

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL,
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 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, NIELSEN, TENIENTE; Absent: NONE.

- - -
75-12 The invocation was given by The Reverend David Montoya, El Divino Salvador United Methodist Church.

- - -
75-12 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

- - -
75-12 The minutes of the Regular Meeting of February 20, 1975, and the Special Meeting of February 21, 1975, were approved.

- - -
75-12 DR. D. FORD NIELSEN
MR. RICHARD TENIENTE

Mayor Becker welcomed to their first regular meeting newly appointed Councilmen, Dr. D. Ford Nielsen and Mr. Richard Teniente.

- - -
75-12 SETTING OF AD VALOREM TAX RATE

The Clerk read a proposed Ordinance levying an Ad Valorem Tax Rate for support of the City Government of the City of San Antonio for the fiscal year beginning June 1, 1974 and ending May 31, 1975.

The following conversation took place:

MR. CARL WHITE, Finance Director: I have a letter from City Manager Sam Granata that I'd like to read and then I'd like to get into some detail about the tax rate to brief the Council on it. The letter is addressed to the Mayor and the Council from Sam Granata, City Manager. It says, and I quote, "I had planned to appear before the City Council and present this tax message in person. My doctor advised me not to make any public appearances for a while; therefore I have asked Carl White to present it for me.

I have, however, taken an active part in preparing this message through a series of meetings with the Director of Finance and other staff members. I have reviewed all supporting revenue and expenditure figures and I am satisfied as to their correctness.

Based upon analysis of the financial condition of the City, I recommend that a tax rate of \$1.89 per \$100 assessed valuation be set for this year. If adopted, this will be the seventh consecutive year that the tax rate has been held at \$1.89.

It should be realized that the sewer and garbage service fees generate approximately \$10,000,000 in revenues from within the

February 27, 1975
kry

City. This is equivalent to 58½ cents in the tax rate. Without these fees the tax rate would now be close to the legal maximum of \$2.50.

There is no built-in surplus in the budget. Ninety-four (94) cents out of every tax dollar goes to services to the public. Overhead, which includes the cost of the City Council, the City Manager's Office, City Clerk's Office, and the Departments of Finance, Legal, Personnel, Planning, Purchasing, E.E.O., and Land Acquisition, amounts to less than 6 cents out of the tax dollar.

Inflation has affected the expenditures and recession has reduced revenue. This combination makes it difficult to balance the budget without laying off employees and reducing the level of service.

Analysis of revenues and expenditures for the first six months shows that we can finish the year with a balanced budget, but there are some significant items which should be brought to your attention.

REVENUES

CITY SALES TAX

When revenue estimates were prepared there was no way to foresee the impact of the fuel passthrough. It now appears that sales taxes from this source will be about \$800,000 higher than anticipated. Despite this, the total revenue from sales taxes is now \$243,000 less than budgeted. It is hoped that, when taxes for the Christmas shopping season are received, the short fall for the whole year will be no more than \$357,000.

It must be pointed out that this is a rather alarming statistic. If the unanticipated revenue from CPS is deducted, sales taxes will reflect a decrease of more than \$100,000,000 in retail sales in San Antonio.

PROPERTY TAXES

The projection of property tax revenues was based on an assumption that total valuations would increase in accordance with a long-term trend. This increase was not realized, home-building in San Antonio came to a virtual standstill. The actual increase in assessed valuations was \$20,700,000 less than estimated.

For persons 65 or older, the Homestead Exemption was increased from \$3,000 to \$10,000. A corresponding loss in revenue was anticipated and provided for in the budget, based on the number of exemptions applied for in previous years. A surprising development took place. Many citizens, who had not applied for the \$3,000 exemption, found it worthwhile to take advantage of the higher exemption. Exemptions actually granted totaled a loss in assessed valuation of \$10,400,000 more than had been provided for in the budget.

This loss due to these two factors, has been partly offset by a slight increase in personal property assessments. The total loss in budgeted tax revenues will be about \$641,000.

LICENSES AND PERMITS

The revenue from licenses and permits for the first six months is \$205,700 below estimates. The decline in local building accounted for most of this; the revenue from building permits alone is \$196,000 less than anticipated.

It is hoped that building will increase in the last half of the year and that the total shortfall will not be more than \$335,000.

CPS

As has been explained in other messages, at the beginning of the fiscal year CPS revenues were estimated at \$21,282,000. Included in this total was an anticipated \$3,800,000 from fuel passthrough.

The rise in fuel costs increased the revenue from the passthrough to over \$14,500,000. The Council acted in December to rebate the City's percentage of the passthrough on gas. The newly revised figures from CPS now show a total projected revenue including the passthrough on electricity, to be \$28,280,000.

The City's utility bill, including charges for energy and streetlight construction, will total an estimated \$5,940,000. This leaves a net of \$22,340,000 or some \$4,958,000 over beginning estimates. All of this has been appropriated by the Council to cover employee raises, Convention Center expansion, and other unanticipated expenses.

EXPENDITURES

DEPARTMENTAL

For the first six months, overall departmental expenditures are in line with budget appropriations. Costs of materials and services have increased beyond budget figures and it would have been impossible to hold the line had we not adjusted personnel costs. Missions of some departments were modified; 217 positions were held unfilled; raises were frozen for 4 months; filling of some seasonal positions was delayed beyond normal starting dates. These economy measures resulted in a savings of approximately \$1,500,000.

As a single example of the way in which the prices we pay have increased, the cost of plant-mix asphalt increased 73 percent over the cost in the last fiscal year. As we use 80,000 tons of this material annually, the cost of patching chug holes has increased by \$330,000.

The stringent economy measures imposed upon the departments resulted in savings in the first six months large enough to balance the budget. It might have been possible to relax some of these measures during the last half of the year, had it not become necessary to transfer the Transit subsidy from Revenue Sharing to the General Fund.

To qualify for an UMTA Grant for Transit System operating subsidy, the City is required to furnish \$1.3 million in matching funds out of the General Fund.

ENDING BALANCE

The balance at year's end is estimated to be \$2,091,000. Sound fiscal policy sets \$2,000,000 as the minimum amount necessary in a budget the size of San Antonio."

MAYOR CHARLES L. BECKER: You know, I had a clipping sent to me by a friend in New York the other day, Carl. Remember when we were up there at Moody's and Standard and Poor's.....

MR. WHITE: Yes, sir.

February 27, 1975
kry

MAYOR BECKER:talking about the deficits of the City of New York. Well, it's estimated now to be \$1.8 billion this year, which will absolutely take them out of the bond market. Now, they're relying on the State Government of the State of New York, which is also running a deficit, and the Federal Government, to bail them out of their problem up there. They're putting a ten percent increase on all property taxes in the City of New York and they already have buildings - brand new office buildings - and they're standing practically, totally vacant or half vacant, so they are in a real dilemma. That also applies to Detroit, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and you can just - across the whole spectrum.....

MR. WHITE: That's true, that's true pretty much across the board, as you pointed out.

MAYOR BECKER: That's right.

MR. WHITE: The National League of Cities just conducted a survey in January and it showed that 43 of the cities - they surveyed 62, I believe, with population, I think, over 300,000 - I forget where the break was, but anyway out of 62 cities were surveyed, 43 of them indicated that they were going to have to lay off some employees or curtail services, in that survey.

MAYOR BECKER: They're talking about firing 10,000 employees in the City of New York.

MR. WHITE: That's pretty general across the board.

MAYOR BECKER: And it won't even begin to affect a \$1.8 billion deficit.

MR. WHITE: That's correct. Now, I have, and I'd like to go over it with you, I have passed out to the Council - it was just completed printing yesterday, so we could not get it in your packet - a six-month financial report. The first two pages attached to this financial report - these two pages in front on the revenues and expenditures are simply taken from the quarterly report, so it's kind of cumbersome to go through the quarterly report, but I'd like to go through these estimates with you.....

MAYOR BECKER: Revenues and appropriations.

MR. WHITE: Revenues and appropriations, yes, sir.

MAYOR BECKER: All right.

MR. WHITE: The first two schedules here, you will notice that the first column is the fiscal year '73-'74 actual collections. The next column is the first six months' actual collections. These are actual collections and actual expenditures. The second column indicates our estimate for the balance of this year and there are some fluctuations in here, because some of these revenues and some of the expenditures are cyclical in nature. They're not - it's not a constant situation. For example, the City Sales Tax - we collected in the first six months \$8 million roughly. We're estimating, for the second six months, \$8.4 million or pretty close to \$8.5 million. The reason for that is that the Christmas - we're six months behind in collecting, from the State of Texas, the sales taxes, so we have the Christmas quarter coming up and also the first three months of this year, so we're estimating an increase in sales taxes and right on down the line.

I think that you will find these - we have done the best job that we know how to do, based on ten years of historical trends and adjusted by variations that we know about that are occurring presently, which tends to throw some of these trends out the window.

The other thing that I want to point out - there is a letter also included in your packet there, from the City Public Service Board. I want to point out that the estimate that we're using here is their estimate and not ours. That \$28,280,000 was derived by applying the estimate that CPS gave us, and if you'll look at their estimate, they gave us an estimate for the last six months. We took what we had collected for the first six months and simply added what CPS said - what they estimated the balance of the six months would be. So, that estimate is their estimate. Unless there are some questions on the other revenues, those are the significant things on the revenue side.

On the appropriation side of the ledger, here again, you will see the actual expended last year. You'll see the actual expended for the first six months of this year by the departments, and then an estimate for the second six months. Here, again, some of these things are cyclical in nature; some of the things like Parks and Recreation, for example, their activities peak during the summer months and the same is true of Public Works. So, you will see more estimated in the last six months than was incurred in the first six months. That's not true in every case, but it is in several cases. For example, the City Clerk, you'll see that the City Clerk expended \$87,000 the first six months; the estimates for the balance of the second six months is \$172,000, and that's to take care of the two elections that are planned. The other variations in here are based on increases that historically occur. For example, the Police Department shows an increase of about a million dollars the last six months over the first six months and that's because they will have more policemen on the payroll. I don't know why but they seem to drive more miles during the summer months - their expenses are greater during the last six months than they are the first six months. This is true to a certain extent in the Fire Department, but not to that degree. The second six month estimate is higher than what was expended the first six months. But each of these departments have vacancies, they're filling filling those vacancies, and so the expenses have got to be more the second half than they are the first half.

MAYOR BECKER: You're talking about the police and the fire.....

MR. WHITE: The Police and the Fire Departments, and this is true in some of the other departments as well. But what I'm trying to say is that we have pegged these estimates as realistically as we can possibly make them.

Now, the third thing that's attached, and I want to spend a few minutes on this, because I think there is quite a misunderstanding - this second thing - I mean the third piece of paper there - that was included in your packet - it's entitled, "City Authorized Positions," status as of February 9, 1975. I want to go over this with you, it was attached to the front. Now, you'll notice that this has the funds, the general fund and it is followed by the Aviation fund, the Convention and Visitors' Bureau fund, Sewer fund, and so forth, right on down through all the funds that have employees, including the grants, federal grants.

