

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN  
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON  
THURSDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1979.

\* \* \* \*

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 P.M. by the presiding officer, Mayor Pro-Tem Gene Canavan, in the absence of Mayor Lila Cockrell, with the following members present: CISNEROS, WEBB, DUTMER, WING, EURESTE, THOMPSON, ALDERETE, CANAVAN, ARCHER, STEEN; Absent: COCKRELL.

79-50 The invocation was given by The Reverend Joyce Kelley, Travis Park United Methodist Church.

79-50 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

79-50 The minutes of the meeting of October 18, 1979 were approved.

79-50 CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Steen moved that items constituting the consent agenda be approved, with the exception of items 7, 8, 10, 12, 15, 17, 18, 19 and 25, to be considered individually. Mr. Archer seconded the motion.

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

AN ORDINANCE 51,399

ACCEPTING THE BID OF ALAMO WELDING AND BOILER WORKS, INC., TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT WITH THE RETUBING OF BOILERS FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$3,867.50.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,400

ACCEPTING THE BID OF PLETZ CORPORATION TO FURNISH THE CONVENTION AND VISITORS BUREAU WITH THE PRINTING OF PROGRAM COVERS WITH POCKETS FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$6,524.10.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,401

ACCEPTING THE BID OF DICTAPHONE TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO POLICE DEPARTMENT WITH RECORDING SYSTEMS FOR A TOTAL OF \$7,140.00 LESS 3% - 30 DAYS.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,402

AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF ONE (1) PORTABLE SEWAGE LIFT STATION FOR THE SAN ANTONIO PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT FROM P.M.I. FOR A TOTAL OF \$14,078.00.

\* \* \* \*

October 25, 1979

mb

AN ORDINANCE 51,403

ACCEPTING THE BID OF DAVIS TRUCK AND EQUIPMENT CO., INC., TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO AUTOMOTIVE OPERATIONS DIVISIONS WITH REFUSE COLLECTION UNITS FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$22,000.00.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,404

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF FIELD ALTERATION NO. 7 IN THE SUM OF \$5,985.25 TO THE CONTRACT FOR HILDEBRAND DRAINAGE PROJECT, #37 WITH HEATH AND STICH, INC.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,405

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A LICENSE AGREEMENT WITH THE MISSOURI PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY PERTAINING TO A CROSSING OVER THE COMPANY'S TRACKS TO PROVIDE ACCESS FOR AIRPORT CRASH EQUIPMENT TO LOCATIONS EAST OF THE AIRPORT; APPROPRIATING THE AMOUNT OF \$6,650 IN FUND 51-001000; ACTIVITY 33-02-01, INDEX CODE 352526; AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT THEREOF.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,406

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF REFUNDS TO PERSONS MAKING OVERPAYMENTS OR DOUBLE PAYMENTS ON 13 TAX ACCOUNTS.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,407

AUTHORIZING ADJUSTMENTS TO THE TAX ROLL IN ACCORDANCE WITH RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE TAX ERROR BOARD OF REVIEW.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,408

FINDING THAT CERTAIN TAX ASSESSMENTS ARE INVALID AND ORDERING THAT THE INVALID ASSESSMENTS AND THE TAXES BASED THEREON BE CANCELLED.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 51,409

ACCEPTING THE BIDS FROM CERTAIN BANKS RECEIVED IN CONNECTION WITH CITY FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR DEPOSIT IN INTEREST-BEARING CERTIFICATES OF DEPOSIT AND ESTABLISHING A CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND FOR MUNICIPAL AUDITORIUM RECONSTRUCTION.

\* \* \* \*

## AN ORDINANCE 51,410

ABANDONING A PORTION OF ALTURA AVENUE AND  
AUTHORIZING A QUITCLAIM TO ADJACENT OWNER,  
JUNE BIERSCHWALE.

\* \* \* \*

## AN ORDINANCE 51,411

AUTHORIZING WRITE-OFF AS UNCOLLECTABLE  
VARIOUS ACCOUNTS RECEIVABLE TOTALING  
\$193,178.51 FOR SERVICES RENDERED BY  
THE SAN ANTONIO FIRE DEPARTMENT EMS PROGRAM  
FOR THE YEARS 1974 AND 1975.

\* \* \* \*

79-50 Item 27, being a proposed ordinance authorizing the renewal of Comprehensive General Liability Insurance, involving three policies covering City-owned facilities and activities, for the period August 1, 1979 to August 1, 1980; and authorizing payment of the premium of \$24,210.00, was withdrawn from consideration.

79-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

## AN ORDINANCE 51,412

ACCEPTING THE BID OF KAUFMAN UNIFORMS, DIV.  
OF SUPERIOR SURGICAL MFG. CO., INC., TO  
FURNISH THE CITY HEALTH DEPARTMENT WITH  
ANIMAL CONTROL EMPLOYEE UNIFORMS FOR A  
NET TOTAL OF \$4,597.60.

\* \* \* \*

Dr. Cisneros moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Wing seconded the motion.

In response to a question by Mr. Thompson, Mr. George Noe, Administrative Assistant to the City Manager, described the type of uniforms that would be worn by the department employees. He stated that the laundry and care of these uniforms would be the responsibility of the employees.

Mr. Archer commended the new Manager of the Animal Control Facility for doing a good job.

Dr. Cisneros spoke in support of the Ordinance and stated that providing uniforms for the employees is a step forward in the morale of the men and complimented staff for their efforts.

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

79-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

## AN ORDINANCE 51,413

ACCEPTING THE BID OF LEO E. STAGGS TO FURNISH  
THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO PUBLIC WORKS SEWER  
DEPARTMENT WITH LABOR AND EQUIPMENT TO BACK-  
FILL CHAVENAUX IRRIGATION GARDENS FOR A NET  
TOTAL OF \$5,250.00.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Steen moved to approve the Ordinance. Dr. Cisneros seconded the motion.

In response to a question by Mr. Thompson, Mr. Frank Kiolbassa, Director of Public Works, stated that in this case, the Public Works Department felt that it would not be in the best interest of the City to undertake this contract. He explained that the City lacked the equipment and the manpower required for this type of project.

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

79-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,414

ACCEPTING THE BID OF LEO E. STAGGS TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO PUBLIC WORKS SEWER DEPARTMENT WITH GRASS PLANTING (OVERSEEDING) AT CHAVENAUX IRRIGATED GARDENS FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$6,660.00.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Steen moved to approve the Ordinance. Dr. Cisneros seconded the motion.

Mr. Thompson expressed concern regarding the cost of overseeding at the Chavenaux Irrigated Gardens.

Mr. Frank Kiolbassa, Director of Public Works, explained that this project covered an area of 300 acres of land. He also explained that the Public Works Department does not plant grass nor do they have the equipment for this type of project.

