

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN  
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON  
THURSDAY, JANUARY 29, 1976.

\* \* \* \*

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 A. M., by the presiding officer, Mayor Lila Cockrell, with the following members present: PYNDUS, BILLA, CISNEROS, BLACK, HARTMAN, ROHDE, TENIENTE, NIELSEN, COCKRELL; Absent: NONE.

76-5 The invocation was given by The Reverend Mortimer A. Hawk, Harlandale Christian Church.

76-5 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

76-5 The minutes of the meeting of January 22, 1976 and the special meeting of January 19, 1976, were approved.

76-5 PRESENTATION OF BICENTENNIAL CITATION TO  
THE PERRY SHANKLE COMPANY

Councilman Rohde read the following Citation:

CITY OF SAN ANTONIO

STATE OF TEXAS

HEREBY PRESENTS THIS

C I T A T I O N

TO

THE PERRY SHANKLE COMPANY

\* \* \* \*

In recognition of its business program to define positive aspects of this great country's economic system to the Company's employees and customers by applying the 1976 Bicentennial year theme to its total marketing and operational program. Using such innovative ideas as Bicentennial red, white and blue uniforms, awards for sales contests, pens, baseball caps, bumper stickers and other items of Bicentennial colors, Perry Shankle Company reminds their customers of their gratitude for the free enterprise system.

A grateful community commends The Perry Shankle Company for this exemplary display of loyalty and patriotism.

\* \* \* \*

Councilman Rohde together with Mayor Cockrell and Mrs. Vivian Hamlin, Chairperson of the Bicentennial Committee, presented the Citation to Mr. Perry Shankle, Jr., and commended him for their Company's Bicentennial efforts.

Mr. Shankle thanked the Council for this honor and gave each member of the Council a Bicentennial pen and baseball cap.

76-5

REPORT OF THE BICENTENNIAL COMMITTEE

Mrs. Vivian Hamlin, Chairperson of the Bicentennial Committee, read a prepared statement reporting on the activities of the Committee. She said that the Freedom Train will arrive in San Antonio in two weeks and will be parked at the Lone Star Brewery railroad siding. She expressed appreciation to Mr. Harry Jersig and the Lone Star Brewery for making their facility available for this event.

Mrs. Hamlin outlined in some detail the major events planned by the Committee for the celebration throughout 1976. (A copy of Mrs. Hamlin's report is filed with the papers of this meeting.)

Councilman Hartman called attention to the Mayor's Prayer Breakfast which had been held earlier today and attended by some 500 persons. He commended Mayor Cockrell for putting on this breakfast as a Bicentennial event.

Mayor Cockrell thanked Mrs. Hamlin for her fine report and congratulated her for a job well done.

76-5

INTRODUCTION OF MARGIE PYNDUS

Councilman Pyndus introduced his wife, Margie Pyndus, who was in the audience visiting the Council meeting.

76-5

PUBLIC HEARING ON OBSCENITY, NUDITY IN PUBLIC PLACES AND MATTERS RELATING TO MASSAGE PARLOR OPERATIONS.

Mayor Cockrell opened this advertised public hearing and asked City Attorney James Parker to review certain ordinances which are under consideration by the Council.

City Attorney Parker reviewed the four possible ordinances under consideration at the present time, and made the following statement:

"Mayor Cockrell, there are basically four ordinances that we have under consideration, four different types of ordinances that we have under consideration at the present time.

One is in the zoning area of conduct within certain types of establishments that will have to originate through the Planning Commission and is in a draft stage now. That, I think, is going to be presented shortly through the Planning Commission stage which will ultimately arrive at the Council stage.

The second ordinance pertains to certain types of activities, conduct that is going on in certain types of establishments where the employees are soliciting products at rather exorbitant prices and both from a conduct and consumer standpoint we will try to regulate in that area.

The third ordinance tentatively proposed would be one involving on premises consumption of alcoholic beverage where there is no alcohol beverage permit under the holding of the ruling on the La Rue case to regulate in that type of thing where a certain type of conduct is also presented in the establishment.

The fourth would possibly involve a type of registration system to insure that within the constitutional guidelines that juveniles and unsuspecting persons will not have certain types of conduct or activity thrust upon them.

That is presently the basic area that we in the City Attorney's office have been working on, together with in the massage parlor that is one area.

Then, there is a fifth ordinance in the massage parlor area that's in a draft stage at the present time that is being considered be presented to the Council."

Mayor Cockrell then read a statement from Lt. Gen. John W. Roberts, Commander of the Headquarters Air Training Command at Randolph Air Force Base in support of the Mayor's proposals and efforts to curb nudity. Mayor Cockrell asked that his statement be made a part of the minutes of this meeting. (A copy of Lt. Gen. Roberts' statement is included with the papers of this meeting.)

The following persons spoke in support of proposed ordinances aimed at controlling nudity:

Mrs. Lorraine R. Horner, 630 Robinhood.  
 Mrs. Duane Poole, 701 Moorside.  
 Mrs. Robert Patterson, 307 Dresden Drive.  
 Mr. Victor L. Gonzalez, 443 Yukon.  
 Dr. Claud J. Bonam, Huisache Avenue Baptist Church.  
 Mr. Ed Human, 11010 Janet Lee.  
 Mrs. Mary Flinn, President, Archdiocesan Council of Catholic Women.  
 Mrs. Perla Sarabia, Women's Auxiliary, Bexar County Medical Society.  
 Mr. Phil L. Jones, Pastor The New Testament Church.  
 Mr. Lewis B. White, Pastor, Epworth United Methodist Church.  
 Mrs. Evelyn Linton, 11725 Caprock.  
 Rev. Charles Kemble, Pastor, Universal City Baptist Church.  
 Sgt. Hoff San Antonio Police Department. (Read a prepared statement by Captain James E. Despres, Commander of the Vice Squad)  
 Mr. Ralph Langley, President of the Greater San Antonio Chamber of Commerce.  
 Col. C. A. Deason, Executive Vice President of the San Antonio Retired Officers Association.  
 Lt. Col. G. M. Dwight, 1st Vice President of the San Antonio Retired Officers Association.  
 Mrs. M. M. Hughes, Jr., Representing Woodlawn United Methodist Church.  
 Reverend William E. Fortson, 10606 Rimcrest.  
 Reverend C. Don Baugh, Executive Director, San Antonio Council of Churches.

\* \* \* \*

The following persons spoke in opposition to the enactment of ordinances which might infringe upon a person's constitutional rights. They also stated that morality is an individual matter and should not be legislated:

Mr. John K. Courage, 1709 Lamanda.  
 Ms. Barbara Miller, 111 Routt Street.  
 Mr. Nick Shuler, 5214 Keystone  
 Mr. George W. Long, Attorney, Century Building.

\* \* \* \*

Petitions and resolutions in support of proposed ordinances to curb nudity were submitted by:

Harmony Hills Baptist Church, Jimmy L. Swearingen, Pastor.  
South San Antonio Baptist Church.  
Marshall Baptist Church, Reverend Jim Bowman, Pastor.  
Town East Baptist Church, Dr. Joe H. West, Pastor.  
Grace Baptist Church, W. C. Smith, Jr., Pastor.  
National Youth Moratorium on Indecency.  
Bible Baptist Church, Reverend Bernest H. Cain, Pastor.  
Fellowship Baptist Church, 6895 Pearsall Road.  
Faith Bible Church, Lee Patton, President.  
Richmond Avenue Baptist Church, Cecil L. Carnes, Pastor.

Miscellaneous petitions submitted by citizens attending the public hearing are all filed with the papers of this meeting.

Mayor Cockrell declared the hearing closed and thanked all the citizens who had participated in the Public Hearing.

76-5 The meeting was recessed at 11:30 A. M. and reconvened at 11:40 A. M.

76-5 Mayor Cockrell was obliged to leave the meeting and Mayor Pro-Tem Teniente presided.

76-5 PUBLIC HEARING ON THE FAIRCHILD PARK

Mayor Pro-Tem Richard Teniente declared the Public Hearing open.

Mr. Winston Martin, Executive Director of the San Antonio Development Agency, explained the project which is an expansion of an existing investment the City has already made in the Eastside. The existing Fairchild Park is 1.68 acres with a swimming pool and tennis court that are separated by Potomac Street. The proposal that has been developed by the Eastside Citizens Committee working with the YWCA is to take and acquire the sub-standard structures that are adjacent to existing park land, relocate those families and move them into standard housing, and add all that property to the Fairchild Park to provide additional playground space and programs for the elderly that are badly needed in the area. The San Antonio Development Agency has met with the YWCA which is located at the present time at the corner of Pine and Crockett and the YWCA will be a part of the detailed development of a plan for the Park re-use.

Mr. Martin also stated that these are monies that are available to the SADA and will not require any commitment of City funds at this time.

Councilman Black said that this project has been in the making for some time. Since the beginning of this project, there have been some developments which will conflict with his own personal affairs, thereby creating a conflict of interest. He said that he would abstain from voting, although he is supporting the project.

Ms. Ruth Jones, 3439 Willowood, Board of Directors for the YWCA, spoke in favor of the proposed plan for the Fairchild Park. She asked that the proposed ordinance state that the YWCA have priority in programming the Fairchild Park.

January 29, 1976

-4-

img

463

Mrs. Mabel Johnson of the Eastside Neighborhood Development Program read a Resolution in support of the Fairchild Park. (A copy of this Resolution is filed with the papers of this meeting.)

Ms. Debra Gaskin, representing the staff, faculty and students of the Healy Murphy Center, spoke of the dire need for expansion and improvement of the Fairchild Park.

Mr. Robert Forte, Pastor of Mount Gilead Baptist Church, spoke in favor of the redevelopment of Fairchild Park.

Councilman Rohde said that he would support this project and would like to see the YWCA be included.

Other Council members also expressed the hope that the YWCA be involved in the planning of this project.

No one spoke in opposition.

Mayor Pro-Tem Teniente declared the hearing closed.

It was pointed out to members of the YWCA that it would not be in order to specify in the ordinance that the YWCA would be given priority. The Council did, however, concur in the feeling that the Parks and Recreation Department should work closely with the YWCA in programming for this park.

Mr. Ron Darner, Director of Parks and Recreation, said that his department has cooperated with the YWCA in the past and will continue to do so in the future and as a matter of fact meetings have already taken place.

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 46,270

APPROVING AND ADOPTING THE EXPANSION OF  
FAIRCHILD PARK AS A COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT  
PROGRAM ACTIVITY.

\* \* \* \*

After consideration, Mr. Billa made a motion that the ordinance be approved and that the Parks and Recreation Department be instructed to work closely with the YWCA in the implementation of this program. Mr. Hartman seconded the motion, and on the following roll call vote was passed and approved: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen; NAYS: None; ABSTAIN: Black; ABSENT: Cockrell.

76-5 The meeting recessed at 12:15 for lunch and reconvened at 12:45 P. M.

76-5 PUBLIC HEARING ON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT FUNDS BUDGET FOR 1976 - 1977.

Mayor Cockrell declared the Public Hearing open for discussion of Community Development funds.

A number of persons then appeared to speak before the Council concerning certain projects in which they were interested.

Mrs. Beatrice Gallego said that funds spent outside of the CDA target area is in violation of intent of the law. She opposed the purchase of Pecan Valley Golf Course and allocation of funds to the Museum Association.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Ann Donaldson said that money is needed for drainage in the Dollarhide area and all this southern sector of the City and not for purchase of an unwanted golf course.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Olga Trevino, 739 Pickwell, also spoke in opposition to the purchase of the Pecan Valley Golf Course. Drainage and street improvements are needed in the area.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Raymond Castillo spoke in favor of using CDA monies for the Picoso Creek. He said that a very serious flooding problem exists in this area.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Carlotta Williams spoke on behalf of the Rice Road Bridge and Pittman-Sullivan Park and the dire improvements that are needed within this Eastside area.

\* \* \* \*

Father Albert Benavides spoke of the needed street improvements that are listed within the St. Alphonsus area, the St. Timothy area, the Palm Heights area, and 34th Street from Mayberry to Culebra. He also spoke against the purchase of the Pecan Valley Golf Course.

\* \* \* \*

Father Lawrence Matula spoke in favor of parks on the west-side, particularly, the Rosedale Park, the ICC area Park and the San Juan-Brady area park. He also asked that funds they requested for Rosedale Park be lowered from \$1.3 million to \$500,000 and the rest be offered to the Ella Austin Community Center.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Frank Alvarez, Director of the Barrio Betterment Development Corporation, stated that they have acquired the lease on the old Jose Antonio Navarro School and are asking for \$87,000 to make very necessary repairs to this school and asked for favorable consideration of their request.

Ms. Irene Alva also spoke of the need for CDA funds to improve the Jose Antonio Navarro School in order to continue the many services which the Barrio Betterment Development Corporation provides.

Ms. Elvira Lopez spoke of the several ongoing programs provided by the Barrio Betterment Development Corporation and asked for favorable consideration of their request.

\* \* \* \*

Ms. Janet Bell, Youth Guidance Case Worker at the Ella Austin Community Center, spoke of the dire need of funds to make

466  
necessary improvements to the Center to continue to provide basic human needs. She also presented a petition with 6,000 names in support of the Ella Austin Community Center.

Mr. Kent Miller, Member of the Board of Directors of the Ella Austin Community Center and Executive Director of the San Antonio Urban Council, reviewed the history of the Ella Austin Community Center and their needs for CDA monies to make essential repairs with the \$1.6 million they are requesting.

Ms. Meredith Norwood, Coordinator of Youth Services at the Center, reiterated the needs as described by the two previous speakers on behalf of the Ella Austin Community Center.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Beverly Blount, representing the Centro 21 Committee, read a Resolution passed by this committee in support of CDA monies for downtown redevelopment.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Hazel A. Miller, Executive Director of the Miller Child Care Center, spoke of the needed funds to continue operating the Center.

Mr. Bradley Scott, Teacher at the Miller Child Development Center, spoke of the need for the Center and the necessity of acquiring CDA monies in order to secure matching funds. He spoke of the many services and benefits they provide.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Helen Dutmer, 739 McKinley Avenue, spoke in opposition to the purchase of the Pecan Valley Golf Course. She said that CDA money should be used for the community and needed improvements in the Southeast area.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Atanacio Garcia, representing the Lanier High School PTA, asked for CDA funds to build an indoor-outdoor swimming pool near Lanier High School.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Bettye Chumney, member of the Kenwood Community Council, voiced her support for the proposed purchase and development by the City of land at the corner of Dora and Belknap Streets in the Kenwood area. This would provide a much needed park and multi-service center in the area and she asked for favorable consideration.

Mrs. Maria Castillo, Kenwood Community Council, also spoke of the need of a multi-service center in the area.

Mr. John Wandless, Executive Director of the Kenwood Community Council, also spoke of the need of a park and multi-service center in the Kenwood area. He said human and health services are badly needed.

