

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
THURSDAY, AUGUST 23, 1979.

* * * *

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

79-40 The invocation was given by Ms. Margaret Crofton, a Seminary Intern Student with Crestholme Presbyterian Church.

79-40 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States.

79-40 CITY HALL TELEPHONE SYSTEM

Mr. Chet Todd, Vice President and General Manager of Southwestern Bell explained that a new phone system, Centrex II, would be operational for the City of San Antonio on the 27th day of August, 1979. He then proceeded to explain the new modern system to the Council and the service that will be available to better assist the public.

Mr. Russell Brunkman, Account Executive for Southwestern Bell, explained the design and the special features of this new system which will provide better service to the public as well as the City employees.

79-40 The minutes of the meeting of August 16, 1979 were approved.

79-40 CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Steen moved that the items constituting the Consent Agenda be approved with the exception of items 5, 10, 13, 14, and 28, to be considered individually. Dr. Cisneros seconded the motion.

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

AN ORDINANCE 51,123

ACCEPTING THE PROPOSAL FROM DICTAPHONE CORPORATION TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO POLICE DEPARTMENT WITH AN ANNUAL MAINTENANCE CONTRACT FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$4,295.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51,124

APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$18,700.00 FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS; ACCEPTING THE DEDICATION OF EASEMENTS TO CERTAIN LANDS; ALL TO BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN RIGHT-OF-WAY PROJECTS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51125

APPROPRIATING FROM CERTAIN FUNDS AMOUNTS IN THE TOTAL SUM OF \$4,348.08 IN PAYMENT TO EXPENSES INCURRED IN CONNECTION WITH CROW PROPERTY OFF-SITE SEWER MAIN, KUGLER TRACT OFF-SITE SANITARY SEWER, NEW BRAUNFELS OVERPASS, OLMOS CREEK DRAINAGE #88-87, UNSEWERED AREA NO. 57 & 58, SPRING CREEK FOREST SCHOOL OFF-SITE SEWER MAIN.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51126

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF HOWARD L. COOK IN THE AMOUNT OF \$108,171.90 FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THE LEON CREEK STORMWATER BYPASS CHANNEL; AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A STANDARD CITY PUBLIC WORKS CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT COVERING SAID CONSTRUCTION; APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$113,571.00 FOR SAID PROJECT; AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT AS SPECIFIED HEREIN.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51127

AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS TO EXECUTE SUCH UTILITY AGREEMENT DOCUMENTS AS ARE REQUIRED FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF CITY EXPENSES ASSOCIATED WITH SANITARY SEWER RELOCATIONS FOR THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION CONSTRUCTION PROJECT FOR MODIFICATION OF IH-35 FROM WALZEM ROAD TO STARLIGHT TERRACE; ESTABLISHING A PROJECT FUND AS DIRECTED BY THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE FOR PAYMENT OF ALL ASSOCIATED PROJECT EXPENSES AND RECEIPT OF ALL REIMBURSEMENT FUNDS; AND APPROPRIATING \$48,000.00 FROM THE SEWER REVENUE FUND TO COVER THE PAYMENT FOR SUCH PROJECT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51128

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF ADDITIONAL ARCHITECTURAL AND ENGINEERING FEES AND EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH CERTAIN WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT PROJECTS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51129

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AN EASEMENT TO SAN ANTONIO RIVER AUTHORITY IN CONNECTION WITH THE SALADO CREEK WATERSHED FLOOD CONTROL PROJECT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51130

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A LEASE OF SPACE AT STINSON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT TO ALAMO FLYERS, INC.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51131

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A LEASE AT STINSON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT TO LOSTON C. AMOS, DBA ECONOMY AVIATION.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51132

MANIFESTING AN AGREEMENT EXTENDING THE TERM OF A LEASE AT STINSON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT TO TILMAN R. THOMAS FOR A ONE YEAR TERM.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51133

FINDING THAT CERTAIN PERSONAL PROPERTY AND REAL PROPERTY TAX ASSESSMENTS ARE INVALID AND ORDERING THAT THE INVALID ASSESSMENTS AND THE TAXES BASED THEREON BE CANCELED.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51134

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF REFUNDS TO PERSONS MAKING OVERPAYMENTS OR DOUBLE PAYMENTS ON CITY OF SAN ANTONIO TAXES.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51135

AUTHORIZING THE DIRECTOR OF FINANCE TO MAKE CERTAIN ADJUSTMENTS TO THE TAX ROLL AS RECOMMENDED BY TAX ERROR BOARD OF REVIEW.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51136

ACCEPTING THE HIGH BID FROM CERTAIN BANKS RECEIVED IN CONNECTION WITH CITY FUNDS AVAILABLE FOR DEPOSIT IN INTEREST-BEARING CERTIFICATES OF DEPOSIT.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51137

AUTHORIZING THE TRANSFER OF VARIOUS POSITIONS AND FUNDS INTO A JOINT PROJECT ACCOUNT BETWEEN THE CITY AND BEXAR COUNTY IN THE PUBLIC SERVICE EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM UNDER TITLE IID OF THE COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ACT; APPROVING A REVISED BUDGET, AND AUTHORIZING A NEW THIRD-PARTY SUBGRANT AGREEMENT WITH BEXAR COUNTY.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51138

ACCEPTING THE GRANTS FROM THE TEXAS LIBRARY AND HISTORICAL COMMISSION IN SUPPORT OF THE OPERATION OF THE INTERLIBRARY LOAN SERVICE PROGRAM BY THE SAN ANTONIO PUBLIC LIBRARY FOR THE YEAR FROM SEPTEMBER 1, 1979 THROUGH AUGUST 31, 1980 AND IN SUPPORT OF A MAJOR RESOURCE CENTER FOR THE DISTRICT 10 AREA; AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AGREEMENT COVERING THE GRANTS; ADOPTING BUDGETS AND DESIGNATING FUNDS; AND AUTHORIZING PERSONNEL POSITIONS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51139

AUTHORIZING THE ALDERETE PARK DEVELOPMENT PROJECT AT A COST OF \$97,555, ACCEPTING A GRANT OF \$47,555 FROM THE HERITAGE CONSERVATION AND RECREATION SERVICE THROUGH THE TEXAS PARKS AND WILDLIFE DEPARTMENT, AND PROVIDING FOR A CONTRIBUTION OF \$50,000 FROM FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING FUNDS.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51140

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT AMENDING THE CONTINUING PHASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION (SDHPT), CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, BEXAR COUNTY AND VIA METROPOLITAN TRANSIT AUTHORITY.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51141

AUTHORIZING THE CLOSING OF SAN SABA STREET BETWEEN DOLOROSA AND WEST COMMERCE STREETS ON AUGUST 31, SEPTEMBER 1 AND 2, 1979, DURING CERTAIN HOURS.

* * * *

79-40

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51142

AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASE OF 1980 CRISS CROSS DIRECTORIES FOR VARIOUS CITY DEPARTMENTS FROM COLE PUBLICATIONS FOR A NET TOTAL OF \$5,092.00.

* * * *

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

Mr. Thompson asked for a clarification regarding the cost of this project.

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

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51143

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO AND THE SOUTHERN PACIFIC TRANSPORTATION COMPANY COVERING CONSTRUCTION OF A CONCRETE-LINED CHANNEL ALONG ROCK CREEK AND APPROXIMATELY 79.5 FEET OF CONCRETE BRIDGE; APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$15,795.00 TO COVER SAID PROJECT; AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT TO SOUTHERN PACIFIC TRANSPORTATION COMPANY AS HEREIN SPECIFIED.

* * * *

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

In response to a question by Mr. Thompson, Mr. Kiolbassa, Director of Public Works, explained that a temporary shoofly needed to be constructed under the Southern Pacific Railroad. He stated that the City of San Antonio will be required to reimburse the railroad the sum of \$15,795.00 for the cost of the project. He further stated that this is a part of the Olmos Creek Drainage Project #87-88.

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

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51144

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF FIELD ALTERATION NO. 1 TO THE CONTRACT WITH LYDA, INC., FOR THE RIVER BEND PARKING STRUCTURE; APPROPRIATING FUNDS AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF THE SUM OF \$4,245,868.00 TO THE CONTRACTOR, OF \$247,699.00 FOR CONTINGENT CONSTRUCTION EXPENSES, AND \$118,483.00 FOR ADDITIONAL ARCHITECTURAL FEES; AND APPROPRIATING \$160,663.90 FOR PAYMENT TO PARKING, INC., FOR DEMOLITION WORK.

* * * *

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

In response to a question by Mr. Archer, City Attorney, Jane Macon stated that the Finance Department had asked that the Ordinance be more specific and that each allocation be earmarked. She stated that this was a "tightening up" of a previous Ordinance.

A discussion then took place on the fee structure that applies to any City contract.

Mr. Frank Kiolbassa, Director of Public Works, stated that a report on this matter and whatever questions the Council has addressed in regard to professional services, would be forthcoming to the Council.

Dr. Cisneros complimented the legal staff, the department of Public Works, and the City Manager's Office for having this Ordinance available for Council's consideration. He asked for a report regarding a run-down on parking spaces available in the downtown area.

Councilwoman Dutmer asked that the City Manager notify the Police Department regarding the congestion of traffic on E. Commerce. She stated that traffic problem has been increasing due to the construction of the new Hotel.

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

79-40 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51145

APPROPRIATING THE AMOUNT OF \$25,000.00 FOR PROGRAM PLANNING EXPENDITURES IN THE 1980 AIRPORT REVENUE BONDS FUND IN CONNECTION WITH THE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT TERMINAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM; AND APPROVING A BUDGET THEREON.