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

79-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,415

ACCEPTING THE BIDS OF BROWN APPLIANCE COMPANY, F & W SALES COMPANY, AND INSCO DISTRIBUTING COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH WINDOW TYPE AIR CONDITIONERS FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$8,357.00.

\* \* \* \*

Dr. Cisneros moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

In response to a question by Mr. Thompson, Mr. George Noe, Administrative Assistant to the City Manager, explained that these are seventeen standard window units of various sizes that will be placed in the guard shack at the International Airport. He stated that they would be replacing existing window air conditioners.

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

79-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,416

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A STANDARD PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH PAPE-DAWSON ENGINEERS FOR THE "VILLA DE ZAVALA" OFF-SITE SANITARY SEWER MAIN PROJECT; AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT FROM FUND 52-003.

\* \* \* \*

Dr. Cisneros moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

In response to a question by Mrs. Dutmer, Mr. Frank Kiolbassa, Director of Public Works, explained that the subdivision of "Villa De Zavala" is a 42.42 acre tract of land. He stated that this is a single-family subdivision and further stated that the property is not in the recharge zone district.

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

79-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,417

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT TO GEORGE GAISER OF \$101,314.80 FOR THE COST OF CONSTRUCTION OF UNDERGROUND DRAINAGE IN RITTIMAN ROAD SERVING THE CENTER PARK EAST INDUSTRIAL PARK; AND AUTHORIZING A REVISION IN THE BUDGET OF THE GENERAL FUND.

\* \* \* \*

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

Mr. Canavan disqualified himself from voting on this Ordinance.

After consideration, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Archer, Steen; NAYS: None; DISQUALIFICATION: Canavan; ABSENT: Webb, Cockrell.

79-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,418

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF ADDITIONAL ARCHITECTURAL FEES TO O'NEIL & PEREZ & ASSOCIATES ON THE CORTEZ BRANCH LIBRARY PROJECT.

\* \* \* \*

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

In response to a question by Mr. Archer, Mr. Frank Kiolbassa, Director of Public Works, explained the project and stated that this Ordinance authorizes the completion of the design and appropriates the funds that are necessary.

Mr. Archer expressed concern regarding the high architectural fees paid by the City on various projects.

Mr. Thompson stated that he had met with the engineers and architects on two occasions. He stated that there is room for review and that they would be coming back to the City Council and available for a full discussion at a "B" Session scheduled for November 8, 1979.

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

79-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,419

AUTHORIZING THE REPROGRAMMING OF CERTAIN  
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDS  
AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF ENGINEERING  
FEES.

\* \* \* \*

Dr. Cisneros moved to approve the Ordinance. Mr. Steen seconded the motion.

In response to a question by Mrs. Dutmer, Mr. Frank Kiolbassa, Director of Public Works explained that Hi Lions Drainage is located in Councilman Webb's district on Rigsby Road.

After consideration, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Cockrell.

79-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,420

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A CONTRACT WITH  
LA MANSION HOTEL FOR LEASE OF CITY-OWNED  
PROPERTY ON THE RIVER WALK LOCATED AT THE  
NAVARRO STREET BRIDGE FOR USE IN CONJUNCTION  
WITH LAS CANARIAS RESTAURANT.

\* \* \* \*

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

Mrs. Dutmer expressed concern that construction for this project had already been completed before permission had been granted by the City Council.

Mr. Eureste also expressed concern and asked that staff prepare a report on the rationale for allowing La Mansion to build on river property before the lease had been approved by the City Council.

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

79-50      ZONING HEARING

29.      CASE 7851 - to rezone Lots 24 and 25, Block 8, NCB 8672 in the 200 Block of N.E. Loop 410 Expressway, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-3R" Restrictive Business District, located northwest of the intersection of N.E. Loop 410 Expressway and McAllister Freeway, having 88' on N.E. Loop 410 Expressway and 173.6' on McAllister Freeway.

The Zoning Commission has recommended that this request of change of zone be approved by the City Council.      A correction was made that this zoning case was located in district 10, not district 9.

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

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

## AN ORDINANCE 51,421

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOTS 24 AND 25, BLOCK 8, NCB 8672, IN THE 200 BLOCK OF N.E. LOOP 410 EXPRESSWAY FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3R" RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

30.      CASE 7843 - to rezone Lots 17, 18 and 26, Block 5, NCB 16035, 1168, 1172 and 1176 Bitters Road, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "R-5" One Family Residential District, located west of the intersection of Bitters Road and Blanche Coker Drive, having 165' on Bitters Road and 120' on Blanche Coker Drive.

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

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

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

## AN ORDINANCE 51,422

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOTS 17, 18 AND 26, BLOCK 5, NCB 16035, 1168, 1172 AND 1176 BITTERS ROAD, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "R-5" ONE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT.

\* \* \* \*

31. CASE 7842 - to rezone a 4.93 acre tract of land out of NCB 15911, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk, in the 12100 Block of O'Connor Road, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located on the southwest side of O'Connor Road, being 1565' northwest of the cutback between I.H. 10 Expressway and O'Connor Road having 878.9' on O'Connor Road and a maximum depth of 385'; to rezone a 99.04 acre tract of land out of NCB 15911, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk, in the 11400 Block of I.H. 35 Expressway, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located northeast of the cutback between Weidner Road and I.H. 35 Expressway, having 467.21' on Weidner Road, 3170.74' on I.H. 35 Expressway and 46.81' on the cutback between Weidner Road and I.H. 35 Expressway.

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

No citizen appeared to speak

In response to a question by Mr. Steen, the applicant, Mr. Herb Quiroga, stated that the proposed "B-2" area would not be used for a public housing project.

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

AN ORDINANCE 51,423

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS A 4.93 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 15911, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, IN THE 12100 BLOCK OF O'CONNOR ROAD, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT; A 99.04 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 15911, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, IN THE 11400 BLOCK OF I.H. 35 EXPRESSWAY, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

\* \* \* \*

79-50 Item 32, Zoning Case 7852, was withdrawn from the agenda.

79-50 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Archer, seconded by Mr. Steen, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 51,424

AUTHORIZING ACCEPTANCE OF A \$24,000 AWARD FROM THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE DIVISION OF THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE FOR PURCHASE OF A DIGITAL VOICE PROTECTION SYSTEM FOR THE POLICE DEPARTMENT.

\* \* \* \*

October 25, 1979  
mb

79-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,425

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT FOR A CONVENTION AND VISITORS BUREAU RECEPTION IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

\* \* \* \*

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

Mr. Archer expressed concern regarding the expenditure of \$12,000.00 by the City for the purpose of enticing conventions to the City of San Antonio. He felt that this was not necessary.

Mr. Louis Fox, Assistant City Manager, spoke in support of the Ordinance and explained how this procedure has attracted conventions to this City in the past.

