or if it's to be converted to parking that it be a multi-story parking facility. We obviously can't go on ad infinitum taking downtown apart piece by piece, structure by structure to where three quarters or four fifths or five fifths of downtown is nothing but parking structures. I don't know the solution, I'm only complaining about the problem. But it seems to me as part of your Community Development Program, which says according to the Act of Congress, you must address the problems of blight that we've got to devise a better solution for downtown than simply parking lots.

MAYOR BECKER: Well, I think what you're trying to say as much as anything is that some of these buildings, even though they're old and I don't mean 100 years or 200 years old but old, 60, 70 years old, 50 years old. The depreciation has been wrung out of them as far as the original owners a long time ago, but some of them are still usable and with some furbishing and remodeling and rewiring, and I realize that these things get terribly expensive, but with building costs what they are today, it may even be cheaper to try to remodel one of those old buildings than to tear it down and build a new one.

MR. ROSENBERG: Now the Republic National Bank on Broadway is a classic example of that if I might cite it to you. One of the concerns we have in that connection is that the present zoning requirements for downtown, for example, I'll use an example that everybody can easily appreciate. Romex wire can be used in one of Mr. Morton's new subdivisions and no problem. I don't know how much cheaper it is than putting conduit with Romex through it but downtown codes now require for you to do both. To do a new subdivision, you can do without the conduit. And you can go on with your examples. I'll use the other example of the fact that you want downtown residential, you've got to find a place to put parking on premise.

MAYOR BECKER: If you have the multi-story facet of the new - of the downtown building where, frankly, I'd feel more comfortable with conduit than I would just with plain Romex in a multi-story structure, you know.

MR. ROSENBERG: So would I but the problem as I see it is to make downtown investment competitive with what's happening around Loop 410 and that's my concern. Right now the only thing that seems to be competitive is parking and obviously we can see the end of that road.

MAYOR BECKER: Well, the Western International Hotel Corporation just purchased the Plaza Hotel in New York. It was owned by the Senesta Corporation. It's been a loser for years. Western International has a

reputation for being able to take sick properties and make them profitable. One of the reasons though I think they probably paid I think it was \$24 million or \$28 million for this old hotel is that that type of structure today would probably be \$500 a square foot with all the marble and the frescos and the stuff on the columns and all the fancy stuff like they used to build years ago. It's a priceless old structure. Now, they'll fit the management techniques around the hotel and make it a profitable thing but the building is irreplaceable and that's what I believe that we're all talking about at this time. Now, naturally if you take an old relic that's hopeless, you know, without a roof or floor or anything else, then you're really asking for trouble. I'm kind of thinking about some of these old, old buildings that are 150 years old around here, they are just - they're almost prohibitive to.....Now, it's all right to keep them as historical buildings but to try to make any viable tenancy out of them would almost be asking too much. But I believe we're on the same wave.

MR. ROSENBERG: All right. Thank you very much.

The City Clerk received telegrams in support of Mr. Rosenberg's appeal to halt demolition of buildings from the following individuals:

Mr. C. Don Baugh
Ms. Margaret E. Levin
Mr. Mike Lance
Mr. John Larcade
Mr. Ron Bechtol
Mr. John M. Bennett, Jr.

Copies of these telegrams were made available to each Council member and are on file with the papers of this meeting.

MAYOR BECKER: Thank you, Lou. Mr. Rodriguez.

MR. CELESTINO RODRIGUEZ: Mayor Becker, and honorable members of the City Council. My name is Celestino Rodriguez and I reside at 8609 Old Corpus Christi Road, which is in the deep south side of the City, approximately about a mile and a half from the Villa Coronado area. I am a member of the Board of Directors of the Southside Neighborhood Assistance Corporation, which is an anti-poverty agency funded by E.O.D.C. to provide social services for poor in the area. We have community centers at Bergs Mill and Villa Coronado. And we also administer a health clinic at Villa Coronado, which provides free health services for the impoverished of the area. As some of you may well know, Villa Coronado is one of the poorest sections in town and not only in this City but it's also one of the poorest communities in the entire nation. It is to this point that I want to address myself today.

It is beyond my comprehension how this area, which was annexed by the City some two years ago, has been excluded from consideration in the application submitted by the Planning Department. As I understand it, funds from CDA are applied to various categories such as housing, rehabilitation, parks and recreation, street drainage, social services, and so forth and so on. My first question is, why the Villa Coronado and the surrounding area is excluded? It is clear that the need is there. May I point out one of the situations - the streets in Villa Coronado are in a deplorable condition. Whenever inclement weather sets in, the streets which are not paved are flooded to the point where people in the community cannot reach our clinic, let alone a hospital, which is twenty miles away. The doctors who, for all practical purposes, give their services free to the clinic, are unable to reach the clinic, thus denying the poor of the community's much-needed medical attention. As I understand it, Mr. Clemente Alvarado, who is the President of the Villa Coronado Center or Community Council, has expressed, on two different

occasions, the needs of the community to the clinic committee. Why have his pleas gone unheeded? At the last meeting of the Board of Directors of SNAC, we formed a subcommittee to further express the needs of the community. I am a part of that committee and it also includes three practicing attorneys from the south side and other concerned community residents.