February 27, 1975
nsr

-5-

Okay. The only one that is really significant here is the general fund. The other funds, the federal grants and so forth, if there's any money left over in those funds, it has to be returned to the Federal government. We can't divert it to City use, but we don't intend to return any, but the point I'm trying to make is that the thing - the only line here that's significant is the general fund.

MAYOR BECKER: These A and F is authorized and filled.

MR. WHITE: Authorized and filled, yes. I should've pointed that out. Now, if you'll notice in the General Fund - the total over there - the authorized is 6,042. The amount filled is 5,251. All right, now, that's misleading on the surface, because part-time, seasonal and temporary, you know, you see that fourth column there, those are summer recreation people and people like Public Works hires for sidewalk construction. There's 368 vacancies in that category. Funds were not budgeted for those positions until the last three months of the year. So, to take the 791 positions, that's in the General Fund, and multiply it times seven thousand or four thousand or whatever figure you want to multiply it by, just does not work, because of that thing. The next column there is the Fire Department. The Fire Department, as of this time, had 145 vacancies. They're authorized 864, they had 719. In the Fire Department, when there is a vacancy, that station has to be manned and it's filled in most cases on an overtime basis. If you'll look at your six month actual expenditures in your six month quarterly report there, you will see that there is not an accumulation of salary savings in the Fire Department. The reason for that being, we had quite a number of firemen retire in December. They just tested, I think it was something like 1,600 - these positions will be filled before the year is out, but in the meantime, they're being filled on an overtime basis. These stations have to be manned, so they're manned by firemen on an overtime basis. So, there's no savings. Actually it costs more money, because we're paying time and a half.

In the Police Department, the number of vacancies there is - total 61. Here again, the Police Department operates a considerable amount with people on overtime. I want to point out also that when we budget at the beginning of the year for police, and this is true with the Fire Department, we will budget at the optimum level. In other words, we will say that a class of 30 cadets will start June the 1st - that could be the earliest that they could start in a class, depending on whenever the class finishes last, you see. Anyway, we will budget those positions in accordance with the way those classes would finish. So, what I'm trying to say is, that the 1,124 positions were not budgeted for the full year, because we knew it was impossible to fill those positions for the full year. You just can't, on August 1, fill a hundred police positions. You have to do it by classes and it takes four months - they're in training for four months in the Police Academy and then they go to the Police Department. The number of vacancies there is somewhat misleading - that is a true figure, but the amount of money that was provided would not total out to correspond with the total authorized positions, because we stagger them in there in accordance with how they would finish.

Then that brings us over to the regulars - the regular employees. You'll notice the authorized strength there is 3,279. We have filled 362 or 207 vacancies. Now, those vacancies have been held unfilled for this six-month period of time and I think it's the City Manager's direction or decision that those positions for the most part will be held unfilled for the balance of this year. Now, the savings that has accrued from these 217 vacancies, as pointed out in his letter, was a million and a half dollars. That million and a half

dollars has been eaten up by higher costs of supplies and services that the City of San Antonio has to have. So, all in all, while there has been some savings, it has been eaten up by the increases in costs that we've had to pay for supplies and services to City Departments. Unless there are questions, I don't want to burden you with a lot more detail, we could go through this quarterly report, but it's summarized on those two pages there.

MAYOR BECKER: Are there any questions of Mr. White?

DR. JOSE SAN MARTIN: There's only one question, Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR BECKER: All right, sir.

DR. SAN MARTIN: On your revenues of the City sales tax, you say that there is an alarming statistic, because of the decrease or the decline in the amount of revenue from the sales tax would indicate a drop of \$100 million in retail sales in the City of San Antonio. Can that be justified through the bank clearing statistics or can you justify it by saying that the added cost of fuel and the pass through has put that much of a strain on the financial status of all the citizens of San Antonio?

MR. WHITE: Well, I don't think.....

DR. SAN MARTIN: In other words, that moeny could be going into the retail sales statistic.....

MR. WHITE: That's correct.

DR. SAN MARTIN:rather than into the cost of gas.

MR. WHITE: We all know that at least a hundred million a year is leaving the San Antonio economy for this added cost for fuel. Now that has been taken out of the local economy. That would have resulted in sales in the local economy and would have been reflected. Now, what we're saying here is that even though we had not estimated the increase from the fuel pass through in our budget estimates, we're still \$243,000 less than what we estimated in sales taxes for the first six months. This was based on just a straight line trend projection. I want to say here, before we get too far into this, that we don't have enough real good solid data on the sales tax, since it was only initiated in '68, we've only got data going back '68, but we have got enough data now that it establishes or should establish if conditions are normal a pretty stable estimate. In other words, we ought to be able to estimate it pretty doggone close. But, in spite of that, in spite of the fact that we got \$800,000 more, or we will get from the fuel pass through in sales taxes than we had estimated, we're still \$243,000 less than we estimated. So, it could only be - the only explanation for it is that there has been a decline in the amount of retail sales in San Antonio by an approximate hundred million dollars.

MAYOR BECKER: The merchants will substantiate that.

MR. WHITE: I'm sure it is - look up the closings on Houston Street and so forth - that's it's indicative of that.

DR. SAN MARTIN: The only item I'd like to ask is on your property taxes, you say the actual increase in assessed valuation was \$20.7 million less than estimated. This, of course, is before you have taken into account the tax reappraisal study.

MR. WHITE: Oh, yes, sir. The new values for the reappraisal will not go on tax roll until next year.

DR. SAN MARTIN: Next year. They're unavailable to you right now.

MR. WHITE: No, sir. No, sir, they're - none of those are in these figures.

DR. SAN MARTIN: But this figure will change when you do get.....

MR. WHITE: When we apply the new valuations, yes, sir, that will increase the assessed valuation and this Council has gone on record as saying that it would lower the tax rate commensurate with the growth in the assessed valuation. So, in effect, we would not be receiving more tax dollars, but it would simply be - some people are going to be paying more, of course, but the total City dollars collected from property taxes will not be greater than it would've been otherwise.

DR. D. FORD NIELSEN: Mr. White, good to see you again, sir. This is related to the budget, since that's what you're talking about - will you be preparing in the upcoming budget a composite picture of all monies? I noticed on this one sheet at the end you've got the - well, it's somewhere here - you call.....

MR. WHITE: On the number of special projects and all this.....

DR. NIELSEN: No, no, no. Not on personnel. Are you going to attempt to put all funds, federal programs, the whole thing, under one budget for us?

MR. WHITE: Well, Dr. Nielsen, what we've got now and we will have - we have an operating budget and we have a revenue sharing budget, which, by law, has to be kept separate - we have to file that with the Treasury Department and we have to report that differently.

DR. NIELSEN: I understand.

MR. WHITE: We will now have a CD - Community Development budget and then we have a CETA - the Comprehensive Employment Training Act budget. So we, in effect, have four budgets. Now, we could put all of those together in a.....

DR. NIELSEN: Side by side.

MR. WHITE: Or we could put them all side by side - they're separate documents.

DR. NIELSEN: Right. I would hope that under one cover that we can have everything.

MR. WHITE: We could do this - we could put a summary page in the front pulling together all of these various funds so that the Council and interested people - citizens and so forth, could look at one page and say okay, this is the total, you see. They can't do that at the present time. I think that would be a step in the right direction.

DR. NIELSEN: Thank you.

MR. RICHARD TENIENTE: I'd like to ask Mr. White, do we have or does the City have less and less categorical funds coming up?

MR. WHITE: Yes, sir, Councilman Teniente.

MR. TENIENTE: So that they're not really earmarked for specific things like we have had.....

MR. WHITE: What happens to the City - we were getting, prior to revenue sharing, about \$35 million annually in categorical grants. This \$35 million was replaced by revenue sharing - we're still getting some categorical grants, but for the bulk of them, most of them are cut out. Our revenue sharing totals about ten million.

MR. TENIENTE:(inaudible)..... apart or aside, so that - I'd just like to see what we might not have for the future, so that we could not over-budget or not overspend in some areas.

MR. WHITE: We lost roughly \$15 million in federal funds - now that's not true with most cities, but San Antonio was taking more advantage or taking a greater advantage of categorical grants than were most cities.

MR. TENIENTE: Okay.

MR. WHITE: So, our loss was greater than most cities, but that's a fact of life.

MRS. LILA COCKRELL: But isn't it true, then, that this is in part made up now by the Community Development funds?

MR. WHITE: Well, that has now come on. We had a couple of years.....

MRS. COCKRELL: It doesn't address the entire problem, but there is....

MR. WHITE: That's true.

MRS. COCKRELL:some of the items that were covered in categorical grants.

MR. WHITE: That's very true. That's just now coming on stream, though, or on board.

MRS. COCKRELL: And would not be reflected in this budget.

MR. WHITE: That's correct. No. It is not.

MRS. COCKRELL: One thing I would like to comment, Mr. Mayor, is.....

MAYOR BECKER: Yes, ma'am.

MRS. COCKRELL: I just, as one member of the Council, would express a feeling that we really should have gotten this material at least two weeks ago. I think we should have had time just, you know, just to get this this morning - I really feel that we should have had it to study and to really give it in-depth attention. I don't question any of the figures or the recommendations, but I just think we'd be more comfortable with it, if we had it longer to study.

February 27, 1975
nsr

-9-

MR. WHITE: Yes, Mrs. Cockrell, I apologize for that and the reason we - this quarterly report was just - this was just printed - finished last night. Unfortunately, and the Council has taken care of this by permitting, in the early part of the year, an appropriation, as you recall, to hire Peat, Marwick, Mitchell. They have developed an integrated computer finance information system. As you recall, we did this back, I think it was in November or October. It cost \$76,000. This will be in operation next year. Unfortunately, this information - we're not able to close out for the month and pull all of the information together, because some of it's manual, some of it's on the computer, some of it's in various places - we're not able to pull all of this information together until about the 18th - it was the 18th of the month before we got the numbers together for January.

Now, and I'd like to say one other thing - the tax rate historically has been set the last week of February. There is no Charter requirement. There is no legal requirement for it to be set this date. If you'd like, it can be held over till next week. The thing that dictates when the tax rate is set is the sheer workload. The Charter says that we're to get tax statements out and in the taxpayers' hands prior to April the 1st. That's the payment dates - April through July. So, in order to do that, we need about three weeks lead time, because it's a tremendous workload getting 250,000 tax statements in the mail, getting them segregated by mortgage companies and so forth. So, there's an awful lot of clerical work that goes into processing those statements, but this does not have to be done today. If you'd like, we can hold it over, study it, we can meet with you or anything that you'd like to do this week and it could be set next week.

MAYOR BECKER: Any other questions of Mr. White? What's the desire of the Council? Pass on it today or pass it a week?