Mr. Henry D. Nussbaum, Director of the San Antonio Convention and Visitors Bureau, explained that this is a function which is carried out in Washington D.C., every year. He stated that the Bureau will host a fiesta reception/hotel presentation at the Capital Hilton Hotel on the evening of November 7, 1979 for approximately 300 association executives headquartering in Washington. He further stated that these executives are responsible for selecting sites of future conventions for their organizations. Mr. Nussbaum assured the City Council that this function has been successful in the past and serves as a type of "thank you" for the business that has been acquired by the City of San Antonio. He also stated that the Bureau recommends approval of this Ordinance in order to maintain the image of San Antonio as a convention destination.

Mr. Thompson and Mr. Eureste, both spoke in support of the Ordinance.

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

79-50 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,426

REPROGRAMMING CERTAIN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDS.

\* \* \* \*

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

In response to a question by Mr. Thompson, Mayor Pro-Tem Canavan explained that a Committee had been appointed to work on this project and the rebudgeting of project #2035 St. Paul Square and project #3030 St. Paul Square was recommended. He further stated that the results were satisfactory among the people in this area.

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

79-50 Travel Authorization for certain Council members to travel to Houston to attend the Texas Municipal League Conference.

Mr. Eureste made a motion to consider each item individually. Mr. Wing seconded the motion.

City Attorney, Jane Macon, explained that this item was posted as one item but if the Council wished to consider each item individually, six votes were needed to grant this request.

Mr. Wing spoke in support of the motion made by Mr. Eureste.

After consideration, the motion failed to carry by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Wing, Eureste, Alderete; NAYS: Dutmer, Thompson, Canavan, Steen; ABSTAINED: Archer; ABSENT: Webb, Cockrell.

A discussion then took place regarding the amount of money that is spent on trips taken by City officials.

Mr. Archer asked that staff prepare a report on all trips made by Councilmembers this term, including the names of persons taking trips and the amount expended.

After further discussion, Mr. Steen made a motion to approve the Travel Authorization. Mr. Alderete seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion carried by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Steen; NAYS: Archer; ABSENT: Webb, Cockrell.

Mr. Archer then made a motion that in the future, when the City Council takes trips, they pay for half the fare themselves. The motion died for lack of a second.

The following travel authorizations were granted:

Councilwoman Helen Dutmer - Houston, Texas- 10/27/79-10/31/79  
Councilman Robert Thompson- Houston, Texas- 10/26/79-10/31/79  
Councilman Van Henry Archer- Houston, Texas- 10/27/79-10/31/79  
Mayor Lila Cockrell - Houston, Texas - 10/27/79-10/31/79

The meeting was recessed at 2:20 P.M. and reconvened at 4:00 P.M.

79-50 4:00 P.M. -- PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING MAJOR AMENDMENT  
NO. 2 OF THE URBAN RENEWAL PLAN  
FOR THE NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT  
PLAN

Mayor Pro-Tem Canavan declared the hearing open:

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51,427

APPROVING MAJOR AMENDMENT NO. 2 OF THE URBAN  
RENEWAL PLAN FOR THE NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT  
PLAN (NDP) TEX. A-8.

\* \* \* \*

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

No citizen appeared to speak on the issue.

Mayor Pro-Tem Canavan declared the hearing closed.

The motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Cockrell.

The meeting was recessed at 4:05 P.M. and reconvened at 5:05 P.M.

79-50

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

MR. REMIGIO VALDEZ

Mr. Valdez, 611 McKinley Avenue asked that the City Council rescind the previous Resolution regarding the Northeast Housing Project and consider the resolution being proposed by Mr. Eureste later in the Council meeting.

MS. RENE BOMAR

Ms. Bomar, 2031 Harp Street, representing the San Antonio Coalition against Racism, also spoke in support of Mr. Eureste's proposed resolution and urged that the City Council rescind the Resolution that was approved at a previous meeting.

MS. NOLA CRAWFORD

Ms. Crawford, 411 S.W. 34th Street, representing a group of graduate student Social Workers, stated that they had held a meeting within their group and arrived at a resolution, supporting the Public Housing Project.

MR. T.C. CALVERT

Mr. Calvert, P.O. Box 2001, representing the San Antonio Coalition Against Racism, also spoke in favor of rescinding the Resolution that was approved by the Council and asked that the Council support the resolution as proposed later in the meeting by Councilman Eureste.

MR. RICK GREENE

Mr. Greene, P.O. Box 2001, representing the San Antonio Coalition Against Racism, stated that the vote taken on the previous Resolution was not a wise move. He stated that it rekindled a fire of racism in the City of San Antonio. He urged the City Council to support the Housing Project and vote on the resolution that Mr. Eureste would be presenting regarding this matter.

79-50 At this point in the meeting, Councilman Eureste presented a proposed resolution accepting the Board of Commissioners of the San Antonio Housing Authority's response to City Council Resolution No. 79-47-97; extending a formal apology to the residents of every housing unit administered by the San Antonio Housing Authority; and reaffirming the City Council's support of the Housing Assistance Plan and the San Antonio Housing Authority's responsibility of providing housing for citizens of low income.

Mr. Eureste made a motion to post a notice for a special meeting later in the day and asked the Council for a consensus vote. Mr. Wing seconded the motion.

Mrs. Dutmer spoke against the motion. She stated that she was in objection to the word, "apology" in the resolution as proposed by Mr. Eureste. She felt that the City Council was not in a position to apologize since all they had requested, in the previous Resolution, was that the Housing Authority restudy and investigate thoroughly the type of housing project that was proposed for this area.

Mayor Pro-Tem Canavan also spoke against the term, "apology" as used in the proposed resolution. He reiterated Mrs. Dutmer's remarks.

Mr. Eureste clarified that the "apology" applied to the residents of the housing projects in the City. He stated that this resolution would merely clear up any misunderstanding that might have taken place due to the previous Resolution that was set forth by the Council.

Mr. Thompson spoke in support of the resolution as presented by Mr. Eureste.

Mr. Webb also spoke in support of the resolution.

Mr. Steen spoke regarding headlines that appeared in the local newspapers whereby Archbishop Flores criticizes the San Antonio Housing Authority for not giving advance notice to the residents regarding the public housing project proposed for their area. He felt that there was no racism involved in the previous Resolution that had been passed by the Council.

After discussion, the motion to post notice for a Special Meeting, later in the meeting, carried by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Webb, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete; NAYS: Dutmer, Canavan, Archer, Steen; ABSENT: Cockrell.

79-50

CITIZENS (CONT'D)

MR. WALTER MARTINEZ

Mr. Martinez read a letter from State Representative, Joe L. Hernandez, urging the Council to rescind or modify the previous Resolution No. 79-47-97, which has resulted in such unfortunate divisiveness of communities of interest within the City of San Antonio. (A copy of the letter is on file with the minutes of this meeting.)