The Planning Department, for reasons unknown to us, is lacking in its sense of priorities. Monies allocated by HUD will be for low and moderate income communities. I can't think of any community lower in income than Villa Coronado. The children in this area are deprived of any parks and recreation. The nearest park is seven miles away. I extend an invitation to any of you on any given Saturday or Sunday to drive through any of these streets, Sanez, Socorro, San Casimiro, any street in Villa Coronado and witness children playing in the streets under extremely hazardous conditions. During the week, SNAC sponsors an after school lunch program at the community center in Villa Coronado but there are no outside activities because of lack of outside facilities. We only ask, as a matter of human compassion, you consider this area in your application to HUD.

Directly behind the Villa Coronado Clinic is an open sewer that runs directly to Mitchell Lake. During the summer, this open sewer becomes a harbor for infested mosquitoes, thus worsening the health conditions. The stench from the Rilling Road disposal plant, especially during hot weather, becomes unbearable, yet this same area has been excluded from consideration for improvements and our committee asks why? Vacant lots litter the area and are full of mosquitoes, rats and other vermin. They provide a haven for pestilence, to say nothing of providing perfect cover for criminals, who threaten the welfare of the children of this community. Add to this the problem of inadequate lighting. This is an area of about 525 families, which is suffering unnecessarily because of no public facilities. I want to go on record today as stating categorically that we are very much in disagreement with the priority given to the Villa Coronado community if, in fact, any consideration has been given to it at all.

MAYOR BECKER: Thank you, sir. Clarabelle Sadler. Robert T. Buchanan. Mrs. Kearney Albaugh.

CITY CLERK: I don't think she's here, but she left a letter here for you.

(The letter request submitted by Mrs. Kearny Albaugh is included with the papers of this meeting.)

MAYOR BECKER: Well, I'll have to find it. Jack McGregor.

MR. JACK MCGREGOR: Good afternoon. I'm Jack McGregor, representing the San Antonio Museum Association. I have Beverly Slimp, one of our trustees with us today. And Gib Denman made a presentation to you at the last meeting on a request for the old Lone Star Brewery. We're here to answer any questions, if there are any further questions.

MAYOR BECKER: Okay. Are there any questions of Mr. McGregor on the request made by Mr. Denman? You all recall that?

MRS. COCKRELL: Yes, sir.

MAYOR BECKER: I don't think so. Thank you, Jack.

MR. MCGREGOR: Thank you.

MAYOR BECKER: Thank you very much. Clarence Littlefield.

MR. CLARENCE LITTLEFIELD: Mr. Mayor, I won't speak at this time - later.

MAYOR BECKER: All right, sir. Fine. I hate to be difficult but is there a gentleman named Cruz? I can't read the first name. People Community Development Corporation.

SOMEONE IN AUDIENCE: Steve Santa Cruz.

MAYOR BECKER: Santa Cruz.

SOMEONE IN AUDIENCE: Steve.

MAYOR BECKER: Steve Santa Cruz. Steve Santa Cruz. Let's see here, well, I can't - I've lost my eyesight. Mizar - is that Meza - Masa - with the COPS. Mr. Mesa.

MR. JOE MESA: My name is Joe Mesa.

MAYOR BECKER: Yes, sir.

MR. MESA: I reside at 243 Cumberland. Mayor, Council members, I am a member of the San Antonio Communities Organized for Public Services and we are proposing in the area of Brady Gardens, San Juan Courts, Vandale area, from the Laredo Street to Frio City Road and Zarzamora - there is one of the highest density of people per square foot. In this area, there is no recreational - no park facilities for children, the families nor the senior citizens. Mr. Ronald Darner, Director of Parks and Recreation stated, that this has been - this has to be a top priority for the City of San Antonio. COPS demands a major recreational facility that includes three baseball fields with lighting, four basketball courts with lighting, one volleyball field, six tennis courts, track area, playground area for children with equipment, picnic area with tables and cabana, full size swimming pool. In addition, indoor facilities should include a regulation gymnasium, large-size meeting rooms and a game room and a staff for supervision. The areas recommended are at the corner of Merida and Zarzamora and Merida and Hamilton. In this proposal, Mrs. Miller presented the same to Mr. Cipriano Guerra. At this time, I believe Mr. Cipriano Guerra can brief us on the lot and the area that covers these proposed park areas.

MR. CIPRIANO GUERRA: The group of people representing this neighborhood came by my office the day before yesterday with this request and I think it serves as a good example of the kind of thing we're trying to deal with right now. We immediately put some people on it to try to staff out this idea and, you know, we're in the constraint of about a day's work on it. We did try to come up with an estimate of the request for this neighborhood. Based on the request they gave us, we came up with an estimate of about \$1.7 million to do the things they want. I have a map of the area that I want to show you because - it will take a minute to show it to you because it typifies the problem we have in selecting these projects.

MAYOR BECKER: Let me ask you a question. How far or how near are the closest facilities to this particular area?