DR. NIELSEN: I don't know. But as far as the tax rate itself, the only way I could profit from a week would be to, you know, I just haven't had time to compare what the present budget really looks like, line for line, you know, I'm kind of new at this. What kind of projections you're making for next year. I - that's the only thing that would help me - to wait a week, as far as the actual tax rate. I'm sure that the basis on which you've arrived at this - is still legitimate - I felt that it has been, and I'm sure it still is.

MR. WHITE: We would welcome Council committee or anyone that you care to look at these numbers, if there can be any - I mean, if anyone - we'd welcome them - you know, a complete and thorough, an opportunity to go over this in-depth with you, if you'd like.

MRS. COCKRELL: Just for myself, as it happens, I'm going to be out of the City several days anyway, and so I probably wouldn't have the opportunity to study it, were it delayed, but if either of the new Councilmen felt that it would be helpful to them, I think we should do it.

MR. WHITE: That's fine.

MAYOR BECKER: Well, what's the consensus of the Council, inasmuch as Mr. Teniente and Dr. Nielsen are new to the Council - I think it would be sort of an unfair burden to expect them to voice an opinion on something that they just received.....

MRS. COCKRELL: Right.

MAYOR BECKER:last night, you might say.

MR. TENIENTE: I would have to abstain, Mr. Mayor, if we did vote on it, so, it would be.....

MAYOR BECKER: Well, under those conditions, then, why don't we wait a week - do you think a week would be sufficient for you all to bring yourselves up to date?

DR. NIELSEN: Surely. If anyone else would like, I'd like a little time.....

MAYOR BECKER: Will you be here next Thursday, Lila?

MRS. COCKRELL: Yes, I will.

MAYOR BECKER: Will you? Okay. Everybody plan to be here next Thursday. All right. Well, then, someone care to make that a motion or.....

DR. NIELSEN: Move we postpone this for one week.

MR. TENIENTE: And I second it.

MAYOR BECKER: All right. Call the roll.

AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, Morton, O'Connell, Nielsen, Teniente.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: None.

MAYOR BECKER: All right. Thank you, Carl. You will be available to help with any explanation.

MR. WHITE: At any time, any hour of the day or night, yes, sir.

MAYOR BECKER: Fine. Anything else, Carl?

* * * *

75-12 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Carl White, Director of Finance, and after consideration, on motion of Dr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. O'Connell, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, Morton, O'Connell, Nielsen, Teniente; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 44,961

AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF INSURANCE CONTRACTS BY THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH THE UNITED STATES FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY AND THE ALLIANCE INSURANCE COMPANY, INC., AND AUTHORIZING THE PAYMENT OF INSURANCE PREMIUMS IN THE AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF \$24,143.26.

* * * *

CITATION FOR MR. AND MRS. BERNARD MAGNON

Mayor Pro-Tem Dr. San Martin recognized Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Magnon in the audience and invited them to the podium. He explained that this presentation had been scheduled in early January but, because of an automobile accident, Mr. Magnon had been unable to be present.

Mayor Becker read the following Citation:

CITY OF SAN ANTONIO
(STATE OF TEXAS)

Hereby Presents This

CITATION

to

MR. AND MRS. BERNARD MAGNON

FOR OUTSTANDING CONTRIBUTIONS

IN THE FIELD OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

THROUGH THEIR COOPERATION WITH THE CITY COUNCIL

IN HOSTING

JUAN DELGADO NAVARRO,

PRESIDENTE MUNICIPAL OF GUADALAJARA

AND OTHER OFFICIAL REPRESENTATIVES

DURING THEIR VISIT TO SIGN THE SISTER CITIES CHARTER.

* * * *

Mayor Becker presented the Citation and each of the Council members personally congratulated Mr. and Mrs. Magnon.

Mr. Magnon thanked the Council for conferring this honor on them.

PRESENTATION BY SOUTHWESTERN
BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY

Mr. Jim Reed, Division Manager of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company, read a prepared statement reiterating his company's request for a rate increase and citing the fact that the City's rate consultant has filed his report stating that the request should be granted with slight modifications. Mr. Reed said that his company would be willing to put the rate increase under bond until such time as all of the pending allegations are settled legally. (A copy of Mr. Reed's prepared presentation is included with the papers of this meeting. The report of the rate consultant, O'Brien and Gere, is also included with this file.)

Following Mr. Reed's presentation, the following discussion took place:

MAYOR CHARLES BECKER. Thank you, Mr. Reed. Are there any questions from any of the Council members would care to ask Mr. Reed?

REV. CLAUDE W. BLACK: There's a statement I'd like to make, Mr. Reed. I'm greatly concerned about what I call a balance between the business interests and the general economic conditions of the City of San Antonio. Now, I think one of the most significant statements that you made here, that telephone service and the consumers' ultimate interest go hand in hand. I think that's a very, very significant statement. While I was growing up in this community, I can remember when they had one telephone in the block and everybody went to that one telephone and used it, you know. They usually had it in the front part of the house. Everybody didn't have a telephone. Everybody couldn't afford a telephone.

Now, I'm greatly concerned about what I see happening among the public utilities. For example, let me say, in private business the stores that operate in our community don't put a gourmet store in my neighborhood. Do you know why? It's not because they want to discriminate against my neighborhood, but because they know that the people in my neighborhood aren't able to buy the kind of goods that go in that kind of store. So, they have another kind of store. Now, what I'm saying is this. I think there is an increasing obligation to public utilities - all public utilities, when they are justifying a raise to not only justify the raise in terms of their business interests but to also bring to the community the ability of that community to meet that raise that they're talking about. I think that's an obligation because you're the only one that's got the service. The private businessman does it because he's got to be in competition. But you are the only one. I keep saying I've said this to the consultants, I keep saying this about other things and every time I get a report, the justification is for the advancement of the business, and it does not show, the relationship of that advancement to the consumer's ability to pay. When we take an act totally on the advancement of the business and we don't take into consideration the ability of the consumer to pay, then we find ourselves facing a tremendous problem because we have not yet analyzed that fact. I really think I really believe that more of our public utilities are going to have to take into their account not only the fact that this is necessary for the advancement of our business but that we have also made a market study and that market study indicates that consumers at this level, for example, I've read recently that the wage level of San Antonio is at a very low level in comparison to other major cities of the community. How does this relate to what you're asking? Are we going to move toward the time when there will be a telephone in every block rather than a telephone in every home because if the people can't pay it and it is no longer just a nice thing to have a telephone in your house, it's a necessity.

So I'm addressing this not just to you as a telephone company but I think the utilities generally develop their programs based upon their business operation and they have no competition and they never develop it on the basis of the consumers' capacity for paying it.

MR. REED: If I might just say, Reverend Black, I understand what you're saying and I think that some of these factors was what was taken into consideration in spreading the increase into the various categories that they went into, especially two-party service that would have no increase at all. It is \$4.90 and it has been \$4.90. It has gone up twenty cents in twenty years and the proposal of the consultant is to leave it at \$4.90. So I think this is one of the obligations that has been taken into consideration.

DR. JOSE SAN MARTIN: Jim, I'd like to make some comments because what you presented us here, in your opinion, gives us all the information that we need. The last time Mr. Kubik was here, I specifically asked him, "do we have all the information that we need to make a fair judgement on this increase request?" Anyway, he said, no, you do not have all the information that you need and it's a matter of record. You can see it in the records of the minutes of that particular meeting.

MR. REED: I heard he said that.

DR. SAN MARTIN: Well, you can get a transcript and it will be there.

MR. REED: I never did find out what he meant by that though and I have to.....

DR. SAN MARTIN: Well, I haven't either and for that reason, I don't feel that we have all the information that we need even though you state we do. Now, Mr. Kubik has not been back since. I have not seen anything from him since then. This report from Arthur Young and Company, this is the first time we see it this morning.

I specifically asked the consultants to address themselves to two items which I feel we don't have any information whatsoever on and I have to disagree with you that we do have all the information. Now let me tell you the two items. One of them is in line with what Rev. Black just said. I specifically asked for a minimum rate with perhaps 100 outgoing calls for elderly citizens at a very, very modest, perhaps a slightly subsidized rate. Not the \$4.90 two-party line but something in the vicinity perhaps of \$3.00 with a minimum of 100 outgoing calls for elderly citizens who may want to - poor people who may want to get in touch with their families or their doctor in an emergency. They don't use a lot of outgoing calls. Most of them would be incoming. Now we don't have that kind of information yet. I requested an explanation of why the City of San Antonio gets only two percent franchise tax, whereas Dallas gets four percent. That information was sent by Council action last week to O'Brien and Gere. So, we don't have that kind of information. We don't have any, I would say, request from you for any change in that. So when do you think we'll get all this information? Now, what is your feeling, especially on the franchise tax and why does San Antonio for so many years gets two percent when Dallas gets four percent?

MR. REED: I'd like to - I'm glad this question came up. San Antonio gets two percent because that's what the ordinance calls for. The ordinance is called an inspection fee. The fee is to cover the cost of the City policing us in the areas of everything ranging, I guess, from rates to whether we patch a street up properly when we go down with a cable and we pay a little better than a million dollars this year for that inspection fee. Now, there are three cities that have - well, one city has a four percent inspection, gross receipts ordinance or inspection fee, and that's Dallas, and that goes back to the early 1900's when we bought out an independent company and it was a part of that agreement. Now, you have to remember this that we're merely a collection agency for that other two percent and the telephone users in Dallas are paying the City four percent. Now, we collect it and give it to the City, but our gross receipts ordinance or inspection fee is an open ended ordinance and it was negotiated at the time and every other city other than three in Texas have a two percent gross receipts ordinance.

DR. SAN MARTIN: All right, now another item is that you have made a statement to Mr. Carl White, and I believe this is correct, if it isn't you may say so, that some service charges such as relocating telephones from one room to another or installation or new telephones are actually being subsidized by the rate payers because you're only charging \$15 whereas the actual cost to you making a call is in the neighborhood of \$65, is that correct?

MR. REED: We don't have - this is - there are roughly 30 people that are involved in different stages of installing a telephone. Most people think they only see the installer. But 30 different people do some work functions in installing a telephone. There was a study made back East that averaged out for an initial installation, and that would be one where the drop wire has to be placed from the pole to the house, and everything has to be set up new, that ran on an average of around \$60. It's a very difficult thing to say what does the average one do because some of them already have drop a - some already have the connecting block in the house. Some people want it connected as it is. Others want it moved over here. So there's a lot of decisions to be made and it would have quite a variance but that was an average.

DR. SAN MARTIN: But the service charge is \$15.

MR. REED: The service charge now is \$13 for residence and proposed is \$15. That's right.

DR. SAN MARTIN: Do you recommend any adjustment upward there, in order to relieve the basic rate?