\* \* \* \*

Ms. Jan M. Roy, South San Council of PTA's, spoke of the dire need for a park and drainage improvements in their area.

Mr. Cipriano Guerra, Director of Planning and Community Development, reviewed the improvements that are needed in the area including drainage, street reconstruction, sidewalks, parks, housing, library requirements, street lights and bus service. The estimated cost is \$22 million.

Mayor Cockrell said that some work in the general area is planned, and this problem area can be considered in a future overall bond program.

Mr. Nick Monreal, representative of the South San PTA, reiterated the needs of the South San area and asked for favorable consideration.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Patti Radle from Inner City Development Corporation spoke of the needs in their organization and submitted a proposed budget of \$14,535.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Baker Duncan, President of the San Antonio Museum Association, spoke of the needs for funds to begin work in the Lone Star Brewery facade restoration.

Mrs. Nancy Negley, representing the San Antonio Conservation Society, said that they endorse the redevelopment of the downtown area and urged support of Community Development funds to start restoration of the Lone Star Brewery into a museum of fine arts.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Henry Dillard spoke of the need for funding of the San Juan-Brady Gardens Homes recreational facility and asked for favorable consideration.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Armando Quitanilla said he was speaking for Dr. Jose San Martin concerning the Avenida Guadalupe project.

Mrs. Cruz Sellers said that the City Council must talk to the interested people living in the area to get a plan organized.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Howard Schulze asked for favorable consideration of their request of CDA monies to renovate a building for the Presa Community Center.

\* \* \* \*

Mrs. Margaret Lecznar questioned the wisdom of using CDA monies to buy the Pecan Valley Golf Course. She said that more of these funds should be used in parks.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Juan Patlan, Executive Director of the Mexican-American Unity Council, urged the Council to approve the request by the San Antonio Public Library for a branch library in Crockett School which MAUC has renovated. They are asking for funds for shelving and books.

\* \* \* \*

January 29, 1976  
img

Mrs. Cruz Sellers spoke representing the Neighborhood Housing Service which the Mexican-American Unity Council sponsors. She spoke of the need for funds to resurface certain streets particularly in the Sacred Heart area in order to continue their Housing Rehabilitation Program in the area.

\* \* \* \*

Mayor Cockrell declared the hearing closed and thanked all who had participated.

76-5

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD

MR. E. L. RICHEY

Mr. E. L. Richey, 1118 West Craig, spoke of the dangers that a pedestrian faces particularly at night. He has seen several automobiles driving around the City with no headlights on.

MR. SAM DIBRELL

Mr. Sam Dibrell, representing Citizens for Equal Taxation, appeared before the Council and presented a petition protesting the unequal taxation that presently exists in the North Loop 410 area and some taxation on the South Loop 13 area. (A copy of the petition is on file with the papers of this meeting.) He also asked the City Council to take immediate action to remedy the inequalities of the Board of Equalization.

City Attorney Parker said that the Board of Equalization is trying to follow the statutes, rules and regulations of the law, and said that they will bring a report on their procedures to the City Council as soon as the hearings are completed.

Councilman Pyndus said that the Council is aware of the need for the reappraisal program and they are working in that direction. He asked Mr. Dibrell to meet with the Board of Equalization.

76-5 The meeting was recessed at 3:25 P. M. and reconvened at 3:35 P. M.

76-5 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Don Thomas, City Public Service Board, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Billa, seconded by Mr. Pyndus, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 46,271

APPROVING AND SETTING THE ADJUSTMENTS TO CHARGES FOR ELECTRIC AND GAS SERVICE PURSUANT TO ORDINANCE 43862, AS AMENDED, FOR THE FEBRUARY, 1976, BILLING CYCLE AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

\* \* \* \*

76-5 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: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None

AN ORDINANCE 46,272

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH MAVERICK AIR, INC. D/B/A MAVERICK AIRWAYS, INC. WHEREBY SAID FIRM SHALL LEASE COUNTER SPACE IN THE TERMINAL BUILDING AT SAN ANTONIO INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT FOR A PERIOD OF ONE (1) YEAR.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 46,273

APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$58,561.00 OUT OF VARIOUS FUNDS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS, AND ACCEPTING THE DEDICATION OF AN EASEMENT OVER CERTAIN LANDS; AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A PIPE LINE LICENSE WITH MISSOURI PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY; ALL IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN RIGHT-OF-WAY PROJECTS.

\* \* \* \*

76-5

RAILROAD CROSSINGS

Mayor Pro-Tem Teniente said he had come across another railroad crossing where the tracks are in very bad condition on South Laredo near the Gebhardt Company.

Councilman Cisneros asked who had the responsibility of making sure that railroad signal lights are in operation. He said he had received some complaints where the lights weren't working and this created some very dangerous situations.

City Manager Granata stated that the Traffic and Transportation Department was in charge and they would be advised.

76-5 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Carl White, Director of Finance, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Billa, seconded by Mr. Rohde, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 46,274

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL OF SAN ANTONIO RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION FOR THE HANDLING OF DELINQUENT EMERGENCY MODULANCE SERVICE ACCOUNTS FOR COLLECTION.

\* \* \* \*

76-5 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: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde.

AN ORDINANCE 46,275

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A LEASE AGREEMENT PROVIDING FOR CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A HOTEL ADJACENT TO THE CONVENTION CENTER (MARINA HOTEL RIVER EXTENSION SITE).

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 46,276

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A QUITCLAIM DEED TRANSFERRING THE CITY'S INTEREST IN CERTAIN PROPERTY ON F.M. 2696 TO THE OWNER OF THE FEE TITLE.

\* \* \* \*

76-5

PARKING GARAGE

Councilman Cisneros asked Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss for a report on the parking garage at some future date.

Mr. Sueltenfuss stated that they had met with the consultants yesterday who had met with Centro 21. They will have an up-to-date report very soon.

Mayor Cockrell asked about the status of the road at HemisFair Plaza.

Mr. Sueltenfuss stated this project was going very well. They have progressed to the City Water Board and will get their permission to go through their property.

76-5 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: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde.

AN ORDINANCE 46,277

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH NORTHEAST INDEPENDENT SCHCOL DISTRICT FOR LEASE OF DISTRICT PROPERTY ON A RENT FREE BASIS FOR USE BY THE CITY IN ITS PARKS AND RECREATION PROGRAM.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 46,278

APPROPRIATING THE ADDITIONAL AMOUNT OF \$112,325.00 OUT OF THE PARK IMPROVEMENT BOND FUND FOR THE DEL ALAMO PROJECT;

APPROVING A REVISED PROJECT BUDGET;  
AND AUTHORIZING PURCHASE OF MATERIALS.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 46,279

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF FRANCIS X. FARIAS, INC. IN THE AMOUNT OF \$185,000.00 FOR CONSTRUCTION OF FRIEDRICH PARK SITE DEVELOPMENT, PHASE I, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A STANDARD CITY PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT COVERING SAID PROJECT.

\* \* \* \*

76-5 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by City Attorney James Parker, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Pyndus, seconded by Mr. Teniente, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Rohde.

AN ORDINANCE 46,280

ABANDONING, VACATING AND RELINQUISHING PERMANENT SEWER AND TEMPORARY CONSTRUCTION EASEMENTS DESCRIBED BY INSTRUMENT OF RECORD IN VOLUME 6653, PAGES 162 ET SEQ., DEED RECORDS OF BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS, AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A QUITCLAIM DEED IN FURTHERANCE THEREOF.

\* \* \* \*

76-5 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. John Brooks, Director of Purchasing, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Pyndus, seconded by Mr. Cisneros, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 46,281

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF DIAMOND FENCE COMPANY TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH GALVANIZED TUBING FOR A TOTAL OF \$7,583.84, LESS 2% - 10 DAYS.

\* \* \* \*

76-5 BONDING REQUIREMENTS

Councilman Cisneros inquired about bonding requirements of persons who bid on projects such as in the previous ordinance.

Mr. John Brooks said the person who is awarded the contract puts up a ten percent performance deposit, not a bond. This can be

in the form of a cashiers check, certified check, or a certificate of deposit. Upon the completion of the contract, it is returned to them.

In response to Mr. Cisneros' question, Mr. Brooks said no bid bonds are required for the majority of the contracts, only the successful bidder must put up a performance deposit.

Mr. Teniente asked Mr. Brooks why Border Fence was not on the list of bids mailed to.

Mr. Brooks responded by stating that previously the City Council had instructed him to remove from the mailing list those persons who did not bid after three or four times, and this was the case with Border Fence.

Mr. Brooks also stated that on large Public Works construction type contracts they do require a five percent bid bond at the time of the bid proposal.

Mayor Cockrell said that she had requested a conference between small business people to get their comments on problems they encounter in the bidding procedure.

Mr. Brooks said he is working closely with minority groups and minority business people and have met with them. The problem is the manufacturer selling to the small business company will bid directly to the City at a much greater discount that they would even give to these companies. In most cases these small businesses cannot compete with the large distributors or manufacturers.

76-5 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. John Brooks, Director of Purchasing, and after consideration, on motion of Dr. Nielsen, seconded by Mr. Teniente, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 46,282

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BIDS OF  
GENTEC HOSPITAL SUPPLY, JAY BRUTON  
MEDICAL ELECTRONICS, INC., MEDI-  
CENTRAL, SCHERER MEDICAL & SCIENTIFIC,  
SOUTHERN HOSPITAL SUPPLY COMPANY,  
STANLEY SUPPLY COMPANY, INC., AND  
HOPE MEDICAL SUPPLY OF TEXAS TO  
FURNISH EMERGENCY MEDICAL SUPPLIES  
FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$12,299.92.

\* \* \* \*

76-5

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE ATTENDANTS

Dr. Nielsen stated that every effort should be made to have the forms filled out completely by the EMS Technicians because the hospitals are complaining of the illegibility and incompleteness of the forms.

City Manager Granata stated that efforts are being made to form bilingual EMS teams in order to correct the language problems.

The following discussion took place:

MAYOR LILA COCKRELL: Now then in order to proceed with our final decision making on Community Development, does the Council prefer just to stay in here and work. All right fine. Now then, we have a great many requests, and we have a list of things that I think first we might point to our list of potential projects and ask if there are any projects that perhaps were brought to our attention in the public hearing proces today that you still want to have on the list of projects to be considered.

MR. PHIL PYNDUS: Mayor Cockrell, may I suggest we make the circle and ..inaudible..would that be permissible?

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, but I thought first we would get all of the list complete as to what was even being considered. All right, this is for consideration at this point not for adoption, so we're trying to get any other items added to the list for consideration. Yes, Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: All right. There was an item that was suggested for downtown revolving fund of \$500,000. I would like to add that one to the potential project. I would like to add, in addition to that, \$50,000 for the study on the renovation of the Municipal Auditorium. I would like to strike Item 17 off of the list that says tennis courts, \$340,000. That item is included in Projects 31, 32, 33 and 34. That is \$500,000 for the revolving fund plus \$50,000 that would..inaudible..

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. So you wish to add the \$500,000 for the downtown revolving fund for consideration plus \$50,000 on the study of renovation of Municipal Auditorium and you're requesting that we strike the item on tennis courts. Is there any objection to striking the item on tennis courts? All right, then that will be done. Now, then, we come to Dr. Cisneros.

MR. HENRY CISNEROS: Mayor, are you attempting now to get suggestions to move projects that are listed as potential into this status?

MAYOR COCKRELL: No, not yet. The first thing, these things that are not on our potential list that were brought up.

DR. CISNEROS: There is one thing I would add new onto the potential, I don't remember seeing it on here at all, is a set aside for Avenida Guadalupe.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Avenida Guadalupe, all right, and for what amount?

MR. CISNEROS: \$50,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, any other projects? All right, Councilman Hartman, did you have any other ones?

MR. GLEN HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, there was one item that is currently on the potential list that I realize we have another comparable item and that is the lighted softball field, Item number 32 and there was a comparable item that is in the tentatively accepted list. It just seemed like we had an awful large expenditure for that overall purpose and I question the possibility of...inaudible.

MAYOR COCKRELL: What comparable item do we have?

MR. HARTMAN: Lighted softball fields, I'm trying to find it here in the tentatively accepted list.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, on page 2 of the accepted list we had, I just don't quite understand it, we had that listed on both lists.

MR. HARTMAN: Yes, mine is partly a question and I also further would add a question of what appears to be an addition of what I gathered.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Was it additional money? Mr. Teniente.

MAYOR PRO-TEM RICHARD TENIENTE: Yes, madam, it was an additional project that if you look at Item 32, you'll notice that there is no proposed plan for a field in the Kennedy High School area and for that reason I thought that we could at least look at that area for a complex similar to what we have at San Pedro. These others are located in parks but this is the complex we're talking about, not necessarily a softball field.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, so you propose that Item 32 on the potential project is a major complex of softball fields at Kennedy High School. All right, 32B let's call it. Okay.

MR. HARTMAN: So I guess my addressal of that point then is the fact that it seems, in view of the fact that we have a lot of other priority funding, I just raised for question whether we want to, and that would actually amount to a total of say roughly half a million dollars for construction of lighted softball fields. I just wonder if in view of the very tight budget, that we have any way whether we can in good conscience have that large amount for that single item.

MAYOR COCKRELL: That is kind of in the next stage, what we're doing now is to.....right.

MR. HARTMAN: I just want to raise - my first question was confusion because it seemed like we had two of them and secondly, when we get to that point, I would like to challenge the 32.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, was there any other project that needed to be added. Yes, Dr. Nielsen.

DR. D. FORD NIELSEN: Well, not so much added since Phil brought up the revolving funds. Realistically, Phil, we can accomplish this with \$200,000. There is a \$300,000 item in last year's appropriations that have gone unprogrammed. I talked to Winston and others and this is relative to the conversations Mrs. Blount has had with us in the housing committee. We can reprogram that to match an additional \$200,000. We don't have to come up with \$500,000 right now, just \$200,000 will accomplish this. I would suggest to the Council that we do it. It would be very beneficial because of not only economic development or the tourist industry but probably as much as anything to improve some very, very unsightly areas in the downtown which I think along with housing and everything else has got to be done.

MR. PYNDUS: May I respond? I know we're not debating the item. Inasmuch as the newspaper article today says that from private financial sources locally, we will receive in the area of \$20 million I want to go all the way in the downtown area. I would like to stay with the \$500,000 for sure if it's possible.

DR. NIELSEN: We will have that. I talked to Winston. The \$300 is there and we add \$200 to it and we've got it.

MR. PYNDUS: Okay, permit me Mayor, we're going to cut this to \$200 because we have the three. Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: So the downtown revolving fund would be cut to \$200,000 additional for consideration.