MR. GUERRA: The nearest facility we have developing to it are roughly six, seven, or eight blocks. Now, there's the Apache Creek where we're going to spend out of the current Community Development money, we're proposing that, I forget the exact figure, but out of the figure we have we think that about \$500,000 applies to meet the needs they want. For example, they're asking for three lighted baseball fields and we're carrying one baseball field, football field. They want four lighted basketball courts, we're carrying two. One tract and field facility and we don't have that. One volleyball court and there happen to be two proposed in this area.

The trouble is, Charlie, if you will outline the neighborhood for him. This is the neighborhood that they represent. It is, you know, I can accept it as a concept of people for a neighborhood because it's

February 6, 1975

-21-

el

bounded by a railroad track on the north, a railroad track and a major road on the southeast and then two major streets but it's close enough to Apache Creek which has been a park in which the people participate in its definition and the things that are going to go in it. And the major thing that divides them from it is the railroad track running along the northside there running east and west. It isn't very heavily used. It is a few more blocks away than the area they would propose. Charlie, would you point to the area? That's the area they're proposing for a possible park.

MAYOR BECKER: Now where's the one you all are talking about making?

MR. GUERRA: It's along - it's a linear park along that portion of Apache Creek. There's where these items would go. We have a map of it over here.

MAYOR BECKER: You have some of these facilities incorporated into that linear park, as you call it?

MR. GUERRA: Well, where's the blue line - it's linear in the sense that it follows the creek bed and we use land on both sides of the creek to do it. It's that stretch that we consider as meeting part of the needs of that area. It is not as close as we would like to have it. They do have to go I think, on the map we showed you before, one inch represents 800 feet. That's the kind of distance we're talking about.

MAYOR BECKER: Let me ask this. We have maps, I think, showing the location of the present parks throughout the City. We have maps showing the proposed improvements in the way of softball diamonds and that sort of thing throughout the City. And, of course, we also have maps showing the proposed new parks throughout the City. Now, of course, what the gentleman says here is to a great extent part of the crux of this whole situation. Highest density of people per square foot of any part of the City, you see.

MR. GUERRA: No, we have higher density, a little further west.

MAYOR BECKER: Well, I appreciate that.

MR. GUERRA: It is high but the west side is high. That's characteristic of the west side.

MAYOR BECKER: I understand. What I'm merely trying to point out, and I'm not being critical of what the staff has done here, but if there is these facilities planned along this linear park, as we call it, following the creek and all, then perhaps some of these facilities, reduction of these numbers perhaps closer located to where they're speaking of, could always be a possibility. It's something that could be considered. I don't think, you know, that we can - forgive me for injecting myself into the Parks Department but I don't think that you can take one park or two parks and set it over into one whole general area and say that that's going to serve that whole part of the City. What if a kid had to go two and one half, three miles to go to the park, you know, if that's the only place he has for recreation, the only place he has for play, if that's the only place he has for a swimming pool. That's the only thing I'm trying to suggest is that there might be some.....

MR. GUERRA: We're trying to take that into consideration but it's not that far away and - but again, it's a matter of how you perceive your neighborhood and if you perceive this to be out of your neighborhood, you're not going to be happy with it, that's part of the problem we have here.

MR. MESA: Mr. Mayor, we understand there has been some research - the City real estate has been on the lookout for lands and types of lands in our community on Zarzamora over in the Collins Garden section and they haven't been able to find any and we believe that if they are

trying to buy some tracts of land further off, we are insisting and we're demanding that the purchase of land be made where it is needed the most in our community. If they're trying to buy some tracts of land two or three miles from there, we need it in our community and we should have it in our community. Why buy tracts of land out of the area, away from the area that we really need it. COPS believes and demands at this point, you know, the Council should recognize the great need of recreational area in this community and we demand that you should start preliminary steps on the purchasing of these tracts of land which we just mentioned.

MAYOR BECKER: Well, let me say this, sir, that the City does have spread throughout the area of San Antonio certain tracts of land all sizes, shapes, fashion and forms, you know, small pieces, medium-sized pieces and the Land Department knows about these. Now, there has been discussion down here as to desirability of taking some of these smaller pieces of property, putting, say, one basketball court on it, you know, one softball diamond on another and trying to spread these things out so that we do attempt to give coverage and we do attempt to provide some type of facilities for the people. You're not advocating, and I realize that, that every six block area or something have a complete list of all these facilities just unto their own neighborhood. I don't think anybody could ask for that because in the first place, it would be great but we don't have the kind of money for it.

MR. MESA: What we're asking is just the federal regulation on housing where each community with so many people in that area should have a park and that's what we are asking. That's why we would like you and the Council to consider this and consider it in your budget in any way possible as to the purchasing of these tracts of land as a starting point.

MAYOR BECKER: Now, what I would like to ask is that when we have this work session, the Parks Department, Land Department for the City, Mr. Clark, and all those bring their maps of wherever these baseball diamonds, because, you know, we've talked about this now for almost four years that I can recall, putting baseball diamonds and things out there in some of these areas, and see what the pattern looks like. Let's see what the thing looks like and see if we can't somehow or other affect some.....

MR. MESA: We would like to have our area attended, you know.