* * * *

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

In response to a question by Mr. Archer, Mr. George Noe, Administrative Assistant to the City Manager, explained that this Ordinance is in relation to the airport development project which entails terminal spaces and parking spaces.

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

79-40 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51146

CLOSING AND ABANDONING BANKERS LANE (CORCORAN STREET) BETWEEN CITY BLOCKS 108 AND 109, AND AUTHORIZING A QUITCLAIM DEED TO ALAMO NATIONAL BANK FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF \$16,600.00 AND A QUITCLAIM DEED TO GROOS NATIONAL BANK FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF \$16,600.00.

* * * *

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

Mr. George Noe, Administrative Assistant to the City Manager, explained the location of Bankers Lane and stated that Alamo National Bank and Gross National Bank have petitioned and the Planning Commission has approved their request.

Mr. Stewart Fischer, Director of Traffic and Transportation, stated that all surrounding business were canvassed and no one was in objection to the closing of the street.

Mrs. Dutmer expressed concern that the Council should set up a policy to have public hearings on the closing of all streets or alleys.

Mr. Stewart Fischer, Director of Traffic and Transportation, explained that Bankers Lane is an alley which is only 12 feet wide, being a useless area from the traffic standpoint. He stated that there is no future use for this lane.

Mr. George Noe explained that an appraisal cost of \$33,200.00 had been agreed upon.

Mr. Steen spoke in support of the closing of this lane.

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

79-40 ZONING HEARINGS

29. CASE 7785 - to rezone a 3.34 acre tract of land out of Parcel 4, NCB 14941, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk, from "B-3" Business District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located 300' south of the Leonhardt Road and approximately 350' west of the M.K. & T. Railroad R.O.W., having a width of 180' and a maximum length of 958.92'.

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

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

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

AN ORDINANCE 51147

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS A 3.34 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF PARCEL 4, NCB 14941, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, FROM "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

30. CASE 7789 - to rezone a 17.3 acre tract of land out of NCB 10675, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk, in the 3900 Block of E. Houston Street, from "A" Single Family Residential District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located southwest of the intersection of E. Houston Street and I.H. 10 Expressway, having approximately 1078' on E. Houston Street and 1025' on I.H. 10 Expressway.

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

In response to a question by Mrs. Dutmer, the applicant, Mr. Carlos Sanchez, representing Wilbco, Incorporated, explained the proposed use of the property and stated that the requested zoning change would be beneficial to the area.

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

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

AN ORDINANCE 51148

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS A 17.3 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 10675, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, IN THE 3900 BLOCK OF E. HOUSTON STREET, FROM "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

31. CASE 7783 - to rezone the southwest irregular 130' of the northwest irregular 130' of Lot 1, Block 29, NCB 11572, in the 1800 Block of Bandera Road, from "F" Local Retail District to "B-3" Business District, located east of the intersection of Broadview Drive and Bandera Road, having 130' on Broadview Drive and 130' on Bandera Road.

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

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

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

AN ORDINANCE 51149

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS THE SOUTHWEST IRREGULAR 130' OF THE NORTHWEST IRREGULAR 130' OF LOT 1, BLOCK 29, NCB 11572, IN THE 1800 BLOCK OF BANDERA ROAD, FROM "F" LOCAL RETAIL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT STREET DEDICATION IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE MAJOR PLAN, IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

32. CASE 7788 - to rezone Lots 9, 10 and 11, Block 51, NCB 8004, 5103 S. Zarzamora Street from "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-2" Business District, located southwest of the intersection of S. Zarzamora Street and Linden Avenue, having 125' on S. Zarzamora Street and 75' on Linden Avenue.

Mr. Canavan made a motion to deny the request in zoning. Mr. Alderete seconded the motion.

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

The applicant, Mrs. Patsy Torres 6103 S. Zarzamora, gave background information on the subject property. She stated that she intends to sell her property to an insurance agency. She urged the Council to grant the change in zoning.

Mr. Wing spoke against the change because of the single family residential zoning in the surrounding areas. He recommended an "O-1" zoning. He also expressed his concern regarding the traffic problems.

After discussion, Mr. Wing made a substitute motion to grant an "O-1" zoning provided that the applicant work with the Traffic and Transportation Department for proper ingress and egress. Mr. Alderete seconded the motion.

Mr. Steen spoke in support of the substitute motion.

Mr. Stewart Fischer, Director of Traffic and Transportation expressed his concern regarding the drainage problems in the area and asked that the Council allow the department a little flexibility in working out the best solution in regards to the ingress and egress situation.

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

AN ORDINANCE 51150

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOTS 9, 10, AND 11, BLOCK 51, NCB 8004, 6103 S. ZARZAMORA STREET FROM "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "O-1" OFFICE DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT THE APPLICANT WORK WITH THE TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT FOR PROPER INGRESS AND EGRESS.

* * * *

33. CASE 7786 - to rezone the northwest 130.02' of the northeast 100' of Lot 16, Block 5, NCB 11721, 11014 Bel Air Drive from "R-3" Multiple Family Residential District to "B-1" Business District, located south of the intersection of Anchor Drive and Bel Air Drive having 130.02' on Anchor Drive and 146.94' on Bel Air Drive.

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

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

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

AN ORDINANCE 51151

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS THE NORTHWEST 130.02' OF THE NORTHWEST 100' OF LOT 16, BLOCK 5, NCB 11721, 11014 BEL AIR DRIVE, FROM "R-3" MULTIPLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED.

* * * *

34. CASE 7784 - to rezone the west 200' of Lot 16B, NCB 11168, in the 5100 Block of Roosevelt Avenue from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located southeast of the cutback between Rilling Road and Roosevelt Avenue, having 200' on Rilling Road, 584.6' on Roosevelt Avenue and 123' on the cutback between Roosevelt Avenue and Rilling Road; to rezone Lot 16B, NCB 11168, save and except the west 200', in the 5100 Block of Roosevelt Avenue from "B" Two Family Residential District to "I-1" Light Industry District, located on the south side of Rilling Road, approximately 110' from the cutback of the intersection of Rilling Road and Roosevelt Avenue, having 110' on Rilling Road and a depth of 684.6'.

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

Mrs. Dutmer expressed her concern that this is a major entrance to the Missions National Historic Park. She stated that she does not object to the zoning but asked if a stipulation could be included for the purpose of protecting the property.

Mr. Gene Camargo, Planning Administrator, suggested that screening could be erected along the north line of the property.

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

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

AN ORDINANCE 51152

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS THE WEST 200' OF LOT 16B, NCB 1168, IN THE 5100 BLOCK OF ROOSEVELT AVENUE, FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT; LOT 16B, NCB 11168, SAVE AND EXCEPT THE WEST 200', IN THE 5100 BLOCK OF ROOSEVELT AVENUE FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "I-1" LIGHT INDUSTRY DISTRICT.

* * * *

35. CASE 7776 - to rezone Lots 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, 17, 19, and 20, NCB 16198, in the 5400 Block of Rigsby Avenue, and in the 5300 Block of Natho Street from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "B-3R" Restrictive Business District, Lots 1, 2, 16, and 17 are located on the east side of Bermuda Street between Rigsby Avenue and Natho Street, having 190' on Bermuda Street and 120' on Natho Avenue and 121.65' on Rigsby Avenue; Lots 4, 5, 19 and 20, are located between Rigsby Avenue and Natho Street being 180' east of Bermuda Street having 121.65' on Rigsby Avenue and 120' on Natho Street and a distance of 169' between these two streets.

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

Mrs. Dutmer stated that she had no objection to the zoning requested for this property provided that the screening is adhered to.

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mr. Steen moved that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained along Natho Street and that a one foot non-access easement is imposed along North Street. Mr. Wing seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Eureste.

AN ORDINANCE 51153

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOTS 1, 2, 4, 5, 16, 17, 19 AND 20, NCB 16198, IN THE 5400 BLOCK OF RIGSBY AVENUE AND IN THE 5300 BLOCK OF NATHO STREET, FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3R" RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG NATHO STREET AND THAT A ONE FOOT NON-ACCESS EASEMENT IS IMPOSED ALONG NATHO STREET.

* * * *

36. CASE 7779 - to rezone Lot 27, Block 4, NCB 2075, 1147-1151 Culebra Road from "B-1" Business District to "B-2" Business District, located northeast of the intersection of Culebra Road and Elmendorf Street, having 100.36' on Culebra Road and 157.66' on N. Elmendorf Street.

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

Dr. Cisneros moved to deny the request for a change in zoning. Mr. Wing seconded the motion.

The applicant, Mr. Phillip Juarez, 1209 Parkway, Austin, Texas, explained the proposed use for the property. He made mention of the existing businesses in the surrounding areas. He asked that the Council grant the change in zoning.

Dr. Cisneros spoke in opposition to the zoning change. He stated that traffic problems would arise as a result and add more congestion to the already existing heavy traffic, which would also cause danger to the children attending the school nearby. He urged the Council not to grant the zoning change.

Several of the Council members expressed their opposition to the zoning change.

In rebuttal, Mr. Juarez explained the ingress and egress to the restaurant and stated that this facility was located a block from the nearby school and couldn't see any reason why the request for rezoning would be denied.

After discussion, the motion to deny the change in zoning carried by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen, Cockrell; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Eureste.

CASE 7779 was denied.

37. CASE 7770 - to rezone an 11.37 acre tract of land out of NCB 13753, being further described by field notes filed in the Office of the City Clerk, in the 3200 and 3300 blocks of Carver Road from Temporary "A" Single Family Residential District to "B-3" Business District, located on the northeast side of Carver Road, being 2,133' northwest of the intersection of Nacogdoches Road and Carver Road, having a total of 1123' on Carver Road and a maximum depth of 740'.