MR. JOSE OLIVARES

Mr. Olivares stated that racism is alive and well in the City of San Antonio. He commended the City Council for calling a Special Meeting for the purpose of considering the resolution as put forth by Councilman Eureste. He asked that the City Council make a commitment that in the future, public housing is going to be free and welcomed anytime in the City of San Antonio.

MR. JAIME MARTINEZ

Mr. Martinez, international representative of IUE-AFL-CIO stated that a democracy without human rights, is not a democracy. He congratulated Mr. Eureste on his proposed resolution and urged the Council's support.

MR. JESUS ZUNIGA, JR.

Mr. Zuniga, 2407 Towncliff, spoke to the Council in support of the Northeast Housing Project and the resolution as presented by Councilman Eureste.

MR. JOHN L. SANDERS

Mr. Sanders, Chairman of the San Antonio Coalition Against Racism, also spoke in support of the resolution and thanked those City Council members who voted in favor of holding a Special Meeting.

SISTER THERESA PENA

Sister Pena, a member of the San Antonio Coalition Against Racism and the National Organization of Hermanas, a group of hispanic women, spoke regarding the public housing project. She urged that the City Council rescind the previous Resolution, and she thanked the City Council members who voted "Yes" for holding a Special Meeting later in the day.

MR. SEBASTIAN DAVIS

Mr. Davis introduced Ms. Tina Tamez, President of the Graduate Students from the Worden School of Social Services. Mr. Davis also spoke in support of the proposed resolution presented by Councilman Eureste.

MRS. MARIA DOMINGUEZ

Mrs. Dominguez stated that she is concerned about equal education in all of the districts. She also spoke in support of the Public Housing Project.

MR. ALFRED ABREGO

Mr. Abrego, 1801 W. Durango, representing the Guadalupe Community Center, spoke in support of rescinding the previous Resolution and urged the Council's support regarding the resolution as put forth by Councilman Eureste.

The meeting was recessed at 6:10 P.M. and reconvened at 6:35 P.M.

The Clerk read a proposed ordinance providing for the extension of certain boundary lines of the City of San Antonio, Texas, and the annexation of certain territory consisting of 3.38 square miles of land, which said territory lies adjacent to and adjoins the present boundary limits of the City of San Antonio.

Mr. Steen moved to approve the ordinance. The motion died for lack of a second.

The following discussion then took place:

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: If I may I would like to state that there are five people listed to speak. The proponents first for 30 minutes maximum and then the opponents second for a maximum of 30 minutes, with a maximum of 5 minutes per speaker. We would like to get to a vote as rapidly as possible so if you could squeeze it in as tight as possible we would appreciate it. Councilman Thompson.

MR. BOB THOMPSON: Mr. Mayor, I would like to move at this time that we terminate any existing efforts to annex the subject areas that were just read in the ordinance.

MR. JOE ALDERETE: Second it.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: There is a motion and a second before the floor for discontinuance of the process of annexation. I would like to recognize additional members of the Council first before we hear from the citizens. Councilman Alderete.

MR. ALDERETE: We've won. I would just like to - as an opponent of annexation from the onset, I would like to really thank the cooperation and the patience of you people for coming out here from whatever area you come from or from whatever organization you represent for taking the time and the effort to involve yourselves to persuade this Council, to influence this Council that annexation is not always right and as one of the persons, I think so eloquently put it, "You don't go and adopt a child unless you can take care of the ones you already have." And when this City goes forth, if they should ever consider annexation again we should be prepared as a City to offer you those services in return for your tax dollars when you pay up every year.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Councilman Steen, please.

MR. JOHN STEEN: Mr. Mayor Pro-Tem, thank you very much. I have a statement that I would like to make at this time if you'll bear with me. First of all let me say that I will vote against the motion that Mr. Thompson has presented.

On September 13, 1979, the City staff brought before the Council a proposal to annex approximately 26 square miles and to bring more than 43,000 people into the City before the end of the year. I might say that the City's last annexation occurred in 1972 when 53.8 square miles and about 70,000 persons were taken into the City - that was a 27% increase in City area while the latest proposal would increase the City's area by just under 10%. Anyway, this same day a seven member Council majority tabled the annexation plan altogether after much debate.

On Friday, September 14, 1979, Councilman Canavan and I'm just quoting from the Light Newspaper, "vowed to bring the matter back to the

Council himself even if it means accepting less than the whole twenty-six square mile annexation package first offered by the Council. We've got to get it back on the agenda. I will compromise because I think it's vitally important for San Antonio", Canavan declared. The District 8 Councilmember is a firm supporter of the full expansion package, he said, "the annexed area will mean a broader tax base for the City".

On September 17, 1979, nine Council members signed a memo giving their permission for a small 4½ to 5 mile annexation plan containing 13,000 people to be discussed at Thursday's meeting. On September 20, 1979, at this meeting a motion was made and seconded to commence proceedings for a public hearing on areas identified as Area 7, northeast section; Area 12, southwest section; and Area 17, northwest section. This plan would include about 4½ square miles and 13,000 people. This motion was passed by a majority vote of six Council members. At this meeting before the motion was made, one of the Council members told me that the people in the area next to his district wanted to be annexed. We come to October 11, 1979, and the City Council public hearing on annexation, no motion was required at the public hearing.

On Saturday, October 20, 1979, I was shocked and disappointed to read in the local newspapers that Councilman Canavan said Friday he's switching his vote. Canavan said he will vote against any other readings. It could be raised again at any time in the future and Canavan would like to see that happen. I really don't understand his statements because of the previous statements that he did make about being very interested in annexation. Anyway, he said that he wanted the City to set aside funding for services and capital improvements in areas that may be targeted for annexation in the future. I would like that statement explained because I can't figure out where in the world the money is coming from.

I was also extremely disappointed in reading Saturday's paper whereby Councilman Thompson promised to a group of people to introduce a motion, which he did tonight, to kill City plans to annex 5 Bexar County subdivisions. I was kind of shocked about this because the last time I had talked to this Councilman he had told me that people in the southwest area really wanted to be annexed.

Furthermore, I was more than impressed to pick up the newspapers during the first week in October and to read that Councilman Henry Cisneros had made a speech to the U. S. Conference of Mayors in Washington, D. C. I was surprised to read that one of the four main points in his speech for revitalizing America's cities and keeping them healthy was, "broaden your tax bases by annexing more the metro area where you are located." And yet in his own City of San Antonio Henry voted "no" to annexation. Are you scratching your head on that one? I am.