MAYOR BECKER: Well, of course you would and I don't blame you.

MR. MESA: We're asking for your services in our area. Thank you.

MAYOR BECKER: Thank you, sir. All right. Delores Ratliff.

MS. DELORES RATLIFF: Mr. Mayor, City Councilmen, my name is Delores Ratliff. I'm the Director of Ella Austin Community Center. I'm appearing before you again today because, as we understand, in talking with the staff, the two proposals presented by Ella Austin to the City for consideration for funding under the Community Development Act were not included. We are particularly perplexed by the fact that they were not included because in our review of the Act and from our acquaintance with HUD, we feel that these two projects very definitely exemplify the whole intent of the Act.

One project has to do with helping people meet their mortgage payments. Now, long before you can even consider rehabilitating homes or demolishing homes or doing whatever you're going to do with homes, the first concern should be helping people keep their homes and this is what this project has been doing for over 26 months - nearly three years now. We've been helping people keep their homes. And these are low income people. Again, with the Community Development Act, the concern is with our low income residents. This has been their major and only resource because at this point, we are the only counseling agency in the

City. Now, we have been able to conserve some money and keep this project going for another eight months, but after that time there will be no resource for these people who are having problems meeting their home payments. So, I can think of no project that will be more directly related to the funding of the money that is going to be made available to the City under the Community Development Act.

The other project is one that we have already submitted to HUD once before but it fell under the axe of the freeze when Nixon was our President. And, therefore, we were not able to be funded but it very clearly is a neighborhood facilities grant, if the City would include it. It would offer a very valid service to the community and, again, exemplify what the Act should be doing because in itself it would make possible Ella Austin community Center retaining the building that we presently occupy, which, incidentally, has been put up for bids and we will possibly lose it, if this doesn't come through as a resource for us. It would make it possible for us to continue to offer the multi-purpose kinds of services that we're offering.

Now, getting back to my being perplexed, I do not understand what kind of priorities have been set by the staff in determining which projects are included and which projects are left out. I also do not understand why more consideration is not given to using other federal monies or monies from other sources rather than using these very valuable monies that are coming through the Community Development Act, because if I could understand the priorities, I could better understand why we were not included, but I'm sure that even if I were to look at the priorities that I would still see no reason why these two projects were left out.

MAYOR BECKER: All right.

MS. RATLIFF: Thank you for your consideration. I understand that Mrs. Hill has another question and if I have any more time, I want to relinquish it to her.

MAYOR BECKER: Well, certainly, absolutely.

MS. RATLIFF: Okay. Mrs. Hill.

MAYOR BECKER: I was also going to ask Mr. Littlefield if he's ready to speak, whenever he's ready to speak, if he'll just hold his hand up or walk forward or something because I don't know exactly when he wants to talk on his subject. I don't want to overlook him on the list - I've got a star by his name so we won't pass him by.

MRS. HILL: I didn't catch this when I was up here before. I just want to ask a question and get a clear answer on it. Here on Item 33, Operating Agency, Department of Human Resources - can you explain that to me?

MR. MONTEZ: I believe she directed that to me, Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR BECKER: All right, Roy.

MR. MONTEZ: Hope I say the right thing.

MR. O'CONNELL: You had better.

MR. MONTEZ: What we have done here, Mr. Mayor, with all the projects listed, all 43 of them, use existing City departments or City agencies - the only two agencies not City - well, not departments - City Water Board and the Urban Renewal Agency. Those are the only two. All the others are to be administered by a City department. Now, if a department, such as Human Resources was unable to provide the service.....

MAYOR BECKER: Well, she wants to see that you don't speak with a forked tongue.

MR. MONTEZ: I've been accused of that before, too. If a department was not able to provide the service, then that department might solicit the purchase of that service from any agency that can do it but they....

MRS. HILL: It is not a service.

MR. MONTEZ: They would be the supervisory department.

MRS. HILL: What?

MR. MONTEZ: So, this is the way the whole program is set up.

MRS. HILL: Who set it up like that?

MR. MONTEZ: The committee.....

MRS. HILL: I made the application for this project here - Human Resources has not been involved in any part of that project.

MR. MONTEZ: That would be the department responsible and they would - Carver Library is owned by the City of San Antonio now.

MRS. HILL: It is no longer a library.

MR. MONTEZ: Well, the property is owned by the City of San Antonio.

MRS. HILL: It's under Parks and Recreation.

MR. MONTEZ: It's owned by the City.

MRS. HILL: And it comes under Human Resources?

MR. MONTEZ: It would.

MAYOR BECKER: Didn't we put a new roof on that and.....

MRS. HILL: Yes, you've done a beautiful job out there, that's why I want to know how I got over in Human Resources because I (inaudible) program is, as yet as approved by the Council, which I am going to make reservations to come before you within the next week or ten days and give you that.

MAYOR BECKER: All right.

MRS. HILL: Because I'd like to invite you at this time to come out there and see what you spent your money for.

MAYOR BECKER: All right. Fine. Fine, Mrs. Hill. Okay. All right, now, next is Edith McAllister.