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

Mrs. Dutmer expressed her concern regarding the property's being entirely within the flood plain area.

Mr. Camargo, Planning Administrator, explained the procedure whereby permits are issued by the Public Works Department for residents in a flood plain area.

Mr. Tom Haslett, the applicant, stated that he has been at this location for 15 years. He stated that at the present time, he has a perspective buyer which would necessitate rezoning the property.

Mr. Steen and Mr. Canavan spoke in support of the zoning change.

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

AN ORDINANCE 51154

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS AN 11.37 ACRE TRACT OF LAND OUT OF NCB 13753, BEING FURTHER DESCRIBED BY FIELD NOTES FILED IN THE OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK, IN THE 3200 AND 3300 BLOCK OF CARVER ROAD FROM TEMPORARY "A" SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

Mayor Cockrell was obliged to leave the meeting and Councilman John Steen presided.

August 23, 1979
mb

-12-

38. CASE 7777 - to rezone the north 56.2' of Lots E and F; the northeast 169' of Lot G; Lot H save and except the southwest 143' and Lots 3, 3A, and 3B, NCB 10313, in the 1500 Block of Amanda Avenue from "B" Two Family Residential District to "B-3R" Restrictive Business District, located on the east side of Amanda Avenue, being 100' south of the intersection of Amanda Avenue and Alhaven Avenue, having 290' on Amanda Avenue and a maximum depth of 630'.

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

Mrs. Dutmer informed the Council that this was in Mr. Webb's district, and he had no objection to the zoning change.

No citizen appeared to speak in opposition.

After consideration, Mrs. Dutmer moved that the recommendation of the Zoning Commission be approved provided that proper platting is accomplished, if necessary; that a six foot solid screen fence is erected and maintained along the northeast property line and that a one foot non-access easement is imposed along Brenhaven. Dr. Cisneros seconded the motion. On roll call, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following Ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Eureste, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 51155

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS THE NORTH 56.2' OF LOTS E AND F; THE NORTHEAST 169' OF G; LOT H SAVE AND EXCEPT THE SOUTHWEST 143' AND LOTS 3, 3A AND 3B, NCB 10313, IN THE 1500 BLOCK OF AMANDA AVENUE FROM "B" TWO FAMILY RESIDENTIAL DISTRICT TO "B-3R" RESTRICTIVE BUSINESS DISTRICT, PROVIDED THAT PROPER PLATTING IS ACCOMPLISHED, IF NECESSARY; THAT A SIX FOOT SOLID SCREEN FENCE IS ERECTED AND MAINTAINED ALONG THE NORTHEAST PROPERTY LINE AND THAT A NON-ACCESS EASEMENT IS IMPOSED ALONG BRENHAVEN.

* * * *

39. CASE 7781 - to rezone Parcel 49, NCB 15604 (15.16 acres) in the 8200 Block of Clegg Drive from Temporary "R-1" Single Family Residential District to "R-4" Mobile Home District, located on the southeast side of Clegg Drive, being 135' south of the intersection of Hayden Drive and Clegg Drive, having 940' on Clegg Drive and a maximum depth of 1075'.

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

Mr. Carlos Garcia, 6431 Peacepipe Drive, the applicant stated that he is the owner of the property and he proceeded to explain the surrounding areas of the subject property. He stated that if the request were granted, it would enable him to improve the property for the benefit of the whole community.

Mr. Patrick Semelsberger, 8107 Clegg Drive, President of Hillside Acres Civil Action Committee, spoke in opposition to the zoning change and stated that the area in question is not a mobile home park. He described the applicant's property. He stated that the residents of this area are already saturated with mobile home parks and need no more. He further stated that more mobile homes would be detrimental to the area.

Mr. Wing stated that he would be voting against the zoning because he felt that the quality of neighborhoods are not improved if lots are left vacant.

Mrs. Dutmer stated that she would be voting against because she was concern with adding to or perpetuating another "Barrio" situation.

In rebuttal, Mr. Garcia stated that he is not trying to degrade the neighborhood. He stated that this is a mobile home area and that the property is being used by the neighborhood for dumping trash.

Mr. Alderete suggested that Mr. Garcia subdivide his lot and sell it as individual lots.

After a lengthy discussion, the motion to deny the request for a zoning change carried by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Thompson, Alderete, Archer, Steen; NAYS: Wing, Canavan; ABSENT: Webb, Eureste, Cockrell.

CASE 7781 was denied.

79-40 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51156

AUTHORIZING OPERATION OF THE SIXTH YEAR OF THE ENERGY CONSERVATION DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM, BEGINNING SEPTEMBER 1, 1979, AND ENDING AUGUST 31, 1980; ACCEPTING A GRANT OF \$189,655.00 FROM THE STATE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS & PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION FOR THE PROJECT; ESTABLISHING A FUND AND ACCOUNTS AND APPROVING PERSONNEL POSITIONS AND ADOPTING A BUDGET.

* * * *

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

In response to Mr. Archer, Mr. Stewart Fischer, Director of Traffic and Transportation explained the procedure of the program. He stated that a lot of the people, because of the carpooling that is occurring now, are saving considerably more.

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

79-40 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Wing, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 51157

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A SIXTEEN MONTH CONTRACT WITH WILLIE B. MARTINEZ FOR MANAGEMENT OF WILLOW SPRINGS GOLF COURSE.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51158

AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION OF A PRE-APPLICATION FOR A PARK REHABILITATION GRANT PURSUANT TO TITLE X, PL 95-625 (URBAN PARK AND RECREATION RECOVERY ACT OF 1978), ASSURING THE GRANTING AGENCY OF COMPLIANCE WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS FOR URBAN PARK AND RECREATION RECOVERY GRANTS, AND ASSURING AVAILABILITY OF MATCHING FUNDS, THE SOURCES OF WHICH WILL BE ESTABLISHED AT SUCH TIME AS A TENTATIVE GRANT IS OFFERED AND A FORMAL APPLICATION IS REQUESTED BY THE GRANTING AGENCY.

* * * *

79-40 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51159

APPROVING THE NOTICE OF SALE AND ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS IN CONNECTION WITH THE PROPOSED \$6,400,000.00 CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, COMBINATION TAX AND REVENUE REFUNDING BONDS, SERIES 1979; AND DECLARING AN EMERGENCY.

* * * *

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

In response to Mrs. Dutmer, the City Manager, Thomas Huebner, stated that the Certificates of Obligation are a tax liability and he would anticipate that this would be a self-supporting parking garage.

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

79-40 The following Resolution was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Thompson, seconded by Mrs. Dutmer, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Cockrell.

A RESOLUTION
NO. 79-40-91

ENDORING THE TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM FOR THE SAN ANTONIO/BEXAR COUNTY METROPOLITAN AREA.

* * * *

DISCUSSION ON THE FY-1980 COMPREHENSIVE
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PLAN OF THE ALAMO
CONSORTIUM

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51160

AUTHORIZING THE SUBMISSION OF THE FY'80
COMPREHENSIVE EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PLAN
OF THE ALAMO CONSORTIUM TO THE DEPARTMENT
OF LABOR; APPROVING THE PUBLIC SERVICE
EMPLOYMENT POSITIONS FOR THE CITY; ACCEPTING
THE GRANTS UNDER THE VARIOUS CETA PROGRAMS;
APPROVING THE BUDGETS; ESTABLISHING FUNDS
AND ACCOUNTS FOR THE PROGRAM YEAR; AUTHORIZING
THE EXECUTION OF A NONFINANCIAL AGREEMENT
WITH THE TEXAS STATE BOARD OF VOCATIONAL
EDUCATION FOR SUPPLEMENTAL VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
GRANT; AND, AUTHORIZING THE NEGOTIATION
AND EXECUTION OF THIRD-PARTY AGREEMENTS WITH
PROGRAM OPERATORS.

* * * *

MR. JOE ALDERETE: I so move

DR. HENRY CISNEROS: I second the motion.

ACTING MAYOR STEEN: We have a number of citizens to be heard and there are a number of Council people to be heard. Would you like to be heard before the citizens, or would you like to hear the citizens?

MR. ALDERETE: Well, John, the only thing is that I know the citizens are going to speak to a different part of this proposal. And, I'd like to present my part of the proposal, if you will, and maybe we can vote that through.

MR. STEEN: It's been moved and seconded that we pass on Item 45 and I want to call on Councilman Alderete.

MR. ALDERETE: Okay, the only - I make that motion with these conditions, Mayor Steen and that is with these changes. I would like to the A.B.E. (Adult Basic Education) money; E.S.L. (English as a second language) money; and the G.E.D. money, that \$259,400 be divided equally as fifty percent going to each, both A & M and to Project SER, originally, I think, even in the motion first proposed, the E.S.L. Program, and I think even they brought it about; they started it; and they carried out, and I think it's improper for them to be completely excluded. The other part is that I know they've been very much involved in Adult Basic Education and also in G.E.D. classes and Diploma Training and I think that is further rationale for them being included equally with A & M in the particular area.

Along with that proposal, I would also like to have the discussion that surrounded Project Detour last week, who was allotted \$110,000 that 1% be removed from the remaining agencies so that Project Detour could go up to a total of, instead of \$110,000, a \$131,736, which is an amount that the agency can survive with and perform its duties and its tasks that it has presented its proposal. So, that's Project Detour bringing them up from \$110,000 to \$131,736.