MR. PYNDUS: With the understanding that it's being taken care of from another area.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: I'm sorry, earlier it's one thing I meant that it's not something new here but it is something on that apparently new budget figures and that's the Ella Austin Community Center remodeling. It's on here at \$500,000 and if we're going to work from this potential list as the list that we're going to debate on then everything ought to be on here. The figures I have indicated that we're talking in a variety of \$940,000 and I don't know whether we're prepared to do it or not.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, we'll put those \$940,000 as a figure for consideration. Now then, there was.....

MR. HARTMAN: There are also revised figures, I noticed it on the potential projects list the Rosedale Park had been slated for \$750,000 and I notice now in the revised figures that C.O.P.S. has indicated \$500,000. That's the current figure on that. \$500,000 versus \$750,000.

DR. CISNEROS: Also hasn't there been a revision in San Juan-Brady?

MR. TENIENTE: Yes, on this San Juan-Brady, Madam Mayor, there are \$250,000 from last year and so, it's on the second page, so we allow \$150 that would be \$400,000 that we allow the construction of the recreation center.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Sam, \$500,000 is listed on the request as of today.

MR. TENIENTE: There are \$250,000 that was not spent from last year and if we don't have land acquisition - we're going to get that from the District. So if you take \$250 and add this \$150 and at least change \$500 to \$150 and you have \$400,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, I think we might get comment because the original request had been for a million and something.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, another item with regard to budget figures on the.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Darner, would you like to clarify this? Excuse me, I was looking down and I didn't see you and I didn't want to overlook you.

MR. RON DARNER: This is on San Juan-Brady. We have \$250,000. The architects are working on the plans right now for the building. As mentioned the other day, the building is the primary function because of the Boy's Club which is going completely out of business there. The building would cost in the neighborhood of \$350 to \$400,000 so with an additional \$150 to \$200,000, it would get the building programmed.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, so let's put \$200,000 then to be safe.

DR. CISNEROS: For what?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Okay, \$200,000 then is the figure on the San Juan-Brady Gardens. Okay, any other corrections? Yes, Dr. Nielsen.

MR. CIPRIANO GUERRA: We're trying to keep tabs of the adjustments you're making if you.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, this is just the adjustment in the wish list. These are not.....

CITY MANAGER SAM GRANATA: You just cut the million.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: Please let me just update. On Ella Austin, we have a figure for consideration of \$940,000, for Rosedale Park \$500,000. We have scratched the tennis courts at the bottom of the page. On the second page, the San Juan-Brady Gardens is \$200,000. We have added for consideration downtown revolving fund of \$200,000, study of renovation of the Municipal Auditorium \$50,000, study of Avenida Guadalupe \$50,000. The Kennedy High School was simply a refinement of the first item. We call that 32B and it was left at \$260,000.

MR. GUERRA: I think the Municipal Auditorium study, again, we will have an eligibility problem. I talked to Mr. Sueltenfuss. We have a balance of \$60,000 in the account set up to do some repair work on the Municipal Auditorium. We can do the study with that money.

DR. NIELSEN: It's ineligible, Bill.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: It's ineligible for this consideration, that's correct.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Okay. It's a little hard for me to know who was next.

DR. NIELSEN: Just one other thing that we need to change.

MAYOR COCKRELL: One and then two, three, four.

DR. NIELSEN: The Milam School Park, \$50,000. I think that - go that - well, there was discussion yesterday before about that. On the second it should be 50 instead of 30. Is that correct?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Fifty?

DR. NIELSEN: Five zero instead of three zero.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I'm not sure about that. Let me just be - let me recheck that. Just a minute. I see the list is fifty thousand and would you clarify that? We did have some discussion on that I recall. Between 30,000 and 50,000.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: On the Milam Street Park, Cip.

MAYOR COCKRELL: While we're clarifying that one, Mr. Teniente.

MR. TENIENTE: Madam Mayor, in the blue list, in order to adjust the figure on page 2 on the Pecan Valley course, that figure of \$1.3 million should be changed to \$550,000. As I pointed out, from Item 12 where we had \$680,000 for the Hi-Lions for the softball, that was to replace - that would be using that money if it would be accepted by Council. We're not really talking about 1.3 because we already have the \$681,000 in Item 12 and then Item 16 we had \$63,500 and we were going to combine that and my suggestion at the time was to combine those two projects on the southeast part of town, and then use \$550,000 more so that we could come up with the funding.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, now let me recheck this. Was the Item 12 left in or was it taken out and made a part of this consideration?

MR. GUERRA: Item 12 was left in.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Was left in like it is. Okay.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: As \$681,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Okay. Then the additional for this other, should it be substituted for this.....

MR. GUERRA: That was on Item 58, I believe. That was left in at \$485,000. Is that the one you're referring to?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: No, that's Harlandale. Item 12.....

MR. GUERRA: Item 12 was \$681,000.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yeah, page one of the blue.

MAYOR COCKRELL: So, what Mr. Teniente is saying is that should the Pecan Valley be substituted for that item, then it would require an additional \$550,000 rather than a \$1.3 million.

MR. HARTMAN: But I think it's - in other words, it is not a case of reducing that figure. In other words, it is a case of not increasing the total by that much, is what we're saying, with regard to the total calculated portions we have here. Now there was one other item that came up during an earlier hearing that I think there was some discussion about the fact that and this was an earlier item, it was not discussed today. But just as a matter of clarification on the paving of Culebra which was discussed, I believe, the night we had in the Mission Room, what was the final discussion on that? I can't...I'm trying to recall, Mel.

MR. MEL SUELTFENFUSS: Culebra is now protected.

MR. HARTMAN: That was in there? Okay, I just wanted to clarify that. It's in the Urban System's Program, okay.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, just one other point that I wanted to refresh my memory on because I've had a call from Fort Sam expressing a lot of interest. On that entrance way from I.H. 35 into Fort Sam, did we refer that to staff to make a study of that area? Was that one of the items referred to staff? All right, fine, because I did get considerable interest on that from the military. Reverend Black is next.

REV. CLAUDE BLACK: I'd like to get some answers to two questions. One has to do with Pershing Park. I don't know whether or not we are involved...this is a \$30,000 item in the....

MAYOR COCKRELL: That was included I believe.

REV. BLACK: I was just trying to find out was it included in the.....

MR. TENIENTE: Item 31.

REV. BLACK: All right, then let me ask you another question. In addition to that, I'd like to get a clarification on Martin Luther King Park because I'm still concerned because we had an item in the regular appropriation around \$681,000 and I know you don't have that kind of money involved in that joint, so how is this going to affect, how is this going to affect the fact that we are putting this Boy's Club out there and that, how is it going to affect the general allocation and those services that are going to be needed with that particular facility?

MAYOR COCKRELL: You have it listed in both 30 and 32, and would you comment on.....

REV. BLACK: The only thing I was looking at the amount of money that you were involving and the amount of money that was indicated here in terms of the need for the \$681,000 which will be, will not be a part of this. I just wanted to see what part.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, are there any other questions or clarifications? Yes, Dr. Nielsen.

DR. NIELSEN: Since Mel is here, for everyone's clarification and for good communication all around, we did understand you to say that project No. 112, for street resurfacing of Columbia Heights, is, in fact, available out of re-programming money so we don't, right now, have to deal with it, but in terms of accountability, we're all agreed and I think you understand - that that's a first priority in terms of street resurfacing out of that reprogram money.

MR. SUELTFENFUSS: (Inaudible).

DR. NIELSEN: Yeah, right, but I think we're in some agreement on that.

MR. HARTMAN: There was also one - the last comment I had with regard to items that were on the board during the work session, the Thirty Fourth Street, Mayberry to Culebra, that was not picked up in the potential projects.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Oh yes, that \$37,000.

MR. HARTMAN: Yes.

MAYOR COCKRELL: That should be listed.

MR. GUERRA: Which one is that?

MAYOR COCKRELL: 34th Street, Mayberry to Culebra at \$37,000. Oh is that under Item 112? Okay, fine.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: It's part of 112.

MR. HARTMAN: I didn't see it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It's under 112...I'm sorry. Is there anything else now that we have left off the potential list to be funded for consideration? Then we are then ready to proceed. Mr. Guerra, did you have another.....

MR. GUERRA: I had a question on that, on that one last adjustment on Pecan Valley.

MR. TENIENTE: All right, let me tell you.....

MR. GUERRA: Subtract the \$681,000 from the.....

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: No, he's eliminated Item 12 as I understand it. And 16?

MR. TENIENTE: That's what I brought out at the Tuesday meeting. I combined the totals there and subtracted and.....

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: And insert in for those two totals 1.3? Using the difference five fifty-five.....

MR. TENIENTE: Actually, it's \$556,000.

MR. HARTMAN: It's only a difference in total? Accumulative, I want to keep that in mind.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Items 12 and 16 are the ones you're earmarking that would be replaced if we authorize the purchase.

MR. TENIENTE: But what I'm trying to do is show that there are not \$12 million worth of projects on this item. It's been reduced.

MR. HARTMAN: The net cumulative difference, assuming that that would be adopted - I want to make that real clear - is still \$1.3 million.

DR. NIELSEN: I was just making a suggestion.

MR. HARTMAN: Oh, I realize it was a suggestion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, in terms of procedure, it might be well to start at the most expensive item first and kind of work down. Would that be...All right, then we would start with Ella Austin. It's on the list considered at \$940,000.

MR. HARTMAN: In terms of actual - are we taking the highest number on the potential list? In other words, the most costly first?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, that's what I was saying.

MR. HARTMAN: Well, I think technically we still have to take the \$1.3 million item first. It is still.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, it was revised downward.

MR. HARTMAN: Except that that's assuming that 12 and 16 are totally off this other sheet.

MAYOR COCKRELL: That was my understanding.

MR. HARTMAN: Well, is it indeed off of that list? I think we need to make sure it's entirely out of here so that we don't get caught in a shuffle.

MAYOR COCKRELL: How do you wish to.....

MR. HARTMAN: Well, all I'm saying is I want to look at Pecan Valley in terms of \$1.3 million and not merely the difference between Items 12 and 16 added together, subtracted from \$1.3 million.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, would you prefer to start with Pecan Valley, would you? All right, fine, we will start with Pecan Valley. And for 1.3. And is there any discussion about it?

MR. PYNDUS: Yes Madam.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: Mayor Cockrell and Council people, to me when we make an investment in a certain area of the City, I try to think what the purpose of the funds being expended would do. As I look at the purchase of a country club and the limitation of some of the children with regards to baseball fields, with regards to open area and with regards to a larger range of activities, I hesitate to commit the City with the limited funds that we have to the purchase of this \$1.3 million facility. We also had this item thrust upon us with the assumption that we could depend upon the valuation placed upon it. We also have had a citizen tell us that within a two to three mile area, we have one of the finest public golf courses in San Antonio at Riverside. So, we also had the Director of Parks and Recreation tell us that there is a sore need on the Southside for softball fields. I would speak out against the purchase of the Country Club with its facilities. That, to me, would not serve the purpose for these Community Development funds for the overall use of the majority of the people, and I would instead ask that we include Item 12 as is, the Southside picnic facilities, \$681,000, and leave Item 16 for a later discussion.

MR. HARTMAN: Yes, Madam Mayor, I think looking back in retrospect at what we have gone through today with regard to priorities of, I would just sort of like to, I think we need to make a notation for the next time we do this. I would hope that we would have established some kind of priority system ahead of time, so that we could work from there. I grant you that is the Council's responsibility. I am assuming that by this time next year we will have a comprehensive planning system and programming and this wouldn't be necessary. Nevertheless, I think in looking at it in terms of priority, when we look at the total allocations as they are sort of tentatively laid out, we have almost \$4 million in park activities, renewal activities \$5.3 million, and public works, slightly over a million and public health drops off fairly sharply. When I look at, examine my conscience with regard to what CDA funding is supposed to be for, I have to think in terms of just that. In other words, it's for the development of the community and basically that to me means that the maximum benefit to most people in the community. It is within the law therefore that certain target areas are specified ahead of time and that actually constitutes the majority of the, if you want to say guidance, that the staff had prior to the time that we really began setting these items. I submit that while it has been argued that this particular facility at Pecan Valley could serve people within the target area, technically speaking, the facility is not within the target area, and therefore, I would have some difficulty with that. Now, from the standpoint of, I think the next thing we have to look at in coming up with some sort of conclusion is the degree of need. My colleague, Mr. Pyndus, has partly addressed that problem with regard to the proximity of two other similar facilities, namely, Willow Springs and Riverside, which are within fairly reasonably close distance of the proposed facility of \$1.3 million at Pecan Valley. So, there again, I have difficulty fitting it in from the second level of consideration.

The third point that I have difficulty with is looking at it in pure business like terms. As we all recall, we went through a discussion several weeks ago with regard to bonding of the City Public Service Board and there again, I think the Council made the decision to proceed with the \$60 million bond issue to continue the coal fired plants, but deferred on the \$90 million bonds because, in my view, strictly from the standpoint of wanting to have a little better feel for what they would be buying the additional \$90 million. I have to view this project in somewhat a similar context because I cannot state

at this point in time what sort of a business deal we would really be getting. I am concerned, for example, as to perhaps additional maintenance costs that may not be aware to us now. I am also concerned that perhaps the over extension of existing City personnel with regard to taking care of yet another facility that we may not be prepared to take care of at this time. Finally, I am wondering, I would think that there would have to be some sort of an appraisal looking at the experience of this facility over say the last two or three years, in terms of costs, overall costs, overall income, to see really what it is what we are buying.

After having gone through those three elements of my reviewing this particular problem, I have discomfiture in fitting it in under any of those three criteria, and I would therefore second the proposal made by Councilman Pyndus that \$1.3 million facility for Pecan Valley not be included and that I would be willing to discuss the Items under 12 and 16 at a later time. I would second the motion not to include the \$1.3 million for Pecan Valley.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Teniente.

MR. TENIENTE: Well, I am going to offer a substitute motion Madam Mayor because..

MAYOR COCKRELL: Actually, there is no motion pending at the moment. I don't believe there is any motion. There is no motion that has been made.

MR. TENIENTE: Well, I am going to make a motion then, Madam Mayor, that we allot the money that has been placed before us of \$1.3 million and make the following statement because I think the opportunity to acquire this Pecan Valley complex with all of its facilities and equipment, I think opens up almost an unlimited potential for what eventually will become a regional recreational center. The opportunity goes far beyond merely adding another golf course to the municipal system. By combining the 142 plus acres of Pecan Valley to the already City owned 564 acres included in the Southside Lions and Southside Lions east and west, the City would possess 746 acres in one continuous tract that could be developed into an unsurpassed regional recreational center, limited only by our imagination.

I think imagination, of course, is unlimited but I think we can do many things if this property is purchased. First, of course, and most obvious is the golf course operation along with the utilization of the associated facilities for recreational programs as meeting rooms, swimming pools operations that are there already.