MS. EDITH McALLISTER: Mayor Becker, members of the Council, I am Edith McAllister and I want to speak just very briefly once again on the subjects generally of historic preservation and hope that with all the urgency and the importance of all the citizens' demands and needs, that somehow you will be able to find a very small percentage of the Community Development Act funds that can go into something that may seem on the surface slightly more long range than what we've been hearing this afternoon and that is in the area of historic preservation. It is, as you know, the fact that we have preserved our heritage in a much more attractive fashion than most cities is why we have the tourist dollar coming in here instead of going to some other city which creates new jobs, new opportunities, and is a great boom to our economy.

Specifically, I would like to say again that we are very much interested in the old Ursuline Academy at 300 Augusta Street, which is in the center City. It is on the River Corridor. It is owned by the Southwest Craft Center and we have urgent problems with one building

that is completely restored - it's referred to as a dormitory, but it's restored and used for classrooms, that have occurred as sort of an act of God, if you will call it that, and a little of man, because in listening to Lou Rosenberg in his parking lot presentation, when this old building probably would have stood there longer than most of us, if the area around it hadn't been paved over for a parking lot and dumped all of this drainage right into its basement. Some day, in the very long, not, maybe not too long off future, we are looking over our wall and we hope, perhaps, to take that parking lot and develop it into a green spot in the urban area in the center City into something that will be another marvelous, not only tourist attraction, but something to which all the citizens can point to with pride, as a craft and art school, second to none in the Southwest and an example of adopted use of historic structures. We will certainly appreciate any consideration you can give to that specific request but hopefully, you will not leave historic preservation out of the package in total. I'd love to answer any questions on any of this if anyone has any questions.

MAYOR BECKER: Are there any questions of Mrs. McAllister? None.

MRS. McALLISTER: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

MAYOR BECKER: Thank you very much, Edith. Ricardo Leal.

MR. RICARDO LEAL: Before I begin, I'd like to pass out some information concerning proposals I will be handing. I know you did get this information a couple of weeks ago but if you don't have it handy, there it is for reference. Mayor Becker, distinguished members of the Council, fellow citizens, my name is Ricardo Leal and I am representing the youth groups of St. Leo's Center, which is located on the southside of town. We have been meeting as a group for the past three years and have about 85 to 100 members. We meet together each Wednesday night just to form friendship and to have fun. Mr. Castelene at St. Leo's has provided us with many extras, including the use of the gym, counseling services, athletic tournaments and dances and field trips. In short, people at St. Leo's have just cared about us. We, for a long time, have had a dream that we could have these activities for more than just us. Having the gym open for three to four nights a week, giving us junior high nights, teen nights and young adult nights...thereby reaching 300 to 400 teenagers a week. By this grant, you could help us with more personnel, help with the team setting up different activities, providing us with money for athletic equipment, use of facilities and field trips. These monies that we are referring to will be from HUD through the Community Development Act. We have given our proposal to Mr. Donahue of Human Resources and we are asking that you, Mayor Becker and your Council, support these efforts for us. Then with this help, we could give more of my friends and peers an alternative to walk in the streets. I hope and recommend that you accept our proposal and thank you for listening to us. Are there any questions?

MAYOR BECKER: Are there any questions on this subject? Thank you very much. Judith Scanlon.

MS. JUDITH SCANLON: Mayor Becker and members of the Council, I am Judith Scanlon, Co-Project Director of the San Antonio Child Abuse Council. Under the National Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act, the San Antonio Child Abuse Council with the Community Guidance Center as its sponsor, applied for H.E.W. monies in October. We were recently informed that our application was not accepted for funding. You may remember that the application was reviewed by the Council and we did receive your endorsement. Also, the Commissioner's Court all voted an endorsement for us. Our application also received a favorable review by AACOG before we applied.

The San Antonio Child Abuse Council was organized as a totally volunteer effort in May of '73. It was organized in an attempt to coordinate rehabilitative services for the abused child and his family.

Without money at this point, our efforts will lack the impact this community needs to stimulate its resources to further help children abused and parents who need non-threatening, non-punitive programs of rehabilitation. Since 1972, the number of children identified as needing protection from abuse or neglect has increased about 300 percent. We feel the educational effort on the part of the San Antonio Child Abuse Council can make the professional and lay community better understand the needs of the abusive family have contributed significantly to this increase and yet we are only touching the tip of the iceberg. Representatives from many community agencies and organizations have been working to further the efforts of the San Antonio Child Abuse Council for several years now along with attorneys, educators, law enforcement officials, psychologists, physicians, etc., all have been very generous with their time and talent. Now we need to fund an administrative staff to continue our work, to further coordinate the services available to the abusive family and to stimulate additional programs in Bexar County to meet their needs. We had a meeting recently to discuss the fact that we were not funded. A recommendation was made that we seek funding in the amount of about \$25,000 to give us some seed money to fund a very small administrative staff to continue our work. Are there any questions?

MR. W. J. O'CONNELL: I have just one if I may. Is there any relation to your San Antonio group with the announcements I've seen on television about Child Abuse Center with an 800 telephone number? Does that have anything to do with you?