The third part is in Skills Training. Under the present proposal, A & M, BCOIC, and Project SER have all the skills training. And MITP was excluded at last Thursday's proposal and what I would like to request of staff is that MITP be given the same reduction, percentage reduction, that the other three agencies received and be brought up to that amount, and that my understanding is, that amount would be approximately \$162,000 give or take, and that was that all the other agencies suffered a 10%

reduction from their last year's proposal which was approximately \$178,000 from MITP, that it be reduced by 10% which approximates \$162,000. So that MITP would be considered as well as another additional training center, and that would be the motion, Mr. Steen.

MR. EURESTE: Second.

MR. STEEN: Do you want to include that in just the motion you have on the agenda in the Ordinance, or are you doing that as an amendment?

MR. ALDERETE: I would propose that as an amendment.

MR. STEEN: Did you make the original motion?

MR. ALDERETE: Yes, sir.

MR. STEEN: I wonder if parliamentary procedure

MR. EURESTE: I would make that amendment.

MR. ALDERETE: I would second that amendment.

MR. STEEN: Okay, I don't remember all that amendment to tell you the truth. But, I think everybody heard it.

MR. ALEX BRISENO, ASSISTANT TO THE CITY MANAGER: I believe that the staff has updated some figures that will be passed out to you. And I would like for them first of all to comment to you on those revised figures, will be affected by the amendment that is being proposed, and also I would assume that the Council would like the staff to comment on the amendment.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Alex. Mr. Cano.

MR. NARCISO CANO, DIRECTOR OF ECONOMIC AND EMPLOYMENT DEVELOPMENT: What I'd like to do is to get you all looking at the same sheet we're looking at which is the one that was handed out just a few moments ago called, "Allocation of Funds, Revision to Attachment I, City Council Briefing Notes, City-County Program." And you can tell you have the right sheet by looking at the third page, lower right hand corner, it has the initials K.W.D. 8/23/79.

Now, we revised these figures from the sheet that we gave out last Monday for several reasons. First, we copied one number down wrong on the one that we gave you last week, and it was a copy error. In addition, we had anticipated we would have some additional carry-over money in the Youth Program, and we looked at the recent rates and that doesn't appear to be the case. We're not going to have the type of carry-over in the Youth Program that we anticipated. In addition, we made in the revision in the way we allocated training monies for Public Service Employment. The law requires that 15% of Title IID funds be spent on training and 5% of Title VI, the original figures we had given you were based on 15% for both, and we realized we had made an error as we were double checking all the calculations. So, we've revised them accordingly. That's why we've given you a new table. So, to correct Councilman Alderete's motion, if I understand you correctly, you're talking about row no. 6, Page 1, \$262,201.

MRS. HELEN DUTMER: Instead of what?

MR. CANO: Row no. 6, page 1, the Councilman had indicated \$259,400. That was the old figure, the new figure was \$262,201.

MR. ALDERETE: All right, the amendment still stands that Project SER receive 50 percent of the monies in that particular category, so that they can continue with their program.

MR. CANO: We would like to comment at the appropriate time on the amendment, Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: I think if you want to you may comment at this time, Mr. Cano. If you'd rather wait, it's all right with me. We have about ten or so citizens to be heard and some of the Council people. So, if you'd rather comment now or wait till later it doesn't make any difference to me.

MR. CANO: Let me go ahead and comment now. I have a letter here from Pat Tanner dated yesterday, where she discusses the \$259,000. "We would like to be able to process," in her letter, she says that they'd like to be able to process about 600 to 700 students through the program. Now, this is for Adult Basic Education which will culminate in GED training and also E.S.L. Now, that \$250,000 that includes allowances will fund about 125 students for the entire 12 month period. This figure would reduce the staff to 2 teachers or maybe 1, and it will be difficult running a quality program if you slash that in half. I think you could say the same thing for both programs. I don't think you'll be doing justice to either one by splitting it down the middle. So, I strongly urge you to not approve that amendment.

I think the others, we have some recommendations, on how if you wanted to fund it, how we would recommend you fund it which would be slightly different than the motion as made.

MR. ALDERETE: Would you suggest that we transfer it all to Project SER?

MR. CANO: If you wanted to fund SER, do and not fund A&M. But, I think by splitting it just makes things worse. I don't think it's a sufficient number for one as it stands now. And if you split it in two, it just makes things worse.

I urge you to leave it at A&M; they've been in the business providing Adult Basic Education. We're going to be getting them a facility built on the south side. It'll be a first class facility, and I think students graduating from there would probably do a whole lot better on the job market with a certificate from the school done by A&M than a school done by SER. That's my opinion.

MR. ALDERETE: Are you saying that a GED from A&M is better than a GED from Project SER?

MR. CANO: Well, I think so.

MR. ALDERETE: Can I ask Mr. Villarreal a question please, the Director of Project SER? I don't happen to agree with Mr. Cano that a GED from A&M would be better than a GED from any other institution that is fully certified. Could you perform satisfactorily with 50% of the monies that are currently being all given to A&M?

MR. VILLARREAL: We could perform at the level that we are requesting of the additional funds that we would be getting. However, I don't agree on one point that the certificate from Texas A&M would be better than SER because the line of instruction is the same. However, the GED is awarded by St. Phillips, and not by Project SER. The GED is awarded either by St. Phillips, SAC, or South San.

MR. ALDERETE: So, in other words, it is a fully accredited institution that awards your GED; you are merely the training vehicle.

MR. VILLARREAL: We are merely the training vehicle for the community.

MR. ALDERETE: And you feel that you can adequately and satisfactorily perform with 50% of the monies.

MR. VILLARREAL: We could, and I might also mention that in the very near future, SER is anticipating to get TEA certification. So, we would be at a pretty high level and still continue in the same line of instructions using the facilities from SAC and from St. Phillips.

MR. ALDERETE: Thank you, Mr. Villarreal, you answered adequately. If we can go onto the next part of the amendment.

MR. EURESTE: I have some questions.

MR. ALDERETE: Oh, excuse me.

MR. STEEN: Okay, okay, we have the Manager's light lit up again to call on Mr. Briseno.

MR. BRISENO: Before we go onto the next part of the amendment, I would like to remind the Council, also, that if you look on the same main stream component, under the Innovated Programs, Project SER is receiving \$175,000. to continue the English as a Second Language Program that they continually, or they are currently operating. So, that part of their operation is not being affected at all, they are continuing for the second year in a two year program at \$175,000. level. I just wanted to make sure that the Council understood that.

MR. ALDERETE: But, the GED and the ABE is affected, correct?

MR. BRISENO: Right.

MR. ALDERETE: All right.

MR. STEEN: Thank you very much. Joe, are you finished for now?

MR. ALDERETE: Yes, sir.

MR. STEEN: We have to wait, just a minute, Bernardo. You're third on the list. Okay, we're going to call on Judge Thompson at this time.

MR. BOB THOMPSON: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I, the comments that I was going to make, Joe has already indicated; but I'm concerned about the increase role of Texas A&M as we have looked through last Thursday, as we reviewed the project. Some of the understandings that I approached that discussion with about the involvement of Texas A&M in our, in programs that we are sponsoring here in San Antonio. It seems that their role has increased. I was under the impression that it was going to be maintained at a fairly constant level, and through this allocation last week, it certainly increased. One of the areas that I was most concerned about is what Councilman Alderete has already mentioned and that is in the Adult Basic Education Program which I felt and feel that it is an encroachment upon what we have been doing locally through local systems, and I oppose that, and I favor his proposal because of that reason.

MR. STEEN: Thank you very much. We'll call on Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. HELEN DUTMER: Well, really, my point wasn't on this, John, but I will address it, and I'm sorry but I'm going to have to agree with staff on this one. We worked very diligently to get Texas A&M to recognize the City of San Antonio and come down here and do something because one of the largest problems we have is with unskilled and uneducated lower paying jobs, and we can't fill them. That's all there is to it; we don't have the trained labor to fill them. So, we brought them down here at great expense; we have funded them. They are going to build their facility. Now, some of these other programs have been in operation here for many years, and they have not apparently accomplished the job, or we would not have had to call on A&M to come down here and bail us out. Now, we are going to turn around and start cutting, cutting and cutting. Well, now I don't blame any University if they would not recognize San Antonio for that matter. I just think that you would be doing them a great disservice if you start cutting A&M funds to this great extent.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mrs. Dutmer, Mr. Eureste.

MR. BERNARDO EURESTE: I don't think we're cutting A&M's funds; when they first got here, they had zero dollars and their funds have gone up, ever since they got into town; and I do understand that they come here with a mission to address the skills training area. That was their area of expertise. That is what they are known for and historically, in this state, A&M has been known for that area of expertise of vocational, technical, the engineering areas, and now that they are coming and dealing with people, not so much in a college setting, but as an institution that can lend their services to the community at a time when we can use those services. I felt that that was why they came into town and why we welcomed them into town but not to get into the business of competing, in trying to run other areas of the training programs that we run here; ESL, Adult Basic Education, etc. I don't know that A&M has an expertise on that, that could be any greater than anybody else's. And I resent a statement that somehow or another is telling the Council that a GED from A&M is better than a GED from SER. Mr. Cano, where did you graduate from?

MR. CANO: I graduated from A&M.

MR. EURESTE: From A&M?

MR. CANO: Yes.

MR. EURESTE: I can see why the statement might have been made.

MR. ALDERETE: We know a degree from UTSA is better than a degree from A&M.

MR. EURESTE: How many people has A&M graduated with GEDs?

MR. CANO: I would have to research that answer, and get it to you.

MR. EURESTE: Well, how can you say that the GED would be better from A&M than from SER. If you don't know the figures?