MR. REED: I think at some point in time that will have to be increased. You know back in 1973, we asked for \$15 service connection charge and rather than that, we were given \$13 with what's called 60-day minimum billing. In other words, you put in a telephone and you use it for two days, you'd be billed for 60 days minimum, and that was when I first came to the City. One of the first problems I inherited were the problems with the press, the elections, the convention business in town and it was obvious to me that was a bad rate, and I withdrew it, with the agreement of the City - withdrew the 30, the 60-day minimum billing. And, so we really were after \$15 back in 1971 when we - or '72 when we filed the case then. But I do think somewhere down the road that will have to come up.

DR. SAN MARTIN: Well, what is wrong with looking at it right now, Jim? I mean, we're looking at it on this go-around, instead of waiting later on for looking at it somewhere down the road.

MR. REED: Well, I guess, to put it in perspective, and I'm going from memory here, but I think I'm pretty close, to take that up - take it up \$7, say, to a \$20 level, the revenue effect of that would be around a nickle for residence one-party service. In other words, a nickle residence one-party revenue would equal - no, I shouldn't say that - it would be about 30 cents, I believe, about 30 cents, so.....

DR. SAN MARTIN: Well, when you talk to people who are having a hard time paying \$4.90 for a two-party line, 30 cents, 50 cents, 75 cents means a lot. This is what I'm talking about.

MR. REED: This is certainly something we could look at. I wanted to mention, I've not been approached on either one of the two questions that you brought up earlier.

DR. SAN MARTIN: I specifically brought them out - this so-called lifeline rate of 100 calls outgoing or 75 calls, I don't know what you would recommend. It was a part of our request some time back. We still don't have that information. The other one on the franchise tax, I brought it to the attention of the Council last week and it has not been, as far as I know, Carl, has it been processed back from O'Brien and Gere?

February 27, 1975

-15-

el

W. B. I.

2.5.75

MR. CARL WHITE: Well, sir, we transmitted that to them on Friday, and, of course, the mail service and all, they probably didn't get it until perhaps Tuesday of this week and they're up in Syracuse, New York, so the time factor from getting correspondence from this point to that point and then back again.....

DR. SAN MARTIN: Well, the reason I'm asking this question, Carl, is that Mr. Reed makes a statement that we have all the information we need now. Is that correct? Yes or no? Do we have all the information that we have requested?

MR. WHITE: Well, we don't have all the information from O'Brien and Gere. Now, I have, and we will pass around, the reason these were not in your packets - these reports from O'Brien and Gere, and they gave a summary of this report to you last week, but they were just mailed - we just received them after the packets were distributed, and so, but we rushed a copy over to Jim Reed to get him a copy and we have not had a chance to get these in the hands of each Council member. But they are in our hands now.

MR. REED: Dr. San Martin, regarding your two questions, if I might address myself to them a little bit more. Actually, the gross receipts tax or the inspection fee is something that is open to negotiations at any time and has been since I believe 1939 was when it was enacted. I don't consider that necessarily a part of the rate case itself. It could be handled at any time. O'Brien and Gere did talk with me back in about October about measured service and I'm not sure whether we got into the capital dollars that would be required for metering these lines - it would require quite an expenditure on our part and - to put in the meters and connect them to the meters, to read the meters each month, to compute the calls each month, and so you're talking about running expenses and capital investment up a great deal by going the measured route.

DR. SAN MARTIN: Well, don't you have that kind of equipment available right now? It used to be available sometime back.

MR. REED: We have it available in limited quantities. At the present time, there is a measured business rate, which is not used very much. There are a few of them and in hotels use measured trunks but those are the only two, but you're talking about entering a new field where there would be potentially maybe larger numbers than we have equipment and while we're - our lead time on engineering jobs is normally somewhere between two to four years. We're engineering for flat rate calling at this time and you don't just change overnight because of the long-range planning aspects of it.

MRS. COCKRELL: I'd like to ask Mr. Carl White, we discussed a little bit about the study that was to be made by, and participated in by several other cities...

MR. WHITE: Yes, ma'am.

MRS. COCKRELL: Can you give us the latest information on that study?

MR. WHITE: Yes, madam. I'm not sure of the firm that was hired but Mayor Dan Matkin is the Chairman of the Texas Utility Advisory Council. They're affiliated with the Texas Municipal League and he's the Mayor of Irving, Texas. They formed this Utility Advisory Committee, the City of San Antonio had a representative on it, they formed a selection committee. There were six proposals received by various firms. They range from a low of \$40,000 to \$60,000. I'm not sure which one they selected but they have made a selection of a firm and that study, I think, has already commenced. If not, it will within the next week or so because the selection has already been made and it will take about two months to complete.

MRS. COCKRELL: For the benefit of the new Council members, would you outline what that survey will address, that study will address, and particularly it's relevance to the rate case in San Antonio.

MR. WHITE: Surely, surely. The study is designed to study the separation practices of the Southwestern Bell Telephone Company in the state of Texas. It's a statewide study because all of us are in the same relative position in terms of how the telephone company makes their separation and so forth. It has been alleged, perhaps, and hasn't been substantiated, of course, and that's what this study would do that the equipment and cost, say, for long distance services and the equipment that is in the San Antonio exchange, for example, that is used for switching or other because that comes through San Antonio like from the Valley, Uvalde, or some place like that come through the San Antonio exchange and on up to the Dallas. There's some equipment installed here that is used not by the San Antonio people but by other people and particularly long distance calls and so forth. It has been alleged that the telephone company allocates, as a part of their separation practices, perhaps 80 percent of the cost of this type of service or this type of these costs to the local exchange and only 20 percent of the revenues or something of this mix. Maybe it's 70-30. I don't know exactly what but the allegation has been that the separation practices in the state of Texas are different and are not consistent with what the FCC suggests or recommends in - at least that's followed in other states.

The study will determine whether or not these practices are valid in the state of Texas and what impact, if any, it would have on the local metropolitan exchanges, the revenues, the costs of those exchanges. This study is estimated to take six months. We'll have that arrangement, 60 days, two months, it's going to take two months at a cost of \$60,000 and our share will probably be about \$5,000. But that will take about two months to complete.

DR. D. FORD NIELSEN: When will it begin or has it begun?

MR. WHITE: I think it has already begun and I'm not sure of the firm that was selected but the firm has been selected. If they've not already begun, they will within the next week or ten days. I think they're already under way.

MAYOR BECKER: What exactly do they expect to prove by that, Carl? What cities are they comparing to? Are they comparing to New York City and Chicago and cities of extreme high density population per square mile or are they comparing to the type of cities that we have down here where we have low density of population and much wire has to be strung for great distances and many poles set and that kind of thing in order to accommodate the same amount of people? You can have a half million people in New York City perhaps in a half square mile area and you'll have a half million people in San Antonio in a 50 square mile area or whatever it is and it seems to me this is comparing apples and oranges, really.

MR. REED: Well, unfortunately, Mr. Mayor, there's very little comparison that can be made. The reason for that - in fact, there are only two states in the union that separate for rate purposes between local and intra-state toll and that's the state of California and the state of Wisconsin, other than Texas. Now, even they don't agree. California used what is called the Ozarke plan which is the FCC separation formula. Wisconsin uses the same as Texas and they are commissioned states, they do have a public service commission. They use special time studies, holding time on calls, so when the consultants, whatever they come up with, they're going to have to make a judgement on and I don't believe they'll find anything to compare it to because normally in a commission state such as Missouri, which recently just had an increase. They get X millions of dollars and some of it goes to toll, some of it goes to local. I wouldn't say they don't care but they don't put in as much time and look at it as we do where it's on an exchange by exchange basis.

February 27, 1975
el

-17-

552

2, 2, 4

555
100

MAYOR BECKER: I'm going to ask you to do something for me, Mr. Reed, when you come back to the Council along with some of this other information that you're being requested to furnish, if you could possibly bring back a comparison of telephone company practices in foreign nations - what's required to be able to get a phone, for example, in France, for example. I think it's about a \$800 deposit. You go through an examination for six months to a year to see whether or not you have the proper credit and whether many other facets of your character and that sort of thing. I think it would be interesting if some of these type of differences could be pointed out. As Americans I'm not sure that we really realize sometimes how fortunate we have been in many areas and this might tend to enlighten certain people with respect to certain facts, with respect to the operation of the telephone company. I, for one, have a great deal of admiration, great deal of regard for the operation of the telephone company in general because I've used the phone systems of other nations and I can assure you that there isn't one anywhere that compares as favorably with respect to efficiency, ease of operation and all that as this telephone company does that we have in the United States. Now, whether it's popular to say that or not, I really don't care. I'm merely stating the facts.

DR. NIELSEN: May I ask Mr. Reed a couple of things? Granted, compared to India, we do have a much better phone service. What do you all do, and I understand there is a considerable amount of what is somewhat outdated equipment that stays around in various smaller not residential but businesses, what do you do to refurbish, to lease, to sell overseas, or whatever, back to produce revenues for the whole system?

MAYOR BECKER: You're talking about like an old telephone set?

DR. NIELSEN: Well, not sets themselves. I'm talking about all this equipment that - this is equipment that you usually see in the back closet, you know, when you've got a series of phones.

MR. REED: We do sell that overseas, as a matter of fact, as well as sets. Western Electric does sell them. One of our problems is that not all of them go overseas, some of them end up back here.

DR. NIELSEN: Okay. There is some attempt being made. What about yellow page advertising rates? I see about \$4 million plus in terms of income. I don't think the City Council has anything to do with setting that rate, is that correct?

MAYOR BECKER: No, they don't.

DR. NIELSEN: Okay. As a source of revenue to, in fact, help, in particular the people that vote, Dr. San Martin, well, that's all it is really in some respect Dr. San Martin and Rev. Black were talking about without in fact gouging the business interests that do find it profitable to advertise, do you have any plans to up those rates?

MR. REED: Yes, in fact, they were raised last year. Our people are out canvassing now and there's another increase and I believe it's in the teens percent. I'm not sure what it is, 15, 14, 13 or something like that and normally since that is a competitive service with other advertising items needed to come out of a budget, it fluctuates up as competition does.

DR. NIELSEN: Let me say this, I'm in no position to be able to vote on anything like this. I haven't seen this consultant study. The only concern I have as I expressed before several years ago was this whole business of depreciation. I am somewhat familiar with depreciation schedules, the high degree of interpretation. Until I'm personally very convinced that there is a very fair value on which this rate is scheduled, I couldn't go along with this increase. I'd be glad to answer any questions.

MR. REED: I might mention this that the fair value has been - the consultant said, "look, talk net book". Let's look at it on a net book standpoint and we did. We looked at it purely on net book. You get the judgemental aspects out of it and then he could compare it with other states, with the FCC and would make other comparisons in arriving at his decision. Then at the end because of Texas law, he had to get back into fair value which he did. I was really computed on a net book basis.

DR. NIELSEN: Well, I think that's extremely critical in both meeting the social needs and the economic aspect. I know you have got to stay in business. Are you on a real economy drive to cut back?

MR. REED: Yes, we are. We are on an austerity program with restricted overtime. In some cases, it is clearly eliminated. The union was in to see me earlier this week suggesting that we put on more employees.