MS. SCANLON: This is coming out of State Department of Public Welfare. Our Bexar County Child Welfare Unit here has been working very closely with the San Antonio Child Abuse Council.

MR. O'CONNELL: This is the State?

MS. SCANLON: This is from the State, yes, and we are coordinating our efforts. This is why we organized to coordinate the services that are available.

MR. O'CONNELL: I see. Do they have personnel - does the State have personnel under that heading?

MS. SCANLON: The State has personnel under the State Department of Public Welfare, Bexar County Child Welfare Division, yes, and they have personnel to meet the legal obligation to protect families from abuse. They are not legally obligated to offer rehabilitative services and they depend on the community for this.

MR. O'CONNELL: Thank you.

MAYOR BECKER: Any other questions? Thank you very much.

MS. SCANLON: Thank you.

MAYOR BECKER: Louis Viramontes.

MR. LOUIS VIRAMONTES: My name is Louis Viramontes. I am an architect and I live at 301 Skyview Drive, West. I am again appearing before you in response to your staff's recommendations concerning the local allocations of the Community Development Funds. I find it distressing that after what I interpreted to be an enthusiastic response from members of the City Council, the press and the public in general to my statement to you on 24 January 1975, there exists no indication of change in the proposed budget.

While I did not personally attend all the community meetings, I am aware of the top priority given to flood control by the public. I, too, am concerned about flooding, and together with my partner, Louis T. Rosenberg, have presented a series of suggestions and other communications to the Council and Agency planners, which support this priority.

I continue to find in the nearly \$18 million budget, however, approximately 15 percent of the Community Development Funds allocated to further land acquisition, demolition and relocation of households and commercial parcels by Urban Renewal. Since we already possess dozens of acres of land cleared and ready for redevelopment, it would seem that what new funds are available could be used more constructively in our City and thus encouraging the private sector.

I am not satisfied by the acceptance on the Council's part that our local lending institutions will not lend funds for rehabilitation of structures in certain sections of the City. Personally, I do not share this opinion but am aware of their need to make secure loans. It seems to me that one appropriate use of Community Development Funds is to insure the availability of private funds for our central and inner City sections.

I am again requesting you to reconsider the use of Community Development Funds for Items 3, 4, 5, 7, 9, 10, and 21. Aside from the many sociological reasons for not spending money in this manner, such activity is simply not good business in terms of dollars and cents.

In one of the handouts that I gave you, there's an article in today's sports page of the United Boxing Club's experience in their use of the - in finding the gymnasium being used and going back to the records, the City was out less than \$40,000 in acquiring that, that parcel of that building, the parking that's adjacent to it. And that's just good business.

I just would like your consideration because I was very surprised this morning when I went to the Planning office to look at the revised budget from last time that it was the same budget that we had two weeks ago or a week ago - and it's - I don't see any change from the meeting on the 24th.

MAYOR BECKER: There possibly will be some.

MR. VIRAMONTES: I hope so.

MAYOR BECKER: Okay. Anyone care to ask Mr. Viramontes any questions? Thank you, sir. All right. We have one gentleman, Clarence Littlefield, who wished to speak later. Are you ready now? Well, you'd be the last one signed up to speak. Are you ready to speak now? All right. Okay. Well, that concludes all the citizens that were signed to be heard on the Community Development funds. So, unless there are any questions that the Council members have of the staff.....

MRS. COCKRELL: I would like to ask for a comment, I see Mr. Van Dyke is here from the Water Board, and I would like to ask him to discuss the Water Board's request for \$400,000 which is giving me some problems.

MR. ROBERT VAN DYKE: Mayor, Members of the Council, I'm Robert Van Dyke, the General Manager of the City Water Board. I'd be happy to answer any specific questions that you might have, Mrs. Cockrell.

MRS. COCKRELL: Yes, I really don't understand why the City is being asked to include this in the Community Development. I don't know why the Water Board isn't including this in your regular budgetary activities.

MR. VAN DYKE: The Water Board previously could obtain funds from the Federal Government through the Model Cities Program and through the HUD Program. The new Community Development Program includes all of these and we no longer have those funds available and they are included in this present problem. So, it is only logical that the Water Board and sewer functions would get some of the funds that are being allocated to the City of San Antonio. We normally try to spend approximately \$1,200,000, plus or minus, depending upon the funds that are available for the replacement of old and corroded and worn out mains that we have in the City of San Antonio. This particular year because of the shortage of funds that we do have, we were only able to include \$160,000 in our budget for mains - some \$8,000 for fire hydrants - and some \$100,000 for services and our total replacement budget this year is \$430,000, as compared to \$2,148,000 last year. So, again, it is obvious that if there are no other ways to obtain the Federal funds through the regular channels, now that they are in this particular program, that they should come through this particular request.

The funds that are being requested by the Water Board here originally started out as \$2 million and then later down to \$1 million and finally we were allocated \$400,000. This money will be used to replace the mains that are in the particular areas that are being considered where all of the other projects are - in the blighted areas. It seems to me rather peculiar to go in to take care of the areas, take care of the drainage and everything else that's involved in an area and then leave the water area not being done. It is our thought, that this should be part of the total package to try to replace the small and inadequate mains in these particular areas, where there is insufficient fire protection at the present time.