Everyone is aware of the overcrowded conditions at our golf courses. That problem will be compounded when we begin the two year renovation of Willow Springs which we have done. Our pools are bursting at the seams every summer. Suitable space for large meetings is desperately needed and last but not least, we are far short of facilities for conducting neighborhood recreation centers and senior citizen programs.

Now, I am going to list some of the things that are available so that you can compare what you have to pay for it if you bought it now. You have 182 acres of land, you would have the golf course, you have the main clubhouse which has over 11,000 square feet. You have the pro shop with the dressing rooms, office space which has 7,200 square feet, the cart shop has 3,888 square feet, the maintenance building has 6,000 square feet, the parking, walk and drives have

100,000 square feet, pool and dressing rooms have 3,100 square feet, the covered terraces have 3,200 square feet and it has 16,000 lineal feet of fencing, there are 58 golf carts which are just going to be given there. There are quite a few pieces of furniture and equipment.

I think what is equally important my statement is certainly going to say that, reveal that the Community Development Act funds don't necessarily hit one target or one economic strata of our society. I think if you live in the area, you are entitled to part of these funds and I think that the misconception that many people have is that golf, just as is tennis is a rich man's game, and I don't agree with that. Golf is a game that is played by many, many low and middle income people that have an opportunity, but they are crowded at the golf courses. As I pointed out, you have got your possibility of other recreational activities, and so my motion is to purchase this facility.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is there a second to the motion? It has been moved and seconded, is there further discussion? Yes, does Mr. Billa want to make any comments?

MR. BILLA: I think Mr. Teniente said all of it but I would just like to briefly state that in reviewing in concert with what Mr. Hartman said, we ought to adopt a plan for this City. He is always talking about plans. So, I think the acquisition of this land would open up unlimited opportunities as Mr. Teniente has already pointed out. There are people here that are willing to pay the \$250,000 for a piece of land undeveloped. So, you see they talk out of both sides of their mouth. If they want something there, well that's cheap, \$250,000 just for a parcel of land for a park in a certain area. They talk about the flooding problem. Retaining this land and its open space such as this right now would certainly alleviate flooding. I would like to point out too, that I have been working on a project to eliminate or alleviate the flooding problem there on Bob Billa and Pollydale and those streets. This land is going to be given to the City. I mean it is not going to have to be purchased and I didn't want to announce that until the deal was consummated, but it is going to help that particular aspect of it. I think that if we are going to really plan ahead, we have got to acquire these open spaces at this bargain price. I think it is a bargain price. I have no interest in it. I hate to say that I want it because I live in the community. But I don't even play golf. I think it is a tremendous thing for this City to acquire this land at the price that it is being offered and the land is available for many additional things way beyond what the golf game is.

Okay, we talked about community development. I heard a remark here today that it is the consensus of those people in the Southeast that they don't want this golf course to be purchased by the City. But I have many friends out there that are golfers and they would love for it to be a City facility so they could go out there and play golf oftener and at a rate that they could afford. There are a lot of Country Club people that don't want people to play golf. This would open the door to many people that could participate in this sport and they could even go out there and hike. I think it would be a tremendous asset to our City to acquire this course.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Doctor Cisneros. Just a minute; I want to ask the audience to assist us - the Council is now down to the last serious bit and I, although I know everyone here has an interest and concern, I just hope that you will permit the Council to discuss it without further display of your feelings about it. Doctor Cisneros.

DR. HENRY CISNEROS: Mayor, I would like to say that I favor a southside mass picnic facility as outlined in Item 12 for \$680,000, and I also favor the Item 16 which is the Brookfield playfield for \$63,000. I would hope that the proponents of this Pecan Valley purchase would have seen fit to proceed on a more deliberate basis that is to say, to take the \$681,000 and it has been indicated that there is a good prospect that it could be matched BOR recreational money and then we could proceed on those grounds because if I am forced to vote yes or no on \$1.3 million purchase from CDA money for this type of facility, my vote is going to have to be no for two reasons.

Number one, I think we do have a priority procedure and we have process, we have established for trying to make decisions about Community Development money. It started last fall with a series of hearings in all the neighborhoods of this City and it continued on into the winter months in December with the Communities Organized for Public Services meeting with the Director of City Planning, literally hundreds of people participating in neighborhood groups and there is a process there that ideas came forward and plans and projects came forward to be deliberated upon. We arrived at this stage in the game and suddenly a project emerges from out of the blue that we are asked to spend 10 percent, fully 10 percent almost, of the total money that is available to us this year, \$16 million, on one particular project and in my view, that is kind of an intrusion of a project without following the procedures that has been established violates the spirit of our decision making process on Community Development money.

The second thing that I would like to say is that Community Development Act money was intended by the Congress of the United States to replace programs like Model Cities, to replace programs like Urban Renewal, to replace programs like Housing money coming in to the cities of this country. The idea was that the cities could do what they wanted with their general budgets and cities could make whatever decisions they wanted to make with revenue sharings but there were certain kinds of money that were to be targeted on low income areas for development of those inner city areas. That was called the Community Development Act and that is what we are making decisions about.

It is my view that this purchase of this Country Club does not satisfy the spirit and intent of that legislation nationally and it is just not the best use of the best priority use of that money. When you consider that we have the Ella Austin problem, when you consider recreational problems in the inner City, when you consider things like the neighborhood housing projects like at the Mexican American Unity Council is proposing, when you consider the needs for drainage like the Picoso Street project and street resurfacing like Palm Heights and others of them, by my scale, the purchase of the Pecan Valley Country Club comes in a very, very, very low priority.

The last thing I would like to say is simply that there is a strong possibility as I understand, that with the money that has been allocated to the Southside mass picnic facility we could embark on a very deliberate procedure of reviewing this proposed purchase getting an appraisal done by the City government of what that land would cost to purchase making and doing some feasibility and marketing studies of what that kind of further maintenance would be required beyond what we would do initially and then if the citizens want this project, if San Antonio wants this project that is supposed to be a City wide facility, then let's get it on a bond issue or let's get it expended out of our Parks and Recreation budget just like we did the Friedrich Park that we acted on today and just like we did the other thing we acted on today. I don't think it ought to be out of Community Development money and my vote, if forced to vote in that manner, will have to be no.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: Thank you, Mayor. Mayor, I want to answer my Councilman, the Honorable Councilman for Place 3, with these remarks. He has touched on a subject that I am beginning to have a question mark on this Council. Who is going to run the City of San Antonio? Is it going to be the City staff? Is it going to be various groups and so forth? I want to feel that the Council here was elected by the citizens of San Antonio by the majority of the vote to run this City. It is our duty to run this government for all citizens. I cannot steer San Antonio into a no progress or no future stagnation. My vote today on the CDA funds will act to restore strength and leadership at City Hall that we do represent all the citizens here and all the tax payers just not one area of the City. I am going to share the CDA dollar medicine with all areas of the body of our City. I want no area of the City to die for progress because of the lack of these dollar medicines that we talk about. CDA dollars belong to all the citizens of San Antonio. This has happened in the last 30 years of this City's growth and its progress and some of the areas that we are working here today are suffering and are suffering very hard from being overlooked in the past. We are growing in population, we need intelligent metro planning and it must be considered for CDA funds dollars for parks, playgrounds and regional parks such as this one.

As a businessman, I can see that this property is worth about \$2.5 million. I know what it is going to cost to operate. It is going to run \$250,000 about \$245,000 a year and it is going to have 24 employees, it is going to require to take it. But the income possibility of it, ladies and gentlemen of this Council, is \$250,000. As a Councilman I know the areas of the municipal concern and needs about our City. As a budget maker for the Parks and Recreation Department, I believe I know the Parks and Recreation needs of this City and I worked in this in areas that tell me that Pecan Valley Course is good for the citizens of San Antonio, for all citizens. It meets the criteria of CDA funds in a very strong area. I have read the criteria very, very carefully. They want open areas, they want recreation for citizens to come and enjoy these things. You don't have to be a rich man, like my friend Mr. Pyndus, to belong to a Country Club like Oak Hills. I want my citizens to feel that they can get the Country Club facilities that belong to the City. This is the thing that is the big issue to me and I want the support of this Council. I want five votes on this thing, or six votes to let the people know that we are representing all of the citizens of San Antonio here by our work here today. Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Let's see, any other speakers. Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: Well, Madam Mayor, I am just compelled to respond to my distinguished colleague in Place 2 regarding the matter of planning. In fact, it is the mere fact that I believe strongly in planning that I find extreme difficulty and heartburn to be able to accept this proposal. I think what we are being offered is a buy now - plan later plan which I find difficulty in accepting. I would like as a beginning to see if perhaps if we can compute the total number of acres of parkland in Southeast San Antonio or in this quadrant we would have with the purchase of this extreme bargain compared to the other quadrants. I think this would be well - I am talking about total acreage of parkland.

MR. BILLA: That's already been computed. I think Mr. Darner can enlighten you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, one at a time. All right, thank you very much. Let's see, Dr. Nielsen.

DR. NIELSEN: Just a couple of facts in particular, Glen. The extension of the Lions Park to include \$681,000 worth of investment will require some more staff. There would simply be no way short of charging some kind of a use fee which we don't traditionally do to pay for that. One of the advantages of this investment is that the Pecan Valley site is that we have revenues to pay for staff, maintenance cost as spelled out and this is a staff preparation, you know, unless

you want to start debating that. The final point that is pretty important, relative to this whole question of planning priorities, and investments, its all somewhat relative to Council makeup, demands of the time, as Father Benavides and I were talking about this. Priorities do change, I understand fully, but as far as you know, meeting human needs, Lord, we've got a responsibility to do that in a number of ways. Granted, streets are important. Recreation is important. It is critical at this time and I want to say one more thing, Madam Mayor, to assure everyone that there is no ripoff potential or anything like this. There has to be an appraisal or two appraisals, I believe, is that right. An independent appraisal and the City staff will have to either concur, reject or whatever so I don't think there is any way but a legitimate business transaction, if this is approved will be entered into and if the appraisals are beyond what we have set aside, we simply cannot purchase and the money will be available for another purpose. It's just that simple.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, any other comments. We could keep commenting and recommending - all right, if you can make one final point, then Mr. Rohde, shall make one final point, go right ahead and I have not commented, and I will be glad to get into it. Dr. Cisneros, do you want to comment? All right, we are ready to vote. The Clerk will call the roll.

CITY CLERK: The motion is to approve the purchase.

AYES: Billa, Black, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen; NAYS: Pyndus, Cisneros, Hartman, Cockrell; ABSENT: None

The motion carries.

MAYOR COCKRELL: This is a - let me ask just for any clarification, may I ask the City Attorney, we just want to be sure that the vote to include this in the project meets the criteria.....

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: This meets the criteria that you are guided by to put the project in and it would draw on these adjoining areas.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, so the motion has passed. All right.

DR. NIELSEN: Madam Mayor, for procedural do we need then to vote.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, then the matter of the other two 12 and 16 that this motion was just on approval so now you are moving to delete the other two, is that correct .....inaudible..... All right, will you make that motion.

400  
MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the motion is to delete Items 12 and 16 with the item that has just been approved, being considered as a replacement therefor. Is there a second to that motion?

MR. BILLA: I second it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It has been moved and seconded. Any further discussion? Clerk will call the roll.

AYES: Billla, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen  
NAYS: Cisneros, Cockrell, Pyndus; ABSENT: None

CITY CLERK: The motion carried.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the motion has carried. We now then have a net addition of \$555,000 to the approved project so that leaves a balance of \$3 million...it was \$4.3 that we had left. So we have about \$3.8 left.

MR. PYNDUS: I would like staff to keep count of that instead of us trying.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, all right, the next item is the Ella Austin Community Center and we now will consider your pleasure on the Ella Austin Community Center.

REV. BLACK: Madam Mayor, I would like to offer a motion on this. I think we have, there has been made an appeal for a \$1.6 in the original recommendation. We asked that there would be some conversation between all parties involved and we've gotten a report from the architect in connection with this recommending the \$940,224 would be used, would be what they would need in order to meet these rather urgent requirements. I'd like to move that as the amount of allocation for Ella Austin Community Center.

MR. BILLA: I second the motion.

MR. ROHDE: How much is that, Reverend?

REV. BLACK: \$940,224.

MR. BILLA: Do you want to use that odd figure of the \$224.

REV. BLACK: All right, I'll say \$940,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: You are moving for \$940,000, Rev. Black? And it was seconded?

MR. BILLA: I seconded it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, is there any discussion on the motion, the \$940,000? Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Madam Mayor, all indications are that the money is needed and would be well spent. I think we ought to.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Dr. Nielsen.

DR. NIELSEN: Having been rather seriously and deeply involved, I think, in all fairness we do have to once again respect the staff in this. I'm not in any way trying to influence anybody. I happen to be a member of the Board. I would just hope that there's a clear understanding relative to the staff recommendation and where they stand on this. I have no problem with the amount of money. I just think that this particular time it's critical that everybody knows where everybody stands. Do you concur, Mr. Guerra?

MAYOR COCKRELL: I'm sorry I just didn't quite understand the remark.

MR. PYNDUS: I'd like to.....

DR. NIELSEN: All this simply boils down to is simply that Mr. Guerra has said that in his humble opinion there were certain things that needed to be done. He's been in conversation with the architect and if he cares to express his feelings, fine. If he doesn't, I understand that also.

MR. GUERRA: Our opinion was that we needed to get a good look at the building. The architect rendered an opinion and I think it warranted, since it's going to be a public building, the City is going to own it that we get a better look at it. Based on our visit, I was not a part of the team, but based on the visit to the building by City crews, we felt that we needed to get a better handle on the building before we could come up with a specific figure. Making some guesses because that's what they were, as to what might be done within a reasonable time in one year because you had instructed us to look at a two year program, we recommended a quarter of a million dollars. At your meeting last Tuesday, and that was intended to do the roof, start with the roof, do some plumbing, do some kitchen facility work and then emergency electrical repair, by that time, we would have a much better handle on what else needed to be done to the building. That was based on the fact that you wanted to look at a two year program. Tuesday, you elected to put \$500,000 on it and I felt that, okay, you want to put \$500,000 on it, we'll try to spend \$500,000 on it the first year. And that's my feeling on the matter.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the motion is for the \$940,000 which was seconded. Is there any other discussion, amendment, motion whatever.

DR. NIELSEN: I just want to say for the record that since I am on the board, I'm going to abstain.

MR. PYNDUS: I feel, Mayor Cockrell, we should call the question. I feel that inasmuch as the figures were changed as readily, I would like to speak against the motion. I think we had settled on a figure the early part of this week. This was the \$500,000 figure. I think in view of other projects involved and the slick way we have of utilizing these monies, that we ought to vote on this particular project.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Do you move to amend?

MR. PYNDUS: I'm speaking against the motion. I vote no.

MR. ROHDE: Why don't you amend the motion?

MR. PYNDUS: I amend the motion to approve \$500,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: We have a motion to amend to strike \$940,000 and substitute therefor \$500,000. Is there a second to the motion?