DR. NIELSEN: Which I suppose you have got a hold on?

MR. REED: Well, we've got a hold on them. We're in a crunch.

DR. NIELSEN: Well, we all are.

MR. REED: We all are, that's right.

MR. GLENN LACY: Jim, did you say that we're above - your businesses are slightly above the average of the nation?

MR. REED: No. If the consultant picked out 17 cities and we would be slightly above on business, the average of those 17 other metropolitan cities and I believe it was something like 70 or 80 cents that we would be above the average.

MR. LACY: If the raise were granted, what you asked for, then what would a, say, a \$50 business phone bill equate to? How much would that increase to? That's a business that has two lines and runs about \$56.

MR. REED: Okay. It would run - it would increase it \$7. It would increase it \$3.50 per line.

DR. NIELSEN: So it would be a 12 percent increase or something like that.

MR. LACY: And I believe that San Antonio is supposed to be way down the scale, 30 percent of the income, do you know where it's spent?

MR. REED: Well, you know, Rev. Black brought up a point and I didn't have the numbers and I don't have them on the tip of my tongue but I was reading a report the other day on what we call our density report. In other words, how many households do we serve out of the available households. We're better off in San Antonio than they are in a lot of industrialized cities that have a lot higher income level. So I don't know that you can look at that. There are many factors that go into it but you can see on the chart in here on the business where San Antonio would be \$24 and it's about \$23.30 or so that is on the average, so we'd be slightly above.

REV. BLACK: I think, Mr. Reed, I think everybody appreciates the quality of the telephone service of San Antonio. I think we all do. But when you start talking about a fair return on investment, too, that many of us are trying to locate a fair return on the use of the salaries we're getting. What we're trying to do is that business isn't just - business isn't going as usual. That's what I'm trying to say. When I'm trying to put together my utility bill and my telephone bill and my food bill and my gas bill and try to put them together on the same salary because there hasn't been the escalation of salaries in my line.

500
I don't know what you're talking about when you say a fair return on the dollar because my dollar is staying the same. So what I'm really trying to do is see whether or not it's possible that the telephone company can recognize that business is not the same. I don't want to, certainly, I know that you want to maintain the quality but somewhere along the line we've got to make some adjustments in terms of how people are going to be able to meet these kinds of responsibilities. As I said, I appreciate the quality of the telephone company in this city in terms of being able to connect, make your connections and dial direct but if I can't pay for it, you know, I'd appreciate a Cadillac but I can't afford one.

MAYOR BECKER: I can only say one thing to you. I've noticed that most collection plates are not very deep and I think that most people are afraid to put in any paper money in there for fear that it will flow out between your walking around with it, it will fall out on the floor. If you got a deeper collection plate, you know, one with high sides like the number three wash tub, it may help your possibilities.

REV. BLACK: It'll just make those nickles and dimes rattle louder.

MAYOR BECKER: Mr. Reed.

MR. REED: Well, I'll be glad to answer any questions you might have or try to answer them.

DR. NIELSEN: We're going to meet several weeks, it would seem to me that to go through all of this, could we set a definite time, Mr. Mayor?

MR. MORTON: Charles.

MAYOR BECKER: Sir.

DR. NIELSEN: Can we set a definite time of some further consideration of this matter?

MAYOR BECKER: I would say, Doctor, that it depends largely on how rapidly the information that we've asked for is given to us. I'm sure Mr. Reed will commence immediately with the compilation of his figures and data and whatnot. If we'll ask the O'Brien and Gere people where they stand with their additional report that we asked them for, the additional matters that were requested of them. I can only say this in behalf of the telephone company, there isn't anybody these days, citizens, people, corporations, I don't care who they are, governments, everybody is having fiscal problems, it's nationwide, it's worldwide. I would only like to think that the relationship that exists between the local company here, which happens to be the phone company that Mr. Reed is representing, and the citizens will somehow converge out here beneficially so that you don't go back to the old days as you said of one phone per block, you also don't go back to some type of situation that when you pick the thing up, the equipment isn't working down at the exchange or whatever breakdowns you can have in not having proper maintenance or that sort of thing or the lines are not carrying the messages because of disrepair and all that. That's the thing we have to guard against. I think most of us want instantaneous telephone service. When we pick that phone up, we expect that thing to work. Well, there's only one way to accomplish it and that is to have hand in hand attitude about what's fair, what's fair to the phone company, what's fair to the citizens. It has to be that kind of a relationship. You can ride a free horse to death or you can ride the public to death, it's both the same thing. So, incidentally, when do you think you can get your information together, Mr. Reed?

MR. REED: I wrote down the information of the measured service and the gross receipts tax. Within a few days I could get some data available on what it would cost for us to provide this measured service.

MAYOR BECKER: All right. Can someone try to reach Mr. Kubik at the.....

MR. CIPRIANO GUERRA: Yes, sir. Mr. White will get that information for us.

MAYOR BECKER: If you could reach him now, for example, and ask him, we might be able to settle this matter of when we'll discuss this again in just a matter of a few minutes.

MR. RICHARD TENIENTE: Mr. Reed, may I present something for some consideration if anything. My contact with people have been in the last seven or eight months in an area that were it not for food stamps, were it not for the welfare program, these people would do without the food and without the medication. As a matter of fact, it's been a tremendous blessing to many, many people in certain areas. I'm wondering if an escalation of the rates could be considered to where if an indigent person or persons that are in low income or elderly people might receive some consideration, not necessarily free service but I'm just talking about a rate and it's not, it sounds outlandish, I'm sure, but any increase that would give an overall increase, I would have to just vote against because I cannot support, I could not support an increase for an area that I have worked in in the last few months. I have had to suffer in my business but I have had to adjust. I just don't do the things I used to do and this is fine. I think this is just what the other people are facing and perhaps this is what your company might have to do in this case but another review, some more studies on this, I don't believe would make me feel that I could support an increase of any kind for anything that would affect the people that I have been working with and I just can't see it that way.

MR. REED: The courts have addressed themselves to that and called it a discriminatory rate and forbids it.

DR. NIELSEN: Isn't that what Dr. San Martin is trying to get at?

MAYOR BECKER: Well, basically, what he's asking for.....

MR. TENIENTE: If we could do that without eventually paying for ten millions of dollars worth of equipment again.

MAYOR BECKER: Mr. Reed, I want to ask you that you combine something else into your studies. What is the cheapest type of telephone that you all have? I'm not talking about the colored ones, the French ones and all that, what is the cheapest type of telephone that you have?

MR. REED: You mean the built up part of town, not out in the rural areas, it would be the two party-line, \$4.90 per month.

MAYOR BECKER: I mean the fixture itself. There's all kind of different rates for fixtures. You've got red ones and all this and that and they're one price, then it's the princess phone, what's the cheapest type of telephone that you all have?

MR. REED: Is this the telephone itself?

MAYOR BECKER: Yes.

MR. REED: It seems to me it's in the teens. I forget what the current cost is - just for the instrument itself.

MAYOR BECKER: What I'm going to suggest is this. It may be well for your company to examine house by house, block by block, you're bound to have the records on the type of installations that you have made. What type of phones are these? How many of them have extension jacks in the house? How many of them have a phone in the livingroom and one in the kitchen? And all this sort of thing. You know, while

we're talking about paring down, let's get it all the way down. Let's get down to bedrock, if that's what's required. Let's find out whether or not people have too many phones in their homes that they can't afford. Let's figure out whether they, you know, it kind of goes hand in hand with too many television sets or too many automobiles or too many boats or too many anything. Let's find out what the true conditions are. How many long distance calls are made over some of these phones? I find an appalling amount of long distance calls made by people who obviously are having a difficult time stretching their dollar, but they think nothing, of course, of picking up the phone and calling Spokane or New York City or this and that because they've been educated to do so. Maybe it's time to uneducate them. You know what I'm getting at, don't you?

MR. REED: I know what you're getting at and you're right. The development on extensions is right at fifty percent and it doesn't matter which part of town you go to, it's right at fifty percent.

MAYOR BECKER: All right.

MR. REED: And the intake is a little above sixty percent and it doesn't matter which part of town you go to, the intake's a little above sixty percent.

MAYOR BECKER: We've all been living a little on the fat side, you know.

MR. REED: That's right.

MAYOR BECKER: Maybe it's time that when we start talking about - start talking about getting the cost down, let's find out what's perhaps responsible for some of these costs. What's causing people to have difficulties with some of these budgets and paying these telephone bills and that? I think it's just part of the problem. It's got to be a part of the problem. Now, when can we set this information up, so that we can have another one of these presentations and discuss this thing in a week or two weeks or what?

DR. NIELSEN: Three weeks or what?

MR. WHITE: Mr. Mayor, I think the O'Brien and Gere people can have their information in perhaps two weeks. Now, I've just been advised that this separation study that we talked about a few minutes ago, got started this past week in the City of Dallas. Now, that's estimated to take two months, so.....

MAYOR BECKER: Well, let's find out what they're comparing because if they're trying to compare these cities in Texas with Detroit and Chicago and New York City and all that, they're wasting time.

MR. WHITE: Well, I think they're going to try to ascertain.....

MAYOR BECKER: They're wasting time.

MR. WHITE: I think they're only looking at the methodology that's used in the state of Texas.

MAYOR BECKER: Well, let's find out what it is.

MR. WHITE: Whether or not it's valid.

MAYOR BECKER: Let's find out what it is because we have a different - we have a different type of requirements in this part of the country for almost any type of business versus what's in New York City, for example. It's a totally different environment - totally different part of the world, so let's find out what it is that they're trying to study.

MR. WHITE: Well, let's find out if it's worth waiting for, is what I'm trying to get at, Carl. Do you see what I mean? Is that enough on that subject? Thank you and give our best to Mr. Todd, if you will please, or at least mine. Okay. Now, let's go to Item Number 3.

February 27, 1975
el

506

124.7

75-12 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 44,962

APPROVING A \$17,904,000.00 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION UNDER TITLE I OF THE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974, AND AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION OF SAME TO THE U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

* * * *

Mrs. Cruz Sellers, speaking for C.O.P.S., stated that she opposed the allocation of Community Development Funds to the City Water Board and also opposed the \$5 million that the Council had endorsed for improvements to housing for the poor. She said that this should be done by the private sector.

Councilman Morton moved that the Ordinance be approved. Dr. San Martin seconded the motion and on the following roll call vote the motion, carrying with it the passage of the Ordinance, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Morton, O'Connell, Nielsen, Teniente; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Lacy.

75-12

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

MRS. PATRICIA B. POLLARD

Mrs. Patricia B. Pollard, 1735 Deer Run, speaking for the San Pedro Hills Women's Club, read a prepared statement requesting that the 14.82 acre site designated as Virgil T. Blossom Park be developed for use by the residents of the large area in the very north part of the City. She presented a list of desired improvements including picnic areas, recreation areas and trails. (A copy of Mrs. Pollard's prepared statement as well as a petition signed by residents of the area is included with the papers of this meeting.)