The main argument coming from some of the Council people seems to be that we should not annex any more land until we have provided adequate services to the area already within the City limits. This really does parallel the old chicken-egg argument. How can we provide the services to the extent demanded by our citizens if we do not increase the tax base so that adequate resources will be available? Where would this City be today, where would San Antonio be today if annexation had not been used over the last thirty years as a basic tool of government? Annexation, in my opinion, should be a routine part of the City's orderly annual growth. Annexation is necessary to expand the City's tax base and to avoid stagnation. Annexation is necessary to the economic development in this City and thereby increase the quality of life for our own citizens by providing better and bigger jobs for more pay. I just cannot see any valid reasons for anyone to be against small orderly organized annexations on perhaps an annual basis such as the one that we have before us tonight.

Affirmative annexation plans probably would have more effect on a long term future of our City than anything else this Council could do tonight or at any time in the future. What is really and truly at stake, in the long run, is the future growth of San Antonio as a City. I'm only asking that the City Council act together as one body tonight and that they do vote for the City and its future by going ahead with the small - with the present small annexation proposal. Thank you very much, Mr. Mayor Pro-Tem.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Thank you, Councilman Steen. I would like to comment. I think that most people have read what I said before and I'm going to say it one more time. I'm a proponent of orderly annexation and will vote for what I consider orderly annexation. I have changed my mind for two reasons. Now one thing is I voted to keep the process open and I feel good about that. I kept the process open until the point where I felt that it was no longer viable. I think there's an awful lot of work that needs to be done before we begin annexing. I think there are services that need to be provided and it is my intent to work, number one for providing those services in the event this fails and I will be voting against it. But I want to see annexation, but I want the people to know after we have a chance to address their needs by budget, capital improvements needs that these areas are going to have over the next several years.

I would like to see a 5 year plan of annexation so the people can depend that we will bring them in and that they will have the services that they will be taxed to have provided. I would certainly hope that we will begin an orderly package within the next year. I don't see any way to take 27 areas and drop it down to 3 and then cut those in half when you don't have any sort of priority. I don't believe it's fair for those people that you would bring in. I think that they should know. I'm going to work to bring in those areas that can make this a better City in which to live. I hope that the people at that time are ready to become citizens of our fine City. Thank you. Councilman Wing.

MR. FRANK WING: I first of all would like to commend the group that are presently residents of San Antonio, Communities Organized for Public Service, for bringing to the attention of the entire Council the fact that there are not enough services within the City limits presently. We shouldn't go out and garner any more territory. I would like to express my appreciation to both Councilman Canavan and Councilman Thompson for maintaining their convictions of allowing the process to run its course as far as annexation was concerned and also that they had the sensitivity to listen to what the citizens had to say, those that already are in the City and those that were proposed for annexation.

I will support an orderly plan as I told you, Mr. Canavan, but not a half hazard one; one that has rhythm and reason. There's no business that comes into the City of San Antonio from other places that wants to be within the corporate City limits, so as far as economic development they want to be outside of the City because of the tax incentives there. So, I do commend you for your looking at the situation, both you and Mr. Thompson, and deciding that now is not the time for annexation. Thank you.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Thank you very much. Councilman Archer.

MR. VAN ARCHER: I just wanted to say that I congratulate Councilman Alderete, next to me, for winning the issue and his colleagues for being on the winning side, but I believe that the City of San Antonio, as a whole lost. So without saying anything further when my other colleagues get finished speaking, I would like to move the question before others speak if we could because we already know how the vote is going to come out and we've hashed this over about 4 times and I'd like to move the question.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: I would like to state that these people that came down here and are registered to speak, I would like to give them the opportunity if they would like to pass that opportunity, they have a right to do so. Councilman Eureste.

COUNCILMAN BERNARDO EURESTE: Yes, sir. After the people that are here speak, I would like to make some comments.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: All right, Councilwoman Dutmer.

COUNCILWOMAN HELEN DUTMER: Yes, I'm going to support annexation. In order for any City to be a metropolis that attracts industry, you have to have growth. We have not annexed now for the last three to four years, I think '74 was the last annexation. We did not go for a large amount of annexation. The amount that we were entitled to, for the simple reason that we knew that we did not have enough on board at the present time to give them services. We hear a lot about how we haven't any services in this City, but I'll guarantee you that you can go into any City you want in these United States, and you'll not find any better fire rating. So, apparently, we're getting the services we're entitled to. As far as your police, no, we're not.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Order please, excuse me.

MRS. HELEN DUTMER: As far as the police service, no, you're not going to get a patrolman on every block. There is no way for that. But, if you will look at your crime statistics, the greatest crime takes place in the inner City, inside the Loop. So, this tells me that outside the Loop, you're getting pretty good protection. So, . . .

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Order, please.

MRS. DUTMER: So, I would say that in a City of 875,000 people that the crime rate is just about equal to any metropolitan city. If we give these people 5 years notice, they are going to start incorporating and you're going to find yourselves hammed in just as Dallas is now. And there is another erroneous situation on this Council. A belief that if someone tries to incorporate, that they will notify San Antonio and if we say, "No, no." that they cannot incorporate; this is a fallacy, my friend, a hard and fast fallacy, because I have researched it at the State level and it does not hold true. Further, I think that we are setting a precedent next year, when it comes time to annex, you're going to have twice as many people down here not wanting to come into the City.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Let's give the speaker an opportunity to speak and show some courtesy. I would appreciate it.

MRS. DUTMER: I think what we better do is call on our leadership and make a decision and stick to it for a change. We've backtracked on everything we've voted on for the last three weeks. It's been backtracked on, simply because someone comes down here and says, "No." If you're running a business and this City is, a multi-million dollar corporation, you don't backtrack on your decisions or you'll soon be in the bankruptcy course. You have to make a decision for this City and you have to stick to it and you have to say, "I'm sorry it doesn't agree with you, but I think it's in the best interest of the City of San Antonio and its future." And if you don't do this, you might as well resign, right now, because the City is going down the tube, anyhow. That is all I have to say.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Dr. Cisneros.

DR. HENRY CISNEROS: Yes, I would like to respond to my colleague, Mr. Steen, in a what I interpreted as a kind of a criticism, it was implied to be that maybe I was saying something differently outside of here than I was saying here and I'd like to explain that because it's come up more than one time.

The speech that I made was to a group in Washington of Mayors, primarily from cities in the north and the northeast and they have a very serious problem there. Their problem is that the cities are completely surrounded. A City like Cleveland, a City like Newark, a City like Philadelphia, Baltimore, 100% completely surrounded by suburbs and they could not annex if they wanted to. They're held to the boundaries that they had in the 1940's. If an industry leaves the central city, downtown, it goes out to the suburbs and the City loses the tax base and that is part of the reason those cities are going bankrupt. What I spoke about there, was the need to come up with some sort of tax-sharing plans between the central city and the suburbs and I said that in Texas, we are fortunate that we don't have to have that problem because the central cities are blessed with very enlightened annexation laws and that's the truth. The Mayor of Houston, today, says that Houston is a viable city with a budget in the black, because they have wisely used their annexation policies. Now, because you're for annexation as a tool doesn't mean that you have to haul and vote for every half-baked annexation plan that is presented, and this one, in my opinion, was not well planned.