Most of the mains that are being replaced are two inches or smaller in size and as you realize, under the Board's current criteria, the smallest mains that we allow to be installed in the City are six inch and six-inch mains are the minimum size that will provide adequate fire protection for our citizens. Some years ago, we had in excess of

450 miles of mains in the City of San Antonio smaller than six inches in size and through this regular program of replacement, we are down to around 300 miles at the present time. We will hope to continue the program to replace these mains in the future and one day eliminate all of them.

MRS. COCKRELL: I will comment further that perhaps one reason that this is giving me a little trouble is the present recommendation from the Water Board on the change in the policies of the Water Board under which, in spite of the tight financing picture, as you have painted it, the Water Board is now proposing to furnish all the materials to the developers in developing within the City limits those on-site mains, which they formerly paid for. Now, I think, this is going to cost something like half a million to \$650,000 a year in new costs that the Water Board has not previously incurred. I guess it was this cost that you are proposing to take on that made me question whether we should be using Community Development funds for the \$400,000, which perhaps could have been otherwise taken care of.

MR. VAN DYKE: The Board, in its wisdom, has passed regulations to provide the payment of materials for on-site mains within the City limits. This matter will come before the City Council, as far as the ETJ, but it would not have anything to do with providing materials for on-site mains in the ETJ. You are correct, Mrs. Cockrell, that we anticipate approximately \$650,000 would be spent for the materials in on-site mains in the first year. This is an estimate, and will depend upon the growth patterns, and I presume the economic status of the United States and as well as San Antonio during the forthcoming year. This money we feel is an investment to bring people and development into the City limits. If we are successful in bringing new developments into the City limits through this means, then those properties that are developed will be put on the tax roll, and they will mean income to the City of San Antonio. Mr. Schaefer appeared before the Planning Commission yesterday and indicated that it is anticipated that \$5 will be returned for each \$1 that's invested, both in revenue and in taxes in the future. And, so, the Board in its wisdom, feels that this is a prudent investment and has voted to adopt regulations which do this.

MRS. COCKRELL: Yes, I've read the discussion. Of course, I'm aware of the Board's thinking and certainly I concur with their goals of trying to encourage development within the City, no question about the goals - it's just that I am having trouble with the matter of allocating \$400,000 out of Community Development funds, which are going to be hard pressed to do the job anyway, when I see that apparently the Board has found the money available to take on this new activity, which it previously was not funding.

MR. VAN DYKE: Yes, madam.

MAYOR BECKER: Any other questions of Mr. Van Dyke? Thank you, Bob.

MR. VAN DYKE: Thank you, sir.

MAYOR BECKER: Well, there isn't any further discussion. We consider that we've had the hearing, right?

ACTING CITY MANAGER GUERRA: Yes, sir. If you would allow me, I'd like to make a few comments on the bill.

MAYOR BECKER: All right, sir.

MR. GUERRA: It'll help put some of the requests in perspective. Eventually we'll be faced, of course, with audits and naturally we tend to look at that from a staff point of view. We want to be careful that the money gets spent in eligible areas. The primary objective of the bill is clearly stated in the Act and it says it's - "the primary objective of this title is development of viable urban communities by providing decent housing and a suitable living environment and expanding economic opportunities, principally for persons of low and moderate income." What I'm trying to say is this is not the Health, Education and Welfare Act. That one got vetoed by the President. The main thrust of these monies is to replace the old sewer and water grants, the old Model Cities grants, the old Urban Renewal grants, the old Open Space grants, the old Planning and Administration grants, and we've tried to select projects that fit in that area, because beyond this single sentence that I read for you here, the law goes on to explain the eligible items, and it clearly says they'll be spent only for these eligible items. There's no question there is room for interpretation - there always is. But, generally, they're very clear about the physical requirements of the City. I think you recall the collection we made for you a couple of years ago - \$800 million of capital or physical improvement needs. So, we've tried to orient our work in that direction.

Speaking - addressing myself to priorities, and that question's been raised, how did we establish priorities? Well, the general priorities were established in trying to solve the physical environment in residential - in the poorer parts of town. Mainly, that has to do with drainage and as we discussed with you back in December, we're putting monies in here to do the engineering primarily for a lot of drainage - over \$20 million worth of drainage, not committing construction funds to all that, but at least getting the engineering done, because there are other sources for those funds. The City can issue bonds. We try to devote the rest of these monies for some of the things the City cannot do with its own monies. For example, in the housing area, at this point, you cannot use City dollars to run a rehabilitation program or create a fund for the rehabilitation of homes. You can use, as we understand the bill today, these monies for that sort of thing and so we have put emphasis on creating funds for rehabilitation of homes. We've heard alot about demolition.

There is some demolition in here of buildings, possibly in commercial areas, in some of the Urban Renewal projects, but basically the demolition money we have here is to respond to a community-expressed community need to demolish abandoned housing that is a threat and a liability in neighborhoods. That's where the money's going. There were some reservations expressed about even the emergency repair money and yet, you cannot use City monies to provide emergency repairs to people who maybe develop a leaky roof or lose their electrical system or lose their heating system in the winter. But, through this fund, as we understand it, you can do that. So, we've tried to orient the money in that direction - into these areas that were eliminated by this bill, plus orienting it to the physical, basically the physical environment.