Mayor Becker itemized for Mrs. Pollard the parks and recreation facilities which are being provided for with Community Development funds.

Mr. Ron Darner, Director of Parks and Recreation, said that \$50,000 in improvements to Blossom Park is scheduled in the next 30 days. No funds are presently available for a recreation building as that would have to be financed by a bond program or Revenue Sharing funds. He said also that discussions are being had with the North-east School District for the lease of 10 additional acres adjacent to the park. Present plans are for picnic facilities, a multi-use slab for basketball, irrigation and tennis courts.

MR. KARL WURZ

Mr. Karl Wurz, 820 Florida, claimed that for many years people working for Urban Renewal have falsified records.

MISS PEGGY AUSTIN

Miss Peggy Austin, 7906 Stagecoach, representing Girl Scout Cadette Troop 270, requested that a recreation center and park be provided in the far west side of the City where none presently exists. She said there is also need for a overhead crosswalk over Loop 410 for the students of John Jay High School who live in Rainbow Hills. A petition signed by residents of the area was submitted. Also submitted was a list of 18 improvements needed in the area. (A copy of Miss Austin's statement and petition are included with the papers of this meeting.)

Mayor Becker welcomed Miss Austin and the other members of her Troop to the Council meeting and thanked her for her presentation. He then spoke of the problem of drugs and suggested that she get up a petition demanding stiffer sentences for convicted drug pushers.

REV. R. A. CALLIES, SR.

Reverend R. A. Callies, Sr., spoke to the Council regarding the unsightly condition of some private cemeteries within the City-owned cemetery complex. He described the area as completely overgrown by brush and weeds. They are owned by Knights of Pythias (white), Knights of Pythias (black), Alamo Golden Rule, Grand Union of Odd Fellows, Alamo Masonic Cemetery, Old St. Joseph's Cemetery and the Polish Cemetery. He asked that the City use its influence to get these cemeteries cleaned up by the owners.

Reverend Black agreed with Reverend Callies that the area is in a deplorable condition and asked what legal steps could be taken.

Mr. Louis Garcia, Assistant City Attorney, said that his department will check on the ownership of these properties and whatever contractual arrangements may exist. He will also attempt to determine if these organizations are still in existence. He said that he would come back in two weeks with a report on the matter.

TOW AWAY WRECKERS

Mayor Becker called attention to the recent complaints of cars being towed away in the downtown area and said the matter had been discussed at last week's meeting. He suggested that an ordinance be formulated that would specify certain signs be prominently displayed at every entrance and exit from a parking lot.

Assistant City Attorney, Louis Garcia, stated that information on this matter will be in the Council's packet.

MRS. DOLORES RATLIFF

Mrs. Dolores Ratliff, speaking for the Ella Austin Community Center, thanked the Council for making it possible for the Center to acquire property needed for its operation. She discussed with the Council the matter of counseling for persons receiving home improvement loans under the new program and said she hoped that the counseling service offered by the Ella Austin Center would fit into the program.

MR. RAMIRO TREVINO

Mr. Ramiro Trevino, owner of Dave's Flower Shop at 3900 Broadway, stated that he had sent a petition to the City Clerk requesting permission to place a sign on City property and wanted to know when he would receive an answer.

City Clerk Jake Inselmann explained that the request had been referred to the Department of Building and Planning Administration for investigation and report. An on-site inspection will be made and recommendation made to the Council. Usually this procedure requires one to two weeks time.

MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ

Mr. Raul Rodriguez asked the Council to consider abolishing the City sales tax. He claimed it is a severe hardship on poor people and showed a vial of medicine he was required to pay tax on.

Mr. Teniente advised Mr. Rodriguez that by having a doctor prescribe this medicine no tax would be applicable.

MR. MIKE PASSUR

Mayor Pro-Tem Dr. San Martin recognized former City Councilman Mike Passur in the audience and welcomed him.

MR. TOM FANCHER

Mr. Tom Fancher, 554 Dawnview, said that San Antonio should capitalize on the fact that it has many distinct architecturally historic districts. He called attention to various buildings which were built many years ago having very unique and artistic features which should be preserved. He suggested that the ten block downtown area could be saved.

He talked of esplanades and urban parks downtown, improved sign ordinances and green streets and other devices to improve the downtown area.

After discussion, Mayor Becker asked that Mr. Fancher take this matter up with the Planning Department after which it can be considered in a "B" Session.

MR. G. L. PASTRANO

Mr. G. L. Pastrano spoke of the very poor drainage in the vicinity of Texas Avenue and Elmendorf. The street is in need of repair also. Nothing has been done. He also complained of trash being accumulated in the street.

Mayor Becker asked Mr. Pastrano to take the matter up with Mr. Joe Madison in the City Manager's Office.

MRS. HELEN DUTMER

Mrs. Helen Dutmer, 739 McKinley, said that she was dismayed to see a report in the paper that the City's civil service employees will not receive an expected pay raise because of the large amount of subsidy required by the Transit System. She said that it was unfair to this group and the Council should consider a pay increase as promised when the budget was adopted.

Mayor Becker said that the news report on this subject was premature because the Council has not considered this matter at all. No one has advised the Council at all.

Dr. San Martin said that when the budget was being considered the Council said that it would consider this matter in February, 1975, but no definite commitment was made at that time.

MR. CARLOS "CHARLIE" MATA

Mr. Carlos "Charlie" Mata, 306 N. Cibolo, spoke to the Council concerning the boxing team sponsored by the City Recreation Department and coached by Mr. Mike Ayala. The team will be competing in the Golden Gloves Tournament starting today but will not be allowed to fight as a team but will have to fight as independents only.

Mr. Mata stated that the tournament is sponsored by Boys Clubs of San Antonio which is receiving financing from the City and he asked that the Council use its influence with the Boys Clubs to allow this team to compete.

Mr. Teniente suggested that the two parties be brought together now for a discussion to try to work out an accommodation.

After discussion, Mayor Becker requested that Mr. Ron Darner take immediate steps to contact Boys Club representatives and get them together.

SANYO

Mr. Julian Rodriguez, Executive Director of SANYO, Inc., stated that the Directors of the Economic Opportunities Development Corporation have decided to discontinue its contract with SANYO for the operation of the Youth Development Program which has been in operation over four years. After March 31, it would be operated by E.O.D.C., under its regional program.

Mr. Rodriguez stated that this decision was made without any explanation. Since the program has gone so well he asked that the Council look into the matter to see what can be done.

After discussion, Dr. San Martin requested that the staff contact E.O.D.C. through its Executive Director and report back to the Council as soon as possible.

February 27, 1975
nsr

MR. RAMON RODRIGUEZ

Mr. Ramon Rodriguez, 603 S. W. 39th Street, spoke of the drainage problems in San Antonio and the need to correct it. He said plans were made in 1924 for Culebra Road but were never completed. He urged the Council to give the problem on the west side of the City its attention. He claimed that bonds were voted for this in 1967-68 and should be available.

Mayor Becker asked that staff look into the bond funds to see what the situation is now.

NOLAN STREET UNDERPASS

Reverend Black stated that on Monday there was an editorial regarding the Nolan Street Underpass and it suggested that Council push the staff with reference to this project. He said that he would like to have a public statement made regarding the schedule of the project.

Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss, Director of Public Works, made the following statement: "I can give you the current status that the construction contract has been let. We had a pre-construction conference. The Railroad Company needs to move the track. That's on schedule.

To answer your question directly, the project is on schedule."

75-12 The meeting recessed for lunch at 1:05 P. M., and reconvened at 2:45 P. M.

A. CASE 5938 - to rezone the east 80' of Tract F, NCB 10949, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located 215' west of Clark Avenue and 104.10' south of Offer Street, being 69.65' in width and 80' in depth.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. O'Connell made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Dr. San Martin seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Morton, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 44,963

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE
 THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE
 ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN
 ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION
 AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY
 DESCRIBED HEREIN AS THE EAST 80' OF
 TRACT F, NCB 10949, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY
 RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS
 DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING
 IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

B. CASE 5870 - to rezone a 5.452 acre tract of land out of NCB 14035, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, from "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District to "O-1" Office District; a 4.489 acre tract of land out of NCB 14035, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, from "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District; and a 1.075 acre tract of land out of NCB 14035, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, from "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District.

The "O-1" zoning is located 275' southeast of Ramsgate and 201.95' northeast of I. H. 10 Expressway, having a length of 1088.96' and a maximum width of 227.23'.

The "B-2" zoning is located on the northeast side of I. H. 10 Expressway being 380.05' southeast of the intersection of Ramsgate and I. H. 10 Expressway, having 967.65' on I. H. 10 Expressway and a maximum depth of 209.95'.

The "B-3" zoning is located on the northeast side of I. H. 10 Expressway being 135' southeast of the intersection of Ramsgate and I. H. 10 Expressway, having 240.59' on I. H. 10 Expressway and a maximum depth of 230.00'.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Dr. San Martin made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mrs. Cockrell seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Morton, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 44,964

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 5.452 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 14035, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, FROM "R-3" MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "O-1" OFFICE DISTRICT; A 4.489 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 14035, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, FROM "R-3" MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT; AND A 1.075 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 14035, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, FROM "R-3" MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

C. CASE 5934 - to rezone a 0.972 acre tract of land out of Lot 2, Block 1, NCB 15650, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, 6400 Block of Wurzbach Road, from "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located on the southeast side of Wurzbach Road being 125' northeast of the cutback between Wurzbach Road and Evers Road, having 264.49' on Wurzbach Road and a depth of 160'.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. O'Connell made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved. Dr. San Martin seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Morton, Teniente.

AN ORDINANCE 44,965

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS A 0.972 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF LOT 2, BLOCK 1, NCB 15650,

BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES
FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
6400 BLOCK OF WURZBACH ROAD, FROM "R-3"
MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO
"B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

D. CASE 5884 - to rezone Parcel 35, NCB 14868, 12300 Block of Babcock Road, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located on the southwest side of Babcock Road being 3215' west of the intersection of Babcock Road and De Zavala Road, having 295.8' on Babcock Road and a maximum depth of 278.4'.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Dr. San Martin made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mr. O'Connell seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell, Nielsen, Teniente; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Morton.

AN ORDINANCE 44,966

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 PARCEL 35, NCB
14868, 12300 BLOCK OF BABCOCK ROAD,
FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY
RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS
DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING
IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

E. CASE 5942 - to rezone Lot 2, NCB 13664 (5.68 acres), 7700-7800 Blocks of Oakdell Way, from Temporary "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located on the southwest side of Oakdell Way being 458' northwest of the intersection of Rowley Drive and Oakdell Way, having 734' on Oakdell Way and a depth of 342'.

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

Mr. H. Kyle Seale, the owner of the property, said that this request for rezoning had been approved and recommended by the staff and the Planning Commission and he would speak after the opponents had spoken.