We started with, I don't know about how many miles, 26 miles or something like that, and we finally ended up with a much smaller thing, but there was no rhyme or reason or a logic as to why some were being selected and some were being left out. It certainly wasn't that we were annexing the most lucrative areas of the City because when you do an analysis of the cost that we would have to spend in services to the areas that were planned for in annexing these areas as against what revenues would come in, it's not true that the City was going to make any substantial revenue. So, the reason, the logic that we're annexing with a good solid fiscal plan, was just erroneous; it's not true, it would not have been that lucrative for the City.

The only other justification apart from the economic one, is that somehow the City was going to get blocked, that we would be doing a tremendous disservice to San Antonio if suddenly there was going to be suburbs or other incorporations around us. But the very first fact that we asked for when this debate began, and we asked it of Mr. Bob Hunter, the City Planning Director, and he's here tonight and he can repeat it, if need be, the fundamental fact is that San Antonio is not blocked in, we are not blocked in now, we're not about to be blocked in and Texas Law says that we have first dubs before anyone else can annex in our extraterritorial jurisdiction. Before any unincorporated area can become a municipality and block us in the extraterritorial jurisdiction we have the opportunity to consider another annexation. So, it's just not accurate, and it's just not fair to describe this action that the Council is taking tonight, as the wrong thing. San Antonio maintains its flexibility to annex whenever it is threatened. But I think the right thing to do, in this case, is to realize that because we're not threatened and because we are not going to be making any money from annexation that what we need to do is deal with the problem that exists within the present City, and frankly, I think we have enough on our plate. If you take the set of problems that the City of San Antonio has on its platter, right now, we're not doing a good enough job of digesting those, much less looking to other things. I mean, we just are not, if we want to be honest about it, so, let's look at annexation some time down the road. Let's look at it in the context of protecting the City's boundaries and let's look at it in the context of what makes fiscal sense for the City. But I guarantee you any objective analysis of this plan will tell you that it was poorly timed, poorly thought out, that it does not have a fiscal return to the City, that it cannot be justified on the basis of any threat to the City's boundaries. The right thing to do for San Antonio at this time, is to forego the temptation to annex for its own sake, to forego the temptation to annex just because there is, you know, some magic word like, "growth" associated with annexation, but it's not always true, and it is not always rewarding. I think Mr. Canavan and Mr. Thompson have made the right decision and I applaud them for having the wisdom to see the facts after careful analysis and act accordingly.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Councilwoman Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, we forgot the ending to that, besides, if we annex, we'll have to sell ourselves to that many more people when we run for Mayor. You mentioned the City of . . . .

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Order, please.

MRS. DUTMER: You mentioned the City of Houston, do you know what the last annexation of Houston was, and they didn't allow all of this nonsense to come into the chambers.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Order, please.

MRS. DUTMER: The last annexation that Houston had was a mile and a half around the perimeter.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: I think ~~you are correct~~ in that the citizens have a right to be heard and a right to speak, and I would point that out to Councilwoman Dutmer, however, I would appreciate it also, the courtesy extended to her to express her feelings and that is her right.

MRS. DUTMER: You wonder why Houston and Dallas are such viable cities, well, I can tell you one thing, Houston puts out an edict that the City of San Antonio, said, "Oh no, we can't do that." When it came to their builders, Houston said, "You will build within this area or you will not get utilities." And the builders didn't get up and move in mass. They reached out and they annexed a mile and a mile and a half in some places, around the perimeter of their City. They practically have all of Harris County, now, in Houston, Texas. As far as annexing our territory around the City, they went to the various little cities around San Antonio and they asked them if they were going to annex. Well, no one in their right mind is going to say, "Yes, I'm going to annex that territory over there so you leave it alone." So they just simply, said, "No, we don't plan to annex." Time will tell. Well, I don't have much to say and I know that it won't be a popular vote, but I still feel that I'm right, and I will vote for annexation.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Thank you, Councilman Thompson. And if we would wind it down, and let the citizens be heard.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you very much, and I will keep it short. I only made a 2 or 3 word statement earlier.

I don't care about the annexation policies of Dallas or Houston. The concern that I have is that we maintain the integrity of this City, that we keep the spirit that this City has intact, that we don't spread it so thin, that we don't stress it to the point of rupture. I think that we're in a stressful situation now with inflation, and the cost of just providing basic municipal services. Because of that kind of posture that we find ourselves in, the comments that Dr. Cisneros made earlier are most applicable, it addresses the issue straight on and speaks to the very heart of the issue.

I think that as we proceed, Mr. Mayor, I would request that our annexation committee be charged with developing an annexation plan. They have prepared a document, but it is not a plan. I would like to see a plan that would include a priority listing of various neighborhoods, and communities, that surround and are contiguous with the City of San Antonio and we would consider that list as possible areas of annexation. The list would be complete with estimates of what would be required to provide adequate municipal services to those communities if and when they were annexed. It should include a time line for its proper implementation. Once prepared, the plan should enjoy the widest possible dissemination across the City, and out into the suburbs that would possibly be effected if that plan were ever implemented. The plan must be drafted with the view that it would only be implemented by a positive policy statement, emanating from this City Council. The process should begin here, it should end here. We should start it, we should have public hearings, we should sense the mood of our community and if that mood is proper, and if we feel that the City and the annexing areas are compatible both in spirit and the goals that we set for one another, then we would gather again, after public

hearings and commit ourselves to annexation. We should at the time we make the commitment to implement the plan of annexation commit ourselves to establishing a reserve of money and people sufficient to the extent that if annexation occurs the instance of annexation we share and share alike the municipal services that all San Antonians have a right to enjoy. That's the kind of plan that we have to have, that's the kind of plan that will instill the confidence and the trust that we have to have in areas that we intend to annex. Without that, I shall not ask, I should not even think about asking for the kind of commitment in tax dollars that we would, in fact, demand upon annexation if we can't have in ready reserve those kind of services. I would ask the staff to look into those points and that these suggestions be carried back to the Annexation Committee and that the product of their work then be brought back for Council review. Thank you.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Thank you very much, Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: I would say that if we use your reasoning we'll never annex anything because the tax base will never pay for the full services of any given area. I don't care what area it is, it will never do it - it has to be supplemented- and so if we're just going to sit down and look at the territory and see how many dollars we have coming in, and you expect them to pay for the services that the people expect out of them, you'll never annex any territory.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: All right, our first registered speaker is Mrs. Carmen Badillo.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Carmen Badillo, President of C.O.P.S. commended those Council members who had stated their position against annexation. She said that a "No" vote should not be interpreted as anti-annexation but viewed as the time element not being proper. She asked that the upcoming bond election address in particular drainage problems and lack of library facilities.