February 6, 1975
nsr

-31-

In the social services area, the bill does allow you to put some monies in those areas, but it raises additional requirements and it clearly indicates that this is a secondary purpose. If you've done these other things in the neighborhood, if you've worked on the streets and the sewers and the drainage and the houses, then you can spend monies for social service programs where you can show that that money was - that you applied for, and were unable to obtain those monies from another source.

So, that generally is the way we approached this. We dealt with the primary physical problem in this town seems to be drainage, so we try to address it first. The next requirement we heard a lot about was open space, parks. You heard the gentleman today with the San Juan area. So, we try to address parks. Economic development is an important area that's also sometimes difficult to understand. If we do things downtown and make it attractive to redevelop downtown that leads to better jobs, then that leads to better, you know, better tax return to the City and eventually we can address some of the social problems with this extra capital.

I just wanted to summarize very briefly for you the general thrust of what we did. Now, you can take our list of 40 odd projects here and change them around. It's akin to looking at a man who's 75 percent burned over his body and you got three band aids, you know, where do you put them? And, you know, one person can pick three spots and somebody else can pick three. At our work session, we're open to any changes the Council wants to make. We'll work with you in trying to balance it out. We'll try to advise you only where we think you may be operating in ineligible areas. But, that's the approach we took. With that, Mayor, I'd like to suggest that, if possible, we try to set a working date and - in discussing with Roy, he's suggesting Monday the 10th. Would that - is that too early?

MRS. COCKRELL: I'm going to be out of the City Monday.

MAYOR BECKER: Okay. Let's see what we have.....

I'd like to start in the morning and give ourselves enough time, if we could, to finish it. So, I'm thinking of Wednesday, perhaps, Wednesday, February the 12th; so, we could start say at 9:00 in the morning and if it took us all day to hack it out, so.....

MR. GUERRA: All right. Being an optimist, though I'm always accused of being a pessimist - I would like to go ahead and put an item on the agenda for Thursday, presuming we can work things out Wednesday.

MAYOR BECKER: Well, fine.

MRS. COCKRELL: It could be pulled, if we couldn't.

MR. GUERRA: Right. Okay.

MAYOR BECKER: Is Wednesday, February the 12th, convenient for you all? Nine o'clock in the morning?

MR. GUERRA: All right. Can I suggest the "B" room, where we can put up maps?

MAYOR BECKER: Right.

MR. GUERRA: It'd be - it'll be a little easier to present, Well, Mayor.....

MAYOR BECKER: Yes, sir.

MR. GUERRA: Actually we have more room over at the Information Center over at the Planning Department - it's a bigger room, we've got plenty of maps - the park map, for example, it's already up. A lot of the maps you want to see are already mounted on boards over there - would you mind meeting over there? 421 South Alamo.

MAYOR BECKER: Well, 421 South - is - what you're speaking of the German-English School?

MR. GUERRA: Yes, sir. The German-English School at 9:00 o'clock.

MAYOR BECKER: 421 South Alamo - okay.

CITY CLERK: That's going to be a work session - not a Special Meeting?

MAYOR BECKER: No, that's a work session for the Council on this CDA money, and we hope to come to some conclusions and we should. So, if there's nothing else.....

* * * *

Mayor Becker then declared the Public Hearing closed.

-
75-8

-
BEXAR COUNTY COUNCIL OF MAYORS
-

Dr. San Martin stated that he had attended a meeting of the Bexar County Council of Mayors, and it became obvious to him that the City needs a permanent representative on the Council for a full two year term. In the past a member of the Council has been attending the meetings but there is no continuity of feed back to the City Council. There are several problems of concern which need to be resolved one, of which, is the Emergency Medical Service. Dr. San Martin suggested that a permanent representative be appointed.

Mrs. Cockrell stated that the Council also needs to appoint a replacement for Mr. Leo Mendoza to the ACOG Board and to the Transportation Policy Committee.

-
75-8

-
TAX REAPPRAISAL PROGRAM
-

Dr. San Martin said that there was a representative from the Tax Reappraisal Board present at the meeting of Bexar County mayors who gave an excellent explanation of the program. It clarified the situation regarding the reappraisal program very much.

-
75-8

-
INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE
-

Mr. O'Connell asked for help in getting persons assigned to his investigation committee.

-
February 6, 1975
nsr

75-8 The Clerk read the following letter:

January 31, 1975

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

Gentlemen and Madam:

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

January 28, 1975

Petition of Mr. Lamar W. Gardner, Jr.,
1911 East Lawndale, San Antonio, re-
questing permission to erect an eight
(8) foot wood fence on the east side
of his property.

/s/ J. H. INSELMANN
City Clerk

* * * *

There being no further business to come before the Council,
the meeting adjourned at 4:00 P. M.

A P P R O V E D

ATTEST: *J. H. Inselmann*
City Clerk