Mr. Jack Crowder, 7318 Lamb Drive, passed out plats showing properties in the area being considered. He said that he does not oppose the rezoning but he does ask for a postponement until such time as Mr. Seale furnishes a legal commitment assuring the other property

February 27, 1975

-31-

el

571

owners on Lamb Drive safe ingress and egress to their properties. Lamb Drive is a 20' lane that runs across the southeast part of Mr. Seale's tract and has been used for many years. He said that Mr. Seale has agreed to a moral commitment but has not made a legal commitment.

Mr. Kyle Seale said that as a condition to rezoning, the Planning Commission has required that his property be replatted at which time dedication of an easement will be required. He said he had already written a letter to the Director of Public Works agreeing to dedicate right-of-way for Lamb Drive. He objected to postponement and asked that the Council approve his application now.

After consideration, Mr. Morton made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished and that a 60' building setback line be imposed on the southeast property line along Lamb Drive. Dr. San Martin seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, Morton, O'Connell, Teniente; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 44,967

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 2, NCB 13664 (5.68 ACRES) 7700-7800 BLOCKS OF OAKDELL WAY, FROM TEMPORARY "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED AND THAT A 60' BUILDING SETBACK LINE BE IMPOSED ON THE SOUTH-EAST PROPERTY LINE ALONG LAMB DRIVE.

* * * *

F. CASE 5941 - to rezone a 79.76 acre tract of land out of NCB 14866, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District; and a 48.01 acre tract of land out NCB 14866, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District.

The "B-2" zoning is located on the northwest side of North F. M. 1604 West approximately 1700' northeast of the intersection of F. M. 1560, having 3867.06' on North F. M. 1604 West with a maximum depth of 1297.50'.

The "B-3" zoning is located north of the intersection of F. M. 1560 and North F. M. 1604 West, having 1452.65' on F. M. 1560 and 1700' of North F. M. 1604 West.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Dr. San Martin made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper platting is accomplished. Reverend Black seconded the motion.

On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, Morton, O'Connell, Teniente; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 44,968

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 79.76 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 14866, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT; AND A 48.01 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 14866, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

G. CASE 5935 - to rezone Tract I, NCB 10319, 3351 Roland Avenue, from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located on the northeast side of Roland Avenue being 411.35' northwest of the intersection of Pecan Valley Drive and Roland Avenue, having 52.48' on Roland Avenue and a maximum depth of 186.2'.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Dr. San Martin made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Mrs. Cockrell seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, Morton, O'Connell, Teniente; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 44,969

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 TRACT I, NCB 10319, 3351 ROLAND AVENUE, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

H. CASE 5846 - to rezone a 4.834 acre tract of land out of NCB 13857, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, from Temporary "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District; and a 5.511 acre tract of land out of NCB 13857, being further described by field notes filed in the office of the City Clerk, from Temporary "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District.

The "B-2" zoning being located on the southwest side of Thousand Oaks Drive, being 361' northwest of the cutback at the intersection of Thousand Oaks Drive and Jones Maltsberger Road, having 264' on Thousand Oaks Drive with a maximum depth of approximately 806.9'.

The "B-3" zoning being located west of the cutback at the intersection of Thousand Oaks Drive and Jones Maltsberger Road, having 361' on Thousand Oaks Drive, 506.49' on Jones Maltsberger Road and 70' on the cutback.

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

No one spoke in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. O'Connell made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved, provided that proper replatting is accomplished. Dr. San Martin seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cockrell, San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, Morton, O'Connell, Teniente; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Nielsen.

AN ORDINANCE 44,970

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 4.834 ACRE TRACT
 OF LAND OUT OF NCB 13857, BEING FURTHER
 DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE
 OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, FROM TEMPORARY
 "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT
 TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT; AND A 5.511
 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 13857, BEING
 FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN
 THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, FROM TEMPORARY
 "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO
 "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT
 PROPER REPLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

I. CASE 5944 - to rezone RED 2, Lots 4, 5, and the east 144' of Lot 6, NCB 125, Lots 1 through 7, 15 and 17, NCB 134, Lots A-34, A-36, A-37, A-39, the east irregular 104.2' of Lot 33, the east 104.2' of Lot 32 and all of Lots 30, and 31, NCB 904, 200, 300, and 400 Blocks of South Presa Street, from "I" Business District to Historic "I" Business District.

The lots within NCB 125 are located northwest of the intersection of South Presa Street and Nueva Street, having 144' on Nueva Street and 262.58' on South Presa Street. Those lots within NCB 134 and NCB 904 are located on the west side of South Presa Street between Nueva Street and Durango Boulevard; having 884.69' on South Presa Street, 112.4' on Nueva Street and 168' on Durango Boulevard.

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

Mr. Camargo stated that there is opposition from owners that represent 72 percent of the subject property. Therefore seven affirmative votes of the Council would be required to approved the rezoning.

Mrs. Beverly Blount, President of the San Antonio Conservation Society, said that her organization had proposed this area as a Historic District because of its concern for the preservation of the City's architectural heritage and for the business district. This area being considered has architectural significance and will provide a link between the River Walk and La Villita to the King William Historic District. It is hoped that the houses in the area will be rehabilitated and that sidewalks will be constructed by the City. This would encourage visitors to walk this route to the King William area. She said that history shows that values will increase as a result of historic zoning.

Mrs. Blount stated that she felt the Historic Review Board will be of much assistance to the people in this area in providing an expertise otherwise not available. She said the Society felt very strongly about this area and asked for Council's favorable consideration.

Mrs. Blount explained that historic zoning means that if a person wishes to do anything to the exterior of a building he must go before the Historic Review Board where the plans are reviewed and passed on. If the Board passes unfavorably, the person has the right to appeal to the decision to the City Council. The person can do anything he wishes to the interior of a building. If a person wished to demolish a building in the area he would have to give a 120 day notice before getting a permit. The Board would also pass on any new construction in the zone.

Those speaking in favor of the proposed zoning change were:

Mrs. Bernadine Rice, 401 South Presa
Virginia Van Steenberg, President of the Monte Vista
Historical Association
Corrine Staacke, representing Maj. General W. A. Harris
Floyd Snyder, President of Texas Historical Foundation
Carolyn Peterson, Architect
William Parrish, Architect
Elsie Bridgers
Robert Buchannan
Clare Bignor
Ralph Bender

* * * *

The following persons spoke against the proposed change in zoning:

- Mr. Charles Rubinstein, 604 S. St. Mary's
- Mr. Hobart Huson, Jr., 1910 Tower Life Building
- Mrs. Alta Tschirhart, 1040 West Magnolia
- Mr. Harold Tschirhart, Marion, Texas

* * * *

Mrs. Cockrell stated at this point that it did not seem to her that the opponents clearly understood what Historic Zoning implies and asked that it be explained further.

Miss Marge Jordan, Planning Administrator, explained that all of the uses in "I" Business District would still be valid. The only change would be that before a person could change the exterior of a building the proposed change must be approved by the Historic Review Board.

Others speaking in opposition were:

- Michael H. Burow, 520 S. St. Mary's
- Dr. Leon J. Tolle, St. John's Lutheran Church
- Mr. Robert Archer

* * * *

Mrs. Beverly Blount spoke in rebuttal saying that she felt that there is a lack of understanding of just what is involved. She asked that the Council approved the rezoning.

The following conversation took place:

MAYOR BECKER: It takes seven votes out of - it still takes seven?

ASSISTANT CITY ATTORNEY FINLAY: Yes, sir.

MAYOR BECKER: All right. What's your pleasure?

MRS. COCKRELL: Well, to get it up for consideration, I will move that the Historic Zoning be approved.

MR. MORTON: I second it.

DR. NIELSEN: May I ask one more question of the staff? Has there ever been dialogue between the Review Board and the residents?

MRS. BLOUNT: May I speak to that. We had a meeting and invited a representative of the Review Board. And he did speak at that meeting.

MISS MARGE JORDAN: Doctor, if I might add to that just a little bit further on behalf of the staff. The Ordinance does not require us when things come before the Historic Review Board to notify the neighbors. However, I believe Mrs. Blount did do that.

MAYOR BECKER: If I may make a suggestion that's an amendment I think that should be made to that Ordinance. I think it's the only fair thing to do. I don't know whether the Council cares to consider that this afternoon or not but.....

MR. MORTON: I'd say this, sir. That, not only do I agree with you in modifying the Ordinance to include the notification, but also I don't look at this and regular zoning as necessarily being so synonymous that we have to have the appeal procedure identical. Here you are imposing zoning not at the request of the property owners. I would like to think that the appeal would be from the Review Board to the Council and then to the Court. I feel like this is dissimilar enough that you should let Council have that appeal authority because you are talking about money to go to Court.

MAYOR BECKER: Let's vote on that thing then and get that a part of this whole deal.

MR. MORTON: I would like to move that the notification that you discussed and the appeal from the Review Board to the Council and then to the District Court.

MAYOR BECKER: Right.

MRS. COCKRELL: I think that will have to be written up by staff and will have to come at a later date.

MR. MORTON: I understand that. I'm saying that as far as this is concerned, I'm approving it with those conditions or modifications in there as opposed to the way it is now written.

MAYOR BECKER: Call the roll please, Garland, Mr. Morton seconded it.

MRS. COCKRELL: We had a motion so his second is conditional on these changes.

MR. MORTON: Is that acceptable to you?

MRS. COCKRELL: Yes, assuming that we are going to take this up at the first available time.

MR. MORTON: I understand that.

MAYOR BECKER: I'd say like the next week or the week after so we can get this done and see to it that it gets done while we are all still on this Council.

MR. TENIENTE: In other words, you are going to build in this appeal in this case so that everybody here will understand where they go to next. Is that correct?

MR. MORTON: That's correct.

MAYOR BECKER: That Ordinance is going to be changed. I'm going to vote yes, and I'm going to get my paddle in the water and it's not an amendment to the motion - that this City Council, this present one, considers a means of funding or financing the restoration and maintenance of these properties such as the Ursuline Property and those kind of valuable buildings and not leave it up to happenstance and whether or not we have a carnival in this business. So my answer to the question is yes.

MR. CIPRIANO GUERRA: To clarify the question of making it conditional - why don't you make it effective - make this zoning case effective with the change in the Ordinance? That way we'll bring you the change and that will give you an effective date.

MAYOR BECKER: That's fair enough. All right. I still vote yes.

* * * *

The Clerk called the roll.

REV. BLACK: Yes.

MR. LACY: Yes, and I'd like to make a comment. At the time, I would be vitally opposed to it and say no because I hate to see any property right taken from anyone when they are the ones that pay for it, maintain it, pay the tax on it and still can't have any control. The only reason I'm saying yes, of course, I realize that we need it very badly, and I'm all for that, but I don't like to take away property rights but as I understand it the reason I'm going to vote yes in addition to that for the property right is that I understand that they could tear it down and if it were in keeping with the structural design they could do that, and if it were approved and still build a new building. So, if that's right, then I vote yes.

MR. MORTON: Yes.