Mrs. Helen Walter stated that she is against the proposed annexation because she felt it was not a well-planned or well-conceived plan.

Mr. Tom Callison spoke against the proposed annexation because he felt it was not well planned. He also felt that the time was not proper. He further stated that they will support a properly planned annexation.

Ms. Laurie Borski, 6802 Rene, also spoke regarding annexation and stated that the City is not prepared to provide proper essential services.

\* \* \* \*

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: I would correct one thing that was mentioned that the fire rates would go up. I assure you the reasons for your good fire rates is because you are adjacent and you are a fringe of the City of San Antonio. So, that is correct, it's not that much difference, but it would go down slightly. Councilman Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: Are we through with the speakers.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: No, we have one more.

MR. EURESTE: Okay. I'll wait till after that.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Councilwoman Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: I just want to say that there's a lot of things that have been said up here that aren't exactly true, and I can realize that if I were you, I wouldn't want my taxes raised, either. I'm not howling about that. I am saying that for the betterment of the City of San Antonio, and that's what we're elected up here for, is to take care of the City of San Antonio, not the fringes. And there's been - I know you don't agree with me, but if you'l

. . . .

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Please give her an opportunity to speak, and we'll get this thing moving.

MRS. DUTMER: As I have said before, I respect anyone who respects themselves enough to act like a lady and gentleman and act like a United States-American. And if you'll just bear with me a few minutes, I have a right to my opinion, the same as you have a right to yours, if we're speaking about rights. So, I will re-state that I'm here to take care of the City of San Antonio and its needs, and not the fringe of the area. Now, as far as I'm concerned if you don't want to be annexed to us, that's fine and dandy, because that means then, that you will continue to enjoy all the fruits of the City of San Antonio except voting, and that's all. Now, don't tell me about the sales tax because I know that you come into the City and that you do your shopping, but stop and ask yourself if this City were not here, what would you do, sitting on the fringes?

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Councilwoman Dutmer, is that all?

MRS. DUTMER: That's all I have to say.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: All right, the next speaker is Mr. James D. Bradley.

Mr. James D. Bradley stated that residents of the proposed annexation areas are opposed because of the last annexation undertaken by the City of San Antonio. He stated that a proper annexation plan should be well thought out and provide for orderly growth and provision of adequate city services.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Councilman Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: Mr. Canavan, I just wanted to say a few words before we get to the vote. I want to thank the people that came here tonight from the different areas, Camelot, the Sky Harbor, the Americana, Hidden Cove, Forest Glen, Twin Creek, Indian Creek, and other subdivisions that perhaps have not been mentioned. Many of them were not mentioned in the planning document, and yet it was that planning document that was going to bring you into the City, and yet we had not identified your subdivision. But, upon visiting your areas, I find that you have other smaller subdivisions in those areas and you identify with those smaller subdivisions.

There have been some comments made that the City of San Antonio will lose if we vote this issue down. I don't know that the City of San Antonio will lose, maybe the proponents will lose, but the City of San Antonio. As I have said before, if I could see a massing of residents a group of residents in the City propped outside with banners and flags, marching onto City Hall, saying "Bring those people in", then I would say that we have two views to the matter, and two sides. But you don't see the proponents - the only place you see the proponents is on the City Council, and not out in the streets, and not in the homes. Somebody said that the other side would show up today, and I was waiting for the buses and buses to come in with the proponents, and I waited out there - I got up real early this morning about 5:30 and I looked around and I couldn't find them and I drove around the City and couldn't find anybody having meetings or anything like that. So, I think what we see here today is the true reflection of the feelings of the people, not only in the areas that were considered for annexation, but also in the City of San Antonio. I think this is the true feeling of the people. And if we are true representatives of the people, as elected officials, then we'll respond to the position of the people and that response is to vote down annexation.

The statement that the City of San Antonio will lose, again, is not substantiated much like any argument that was used by the proponents for annexation. It is not substantiated. It is another argument that is very difficult to respond to. It's like the argument that we needed to retain the 10th largest position. Like the argument that we needed to keep ourselves from being ringed in by suburban incorporation, which I don't see a lot of that going on. Like the argument that we needed to get more federal dollars and yet some of the people on the proponents side resent large numbers of federal dollars coming into the City. So, to me, that represented a contradiction, more than anything else, and a smokescreen and call it what

it really is, a smokescreen. And the argument that—I think that this one is a most interesting one, that economic development was needed, I mean in the City, and therefore, we have to go about annexing because businesses do not come to the City of San Antonio unless we annex. And all I know is that, as Dr. Cisneros said a little while ago, and other Council members have said it in the past, and the experience of this Council is that businesses that come to San Antonio ask this Council for waivers, so they can establish outside the City limits. And we've given them a written contract, a written contract that we will not annex them for seven years, for seven lousy years we will not annex them, so they can come to the City and take advantage of the tax- of not having to pay City taxes. And we provide them certain services. We'll connect them to our sewer, we'll connect them to water, we'll give them fire and police protection under contract. We do that, and yet to turn around and say that businesses will not come unless we continue annexation has got to be the biggest farce that I have ever heard - that I know of. And when it comes to guarantees that you give the subdivisions that develop outside the City, as Beluski would say, "But no, But no." We can't give them any guarantees, we can't give them any contracts, we can't give them any assurances that there will be a moratorium on annexation of those areas over a given period of time. No, those people out there have to fend for themselves. And we scare them once in a while, with proposals like this that goes out there and studies 39 areas and proposes 27 and talks about bringing in possibly 44 to 42,000 people as if we were going from 6 o'clock to 6:01 in the afternoon. You know, as if nothing significant was happening. You know, all we're talking is about homes, where people raise their families, where people enjoy the company of one another, that's all we're talking about and all we're talking about is taking away tax dollars from those people that's all, and then we come up with some very logical argument that, well, let's not take the 27, let's just take 3 of them. And then you ask for the rationale, and then they say, "Well, because they're there." Well, give me a better one. "Well, so that we can continue to be the tenth largest City in the country." Well, I don't know that 13,000 people is going to keep us as the tenth largest City in the country.

I need to repeat this because I've been saying this over and over and over again, and if people brought me to this point, tonight and they brought you here tonight. I think you need to enjoy your victory. I think you need to enjoy what you're going to get out of this meeting here tonight.

I welcome you to the City of San Antonio, when you're ready to come into the City of San Antonio. I think that's the way people should conduct themselves. And not drag people, fighting and kicking and fussing, with the organizations of people saying, "No, no, I don't want to come in" and members of this Council saying, "Yes, yes, but we want you in." That's not how you make friends. There is a process whereby people can petition to become a part of the City, and out there in those communities, people have not spoken negatively about the City, they're proud to be neighbors of the City of San Antonio and at the appropriate time, when they're ready, they'll come in. Well, some of you made some comments that made these people feel bad, and I want to make them feel good, so they'd go home tonight and have a happy night.