MR. ROHDE: I'll second the motion to get a vote on it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: There is a second to the motion to amend.

DR. NIELSEN: Although I made my voting position clear, I do want to state, however, in terms of conversation, and Mr. Guerra was a party to them, from the architect's point of view, and he explained it building by building and whatever, that \$500,000 was not going to do the job that needed to be done, very candidly, and I hope that and I want to doubly emphasize that. Phil, granted that number was picked out of the air and very realistic, I don't think, the architect is here, but I think Mr. Guerra will speak to the figure that he did suggest and very emphatically said that \$500,000 was not going to get the job done.

MR. PYNDUS: He just stated that \$900,000 would not either.

MR. GUERRA: That was for one year, Dr. Nielsen. I was still going on the premise you wanted a two year program based on our discussion and \$500,000 was adequate for the first year.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion for \$500,000 anticipates a two year project, is that correct? Is there any further discussion? Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, just by virtue of the fact that we are rapidly running out of money and by virtue of the very large chunk that was confiscated on the last effort, I will be, I would certainly concur with Mr. Pyndus' motion. We're just going to have to spread this very limited fundage out a bit and I would therefore favor the \$500,000 figure.

REV. BLACK: Madam Mayor, may I speak against the amendment.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, Rev. Black.

REV. BLACK: The last time I heard a great deal expressed on the very nature of Community Development funds and how they were designed to upgrade the community (inaudible). I don't know anything that might be done that would tend to upgrade the quality of life in that community more than making adequate the resources of Ella Austin Community Center and I would like to speak against the amended motion in favor of the original motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, fine. Any further comments? All right, Clerk will call the roll.

AYES: Hartman, Rohde, Cockrell, Pyndus; NAYS: Black, Teniente, Billa, Cisneros; ABSTAIN: Nielsen

CITY CLERK: The motion failed.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion failed. We now come back to the original motion which is to approve \$940,000. Clerk will call the roll.

MR. ROHDE: Could there be another motion, Mayor?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Substitute motion?

MR. TENIENTE: Yes, a substitute motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right.

MR. TENIENTE: A substitute motion for \$750,000.

MR. ROHDE: I second it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, it has been moved and seconded that we strike out \$940,000 and substitute \$750,000.

MR. PYNDUS: Could we get some clarification why the change of figures?

DR. NIELSEN: Yes, very candidly, the architect had suggested that our of this if you will look at the two pages of figure 694,000 and... and the first three items total \$757,710, that's what this most realistic first year out of a two year program would break down to.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Fine. Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, I just would like to observe the real detailed planning we're doing on the expenditure of this large amount of funds, and I just wanted to make a note of that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Thank you, sir. We have a motion to amend by striking out \$940,000 and substituting \$750,000. The Clerk will call the roll.

AYES: Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Cockrell, Billa, Cisneros.

NAYS: Black, Pyndus.

ABSENT: None.

ABSTAIN: Nielsen.

MR. PYNDUS: Are we voting for \$750,000 rather than the \$940,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes.

MR. PYNDUS: Well, my original motion was \$500,000. If this motion fails, does the \$940,000.....I vote no.

CITY CLERK: We have two nos, four ayes and one abstain. Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Yes.

CITY CLERK: The motion carries.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the motion has carried. We now vote on the motion as amended which is to approve \$750,000 for the Ella Austin Community Center.

MR. HARTMAN: That was on \$750,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: That was the motion to amend. We now have to vote on the motion as amended for approval. All in favor say aye, any opposed no.

MR. PYNDUS: No.

AYES: Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Teniente, Cockrell, Rohde.

NAYS: Pyndus.

ABSENT: None.

ABSTAIN: Nielsen.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Motion is carried with one no. All right, now then the next item is the Colima.....

REV. BLACK: Madam Mayor, I'd like.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, the street projects are next in order. The streets are very important and also the Picoso.....

DR. CISNEROS: Madam Mayor, if I may, I'd like to - this is a procedural problem - I'd like to move that we go to Picoso despite the fact that it is a lower amount since I believe that there is Council consensus on this.

REV. BLACK: I'd like to move that.

DR. CISNEROS: Second it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It has been moved and seconded for approval of the Picoso Street drainage, any discussion?

AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Nielsen, Teniente, Cockrell, Rohde.

NAYS: None.

ABSENT: None.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion carried. Now, then, may we have a total of the balance.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: \$2,345,261.

MR. HARTMAN: We have that left in the kitty?

MR. PARKER: Yes, sir.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: I would move that we consider streets in terms of priority in community need. I would think that that would be our first priority.

MAYOR COCKRELL: What do you move then?

MR. HARTMAN: I would move really that we consider the streets. I think we, of course, running right off the top, we have had the street resurfacing of Columbia Heights under discussion for a long period of time. I think that is one I'm sure that Dr. Nielsen would buy, inasmuch as that was his project initially. I think the other streets resurfacing including Palm Heights, Eskimo, Sims and Cottonwood, 34th Street, Mayberry to Culebra, I would think would certainly fall very much within there. And I have a little difficulty separating the figures on that other group of streets.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The first one is the Colima-Vera Cruz-Tampico that is in the St. Alphonsus area. The San Carlos and so forth is in the St. Timothy area.

MR. HARTMAN: And the other is Palm Heights.

MAYOR COCKRELL: And then St. James and Palm Heights.

MR. HARTMAN: I would make the motion for the resurfacing of the streets listed there in the wish list.

MAYOR COCKRELL: May we have a total of what they would be to get them all so that we would have a figure.

DR. NIELSEN: A point of clarification again, Mel. It's not including the 300 and.....

MR. MEL SUELTFENFUSS: You don't need to include the 300.....

DR. NIELSEN: It was brought up earlier, maybe you missed it, there's \$340,000, and we discussed this before when this comes up within the next couple of weeks for re-programming, I think.....(inaudible).....

MR. HARTMAN: Oh, I'm sorry, yes, that's right. Thank you for reminding me. So, actually, what we're talking about here is the figure.....

MR. GUERRA: \$3,259,880.

MR. HARTMAN: Is that with the \$304,000 taken off? So, we're, what's our shortfall. That seems.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: May we have the total of the streets? Not counting... the \$304,000 for Columbia Heights.....

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: It would be half million more than what you have left.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Pardon.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: If you added all the items that were listed under 112, except the Columbia Heights, plus the items that are listed 148 through 155, you would exceed it by a little over half million dollars.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Now, the Columbia Heights is \$304,000. We're not counting that.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: That's excluding that.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Excluding that? And the rest of it is how much?

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: It would be \$2,858,885, and you have \$2,345,000 left.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Let's go one by one and be sure that we're both on track for the Colima, Vera Cruz and so forth.....

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: You've got \$882,885.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, there's some difference of some figures here. I have two different sets of figures, I guess is the problem here.

MR. HARTMAN: I have 1.75 on one set of figures, and here I get....

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: I didn't add.....

MR. PYNDUS: Mayor Cockrell?

MR. GUERRA: All of the streets here except Columbia Heights, you get \$3,259,885. If you subtract the streets from Irving, you're back to the figure Mr. Parker called out - \$2,859,885.

MAYOR COCKRELL: And the balance that we have \$2,345,261. Mr. Hartman, you were the one that was making this motion. What is your wish?

MR. HARTMAN: I would like to make the motion in this form that inasmuch that we are exceeding the or we're using up the remainder, I would like to make the motion that the remainder that is in the kitty, I think, should certainly be applied to what I consider to be a fairly high priority item in community development and that is resurfacing of the streets, and I would so move that the remainder of the amount be used for that purpose.

MR. PYNDUS: May I make a .....

MAYOR COCKRELL: Directed toward these projects with the hope that it could be stretched if possible. All right, is there a second?

MR. PYNDUS: May I make an amendment. I would second it with an amendment if I may. I'm wondering if we could review Item 58 on the proposed list. Item 58 was Harlandale area recreational complex. Inasmuch as we bought a golf course, we have for that item \$485,000. I wonder if we can apply that to the streets so that we could come within the budget, if the Council would consider that.

DR. NIELSEN: May I say, Madam Mayor, we don't know for sure because we've got an appraisal and a whole lot of other steps to go through relative to Pecan Valley. The situation with Harlandale is a vastly different situation. It doesn't have anything to do with streets or

anything else. It has to do with a recreational and possibly a multi-service center study. We've had some further discussions and that may just possibly work out to be not only a recreation area but possibly a multi-service center site.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, let me just make this comment. It is the Council wish to reprogram the balance of the money towards these streets. It is possible that there could later be some shifting of funds if something takes more or less than anticipated. Those streets would then be at least designated but that's the decision of the Council. Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Ordinarily, I would say, not ordinarily, in this case I'd say this is the kind of thing that Community Development money would have to be spent for so I would say that we should go in the direction of the motion. However, there are some other equally high priorities and I'm thinking, for example, of the Mexican American Unity Council Community Housing Project. Speaking, for example, for the Barrio Betterment Corporation Project. I'm speaking for example of the Rice Road Bridge, for example, the Immaculate Conception Park. If we spent all the money on the streets, I think we ought to take some of the streets and (inaudible). But I really think that what we need to do, Mayor, is either vote on what's been presented and vote it down and then go through project by project or look where there is obvious consensus like on Picoso and take those first and because I think the procedure we are following is going to get us in a bind.

MR. PYNDUS: I would second Glen's motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: There is a motion and a second that is pending which is to apply the balance of the money toward streets.

(ALL TALKING AT ONCE)

MRS. GALLEG0: Before the motion, I think you have a wrong figure on this. I have \$1.5, \$1,532,000 on streets.

DR. NIELSEN: Do you understand, Mrs. Gallego, there are other street repairs also?

MRS. GALLEG0: We're still considering the Rice Road and ICC and in order to do that we have broken down....

MAYOR COCKRELL: At any rate, we have all of these streets that are considered in the project in the motion. All right, then, we have a motion and a second to apply the balance of the money on these streets that have been outlined here. Clerk will call the roll.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, just one point of response. Dr. Cisneros' point is well taken. I recognize that there are some other high priorities.

DR. CISNEROS: (Inaudible).

MR. HARTMAN: That's what I'm saying. We've got ourselves in a box and my concern is over the fact that we do have these other priorities. I would hate to see us, however, to get in a position of fixing up one or two streets and then having some others still in a terrible shape. We don't take care of a community that way. We just have one or two nice streets and then still some in very bad repair, that's the only reason that I would (inaudible).

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right.

DR. NIELSEN: Realistically, though, until we spend over a \$100 million we're going to have the same problem.

MAYOR COCKRELL: If there's no further discussion, Clerk will call the roll.

CITY CLERK: (ROLL CALL VOTE)

MR. ROHDE: Abstain. It's not clear to me what I'm voting on.

MR. PYNDUS: Well, wait a minute then, would you make it clear please?

MR. TENIENTE: Abstain.

DR. NIELSEN: No.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Aye.

MR. PYNDUS: Yes.

MR. BILLA: No.

DR. CISNEROS: No, because I think we need to go through it with a finer tooth comb.

REV. BLACK: Aye.

MR. HARTMAN: Aye.

CITY CLERK: Motion failed.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. The motion has failed and we are now re-addressing the \$2.3 million. Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: (Inaudible).

MAYOR COCKRELL: May I ask Mr. Guerra to check with the representatives and clarify where their figures are.

MR. CIPRIANO GUERRA: All right. The list they have given is the Colima, Vera Cruz, Tampico, Potosi, and Chihuahua in the St. Alphonsus area and that's for \$832,000. Then San Carlos, Loma Vista, Tampico, Laredo and Hidalgo and 18th and that's the St. Timothy's for \$300,000 and that also includes Potosi and Minter. Then there's.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: How do they - what happened to the \$500,000 there?

FATHER BENAVIDES: The original figure was much higher. We have shaved it down in order to accommodate other projects.

MAYOR COCKRELL: So, in other words, what you are saying that these streets though they may not all be able to be done but \$300,000 allocated toward their.....

FATHER BENAVIDES: But at this point we'll take that, since the others will be out on the golf course.

MAYOR COCKRELL: What is the next one, Mr. Guerra?

MR. PYNDUS: I'd like to have a clarification of that.

MR. GUERRA: The next step is Eskimo, Cottonwood and Sims, St. James and Palm Heights area and that's \$363,000.

DR. CISNEROS: Instead of \$500,000?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: And how about 34th, that's in there?

MR. GUERRA: And then 34th Street from Mayberry to Culebra, \$37,000. That total is \$1,532,000.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, I move that we act on that basis.

DR. CISNEROS: I second the motion.

CITY CLERK: The motion is what?

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion is to move and seconded to approve the project with the amended figures and let me be sure that I have these figures correct for they're in the motion. The Palm Heights, Eskimo, and so forth is \$363,000. The Colima, Vera Cruz, Tampico and so forth is \$822,885.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: No madam. That came off of it. They're taking it off of their list, Mayor.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Okay. Then Tampico, Laredo, Minter and so forth is \$300,000.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: That's correct.

MAYOR COCKRELL: And then \$37,000 the Mayberry to Culebra, and that's it. The Delgado and the \$667,000 is scratched and the streets west of.....

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: It's different names.

CITY CLERK: Mayor Cockrell, I need to get that second figure.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. The second figure was \$822,832.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: It's Colima, Vera Cruz, Tampico, Potosi. It's \$832,000 even is the first figure that they gave and it's - and then the second one is St. Timothy area, 18th and Hidalgo, Potosi and Minter is \$300,000. Then they've also got Eskimo, Cottonwood, Sims, St. James and the Palm Heights area, \$363,000 and 34th Street, Mayberry and Culebra. And that totals \$1,532,000. And leaves us a balance of \$8,013,261 allocated, if you vote for that motion.

MR. HARTMAN: We have a motion on the floor to that effect.

MAYOR COCKRELL: We have a motion and second and these streets would amount to about \$1,500,000, is that correct?

MR. PYNDUS: Question, please.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes.

MR. PYNDUS: How were these figures arrived at? I'm not quite sure how we changed them.

FATHER BENAVIDES: (Inaudible)...in order to accommodate other projects and Mr. Sueltenfuss had told us that that would be enough for at least for a beginning just so that we could accommodate other projects that we felt were important.

MR. PYNDUS: Okay, now does staff support these figures?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Let me ask Mr. Sueltenfuss what he....

MR. SUELTFUSS: Let me say this, that my reaction was if we want to do this much dollar's worth, we can do this much dollar's worth. The feeling is we can't do everything for that amount. Now, if we can select certain portions of it, we can live with it in any amount of money of course but I want to make it clear this will not do the complete job.

MR. PYNDUS: Well, my question is, will we be spending money needlessly instead of.....

MR. SUELTFUSS: No. No, sir, we would make sure that it fits but what I'm getting is I think the point I want to make is that this can't do the complete job.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Mel, this is strictly overlay or reconstruction?