MR. O'CONNELL: Yes.

DR. NIELSEN: Yes.

MR. TENIENTE: Yes, a reluctant yes because I feel sorry for the fellow that's got the parking lot but I'll still vote yes.

MRS. COCKRELL: Yes.

DR. SAN MARTIN: Yes.

MAYOR BECKER: Yes.

CLERK: The motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed:

AN ORDINANCE 44,971

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 RED 2, LOTS 4, 5, AND THE EAST 144' OF LOT 6, NCB 125, LOTS 1 THROUGH 7, 15 AND 17, NCB 134, LOTS A-34, A-36, A-37, A-39, THE EAST IRREGULAR 104.2' OF LOT 33, THE EAST 104.2' OF LOT 32 AND ALL OF LOTS 30, AND 31, NCB 904, FROM "I" BUSINESS DISTRICT TO HISTORIC "I" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

75-12 At this point the Council meeting recessed and went into "B" Session. At 5:30 P.M., the meeting reconvened to consider other items.

75-12 STATEMENT BY MAYOR CHARLES L. BECKER

During the Council's "B" Session, the matter of considering a code of ethics and conflict of interest was discussed. Mayor Becker requested that the following statement made by him be transcribed and inserted in the official record:

MAYOR CHARLES L. BECKER: There is only one thing I would like to point out though, Reverend, and this I would like to be extracted from this "B" Session and put in the "A" Session testimony, Garland.

Regardless of how many times you swear under oath and appear before committees and grand juries and everything else, as in my case that I did not ever get one cent from Oscar Wyatt or Coastal States, Lo-Vaca, the officers, directors, any employees either directly or indirectly representing those corporations, agents, nominees or whatever, you still get accused of it regardless as I'm being accused of it now from the floor in Congress in Washington, D. C., by none other than our Congressman, Henry B. Gonzalez. So, whatever this thing here is worth, I don't know what it's worth. I don't know what you have to do to try to prove or evince or vindicate your honesty in this world. You're going to be subjected to harrassment from people who have apparently no sense of responsibility, no sense of consideration or ethics as to who they accuse and who they cause any harm because when something's read into the Congressional Record it becomes a permanent part in the history of the United States of America.

I'm in the process right now - I'm trying to find ways and means to clar my name and expunging those remarks from the Congressional Record because I don't want that stuff going down as a history of conduct that I'm purported or alleged to have engaged in.

Now, while we're thinking about all this business, and I'm not taking you a task, and I want you to understand that, let's try to also figure out how you can deal with a man fairly or a woman, you know, and not just malign them and have all these slanderous remarks and all this kind of stuff placed upon their character in an absolute irresponsible fashion, without some type of protection. Do you see what I mean? You know there's got to be give and take in everything and so I just.....

REVEREND CLAUDE W. BLACK: I certainly agree with you, Mr. Mayor, that a man has to be protected when he is attacked and he recognizes that what is being said about him is not true.

MAYOR BECKER: I would think that there should be some time element in there that you either prove your charges or you cease and desist. There has to be something to protect a person because talk about getting candidates to run for office with that sort of thing. Okay.

* * * *

February 27, 1975
nsr

-39-

5000

1000

75-12 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss, Director of Public Works, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell, Nielsen, Teniente; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Morton.

AN ORDINANCE 44,972

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF THE W. R. GRIGGS CONSTRUCTION CO., INC., OF CASTROVILLE, TEXAS, IN THE AMOUNT OF \$776,000.00 TO CONSTRUCT THE NORTHWEST SERVICE CENTER AND POLICE SUBSTATION FACILITY, AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF ADDITIONAL ARCHITECT FEES AND CONTINGENT EXPENDITURES IN THE PROJECT, AUTHORIZING A CONTRACT WITH SAID CONTRACTOR, PAYMENT OF \$776,000.00 TO W. R. GRIGGS CONSTRUCTION CO., INC., AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS FOR THE PROJECT IN THE 1970 G. O. NW CENTER BONDS FUND AND PROVIDING FOR ADDITIONAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PROJECT FROM OTHER FUNDS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,973

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF M. H. BRADEN ENTERPRISES TO CONSTRUCT THE HEMPHILL STREET PEDESTRIAN OVERPASS FOR A TOTAL OF \$29,853.65; AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A STANDARD CITY PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT, AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT FOR THE PROJECT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,974

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF ACTION UTILITY CO., INC., IN THE AMOUNT OF \$146,800.35; TO PERFORM WORK IN CONNECTION WITH THE UNIVERSITY HILLS SUBDIVISION OFF-SITE SANITARY SEWER MAIN PROJECT; AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT COVERING SAID WORK; APPROPRIATING THE AMOUNT OF \$154,141.00; AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT.

* * * *

75-12 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Ron Darner, Director of Parks and Recreation, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell, Nielsen, Teniente; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Morton.

AN ORDINANCE 44,975

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF J. M. LERMA CONSTRUCTION COMPANY TO CONSTRUCT THE ROOSEVELT PARK RENOVATION AND MISSION PARKWAY IMPROVEMENTS FOR A TOTAL OF \$194,200.00; AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A STANDARD CITY PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT, AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT FOR THE PROJECT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,976

CANCELLING AN EXISTING CONTRACT WITH MANOHAR SHARMA AND MANIFESTING AN AGREEMENT WITH R. EUGENE JACKSON AND CHARLES E. SYNDER FOR LEASE OF PROPERTY ON THE RIVER WALK FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,977

ESTABLISHING A PARK BOND PROJECT ACCOUNT AND BUDGET; APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR, AND AUTHORIZING PURCHASE OF MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT NEEDED FOR RENOVATION OF THE SUNKEN GARDEN THEATER.

* * * *

75-12 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: Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell, Nielsen, Teniente; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Morton.

AN ORDINANCE 44,978

APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$97,680.00 OUT OF VARIOUS FUNDS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS AND EASEMENTS OVER CERTAIN LANDS; ACCEPTING THE DEDICATION OF EASEMENTS OVER CERTAIN LANDS; ALL TO BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN RIGHT-OF-WAY PROJECTS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,979

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO SUBMIT AN APPLICATION FOR A GRANT TO THE TEXAS CRIMINAL JUSTICE COUNCIL AS PRIME SPONSOR FOR THE HEALY-MURPHY LEARNING CENTER'S TEENAGE EDUCATION AND REHABILITATION PROGRAM.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,980

ESTABLISHING AN ACCOUNT ENTITLED CONTRIBUTION TO ALCOHOL SAFETY ACTION PROJECT FUND, AUTHORIZING MONIES FROM SAID ACCOUNT TO BE PAID INTO THE ALCOHOL SAFETY ACTION PROJECT FUND, AUTHORIZING PAYMENT INTO SAID ACCOUNT OF \$56,925 FROM CONTINGENCY FUNDS, AUTHORIZING ACCEPTANCE OF MONIES FROM BEXAR COUNTY INTO THE ALCOHOL SAFETY ACTION PROJECT FUND, AMENDING THE PROJECT BUDGET AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,981

MANIFESTING AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO AND BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS, RELATIVE TO THE FUNDING OF THE ALCOHOL SAFETY ACTION PROJECT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,982

DECLARING A PUBLIC NECESSITY FOR THE ACQUISITION OF AN EASEMENT TO CERTAIN PRIVATELY OWNED REAL PROPERTY AS WELL AS FOR A TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENT TO ADJOINING LAND, SAID PROPERTY BEING SITUATED IN SAN ANTONIO, BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS, AND BEING NEEDED FOR A PUBLIC PURPOSE, TO WIT: THE LOCATION, CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENT, REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE OF PUBLIC FACILITIES IN CONNECTION WITH THE CATALPA - PERSHING DRAINAGE PROJECT; AND DIRECTING THE CITY ATTORNEY TO INSTITUTE AND PROSECUTE TO CONCLUSION CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS TO ACQUIRE SO MUCH THEREOF AS CANNOT BE ACQUIRED THROUGH NEGOTIATION.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,983

DECLARING A PUBLIC NECESSITY FOR THE ACQUISITION OF EASEMENTS ACROSS CERTAIN PRIVATELY OWNED REAL PROPERTY IN SAN ANTONIO, BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS, FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES, TO WIT: THE LOCATION, CONSTRUCTION, RECONSTRUCTION, IMPROVEMENT, REPAIR AND MAINTENANCE OF SALADO CREEK SANITARY SEWER MAIN EXTENSION; AND DIRECTING THE CITY ATTORNEY TO INSTITUTE AND PROSECUTE TO CONCLUSION CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS TO ACQUIRE SO MUCH THEREOF AS CANNOT BE ACQUIRED THROUGH NEGOTIATION.

* * * *

75-12 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Joe Madison, Executive Assistant to the City Manager, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. O'Connell, seconded by Mr. Lacy, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSTAIN: Teniente; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Morton.

AN ORDINANCE 44,984

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER, DURING HIS ABSENCE OR DISABILITY, TO DESIGNATE ANY ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER TO PERFORM THE DUTIES OF CITY MANAGER.

* * * *

75-12 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. John Brooks, Director of Purchasing, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell, Nielsen, Teniente; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Morton.

AN ORDINANCE 44,985

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF A. B. DICK COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH AN OFFSET DUPLICATOR FOR A TOTAL OF \$5,498.00.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,986

ACCEPTING THE HIGH QUALIFIED BID OF, AND MANIFESTING A CONTRACT WITH, MARK GRIMM FOR THE SALE OF SEWAGE SLUDGE IN CONSIDERATION FOR PAYMENT TO THE CITY OF \$0.35 PER CUBIC YARD.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 44,987

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AMENDMENTS TO CITY CONCESSION CONTRACTS FOR THE PURPOSES OF ALLOWING CHANGES IN ITEMS FOR SALE, SERVICES OFFERED, AND PRICES CHARGED; PROVIDING FOR ANNUAL CITY COUNCIL REVIEW OF THE AMENDMENTS.

* * * *

75-12 Item No. 20 of the Agenda, being a proposed ordinance establishing a Downtown Renewal Advisory Committee, was withdrawn from consideration at the request of Mayor Becker.

75-12 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Lacy, seconded by Mr. Teniente, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Lacy, O'Connell, Nielsen, Teniente; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Morton.

AN ORDINANCE 44,988

APPOINTING FLETCHER C. McNEAL TO THE ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON ENERGY FOR AN INDEFINITE TERM.

* * * *

75-12 The Clerk read the following letter:

February 21, 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.

February 20, 1975 Petition submitted by Mr. Ramiro Trevino, in behalf of Dave's Flower Shop, 3900 Broadway, requesting permission to place a portable sign, 6 feet wide by 8 feet long, on City property.

/s/ J. H. INSELMANN
City Clerk

* * * *

75-12 There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at 7:15 P. M.

ATTEST: *J. H. Inselmann*
City Clerk

A P P R O V E D
[Signature]
MAYOR

Charles L. Becker