The comments about how certain Council members reversed on their votes and reversed on their statements. Every one of us is guilty of that at one time or another. The reason that we reverse our votes is because we are human beings, and we have a brain that sometimes tells us to go this way and then sometimes tells us to go the other. I don't think there's a person in this audience, a person in this universe, who hasn't changed their mind at least once or twice in their lifetime. And this Council is guilty of changing their minds because they are human beings. And I think all of us ought to be very proud that we can do that once in a while. And at least the reversal gives us decisions that are beneficial to people, really beneficial to people. The statement was made that if the City of San Antonio were not here, well, you wouldn't be here either, because we wouldn't be out there trying to annex you, that's for sure.

October 25, 1979  
mb

-22-

I want to thank the staff for giving us the time to be big with each and every one of us here, and to listen to people, it was a very trying process for a lot of you, it was very trying for me, but our staff did what they felt they needed to do. I hope that next time from experience, they'll do better, and that next time that we do something like this that they wait for the Council to give direction, and before they go out there and take aerial photographs of the neighborhoods that we're thinking of annexing maybe they ought to drop leaflets and tell the people that they are going to take photographs so that people can dress up their houses and come out and wave goodbye to the airplane.

And I want to thank my opposition, which would be the proponents of annexation, for what I considered to be a fair fight. This is democracy in action. It is elected officials, and elected officials responding to people. I think that's what the whole foundation of this country is based on. The whole foundation that our democracy is based on, and that is listening to people, responding to people, and I think that the action that we will take here tonight is a response to people both inside and outside the City of San Antonio.

The City of San Antonio will lose - "No." To lose, is to somehow or another to decline. To lose, is to somehow or another to take a step backward. And I wrote some notes here. I say that the Alamo will continue to rest here in San Antonio, as a symbol, a shrine of liberty for the State and for the entire country. So, the Alamo is going to remain intact. That the river will continue to flow through San Antonio and continue to be a major attraction to tourists, a major attraction to the very people that reside in this community, not only inside the City but outside the City, and if you live outside the City you are free. I welcome you to come down to the river and take a ride on the boats whenever you want to. The Tower of the Americas will continue to live day to day, dealing with their problems, dealing with their concerns, dealing with their joys, dealing with everything that human beings deal with in their lifetime. Our neighborhoods will continue to prosper, they will continue to develop. Some will decline, some will go up, but we will continue as people in this City and "No," San Antonio is not going to die as a result of this. This is not a loss for San Antonio. San Antonio will continue, all of you will go to bed tonight and wake up tomorrow morning to go to work. Thank you very much.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Councilman Webb. If we may, we would like to have a vote, and we are running late. Councilman Webb.

MR. JOE WEBB: I would like to say to the Council, and to everybody that's interested in the 1972 annexation, that I brought forward after visiting that area that was annexed or one of the areas that was annexed, and I stated my objections to annexation at that time and I still am of the same mind, and I just think that we wouldn't be able to provide services to the people. I have no problem with annexation.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Could we ask that the door be closed, please.

MR. WEBB: I have no problem with annexation, per se, in an orderly fashion, but I do have to remember and recall the fact that there are people that have been annexed, and we have not provided services to those people that we promised to provide services to by way of annexation. I would like to ask this Council to either provide those services that I brought before you on the last meeting night, or that some form of de-annexation be taken on because they weren't asking for very very much, and so I got a call yesterday, and there hasn't been a dumping sign - one of the things they had asked for - just a mere sign that says, "No Dumping." Another thing that they had asked for was some gravel or something to be put in some chug holes that at one time when the country maintained those roads out there, where Seguin and Pfeil, and some of the other roads I mentioned. It's all on record, and I think that maybe I'd be redundant if I repeated over again what I had said last time, but I would ask that the Council address those problems that I brought forward last time that we met concerning annexation. Again, I would like to reiterate, that at this time, I'm against any annexation, and I would like to get the vote on it.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Councilman Alderete.

MR. JOE ALDERETE: I'd like to call for the question, Mayor Pro-Tem, to vote.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Okay, is there a second?

MR. STEEN: Second.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: There's a motion and a second to call the question. All those in favor please raise your right hand. We're one short - well, we have one more speaker. Councilwoman Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: I'll state one more time, that the territory that you are speaking about, is not a territory that the City of San Antonio was ready to annex, or that they wanted to annex. It is agricultural land, but the Federal Government saw that Randolph Field was going to be impacted and they, in fact put it to us that we would either annex it or they were going to have to move Randolph Field out. And so the City of San Antonio went forward with the annexation full well knowing that they were too far from the City of San Antonio, and they were not contingent to the City of San Antonio and they not provide services out there. This was for the Federal Government. Now, if you doubt that, just go look it up. It's a matter of record.

And I realize that you don't agree with me, and that one of my colleagues here missed his calling, should have been an actor, but, or comedian, whichever, but at any rate, when the businesses do come to the City of San Antonio, yes they do locate outside the City. The businesses that located outside the City would not be allowed in a populated area because of the emission standards that those businesses put out, and yes, we do give them tax abatement or rather for seven years. But the services that they pay for are far more expensive than their taxes would be if they were in the City of San Antonio and simply paying taxes. Now, if you haven't been in business, if you're not a businessman, if you have not understood fully free enterprise, colleagues do think; however, I know it's useless for me. They have the votes, and we might just as well get on with the voting, get it over with and once again, we'll have the record of backtracking on a vote. Twice in one day.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: If there is not further discussion, there is a motion and a second to discontinue the process of annexation as presently proposed. I would like a roll call vote, please.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. ALDERETE: Yes.

MAYOR PRO-TEM CANAVAN: Yes.

MR. ARCHER: Absent.

MR. STEEN: No.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Absent.

DR. CISNEROS: Yes.

MR. WEBB: Yes.

MRS. DUTMER: No.

MR. WING: I don't backtrack, Yes.

MR. EURESTE: Yes.

MR. CANAVAN: We will give you an opportunity to clear the Chamber if you wish, and this meeting, this session is adjourned, and we're now going into a special session as called.

79-50

The Clerk read the following Letter:

October 17, 1979

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

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

October 15, 1979

Petition submitted by Rudy V.  
 Lopez, Student Council Chairman,  
 Luther Burbank High School, requesting  
 a bonfire on Wednesday, November 14,  
 1979.

October 17, 1979

Petition submitted by Karen J. Pope  
 and Laura J. Pope, requesting permission  
 to conduct a carriage ride between the  
 Alamo and Hemisfair.

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

— — —  
 There being no further business to come before the Council,  
 the meeting was adjourned at 7:48 P.M.  
 — — —

A P P R O V E D

*Lela Cockrell*

M A Y O R

ATTEST: *Kyrra J. Rodriguez*  
 City Clerk

October 25, 1979  
 mb

-25-