MR. CANO: I can get you the figures. My statement comes from talking to people, those of you who have gone out of the Skills Training Center, since A&M took it over and have been out there before they took it over, I went and have talked to the people who are being served there and the drop out rate has reduced. The completion rate has increased, and I talked to the enrollees, and they are looking forward to getting that certificate on there and they have gone out of their to say it makes it better because it's got Texas A&M label on there, instead of, the old San Antonio Skill Center label on there that was kind of innocuous. It carries something. That's what I'm coming from.

MR. EURESTE: Well, I mean because it carries a label, I don't think-I don't think we ought to judge programs because it carries a label. I think we ought to judge programs on the quality. I think professionals need to judge programs on quality, on what they are producing, not on the kind of label. I mean if we wanted to do that, then we would have the Cambridge School of Economics.

MR. CANO: I can get you the figures, very quickly.

MR. EURESTE: INAUDIBLE . . . to do GED work here in town and that would sell a lot of better here in the City, than say, A&M.

MR. CANO: We'll get you the figures. I did want to say that A&M is not proposing to do something new, this has been done under the ACE Program, that has been funded traditionally under this program, what happened is that the old Bexar County School District went out of business in January I think; and they were looking, the ACE Program was looking for new sponsors and A&M agreed to become the sponsors, to give it direction. I think that the advantage that A&M has is when they can link, being linking the education, the giving of education, with the providing of solid training, and that's what we need to do for San Antonio I think.

August 23, 1979

mb

MR. EURESTE: Well, I think in the same light, though, you need to understand that perhaps, the best system for the City, I think that this has been proposed by the staff in the past, the best system, and this is being proposed by other individuals also, might be one in which you centralize, which is what we attempted to do here, and I would grant you that centralization could bring about more efficiency. It very well could bring about more efficiency; but then again, there's also another theory that decentralization might lose you in one area, but might gain you in another and that I think something that needs to be weighed and needs to be considered. I think it's wrong just to look at the program just from the efficiency angle, and you've got people that aren't totally satisfied with access they might have to a program or input that they might have into a program. Project SER is a program that is located in the heart of the west side, in the heart of west side San Antonio. People have, feel that they have access to that site. BCOIC, on another decision that we made here last week, is on the east side and there are people that feel comfortable with BCOIC; they feel that they have access to BCOIC. It's not that they hate one versus the other; it's just that they feel a little bit more comfortable in one setting, versus the other and I think that is something that needs to be weighed in the decisions that we make.

And I would say that the argument on giving all of it to A&M or giving it all to SER, which you claim would bring about a better program and more efficiency, we can also, you know, propose the other argument that we can split it 50 to 50 and that a job is going to be done that addresses the mission of this particular component, and that is to provide Adult Basic Education and hopefully, produce people that have GEDs, and hopefully, through this process, we will have a little competition between the providers, and who know, we might have a SER University, one of these days, doing something good for the community, in which their name on the degree might carry more weight than A&M. I don't know if that would ever come to pass, but who knows.

MR. CANO: I want to point that SER under this proposal we've laid out will be receiving almost 1.7 million dollars of the total, A&M would be getting a little over 1 million.

MR. STEEN: Thank you very much, I'll call on Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Irrespective of the amount that they are getting, I think the last couple of sentences, that Councilman Eureste put forward is the key to the whole thing, and that is access and input. I do know that there is a bit of ill feeling because of the location of Texas A&M, and it has been changed. For someone to make a statement that they think that the certificate from SER, a political social project is on the same level with an accredited certificate of a recognized University, is just a little bit ridiculous in my opinion.

Now, you cannot teach skills or anything else to anyone that does not have the ability to assimilate what you are trying to teach them and that is actually the basis of your Adult Basic Education and that is to give them a general knowledge of what is going on. I think to come back at this date now and want to change up the entire thing when you had a chance at it before, with full Council in a "B" Session, I think that it's not going to carry too much weight, at least I hope it's not going to carry too much weight. If it does, I can see where we're fighting a losing battle trying to upgrade the education and the skills of the people in the City of San Antonio but rather we're going into the old political game once again and with that statement . . .

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mrs. Dutmer, Mr. Archer.

MR. VAN ARCHER: Mr. Cano, what percentage of these different figures would you say go to overhead of the two groups?

MR. CANO: Well, according to the fellow most familiar with the proposals, A&M's overhead for these two, ABE is zero and SER would be 10%. SER proposed a total administrative cost of \$26,000. A&M proposed administrative cost of zero. Mr. Eureste, I have those figures for you now. ACE had three hundred graduates, about 95% successful. SER had 50 graduates about 90% successful.

MR. STEEN: Okay, I think we've heard from all the Council people for the time being. We're going to start on the citizens to be heard that want to speak on this item which is number 45. I'm sorry, what did you say, Henry?

MR. ALDERETE: On the other two-thirds of the motion, Project Detour and MITP.

MR. STEEN: Oh, I'm sorry, Joe.

MR. ALDERETE: The Project Detour and the MITP inclusion.

MR. STEEN: Go ahead.

MR. ALDERETE: Well, I don't know if staff wanted to comment to it. I think they know.

MR. STEEN: You've already stated your part of it.

MR. ALDERETE: Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

MR. STEEN: Okay.

MR. CANO: If you wanted to fund MITP FOR \$162,000, we have some ideas about how you can do so, some recommendations. Let me begin by saying that we don't recommend you do it, but if you want to do it, we would recommend that you prorate the amounts from row 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 13, 14 and 15. Would you like for me to repeat that?

MR. ALDERETE: In rows 1, 2, 3, & 4, 7 13, 14, & 15?

MR. CANO: Yes, sir.

MR. ALDERETE: Under rows, 1, 3, & 4, what are the figures there? I don't see any figures. If I'm reading the rows correctly, you're talking about the rows this way, horizontally?

MR. CANO: They would combine to form 436.

MR. ALDERETE: I see. All right. And you're suggesting that you could come up with the amount of money in that manner.

MR. CANO: Yes, sir. What we're trying to do is not trim the ones that are providing the skills training and educational courses, and the assessment as well as the on-the-job training portions. We'd like to hold those at the level that we're suggesting.

MR. ALDERETE: Yes. I don't agree with Mr. Cano. I have some great difficulty taking away from the handicapped training, which is one of the rows you've indicated. And the Buy-In Training Program has some questions as to whether it can be handled in that manner or adequately in that manner.

MR. CANO: Under your proposal we would be taking some from them anyway.

MR. ALDERETE: The Skills Classes where I spoke of taking, removing the money was Project from A&M, OIC, and SER which are the skills classes and MITP come from those three agencies in a pro-rated manner, so that the \$162,000 come from that. That's what I stated.

MR. CANO: Right, We would prefer not to . . .

MR. ALDERETE: Well, then it wouldn't come from handicapped training, my proposal wouldn't come from handicapped training.

MR. CANO: Oh, I see, I understood that it would be a one percent reduction in all areas but I guess that was just for Detour.

MR. ALDERETE: No other, that's on Detour.

MR. CANO: On Detour, we also have some recommendations.

MR. ALDERETE: Okay.

MR. CANO: As to where the funds would come.

MR. ALDERETE: I'm ready to hear on Detour.

MR. STEEN: Go ahead.

MR. CANO: On Project Detour, if you would turn to page two, the amount would come from row 29, 31, 32, & 33. Since it is a special project. Would anybody like for me to read them again?

MRS. DUTMER: Yes.

MR. CANO: For Detour - 29, 31, 32 & 33. That would be about 2½%.

MR. ALDERETE: My suggestion - do you have the old form of attachments, the ones that you gave us last week?

MR. CANO: Yes, I do.

MR. ALDERETE: Okay, what I was suggesting for Project Detour that the monies come from at one percent from the Eligibility Certification Eligibility Verification, Assessment, Screening and Referral, I'm talking about total dollars now - the ABE, GED Program, the Handicapped Training, the Veterans Outreach, Pre-Trial Diversion, Ex-Offender Placemen and Non-Traditional Jobs. Well, it excludes Pre-Trial Diversion because that's one that's being upgraded in funding. So, it would be one percent of those that I just mentioned. Those areas in those categories.

MR. EURESTE: Give him the amounts.

MR. ALDERETE: Pardon me?

MR. EURESTE: The amounts.

MR. ALDERETE: The amounts would be like \$6,700 from Eligibility Certification,

MR. EURESTE: \$670.

MR. ALDERETE: \$670, I stand corrected. Eligibility Verification would be \$2,280; Assessment would be \$3,640; Screening and Referral would be \$4,220; ABE - ESL, GED would be \$2,594; Handicap Training would be \$2,057; Veteran's Outreach would be \$120.00; the Ex-Offenders and Non-Traditional Jobs would be \$3,340; and let me back track over here a little bit under OJT, it would be \$2,735. Which comes to a total of \$22,736, which would be added to the Pre-Trail Diversion Category to go exclusively to Project Detour which would upgrade them to approximately \$131,736. That would be the recommendation that I would have.

MR. STEEN: Joe, that completes your amendment?

MR. ALDERETE: Yes, that completes it, John, thank you.

MR. STEEN: Okay, I think now, once again, we'll ask Citizens to Be Heard to speak. We have a number of them and the first man, his handwriting is much better than mine, I'll have to admit, but I still can't read his last name. It's Reverend Joseph still can't read his last name. It's Reverend Joseph

MR. ALDERETE: Father Joe.

MR. STEEN: LaPauw. How does he spell that? LaPauw, come forward to the podium.

REVEREND JOSEPH LAPAUW: My name is Reverend Joseph L-A-P-A-U-W. It's a bi-lingual name. Dutch and French. It means, the Peacock, Joseph, the Peacock, if you like.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, sir.