MR. SUELTFUSS: Some of it is reconstruction.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yeah but without curb, right?

MR. SUELTFUSS: That's right. No, some of it has curb, that's right. Yeah, but the point I'm making is that we would have to be selective, the point is we wouldn't be able to do it all.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: With the engineering in-house?

MR. SUELTFUSS: Yes, we could do the engineering.

DR. NIELSEN: Madam Mayor, in speaking against the motion, I just want to re-emphasize again that Glen, you know, you keep talking about planning, a lot of us do, I don't really see any coherence of planning involved here either. I would think that there are a number of other items that, well, for one thing, since you're going to assume that responsibility, that there are a number of other projects that have in my opinion far greater priority because we've got some reprogramming money coming up and this is all that critical and we'll do it. Fine. See, what we're entering here without any particular neighborhood planning other than what we've got in the Columbia Heights area or even any District planning or unless we can relate it to some sort of coordinated activity, it's just a shotgun sort of a mess that doesn't make sense.

FATHER BENAVIDES: (Inaudible).

DR. NIELSEN: That's going to probably even be done, Father Benavides, you know, unless we have \$100 and some million dollars to do them all, okay. It's just the way it works.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Mr. Hartman.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, in response to Dr. Nielsen's point, when you are in a situation where you're looking at sure dollars, you've certainly gone beyond the point of planning there and I'd like to address the fact that what we're doing here now is trying to allocate expenditure in terms of priority of need. That is the only basis I have and in terms of priority of need, I would view those streets as having a priority of need. And that's simply it in a nutshell.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Let's then move to the vote. This is on the motion to approve \$1,500,000 on these streets as designated as far as the money goes. All right. Clerk will call the roll.

DR. NIELSEN: Madam Mayor, I would like to offer a substitute motion that we appropriate - I don't even know whose list is current any more in terms of a particular area or some semblance of dealing realistically in what some area street needs are, but I'm not sure how you arrived at a million and a half, to be very honest. For instance, in the St. Timothy area, I see 18th, Hidalgo, Potosi and Minter at \$300,000 from the C.O.P.S. budget. I don't know what that means but I would move that we appropriate that sum - well, it just seems that.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: You mean \$300,000?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yes, that's where.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. The substitute motion is to strike out the \$1,500,000 and substitute instead \$300,000. Is there a second to that motion? Motion dies for want of a second. All right. The motion is seconded. Clerk will call the roll on the motion to substitute which was reduced to \$300,000 the amount available for streets...instead of \$1.5. Clerk will call the roll.

AYES: Teniente, Nielsen, Billa; NAYS: Cockrell, Pyndus, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde; ABSENT: None

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right. Motion fails. We then have the vote on the original motion for approval of \$1,500,000 for the streets.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: \$1,532,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: 532.

MR. TENIENTE: A substitute motion and raise that figure up to \$750,000 for streets.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is there a second? It has been moved and seconded to strike out \$1,500,000 and substitute \$750,000. Is there any further discussion?

MR. PYNDUS: Yes, madam.

CITY CLERK: May I ask who seconded that?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, it was seconded by Mr. Billa.

MR. PYNDUS: Mayor Cockrell, as I understand, Mel Sueltenfuss' remarks is that he can go a certain distance with the amount that we had appropriated totaling \$1.5 million. I think if we're going to cut that it would be meaningless and I would speak against the motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Clerk will call the roll.

AYES: Billa; NAYS: Nielsen, Cockrell, Pyndus, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente; ABSENT: None

CITY CLERK: Motion failed.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Motion failed. We're now voting on the motion.

MR. ROHDE: I make a substitute motion.

MR. ROHDE: The figure is one million dollars.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion to substitute one million dollars instead of one million five hundred thousand dollars, is there a second to the motion?

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: I'll second that motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It's been moved and seconded. Clerk will call the roll. The motion to substitute is to substitute one million dollars for one million five hundred thousand dollars. Clerk will call the roll.

AYES: Billa, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen; NAYS: Cockrell, Pyndus, Cisneros, Black, Hartman; ABSENT: None.

CITY CLERK: The motion failed.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion fails. The vote is now on the original motion which was to approve \$1.5 million for the streets, 532, excuse me, for the streets. Clerk will call the roll.

AYES: Pyndus, Billa, Cisneros, Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

CITY CLERK: Motion carries.

MAYOR COCKRELL: What is the current balance now that the Council has to work with?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: \$813,261.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: Mayor Cockrell, I would like for the Council to reconsider or consider the item 185 - restoration of the Lone Star Brewery and I'd like to speak to this item.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is there - are you making a motion for reconsideration and is there a second?

MR. ROHDE: Yes and I want to make a talk on the second.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, then fine. Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: I feel that many of these projects have been neighborhood projects and I think that this project is a community project and I mean the entire town. The funds that we will provide will be matched in its entirety for the restoration of this brewery. It will bring new dollars into San Antonio and it will also enlarge the downtown area, make it more desirable, bring in outside tourist dollars and I think that the percentage of money that this Council has dedicated to downtown has been very, very small. I would ask this - I would make a motion that we put this into the budget.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the - Mr.....

MR. PYNDUS: \$300,000.

MAYOR COCKRELL: \$300,000, that would - let's see, our balance was \$813,261, that would leave a balance of about \$500,000. Yes, Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, I want to speak in favor of the motion because this yes, I seconded it - this is a treasure that must be preserved for the inner city for the future culture of our citizens because it's there, it's in great need of preservation, it will provide jobs, and the thing about it is what's great about it is that it's everybody can get to it very closely. It's also being matched by federal dollars. This is one of the few programs we're voting on today that comes in and is equally matched and I support it very fully.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, is there any other discussion on this motion? Anyone, Dr. Nielsen.

DR. NIELSEN: I just want to - not speaking against the project, but to simply inform the Council that if we don't, well, if we do this first and there's only what?

MAYOR COCKRELL: \$500,000.

DR. NIELSEN: Well, if this is funded that doesn't begin to deal with a number of very important items that I thought we had some consensus on. One of them being the Unity Council program and the swimming pool, ICC.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Madam Mayor, I'd like to vote for a substitute motion, please.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Teniente.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Yes, I would go along with what Mr. Pyndus has suggested, with adding the 450,000 more or less, whatever the figure would come out for the Mexican American Unity Council and the \$50,000 for Barrio Betterment to close out to vote all in one. Put it all together. I would make that motion.

MR. PYNDUS: I would like to speak against the motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: That is a motion to amend by adding and would the second to the motion to amend.

MR. BILLA: I second it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It has been moved and seconded to amend the proposed Ordinance or the approval of the \$300,000 by adding the funds for the Mexican American, of how much, \$450? Then what was the other project? \$50,000 for Barrio Betterment so that in effect would close the funds out. All right, Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: I would like to speak against packaging the whole thing that way because I think we are forced to vote on some things that we want and some things that we don't want and I don't want to do that. I favor the Mexican American Unity Project. I favor the Barrio Betterment Project. I'd like to be able to squeeze some money out for the Immaculate Conception Park and the Rice Road improvements. I do not favor proceeding with the restoration of the Brewery with this particular money for the same reasons I didn't favor going along with the golf course with this kind of money. I think there are other monies to do those sorts of things with so I would like to speak against the bunching together of these.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is there any further discussion on the motion?

DR. NIELSEN: Speaking in favor, of course, I'm not opposed to the Rice Road bridge or Immaculate Conception, but we have in terms of if you want to be very candid about it both the golf course and the way we handled the street improvements we have limited ourselves greatly. The reason I am in favor of the Brewery Project is we have had a commitment relative to the International Trade Fair. I think that is of such high significance and I think there is a direct relationship there that I think it's very worthwhile.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: Mayor Cockrell, I would like to separate those two motions and vote on the restoration alone. Is that possible?

MAYOR COCKRELL: You would then, no, you would have to vote against the motion to amend.

MR. PYNDUS: Thank you.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, can we call the roll on the - oh, all right.

MR. GUERRA: Which Mexican-American Unity Council Project are you considering?

DR. NIELSEN: Housing.

MR. GUERRA: Housing?

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: That would be \$463,261.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: If this comes out?

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion now is to amend by adding the enumerated projects, the Mexican-American Unity Council Neighborhood Project and also the Barrio Betterment Project for approximately \$450,000.

DR. CISNEROS: Would a yes vote mean that you agree?

MAYOR COCKRELL: That you would agree to the addition of those to the original motion.

DR. CISNEROS: So, yes vote would mean that you would be adding it and then a yes vote after that would close out the whole thing?

MAYOR COCKRELL: A vote for the amendment adds those items to the original motion which then packages and closes out. All right, Clerk will call the roll.

DR. CISNEROS: I am voting no, although I want these projects because I think we ought to deal with these separately. I do not want the Lone Star Brewery built and packaged into this so we effectively close ourselves out.

AYES: Black, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Billa; NAYS: Hartman, Cockrell, Pyndus, Cisneros; ABSENT: None.

CITY CLERK: Motion carries.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The motion carries. We then vote on the main motion as amended which will close up the funds by this particular combination.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yes, as I understand it you approve \$50,000 for the Barrio Betterment, \$300,000 for the restoration of the old Lone Star Brewery which now left a balance and figure of \$463,261 to be applied to MAUC Neighborhood Housing.

MR. GUERRA: If you're going to consider that figure for MAUC the figure was broken out into three figures. If you leave us the option of working out how much of that to administration.....

DR. NIELSEN: That was understood. It's been understood with MAUC that within that \$461,000 there's (inaudible) that was understood from the beginning.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: That's got to be negotiated.

DR. CISNEROS: Mayor, I would like to speak against the original motion because I do not feel that this kind of money ought to be spent at the Lone Star Brewery. I think that when I have a choice between Rice Road, for example, improvements and Lone Star Brewery, when I have a choice Immaculate Conception Park and Lone Star Brewery, when I have a choice between perhaps adding some more streets and Lone Star Brewery, then I'm not going to vote for a package deal that includes restoration of a brewery that exists between that brewery and the International Trade Center. There's no decision on the Mexican government yet and when it comes there are - not commit themselves to any

particular geographical .....(inaudible).....I know that for a fact.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, any other comment?

DR. NIELSEN: Let's just for the record, Madam Mayor, that as far as the possibility of a site for that trade fair there's no question, however, Henry, that what we do in terms of preparation availability, encouragement is just as important as their input. You know, it's not that they're going to come in and tell us where to put it. We've got to do some homework. We've got to have some homework. We've got to have some options and I just think very candidly that this is one darn good possibility for a site as a potential, that's all, and he stood there publicly and said that they would be willing to work on the part of the Museum Association who has a bit invested in that area to help because of the importance of the International Trade Fair. That's all.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, Mr. Rohde.

MR. ROHDE: I want to answer my Councilman - answer the thrust of my Councilman from Place 3. I was just wishing that he was 55 years old and could look what culture has done for this country and the way we have to preserve it and so forth. When that place opens and he goes to its opening and whatnot, I hope he looks around and says, well, My God, I wish I supported this thing because it can mean something for every citizen of San Antonio. For the rich, the poor, and things of this City. Now, I will agree there's other needs of this City, but don't take culture out of this City because we need it. It's good for San Antonio.

MR. SARABIA: Mayor, may I speak on this motion, please?

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Sarabia, I'm sorry, we're calling for the question, I'm sorry. We have - if I opened it to you I would have to.....

MR. SARABIA: I just want to say on Rice Road two people have died over there and you know, we're concerned with culture, you know, take life into consideration, too.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, thank you very much. All right, now, this is to - the motion is for approval of the package item that would include the old Lone Star Brewery. It will include the Mexican-American Unity Council neighborhood housing and will include the Barrio Betterment Development Project. All right, Clerk will call the roll.

AYES: Billa, Black, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Cockrell; NAYS: Cisneros, Hartman, Pyndus; ABSENT: None.

CITY CLERK: The motion carries.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Well, I will go ahead and vote for it but I just - I really grieve over some of the ones that we haven't funded and I - all I can say for the ones that were not funded I will just have to say that I hope that we can get some of them in the next funding because we have some money to reprogram and it's just heartbreaking to leave some of these unfunded. All right, now - we have now completed - we have the Ordinance to approve with all of these additions the final Ordinance. We read the caption of the Ordinance.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Just a second. We have to take about a 10 minute recess and go upstairs and add up exactly what you added and come down and vote on that.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, is there any possibility of trying to get some of the "B" Session .....

MAYOR COCKRELL: No, they're gone. We had to cancel, the people have left.

76-5 The meeting recessed and went into executive session while additions and deletions were made in the Ordinance to be acted upon.

76-5

AN ORDINANCE 46283

APPROVING A \$16,000,000.00 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION UNDER TITLE I OF THE HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1974, AND AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION OF SAME TO THE U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT.

\* \* \* \*

MR. PYNDUS: I move adoption of the Ordinance.

MR. BILLA: I second the motion.

MAYOR COCKRELL: It has been moved and seconded for adoption, is there any discussion?

DR. CISNEROS: I just have a question on the Mexican-American Unity Council Project. We allocated \$463, 261. The Unity Council had presented two different projects to us, one of which was a housing project and the other one was the library.

MAYOR COCKRELL: This is the housing project.

DR. CISNEROS: However, the library was \$340,000 and it is my understanding they required \$40,000 not \$340,000 but \$40,000 is the bottom line figure that would take to be able to keep that library in the Crockett School Project. So what I am advocating here is given that we run out of money and we can't come up with an extra \$40,000, is to split the \$463, \$423 and \$40 in such a way that we keep the library project alive. If we don't allocate at least \$40,000 we're ruling that out and severely damaging the overall library project. I would like to have Mr. Patlan, if he is still here, comment on it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: I think we don't want to re-open the - the only other thing that I would suggest to you is that we are going to - when is it that we are going to vote on re-programming?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yes, we ought to do it on the re-programming because there's another point here, not the books, then you would have to go with the books.

MAYOR COCKRELL: On the re-programming, that may be after the public hearing on the library master plan and it maybe that then you would be in a better position to make the final decision on the library.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Also take another shot at that Revenue Sharing re-programming.

MR. BILLA: .....(inaudible).....

MAYOR COCKRELL: Just the total, has he rechecked the total?

DR. NIELSEN: I would personally have no problem having understood. I think pretty clearly what went on that and I would move that we amend this \$463,000.....

MAYOR COCKRELL: Does that have to be reprinted?

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: We would have to retype that part of it, yes sir, it would have to be in writing before you do it.

MR. PYNDUS: I think that this item as printed and as the motion is on the floor - we've gone the whole day and if we start one, I think, others should have the same opportunity.

January 29, 1976  
msv

-42-

52  
DR. CISNEROS: The only reason I bring it up is because number one, we know the conditions under which we made the decision which was after everything was finished, it was just bundled in. It's not their fault. It's our manner of procedure and our responsibility. We have gone the whole day but that shouldn't bear on the sageness of our decisions and, finally, that what we really are talking about is the fact that they do need that money to keep that project alive. It's that simple. I wouldn't be bringing it up if that wasn't the case. I don't want to be impolite or anything else. I'm told it's absolutely necessary.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is it necessary today or could it be considered in the re-programming?

MR. PYNDUS: This was not a high priority item in the beginning.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Mr. Teniente.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: If we adopt this as it is today, could we change it next week and adjust it or are we going to have to wait until what time?

MR. GUERRA: When you approve it, it still has to go through the State and AACOG and if you make any changes before that process is finished we have to start it all over again.

MR. HARTMAN: As I understood from Dr. Nielsen's statement, I think during the debate the fact that there would have to be two separate or three separate appraisals. For example, the Pecan Valley property and if that happens at that time, then that would require re-programming also. There would be some problem there.

DR. NIELSEN: Let me just say, Madam Mayor, that realizing the importance of the Crocket School Project, I know that Prospect Hill area is asking for a library plan for a library site and my feeling is that this is important enough to extrapolate right now. Can we just reprint this one page very quickly here and.....(inaudible).....

DR. CISNEROS: If you don't want to listen to me, Mr. Patlan is sitting there and you can hear from the horse's mouth.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: The \$40,000 just gives them the money to get the lease. Now, this doesn't get them the books and everything else.

DR. NIELSEN: I understand that.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: We can reprint the page if you want to.

MR. ROY MONTEZ: The money won't be available until June of 1976 anyhow.

MAYOR COCKRELL: May I point out that it does make a commitment that we have made a decision on the library. I think that if we consider it in the re-programming, that will be after we have made a decision on the master plan. Isn't that correct on the library?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: That's right.

MAYOR COCKRELL: If we approve that site or that area for the master plan on the library then we could get it in the re-programming, isn't that correct?

MR. GUERRA: Well, at the risk of adding to the confusion, I did say that. You could re-program it but then it occurred to me that re-programming money has to be committed, first year money, and it couldn't. Their building won't be ready the first year, so it would have to be identified here, if you want to use CD monies for it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: You mean the \$40,000?

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: You have to use it within a year.

MAYOR COCKRELL: The \$40,000 couldn't be committed in a lease?

MR. GUERRA: My recommendation with regard to re-programming had to do with the first year funds. If we re-program them, \$40,000 from first year funds they would not be able to commit them before June 1976. The building won't be ready, so if you're going to identify monies for the library for this purpose, it has to come out of second year funds when there's an opportunity to get the money committed.

MR. HARTMAN: Madam Mayor, just a procedural question. The statement that this has to be printed before acting on it, if we simultaneously print a line in there .....

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: It's got to be in writing before you can write it into anything else. It's got to be in writing before you can act on it.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Can't the City Clerk just .....

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: I don't care what anybody does except the City Clerk. The City Clerk's is the official version and his is the one that has to be changed in writing before you can vote on it to make it effective or legal.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Garland, will you put another add and then what did you call it, Mr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: .....(inaudible)..... I would like to make a motion. It would be an amendment to the final action that we would take that item .....

DR. NIELSEN: It's on page 5.

DR. CISNEROS: On page 5, item number 74 goes under the Mexican-American Neighborhood Housing Project, there be another add which would be called, Mexican-American Unity Council Prospect Hill Library, \$40,000 .....

MAYOR COCKRELL: That would be subtracted from .....

DR. CISNEROS: The subtraction would result with \$423,000.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Change that to \$423,000 and initial that.

CITY ATTORNEY PARKER: Perfectly legal.

MAYOR COCKRELL: \$423,261 and adding the Library.

FATHER BENAVIDES: The C.O.P.S. organization has been working on the master plan for libraries for a very long time. We would need to point out to you that we consider it a slap in the fact that another proposal would be given such complete and total yes when we have been working for quite a long time and .....(inaudible)..... It is a definite slap in the face.

DR. NIELSEN: I don't consider it as such Father Benavides.

MAYOR COCKRELL: There is a motion to reschedule these funds and there is a second to the motion. May we then call for a vote on the amendment. The amendment to page 5 of the second year budget. Will the Clerk call the roll on the amendment.

AYES: Black, Hartman, Rohde, Teniente, Nielsen, Billa, Cisneros;  
NAYS: Cockrell; ABSTAIN: Pyndus; ABSENT: None.

CITY CLERK: The motion carried.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right, the vote now is on the entire budget as amended. Clerk will call the roll.

BLACK: Yes.

HARTMAN: I will vote yes with the statement that I have severe reservations to the propriety of at least one item in this package.

ROHDE: I have the most comfortable shoes here in the Council. The answer is yes. This is a great package for the citizens of San Antonio.

TENIENTE: Yes.

DR. NIELSEN: Yes.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Yes, my views on some of the subjects have been expressed earlier.

PYNDUS: Yes.

BILLA: Yes.

CISNEROS: Yes, with the same reservations that Councilman Hartman made.

MAYOR COCKRELL: All right the motion.....

MR. PYNDUS: You can add mine, too.

MR. ROHDE: I'm sorry, I didn't hear the Mayor make any comment. If she has them I would like to hear about it.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Is everybody through. The motion has passed.

76-5 The Clerk read the following letter:

January 23, 1976

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

Madam and Gentlemen:

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

January 23, 1976

Petition submitted by Mr. John W. Harris requesting the City of San Antonio to release 140.47 acres out of the F. Cadena Survey No. 133 adjacent to Kirby, Texas, jointly owned by Mr. John W. Harris and the Estate of Mrs. Florence H. Meyers, from their jurisdiction and allowing it to be incorporated into the town of Kirby.

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

\* \* \* \*

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at 6:45 P. M.

A P P R O V E D  
*Allen Cockrell*  
M A Y O R

ATTEST: *G. V. Jackson, Jr.*  
City Clerk

January 29, 1976  
el

ADDENDUM TO THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 29, 1976

76-5

PUBLIC HEARING ON FAIRCHILD PARK

MAYOR PRO-TEM RICHARD TENIENTE: I'd like to call the meeting back to order and the 10:30 hearing on Fairchild Park will get started. I think the only way you're going to hear is for you to remain quiet as we start our hearing, folks, because we do have some registered citizens for the public hearing on Fairchild Park. At this time, I'd like to call on Mr. Martin, I guess you'd give us a presentation on this.

MR. WINSTON MARTIN: Mayor and members of the Council, you'll remember some time ago, the San Antonio Development Agency Board recommended to you two actions that they would like your concurrence in. One was the purchase of a Westside park that would eventually be developed and named after one of our policemen who lost his life in the line of duty. The second is the park that we call Fairchild Park and this is an expansion of an existing investment the City has already made in the eastside.

To help you identify the area, it is 1.68 acres with a swimming pool and a tennis court that are separated by Potomac Street. Both facilities are surrounded by residents which are in extremely poor structural condition. The proposal that has been developed by the Eastside Citizens Committee working with the YWCA is to take and acquire the substandard structures that are adjacent to the existing park land, relocate those families into standard houses within the neighborhood through the relocation funds that would be made available, add that property to Fairchild Park for purposes of expanding it to provide for playground space and action area and programs for the elderly that are so badly needed in the area.

We're counting a great deal on the YWCA which is located at the present time at the corner of Crockett and Pine and their on-going program. We have met with them and they will be a part, as will the citizens in the area, of the detailed development of a plan for the park reuse. We've been assured by those connected with the YWCA that they will cooperate and make staff available to help the City keep their cost of operation of the park to a minimum in carrying on the programs that will possible in this area.

There is no question of what this park has a great significance to the entire area that it serves at the present time. It's a park that's used by young as well as very old. The park at the present time is almost - you could pass it by without even being aware it's there because of the substandard structures shown in the red on the map to the left as you look at the wall area, and on Pine Street which should be the approach, it's an unsightly approach because, again, of the slum development that surrounds the park.

In addition to this, the people that are there have been contacted and are willing to make a relocation move to a standard situation. So you're doing two things. You're expanding the park and providing program area for the neighborhood. You're eliminating blight and unsightly development that is there and you're permitting families, some twenty-five, to move into standard housing within the same area and use up some of the space that is there to be developed at the present time.

January 29, 1976

el

Rather than take any more of your time this morning, you do have some people who are anxious to speak on the plan the discussion with reference to Fairchild Park. Let me say again that these are monies that are available to the San Antonio Development Agency and would not require any additional commitment of City funds at this time. These are funds that we have been able to glean from what we call our neighborhood development project which was the larger NDP area that was once Model Cities. These are funds that we are asking you to simply permit us to expand and that will be dedicated to the City at no cost. Thank you.

REV. CLAUDE BLACK: I'd like to just make an opening statement before others to come. I think we have recognized that this project has been in the making for some time. Since the beginning of that project, there have been some developments in terms of my own personal affairs that would place me in conflict of interest. I certainly will abstain while I'm supporting the project and think it's very good. I do want you to know that I'd like to have it put in the record that I abstain from voting on it.

MR. TENIENTE: All right, thank you. We will get started in the following citizens that have registered to be heard on this subject here. Beverly Dudley is the first one to..All right, Miss Ruth Jones is registered and she is second person. Miss Jones, if you would....

MISS JONES: (Inaudible).

MR. TENIENTE: All right. Well, that's fine, Miss Jones. Good morning.

MISS RUTH JONES: Good morning, Mayor Pro-Tem Teniente. Ruth Jones, 3439 Willowwood.

MR. TENIENTE: Can you hear back there, folks? I think you'd better speak.....

MISS JONES: Ruth Jones, 3439 Willowwood, on the Board of Directors, YWCA. Mayor Pro-Tem Teniente, City Councilmen. The Young Women's Christian Association, namely, the YWCA is extremely interested in proposed plan for the Fairchild Park. Mrs. Fairchild, as you know, was the first Director of the Pine Street YWCA facilities located presently at 328 North Pine Street. That facility encompasses an area of 1.6 acres of land. In fact, the park now adjacent to our Pine Street facility is named in honor of this distinguished woman, Mrs. Fairchild. The YWCA has a 58-year history of providing service to the eastside community residents in this particular area of San Antonio.

The YWCA truly recognizes the dire need for extensive development in the eastside community. We recognize the need because we have been a part of the community for 58 years. It would be detrimental to the City of San Antonio if, in fact, the City Council is not able to see the needs for community development in this area, namely, the Fairchild Park. The YWCA goes on record as being in favor, and I mean in favor, of development of the Fairchild Park. However, we members of the YWCA are the focal point of the community of this area of the proposed development site.

The YWCA specifically goes on record as stating that we, Young Women's Christian Association, be a part of and integrated into the planning and development of the Fairchild Park. We hereby request from you, City Councilmen, that the proposed ordinance presented before you today states that the YWCA have priority in programming the Fairchild Park.

Our understanding is, and I know it is rightfully so that you, the City Council of San Antonio do indeed see us as an integral part of Fairchild Park because, 1) The YWCA is servicing and we have been servicing the community of San Antonio for 58 years. 2) We, the YWCA, are the focal point of the community because we have not only provided recreational facilities for residents of this area but we also provide human development which no other agency can attest to. The YWCA has proven to the City of San Antonio that we develop community leaders like our distinguished Reverend Claude Black, like Nancy Bohman, like Mrs. Lounelle Sutton, the Mrs. Black, the Mrs. G. J. Sutton. We have proved that we, a community organization take a definite stand in the quality of life in that community. All the people that I have mentioned, and you know them very well, have a traceable, a traceable heritage in the YWCA.

We, the YWCA, Young Women's Christian Association request that you, the City Council of San Antonio, incorporate in the proposed ordinance that you consider and completely consider, please, that the YWCA have the priority in programming in that area. I must say to you, Honorable councilmen, that unless you incorporate this into this ordinance that the very life of the community of the Fairchild Park area will be taken away, will be taken away because the members of the community, we the YWCA, the focal point of the community will die because we will be strangled. Thank you.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Thank you, Ruth. Now we have Mabel Johnson from the Eastside Neighborhood Project Area Committee, Neighborhood Development Program. Ms. Johnson.

MS. MABEL JOHNSON: To the Honorable Mayor Pro-Tem and City Council members. I am Mabel Johnson representing the Neighborhood Development Program project area committee.

#### A RESOLUTION

APPROVING THE EXPANSION OF FAIRCHILD PARK AS A COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY BY THE URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, AND RECOMMENDING SAID EXPANSION TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR APPROVAL.

WHEREAS, the Urban Renewal Agency of the City of San Antonio (a/k/a San Antonio Development Agency) has proposed the expansion of Fairchild Park as a Community Development Activity, located within the City of San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas; and

WHEREAS, the general scope of the Expansion Plan being the designation of all properties within NEW CITY BLOCK 1374, with the exception of the existing YWCA and park properties, for acquisition and subsequent development for park purposes; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of the project being the expansion of existing park land and facilities, and the improvement of the residential character and environment of the immediate area by removing deteriorating and substandard housing; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED BY THE EASTSIDE NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM PROJECT AREA COMMITTEE:

1. The Fairchild Park Expansion Plan, as presented, is hereby ratified, adopted, and approved.

2. It is hereby recommended to the City Council of the City of San Antonio that the aforementioned Expansion Plan be adopted and implemented as provided by law; and that the San Antonio Development Agency proceed as soon as possible with implementation activities.

PASSED AND APPROVED this 8th day of January, 1976.

Alice W. Hines, Chairman

ATTEST: Marion N. Hopkins, Secretary

Resolution No. 5

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Thank you, madam. Mr. G. L. Pastrano. Is Mr. Pastrano here? Debra Gaskin.

DEBRA GASKIN: City Council and City staff, my name is Debra Gaskin and I'm representing the students, staff and faculty of the Healy Murphy Learning Center which I would like to .....(inaudible).....

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Would you speak a little closer into the mike. Move it towards you, please.

DEBRA GASKIN: When I first heard of the possible improvement and expansion of Fairchild Park my response was, well, what's Fairchild Park? Now I've lived on the eastside of San Antonio all my life and I've rode around the community and worn out many shoes, you know, getting around in the neighborhood. I was never aware of any part at Center Street pool called Fairchild Park. So I went by the park the other day and I checked it out and there was a park there, you know, two swings, a slide, a merry-go-round, and two tennis courts. Then I thought about how I could have been missing all this excitement. Then I remembered a couple of times during the summer when I went to the park there were so many people there, it was so crowded until the only thing I could think about was, you know, getting a quick splash and getting out of there and I have to wonder if I'd be able to get out with all my friends crushing themselves into the pool because it's so small. Now I understand what was meant when I was told of the expansion and the improvement of Fairchild Park. We here, especially my fellow classmates know who lived on the eastside of San Antonio all our lives growing and playing, we urge the City Council to hear our community's appeal for development of Fairchild Park. You know, another pool or a much larger pool, restrooms, dressing rooms, water fountains, lighted tennis and basketball courts, a full size gym with a regulation size basketball court which could be rented by our school as well as other groups in need of a large enclosed area. These are just some of the possibilities, the dreams which can be made realities by you with your support in favor of Fairchild Park expansion. Thank you.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Ms. Ruth Woodward. Ms. Woodward is not here. Charles Williams. Is Charles Williams here? No. Robert Porte.