REVEREND LAPAUW: I'm here on behalf of Amistad Music and Dance Program. The purpose of Amistad Music and Dance Program is to teach young children, teenagers, adults and elderly especially those of hispanic descent, Mexican and Chicano forms of music and dance. And so this program helps them to better appreciate their culture. The program is also invented to create a positive role model for children who may aspire this, such as we see in the Mariachi Infantil, Guadalu-pana and other Mariachi groups for children and for youths here in this City of San Antonio. And the program also seeks to make San Antonio a place where beautiful hispanic traditions of music and dance are highlighted. At the moment, there are 800 children and youth and adults and elderly enrolled in this program and the centers all around the City are in St. Jude's Church, in the House of Neighborly Service Center, and Our Lady of Guadalupe Church and St. Henry's Church, Alazan Apache Recreation Center; J.T. Brackenridge Elementary School; Presa Community Center; Victoria Courts Community Center; Holy Family Church; Our Lady of Angels Church; Mission Espada; Centro INAUDIBLE . . Kenwood Community Center; Centro Del Barrio; Our Lady of Perpetual Help Church; St. Timothy's Church; St. Magdalen's Church. The program is directed by the Amistad Music Program Coordinating Committee of which I am a member. As of October 1, there will be a permanent Director for this program.

There are presently 26 CETA participants who act as instructors and who administer the program. And, we are now at the mercy of you, the Council members, to continue this program. So, we are requesting 26 CETA positions, the 26 participants for this program, so that we can continue the quality and the quantity of this program for which has great educational value for some many participants in the City of San Antonio. I wish to finally say that what we see that children and youth and adults and elderly participants in this program get really a more positive image of themselves. They feel that they are something more worth and I would just suggest that when you see maybe children that you have, sons and daughters, and you see them able to play instruments just imagine, how you feel. And that's the way many parents feel who see their children and youth performing or learning an instrument. I, myself, would say, I'm from Belgium, from the northern part of Belgium, and I have enjoyed seven years of basic music and education. I came from a very humble and poor family, but in seven years the city where I lived in Belgium allowed me because they gave this program free to the City and many were able to get a basic, good music education through the help of the City and several Councilmembers. So, I would hope that I would see the same responsibility from Councilmembers. Thank you very much.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Father Joe.

MR. STEEN: Reverend, Thank you very much. Okay, I'll call on the next man, Dick McGoan.

MR. MCGOON: I want to thank you for giving us an opportunity to speak with you. My name is Dick McGoon. I'm with the Durham Business College and I'm here speaking on my behalf and also some on the part of the other proprietors. However, they're here to speak as well.

I feel kind of like the popular song that has the lyrics, "Where do I begin". Because, of course, this all started some years back when proprietary schools have been trying to get a reasonable participation in this program. We feel we've been able to evidence that we can benefit the program, correct and rectify many of the mistakes in the past. We can do it more economically, we can do it more efficiently and at a risk of one of our old lines backfiring on us, luckily, Mr. Eusebio, is not listening so he can't attack me on this; but we feel, for example, that last year we lost a class to a rented facility out by the airport that has since closed, and as I often say, of course, ours is not an A&M diploma, but we do feel that students graduating and employers looking for people would probably be more receptive to somebody that took accounting at Durham Business College than out at some facility that is now closed, never heard of and the operator is under indictment.

In trying to think, where would I begin I thought of the letters which last Thursday night, I believe, it was, Councilman Van Archer that said I wish you'd leave off these letters and tell us what these things mean. And I was thinking of CETA. You, know, I'm not even sure I know what CETA means. What does CETA actually what does those -

MR. VAN ARCHER: About \$35 million.

MR. MCGOON: But is it actually Comprehensive Employment Training Act. That's really it. If you'll look over this proposed budget as to where all the money is going. I see very little training, and you know I like to see children... and Father this is no... I want to see children dance, happy and be singing, you know. But I'd also like to see their fathers and mothers of those same children and the other brothers and sisters try to get a few bucks for training so they could get a job and maybe even pay for dancing lessons at a later time themselves.

I know my time is limited. You may recall that back on July 5 we appeared before the Council, and the Council positively agreed and voted on three items. We were much surprised last Thursday night I guess it was when we came to the "B" Session with the proposal that was here. Business Proprietary Vocational Training, it really is not mentioned anywhere other than to say that it was non-competitive. It wasn't competitive, we couldn't get it. One place we did see some things that were approved but there was no money for that. So, we'd like to remind the Council as we have on paper, that they agreed on three things.

One, of course, initially that no institution would be allowed to start new programs and offer them under a CETA situation where these programs already existed and institutions that were handling this locally and have been for some period of time. We see a lot of changes in that.

Number two, is that A&M was to revert to what their original plan was and that was to offer higher training. I'm certain that a degree in architecture from A&M would mean a great deal more than a diploma from Durham Business College in drafting. But I'm not so sure that they can sink to the levels of these modest training that we've done for 40 years in the secretarial, accounting, and so on fields. We see that A&M has a greater part. They've put in welding. Welding schools that have been here for years have been turned down because their courses are too short, yet their placement records are excellent. They don't spend enough, I guess in allowance money, is what it must be. You see they have air conditioning programs turned down because there's no demand. Yet we see A&M, all of a sudden CETA funds can be spent there, because there are funds there. Now we're not in any way discouraging the acts of A&M, we'd simply

August 27, 1979
bh

like to see them fill a need where they are really needed. And not have so much duplication as we've had in the past and looks like some people would like in the future. And the last thing was that the proprietary schools would be given 50% of the total participants in the skills training. Skills training, of course, has virtually dropped to nothing and then the interpretation has come over to where it's skills Buy-In training. Everytime they talk about cutting something and its skills Buy-In training. Staff says lets take it from skills Buy-In, you know, which is almost non-existent.

In this report we saw nothing that said how much would be there. So, of course, it compels us to request of you and we realize that there are only two women on the Council and you all have a right to change your minds. But, you did vote on these three things, and we now ask you for the fourth one. And that's very simple so that it cannot be misunderstood in case the recorder is not on during this part of the program as it wasn't during the last session. That the Council, specifically, say that Proprietary Schools are going to receive \$500,000 of this 32, 35, 31, 34 who knows million dollars for training skills. Which they've done for years, they did not evolve to grab up these government dollars, and we've been doing it. And we can take care of it in the future for less money and we just ask that you do what you said, what the act calls for and give us the opportunity for one year. We've been put off in the past because of accountability. No one has found accountability on these other people, yet they're still getting their money. So, give us a chance this year. Then let's all account next year and then you'll be able to make some intelligent decisions. In the meantime, I don't know how you could because I went to a lot of meetings. I've been very conscientious and I've studied the stuff. Of course today I couldn't have kept score because I didn't have a bingo card. So, I didn't know what row so and so was. So let me suggest that whatever you have to do to get Proprietary Schools in, if it goes A through Omega, I missed that part Alpha through Zeta. If you have to go one through infinity, whatever it is, cut them off, but get some training for skills and give Proprietary Schools the opportunity you said you would and the one they should get. Thank you very much.

MR. STEEN: Thank you very much. I'll call on Mr. Archer.

MR. ARCHER: Dick, are these people that go to these training schools, whether it's yours or the agencies or whatever, are they paid to go to school?

MR. DICK McGOON: On the CETA programs?

MR. ARCHER: Yes.

MR. McGOON: Yes, sir, they get paid now \$2.90 an hour for training and they'll get \$3.10 after the first of the year.

MR. ARCHER: They're paid to go to school?

MR. McGOON: They're paid and that's one of our problems, Mr. Archer. Is that actually our schools have had students enrolled, arrangements made and these CETA institutions have gotten funds have taken them out of school because they not only can pay for their courses, but they can pay them to go, \$2.90 an hour and it will be \$3.10.

MR. ARCHER: So, in other words, it behooves them to get out and hustle up students.

MR. McGOON: Yes, in fact, if you've made some of these meetings you'd hear about it. How they talk about the funds they need in some directions and then how they need to get out and knock on doors to try to fill these slots, because if they don't you know the money won't be spent and they've got it there, and they've got to get rid of it. Now that's another thing,

see the training that they propose to put over to Proprietary Schools 2/3 of the dollars will go out to training allowances, less than a 1/3 of the money will really go to training anybody, unless you pass a motion that we recommend, that we specifically be designated \$500,000, and we can be sub-contracted, there's no problem there. We have, some of our schools have small sub-contracts with these agencies now they can all do it.

MR. ARCHER: Well, this is the first time I've ever heard of a student being paid to go to school. Do they do that at U.T.? Paid to go to school?

MR. STEEN: Sure.

MR. ARCHER: Paid to go to school?

MR. EURESTE: Medical school.

MR. STEEN: It happens at every school.

MR. McGOON: Yes, there's a lot of them. You used to think of Veterans as only getting paid to go to school. But now, I'll just answer your question this way: I tell someone when they come to my school, "Tell me this first, Do you need help?" "Well, I don't know." I'll say, "Wait, don't answer that. Tell me, have you broken any law? Have you sniffed glue or dope? Have you robbed a bank? Did you rape anybody? Did you attack the principal? Or have you cut off a limb to help yourself? If you have, I can take care of everything. Now, if your parents have been law-abiding and if they paid their taxes, and if they tried and you've studied and obeyed the rules and graduated from high school successfully, get out of here. We can't do anything for you." It's almost that bad.

MR. ARCHER: I'm under the wrong impression, because I thought this money went to hire teachers and administrators and all that to try and teach and try to help somebody. I didn't know it went to paying somebody to go to school.