MR. ROBERT PORTE: To the Honorable councilmen, I'm Robert Porte, the pastor of the Mount Giliad Baptist Church located at 1319 Crockett Street with an approximate membership of some 400 parishioners. I come before you today asking that this Council accept the proposal of the San Antonio Development Agency in regard to the Development of Fairchild Park. The residents in and around the Denver Heights area feel that this would be a tremendous asset to those citizens living in and around the Denver Heights community. For truly the citizenry in this community are in desperate need of recreational facilities within the boundaries of their own community. We are aware of the trends that have developed in prior years that has lead us to believe that if we are to enjoy the benefits being offered by our growing City we must face the problems of transportation in getting outside of our own community. This has never been an acceptable idea in the Black community for having had no part in City planning the trend continues. We are aware of the fact that this area has no decent recreational facilities within several miles of this neighborhood. So, the Fairchild Park will be a tremendous value to those people who are in this area.

We're asking that this City Council allow our people the opportunity to participate in the planning of the recreational facilities in their own neighborhood. We feel that a neighborhood devoid of park, playground, swimming pools, and gymnasiums are destined to become ghetto and slum areas being overlooked in planning growth patterns by the City planning board. Truly, the Denver Heights area should not be destined to this future for the Denver Heights area is one of San Antonio's oldest Black communities. We ask that this Council does not allow this community to remain the inheritors of a park that is in such desperate need of redeveloping. We're asking that this park be redeveloped according to the proposals recommended by the San Antonio Development Agency for truly, a city is judged by the concern that it

has for the communities that go to make it a strong city. So, in behalf of the membership of Mount Giliad Baptist Church and the families living in and around the Denver Heights area, we ask that the Fairchild Park be developed and become another one of San Antonio's parks in which the City can truly take pride in. I thank you for your time and I'm hoping that these efforts are not wasted and that they're not calling upon an unconcerned City Council.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Thank you very much, Mr. Porte. Folks, this concludes the list of people that have registered to sign up for the public hearing on Fairchild Park. Mr. Martin, did you have any.....

MR. MARTIN: No sir, unless there are questions.

MR. ROHDE: Mayor, I expect support for the citizens of the eastside, Winston, and I hate to change ordinances after they have been approved by the - by the legal staff and your staff. There's no question that as an interested citizen and as a person next door to this property that the YWCA has a lot of input and so forth in planning. Is that right?

MR. MARTIN: No sir, in fact we feel they are a very integral part of the operation of what comes back. Their programs are on-going and the Parks Department welcomes their input.

MR. ROHDE: Have they ever been denied any input?

MR. MARTIN: No, sir, not that I know of.

DR. NIELSEN: I understand there is a - that something's been posted so if we chose we could act on this today. My only reservation would be that if that be the case, what does seem to be the misunderstanding if in fact there is one between the YWCA and unless we can resolve that and I'm sure we can, I would not want to act on it today.

MR. MARTIN: I think that all needs to be done, Dr. Nielsen, as far as who - if you motion to approve the resolution today approving the expenditure by the agency that you instruct us to include the YWCA and their people in the planning process and in the use of the park as it's developed because we would welcome this but if it's a matter of their being concerned you might get it on record that way.

REVEREND BLACK: I would be certainly willing to, as far as the offering a motion I cannot vote on the issue of that but I would certainly entertain a motion to the effect that the YWCA be involved. I think it would be ridiculous to try to develop that without involving them. I have not understood that.

DR. NIELSEN: Well, yes, huh, Ruth or Chauncy or somebody.....

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Will you please come forward if you are going to speak so that it can be taped.

UNKNOWN: The YWCA was involved in the neighborhood development committee program meeting in September and since that time until a week ago we heard nothing about it. We have not been prepared. We have not had input and our concern is not that we haven't had program input in the past but our concern is that if the City Parks and Recreation come in to program that area with its expanded facilities that we, maybe in a year or two, it is developed we will not be allowed to have programming priority and this has happened in the City of San Antonio, now. We do not have, as you know, a land around our down town facility and we have to use not the swimming pool but the tennis courts and we have to go to all the Catholic Churches we spend most of our time trying to find tennis courts because we don't have them in our possession and City Parks and Recreation have not let us use them.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Let me ask you a question. Are you suggesting then when you take charge of the tennis courts, for instance, that the average citizen that does not belong to your program could not use them?

UNKNOWN: No, not at all. As a matter of fact we are a non-denominational organization. It's just that we have a \$4.00 membership for adults and a \$1.00 for children. I mean it's very minimal, you know, the membership fee. It is not like some of the other organizations. We are not restricted in any way but we do depend on income for swimming classes and tennis classes and other physical education classes in order to maintain our facilities along with United Way funding.

DR. CISNEROS: I have a question I would like Ron Darner, I wonder if you could answer badly needed facility and that what we need to do is get going and authorize the initiation of this project and whatever financial steps that have to be taken, whatever statutory direction to SADA or anybody else we get on the way and then the onus is upon those that will participate as programmed participants to work out something that is the best interest of the community.

UNKNOWN: But what are we saying is that we haven't been consulted.

DR. CISNEROS: I understand that, I think I understand what you are saying and that is that you haven't been consulted and you want to make sure your program priorities are given attention. I think there is certainly no conflict with the City's objectives and I would like to have Ron address himself to that so that before this Council and before any action is taken that we have a clear understanding both to the City family and to those of you other who are also going to be program participants what the relationship is.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: I think the City Manager has a statement.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yes, before Ron addresses you, may I say, we entertain their input but we can't guarantee. They can certainly have input but I think what they want is guarantee and, of course, it would have to be open to the public. You can't give them control.

DR. NIELSEN: Well, then let's get a clear understanding of what kind of relationship and what kind of cooperation there is going to be, otherwise we may just end up kidding ourselves and I don't want to do that.

RON DARNER: I think that there not only should be, but will be, complete cooperation between the YW as in the past on summer programs or any other type of programs that we have carried on. The pools are an example of that. The tennis courts, of course, are on a first come first served basis.

DR. NIELSEN: Can you not, very candidly, like, you know, out here on McFarlin, you set up special times .....

MR. DARNER: McFarlin is the only courts that are on special times. The other courts are not.

DR. NIELSEN: Is there any particular problem, knowing the history and everything else in that particular area, of setting up some priority times for the Y's program at least on the tennis courts? Is that such a problem?

MR. DARNER: No, I am sure there could be, I am sure it could be providing that the times could be worked out. Right now, the YW, face facts, is there at the present time and.....

MR. HARTMAN: I think perhaps I would like to see the two participants here get together and I would like to, Mr. Mayor, defer the action perhaps until later this afternoon to see if there is some kind of more precise arrangement that can be established. I have no objections with regard to the project, but I think we are at a point right here that we sort.....

DR. CISNEROS: Let me outline if I can what might be a compromise and that would be rather than defer action because I think to defer action is not going to solve any problem. They could sit down and they could sit in a room and they are not, if they agree, the agreement doesn't mean anything because its implementation later on that matters and if they don't agree we are in the same bind. So, what I suggest is a two part motion which I would like to make.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Let me do this first thing and close the hearing. I am going to declare this hearing closed so that now we can come into any formal action that we may.....

DR. CISNEROS: I think the motion ought to have two parts. Number one, it ought to suggest that we move ahead on the statutory direction and on the financial issues. The second part of it ought to be that there be a City Council Committee on which Dr. Nielsen ought to be a member along with other members of the Council to participate with the Y, other interested parties to make sure that the priority attention that this Council is concerned about is given. That would be the kind of motion I would make and if there is consensus on it .....

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Okay, Mr. Billa.

MR. BILLA: Isn't there a precedent, I mean for cooperation between the Y and the Parks Department? There is a precedent and I can't see whether there is any big problem.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: We have it with Boys Club, we have it with other.....

MR. HARTMAN: Well, that was essentially the thrust of my suggestion. I think there is going to be precedent, there is bound to be something that you can point to that indicates what would be the arrangement rather than trying to, you know, fish it from the air at this stage. I would like to see us pursue it a bit more formally and I see no reason why we can't defer this until later in the session.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: Okay, Mr. Pyndus.

MR. PYNDUS: I would like to suggest that inasmuch as this is a Public Hearing and inasmuch as there are other individuals to be heard, that this Council does not act with a motion or an Ordinance at this time and I would suggest that we go back into a Public Hearing and, all right, I feel that I would like to look into it rather than pass the motion. I will speak against the motion.

MAYOR PRO-TEM TENIENTE: There is no motion at this point.

DR. CISNEROS: If it will facilitate things any, I would like to make it in a formal motion that we proceed with it in that two part fashion. One, .....

MR. ROHDE: I would like to hear Reverend Black before I do anything on this.

REVEREND BLACK: Let me just define the, it seems to me, the action we are taking. One is, we are taking action in order to begin the process of a park. Now, we don't have a park. There is nothing to cooperate on. You see, there is nothing to cooperate on, we don't have a park. Now, it seems to me that there has been the history of the relationship that's there. The Y has been there, is there right now, they are faced with problems in terms of facilities, resources, right now they have got that problem because there is nothing there of value. But now, if you get something there, it seems to me that you have got something really to work on in terms of some real cooperation. When I say nothing there, I don't mean that you don't have a pool there, you don't have a tennis court, but what I am saying is, what you are talking about is really enlarging this and then having something really, really to talk about, really get engaged in. Now, it seems to me that the advantage that this has to the City is that you have an established agency there that can

facilitate and implement this park and this is important. I would not even be, I wouldn't think about supporting it if it didn't have the agency - the reason is of value - you've got an agency there that can help implement the program there. So it would be obviously ridiculous on the part of the City to become involved in this without relating it to the agency. We are putting other agencies on parks like this. Here we've got an agency on an area that is being expanded. So, I don't see the reason for delaying it because without it, we don't have anything to discuss. All we are talking about now, I think we need to separate those two issues. What we are talking about now is establishing the park. Then we can come back and say, okay, we are instructing SADA to relate in the planning to the Y. Then they will come back and report to us the programming and then we will act on that. I think we have got two actions.

DR. NIELSEN: One final question. Now, SADA certainly is going to be involved in the early stages. Down the road, however, as I hear the Y's concern, it will be basic with the Parks and Recreation Department. The long term relationship and cooperation is going to have to be there. I am sure the tennis courts, general use of land and pool time will probably be the three questions, uncertain areas of agreement, cooperation and so on.

MISS JONES: No, no, well you can't. Maybe you are not understanding what I am saying. Okay, okay. But, what you are doing if you don't you will cut the whole thing, you will gut the whole thing. It has been said that there is no park. Now, there is an existing park there. What we are doing is asking you to expand that existing park. Also, when you expand that existing park, that you continue to let the YWCA have a very integral part of that planning there.

MAYOR PRO TEM TENIENTE: Well there is no problem there. There is no problem there. As Reverend Black pointed out, until we have that park, there is no - you are addressing to something that is not existing. We would like to have the park first.

DR. CISNEROS: I would like to make those motions if I may. The first motion, I would suggest.....

MAYOR PRO TEM TENIENTE: Let us read the Ordinance if we can. Thank you very much, Miss Jones. Thank you.

CITY CLERK JACKSON: An Ordinance approving and adopting the expansion of Fairchild Park as a Community Development Program Activity.

MAYOR PRO TEM TENIENTE: All right, any discussion on that?

DR. NIELSEN: With that would be as I understand what you are suggesting, a clear understanding that direction be given to San Antonio Development Agency, and think you can make it all part of one motion that this particular stage, the planning, particularly the planning because you really aren't going to get involved in the programming, that's going to be the Parks and Recreation. Okay, the San Antonio Development Agency be instructed to work closely with the Y as far as full planning. And the third thing I would suggest then, that we begin now with Darner and the Parks and Recreation Department in getting some sort of an understanding of programming. That is the only way I am going to support it.

MR. PYNDUS: That's not going to be a part of the motion, is it?

DR. NIELSEN: Well why not, surely, it can be.

MR. PYNDUS: Read the part with regards to the Recreation Department and the San Antonio Development Agency. How are they to direct expansion of the park? That's sticky with me, I am not comfortable with it.

DR. CISNEROS: (unable to hear)

MR. PYNDUS: Can I have a point of clarification?

DR. CISNEROS: To give some Council direction throughout the process.

MAYOR PRO TEM TENIENTE: Well, all right, let us see if yours is in the form of an amendment? Is there a second to this? Excuse me madam, we are having a motion,.....

MR. PYNDUS: Could you clarify that?

MR. HARTMAN: I think what I understand of, this amendment is basically what I am trying to say. Could you repeat it once more?

DR. NIELSEN: Yes, the part of planning, the planning of this park in the next six months or a year, I am sure that's mainly physical planning and that sort of thing, is that it is San Antonio Development Agency's responsibility primary, right? It's not the responsibility of the Parks and Recreation Department?

(SEVERAL PEOPLE TALKING)

MR. DARNER: We already have meetings set up with the YWCA for a week from Monday at 10 o'clock in the morning to go over the start of the initial planning. That is why I don't understand the .....

DR. NIELSEN: Well, what part is San Antonio Development Agency is going to play on this from here on?

MR. MARTIN: We acquire the property, we relocate the families, we make the land available to the City and the Parks Department lays out the park-land .....

REVEREND BLACK: That's what I say. There are two different issues.

DR. NIELSEN: All we need to do is add an amendment to simply say that concurrent with this development program will be a programming relationship between the YWCA and the Parks and Recreation Department.

MAYOR PRO TEM TENIENTE: All right, if you want to add it on there, that's fine. Is there a second?

MR. HARTMAN: I'll second that motion.

MR. ROHDE: Why don't the Chair just direct that it be put in.

MAYOR PRO TEM TENIENTE: Sure, its understood but if you want it as part of the amendment, if thats all, we will vote on the amended motion, all in favor of that motion say aye.

ROLL CALL VOTE: All ayes.

MAYOR PRO TEM TENIENTE: Fine. Now we will vote on the motion as amended.

ROLL CALL VOTE: All ayes.

REVEREND BLACK: I want to make the fact that I abstained.

MAYOR PRO TEM TENIENTE: All right, we had announced that the CDA hearing would be at 1:30. However, in veiw of the fact that we do have quite a few citizens, we will recess for 30 minutes and come back and get started at 12:45 so that we can get started on those citizens that are here for the Public Hearing and then we will start at the top of the list. We have 42 people.

-END-