MR. McGOON: I can't give you the figures, but I'll bet there's less than 4 million dollars out of the 32 million spent in all of these schools. Talking about A&M, SER, BCOIC, as far as actual training goes. I may be wrong because you see I'm at a disadvantage; every time I speak here it's like having a debate without a rebuttal, and I'm going to be slaughtered by somebody when I leave here, because they're going to whip out a reg, they're going to do this and going to do that, you know, well we had this revision. I don't believe they can evidence 4 million dollars in spending to train anybody for employment out of this. I mean skilled training.

MR. ARCHER: Four million dollars out of the figure. Nobody knows how much we're going to get.

MR. McGOON: They won't be able to give you the 4 million either.

MR. ARCHER: So, you say 4 million out of 35 million is all that's...

MR. McGOON: I'm certain, unless somebody from the staff is going to correct me.

MR. ARCHER: Is that right, Mr. Cano?

MR. CANO: You're asking if there's four million for allowances?

MR. ARCHER: How much money of this figure that we don't know exactly how much it is, is actually going to train somebody?

MR. CANO: Approximately... let's see... approximately 42% of the Title IIB & C. Approximately 42% of 7 million.

MR. ARCHER: 40% of 7 million.

MR. CANO: 42% of 7 million. 42% of 7 million goes for allowances which translate into \$2.90 an hour.

MR. ARCHER: How much actually goes into hiring some teachers or whatever to try to train somebody...

MR. CANO: 53%.

MR. ARCHER: So 3½ million out of 34, 35 million goes to help somebody and the other goes down the rat hole.

MR. STEEN: Let's don't get into this subject.

MR. McGOON: Thank you very much. I promised myself before I got up here I wouldn't get excited but this is my livelihood. And so I do.

MR. EURESTE: I'm next.

MR. STEEN: I'm sorry, Van, are you finished?

MR. ARCHER: There's nothing else to say. I certainly thought that about 80 or 90% of it went to hire people to help somebody. So, in other words, instead of being an employment training, it's more of a big welfare system. Is that right?

MR. EURESTE: More or less like what Chrysler is hoping to get into. Sometime down the road, welfare.

MR. STEEN: Are you finished, Mr. Archer.

MR. ARCHER: Wait a minute, say that one again, because...

MR. EURESTE: More or less what Chrysler is hoping to get into. Sometime down the road, welfare.

MR. STEEN: We're getting a little away from the subject. Anything else, Mr. Archer? You pass for now. Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes. Mr. McGoon, am I to understand then that you want \$500,000 and you want this Council to earmark it for Proprietary Schools, right?

MR. McGOON: I feel that's the least they can do in good conscience that one successful year CETA training.

MRS. DUTMER: All right, do you have any subcontracts with any of these organizations?

MR. MCGOON: Yes, basically. See that's the only thing any of us would have had because we were allowed to submit for classes, we were told previously we wouldn't get them. So, what we have had is in subcontracting and what we would get if anything this year, unless it's specified under Buy-In, that would be under subcontracts also.

MRS. DUTMER: Well couldn't... I don't... I'll have to ask Mr. Cano this. Couldn't we, perhaps, mandate that these other agencies subcontract a certain percentage of their students to the Proprietary schools?

MR. CANO: Under Row 13, first page. There's a total there of approximately \$834,000 under the last three columns. If you take the total row, it's over 1 million. One million and 18 thousand dollars that will be available for Buy-In Training for people.

MRS. DUTMER: And that is actually earmarked for Buy-In training.

MR. CANO: That is to cover the cost of training, and there are no allowances in the \$834,000 which is the sum of \$619,000 plus \$214,000.

MRS. DUTMER: That includes the allowances or are there none?

MR. CANO: There are no allowances. In other words, those are people on public service employment, and the law requires that we set aside a specific sum of money for training for them.

MRS. DUTMER: Alright then, the 214 is also public service...

MR. CANO: 619 plus. \$619,000 plus \$214,000 are both for training public service employees.

MRS. DUTMER: And then what is the Title IIB, C ?

MR. CANO: Those are Buy-Ins, the same, the previous numbers I gave you... yes. But those are for people who will be paid allowances. Provided, of course, that they qualify for being economically disadvantaged.

MRS. DUTMER: So, then the over-all figure then is \$1,018,000.

MR. CANO: Yes.

MRS. DUTMER: How do you relate that, Mr. McGoon? I'm trying to understand, sir, that...

MR. MCGOON: Of course, I understand that. And I thank you for the opportunity of letting me come back, because you're gracious enough to prove me incorrect earlier when I said I wouldn't get a chance to rebuttal. The point is what Dr. Cano is speaking about there. That's a total Buy-In and many of those are people who are going to be working on these government projects in the day time. All these job slots that you've given out. Now, typical of the thinking would be, for example, Mr. Eason, who has a technical institute, has been approved for diesel mechanics on a P.S.E. And I'm sorry I don't know what that is, except that I know that it's Public Service Employment. So, these people are going to be working in places like the City Hall and that sort of thing, government jobs, things like cutting, you know. Now if they want to go to night school and improve, if they want to take diesel mechanics, and if they get approved, Mr. Eason might get somebody into night school for diesel mechanics out of this group.

Now, if there's all this money there, and I said there's a whole new figure to us, because the last time that it was mentioned before you on July 5, there was talk about a 1/3 of a million dollars and 2/3 of that would go out for allowances. If this is all there, it's a very simple thing to do, and it causes no one a problem. Just designate the \$500,000 of that training dollars be specifically designed and referred to Proprietary schools, and we resolved it. And it works out nicely. And with the rest of it, take it and beef up all these percents you've had to take away from everybody.

MRS. DUTMER: Mr. Cano, it looks like we're in a box. I don't understand all I know about this bit here. If there is, in fact, then, \$1,018,000 do you see any problem with designating \$500,000 of the \$1,018,000 specifically to ...

MR. CANO: No, we're going to have to spend the \$834,000 on training.

MRS. DUTMER: Do you see any problem with designating \$500,000 of that to proprietors schools?

August 28, 1979

cg

MR. CANO: I don't at this time. I don't at this time.

MRS. DUTMER: Thank you, sir.

MR. STEEN: Mrs. Dutmer, are you finished? Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: I'm going to pass. I think the discussion just seems to be going on forever. I don't know about the proprietary school. How much is your allotment going up? I'm asking you, sir. Is that allotment that is going to proprietary schools on the increase?

MR. MCGOON: We had no allotment, so I couldn't tell you.

MR. EURESTE: Is the amount going up? Simple question, you know two years ago you got how much, last year you got how much, this year how much do you think you're going to get, two years ago, how much did you get?

MR. MCGOON: Two years ago, we got about one quarter of one percent. This last year, yes overall proprietary schools did better, but we also had placement records, but we don't know what we're going to get because we're left in the state of limbo. All we ask is for a figure, then I could tell you how much it's going up when I go back and figure it.

MR. EURESTE: All I ask you know was it going up, historically?

MR. MCGOON: Historically, we got a little more this last year than we got the year before.

MR. EURESTE: And the year before?

MR. MCGOON: Of course, when you get half and then you get a three-quarters yes, it's an improvement; it's improved.

MR. EURESTE: And the only way that, how much did you get, if you want 500 thousand, where were you at in a year that you could actually tell me how much you got, where were you at?

MR. MCGOON: I cannot honestly tell you what proprietary schools got as a total, I could probably ask them, and they could tell me pretty quick, but I would feel safe in saying that we received less than \$175,000. I think that would be a high figure for all the proprietary schools.

MR. EURESTE: Do you...

MR. MCGOON: We don't have one, really. Half the schools have never received anything.

MR. EURESTE: Which of the other schools, Mr. Cano, which other programs participate as Buy-In training, what list are we supposed to refer to here? On 13 it says see list, where is that list, or maybe...

MR. CANO: It's attached to your briefing notes. Attachment #2 to your briefing notes. It's in today's package, in your folder, there was -- it starts off with a memo from me to Tom Huebner, requesting a City ordinance, that's the package and attachment #2 is the last page in that package.

MR. EURESTE: These are the institutions that would participate?

MR. CANO: That's right. I should add that this amount for training under public service employment is new, the CETA act was amended in 1978 and has required now as we move through time that more money be devoted to training from public service employment, this is quite a change in the law from pre-1978, which required no training.

MR. EURESTE: Let me ask you, Mr. Cano. All of these institutions that are listed here, are they considered as proprietary schools? The Carol Watkins Driver, CBM,...

MR. CANO: The only one that is not is well, there are two, MITP and San Antonio College and A & M are not, there are 3 out of that list of 13, so that leaves a net of 10 that are not proprietary schools.

MR. EURESTE: What do you anticipate to be the level of you know funding for those 10 proprietary schools, out of the money that's ...

MR. CANO: I would think it would easily surpass half.

MR. EURESTE: How much would that be?

MR. CANO: Four hundred thousand, I'm talking now of the public service employment portion, the 619 and the 214. You sum those two and you get 234, and I would say at least half of that.

MR. EURESTE: And how far away would we be from what he had?

MR. CANO: About a hundred thousand dollars.

MR. EURESTE: So, he would also be moving from what he calculated a little while ago, at a hundred and seventy five thousand to somewhere close to four hundred thousand.

MR. CANO: Yes, I don't know about his figure, but I do know that in general we've never had this type of money available before in the City of San Antonio and as a result of the changes in the law, this is almost like adding \$800,000 to the fund that was available for training.

MR. EURESTE: May I ask you a question. Does that make a better impression?

MR. MCGOON: Not necessarily, because you see PSE means public service employees when would this money be spent, when would these people be allowed to train can they go to day school or do they have to go to evening school or night classes. Now some of us have night classes; some of us don't. But fine, let's split this PSE money, this new-found fund with these other agencies and move some of this day training back into proprietary schools because I don't believe that it will profit us anything at all, I could be wrong, because as I say we don't have I don't want to use the term because too many people would agree that I'm not playing with a full deck, but we don't have the information.

MR. EURESTE: No, we don't either. I mean we're usually confused up here on this thing, that's how come I had to ask so many questions, you know.

MR. MCGOON: No, sir, I do not believe, and if it were what is the problem in simply okay, look the money is there, we won't jack around, we won't have anymore games with you, folks, and that's what the staff has had with us. In fact, I have to say as unpopular as it will make me, which I can't get any worse, I think, it's exactly what the Council has had, because I've seen you give them directive time after time after time, and they come back and never report on what you ask for.

MR. EURESTE: They're getting better. They're very good, lately they presented to us something I think was very much clearer than what I've seen before, and I compliment them for that. Let me just say that yes, I think that the reason we don't, I would hate to lock into a figure say of \$500,000 is because I don't know what the overall implications would be because there are those questions that you, yourself, just threw out that I don't have answers for you know the staff would, and we would need much more debate to get it at all of the answers to all of the questions that could be thrown out there. I am told, though, that the in the movement is up that there is an increase and that they mention a figure of four hundred thousand dollars, now I don't know how - how close that's going to come to the actual distribution; but I feel that what they're saying is information that I can use in my decision and four hundred thousand from five hundred thousand, it's a lot better than five hundred thousand say from a \$175,000, which you might have been at this past year, this current year.

MR. MCGOON: I can see why you would believe that, Councilman Eureste, and it certainly seems logical on the surface, except that we've had three years' debate minimum and everyone else in these programs have been tied in with the fixed amount, yet we have always been set aside. Now, the figures you got a little while ago about 13 schools, yes, these are all proprietary schools with the exception of three.

MR. EURESTE: Now, they didn't say they were all, they said these three are not.

MR. MCGOON: Initially, they did; then they said here's three that are not. Now, let's take what those three were. Who got the money, A & M, skills center, SAC, I don't know about the driving school but just because the percent there were ten of you on there doesn't mean we got any training, or got the money percentage-wise and out of this 400 thousand dollars that they talk about, again, fine can we get that in day school training or does this have to be with things that people want that are in clerical jobs and after work night classes. I don't know, but that's not the way I understand it but I don't have all the information.

MR. EURESTE: Well, yes, but if you don't know on four hundred thousand then you wouldn't know on five hundred thousand.

MR. MCGOON: Well, yes I would know on five hundred thousand if this Council specifically said so because I'll tell you I go back three years ago when I spoke strictly on my own behalf of Durham Business College and somehow by the grace of God and intelligence of the Council they allotted us 30 thousand dollars for my school, and we got those thirty thousand dollars worth of training. All I know is when this is left to indiscretion or to the discretion of the staff which is one in the same to me, we don't get anything, and you get fancy phrases and words about 400 thousand; but fine, just tell them to give us the five hundred thousand dollars in day school, you know the scuttlebutt about the PSE and the new this and new that and how we may get this, then we will believe one time but we have been disappointed and really misinformed on so many occasions that we just have to be totally skeptical, and we have to throw ourselves on your mercy; and let me say this, did this Council pass that resolution on July 5 of those three things and yet everyone of them were just set aside or violated or disregarded. Now, maybe politics required that, and I don't argue with that. We must be political, you said that yourself, and I maintained that probably the only people that supersedes the Council on being political would be the City staff.

MR. EURESTE: I would agree with you. Thank you very much.

MR. STEEN: Thank you very much. I'll call on Mr. Alderete.

MR. ALDERETE: I don't if it goes to Narciso or whoever, but who this PSE training is that primarily night school training or is day school training as well?

MR. CANO: It's - we haven't specified, we have to - it could be either or Roland, do you have any thoughts on this?

MR. ROLAND LOZANO: PSE participants can only work 40 hours a week, and we cannot add to those 40 hours so some participants have worked during the day. We can work during the day, those participants that are working at night, we can't work that out, hours at night but we can - if the participant goes to class six hours they can only work 32 hours.

MR. ALDERETE: My problem is this: that if you have a day time employee, and they want to go they only offer a class for a training during the day, are we going to pay them double by paying them at their employment as well as paying them over there. Okay, how would that happen if you had a situation like that, let me ask you in that manner.

MR. LOZANO: That participant would have time off from work to go.

MR. ALDERETE: Time off means no pay.

MR. LOZANO: No, they would be paid. They're in a paid status when they're going to class.

MR. ALDERETE: So, they're being paid for the job they're in, and they're also being paid for the training.

MR. LOZANO: No, they're only allowed forty hours a week. So it's the salaries plus the tuition for...

MR. ALDERETE: So, in other words, the employer really loses that person for that job during the length of their training. Okay, that's the only time, the only part that I have a problem with because if they're City employees, and we have somebody let's say is going to either secretarial or whatever and they only offer training let's say that proprietary schools only offer training during the day, then we are paying somebody in essence because they're not on the job, but we're paying their salaries while they're being trained at the school.

MR. LOZANO: We currently do that with non-CETA funded personnel in the City.

MR. ALDERETE: We do that now.

MR. LOZANO: Yes, sir, as other governmental agencies are. I don't know about some non-profit agencies.

MR. ALDERETE: Okay, then there's no question with that. That resolves it. I thought we were setting a precedent there for a second. Okay, thank you, my only other comment is to Mr. McGoan. I know that you're confused at times, but I don't know if you realize the history of this whole program. It was a lot more chaotic before than it is now and although I don't agree with some of the staff persons at different times, they have, as I think Bernardo pointed out, brought about an improvement as far as being able to focus in more clearly on what the situation is and if you give them a little bit -- I shouldn't say a little bit -- give them the time to perform and clear up a historically bad problem, there may be a relationship that can be developed not only with proprietary schools and agencies as well where it might work out. I don't think it's humanly possible to tell you the truth to go through all the regulations that these guys have to go through and all the revisions that the federal bureaucrats send down to them without any notice almost, that they have to come over here and ask almost for emergency action sometimes for a revision that creates a tremendous impact and tidal waves through the community. And it's awfully tough, and I would venture a guess that there's not a person in this whole place here that could do the type of job that we're all expecting. And you know I compliment the staff for their efforts. I've worked with them and they work very closely with me, and we don't always agree. As in this particular case, but at least they've sharpened the focus on the particular problem. It's not easy to handle it with all the regulations. I venture to say I think one of the regulation books Eddie one time mentioned was 900 pages in length, and I think they reduced it in size to 700 pages. Well, 700 pages of fine print is awfully tough for any human individual to keep up with. And I don't always appreciate the belittling of the staff. They've got an awfully tough job to handle, and I think they've done it commendably, and I think we as policy makers sometimes have a difficulty in understanding the position, but we also have the right to change and alter any recommendation that they have. And I think they've done a commendable job up to this point. And I didn't graduate from A & M either.

MR. STEEN: Joe...

August 28, 1979
cg

MR. ALDERETE: That's it, Mr. Steen.

MR. STEEN: Okay, thank you very much. We'll call on Dr. Cisneros, the marksman here.

MR. CISNEROS: I need, Mr. Cano, if I may please and I'd like you to refer to the list of allocation of funds. It is true as Mr. McGoan has said that on July 5 when we met in "B" session, we, the Council, directed a number of points. That organizations be precluded from doing new things; that the A & M facility in San Antonio be asked to phase out some of the more traditional programs and move into higher technology in electronics, etc.; and thirdly and I think most importantly, that 50% of the program design would specify that at least 50% of participants would be trained in proprietary schools. That was what we said on July 5; I personally made the motion. Now, what I don't understand is the great variation from that direction and what we have in front of us in this allocation of funds. Or if there's no deviation, then I just need to have that explained.

MR. CANO: There's no deviation, Councilman. The motion was that 50% of the Buy-In would be to proprietary schools. And as we've indicated, we think that will be met.

MR. CISNEROS: Through the P.S.E.

MR. CANO: That's correct, right.

MR. CISNEROS: Now, let me say if we were trying to or ask you, if we were trying to set a target of \$500,000 of non-P.S.E. training that would be done by the proprietors, how would that be accomplished? It would be done using item 13 or row 13 and using \$184,000 there, is that correct?

MR. CANO: Yes.

MR. CISNEROS: And then it would be done using row 10.

MR. CANO: Yes.

MR. CISNEROS: Which presumably would mean some proprietary training would be done, at least a portion of that would go to proprietary schools because SER doesn't do its own training for the most part, isn't that correct?

MR. CANO: They do some proprietary training; the amount that you see there recommended for skills classes would be for general office training, bi-lingual executive secretary and junior accounting.

MR. CISNEROS: The whole 438?

MR. CANO: Yes, sir.

MR. CISNEROS: So, there would be none there for say proprietary training?

MR. CANO: No. The Buy-In training... Yes, the Buy-In training goes to the CETA Service Centers for distribution.

MR. CISNEROS: The Buy-In training from SER?

MR. CANO: No, the one on row 13.

MR. CISNEROS: On row what?

MR. CANO: 13.

MR. CISNEROS: Okay.

MR. CANO: \$184,654.

MR. CISNEROS: It goes to the CETA Service Center?

MR. CANO: Goes to the CETA Service Centers for Buy-In.

MR. CISNEROS: So the only money under this plan available for proprietary schools is out of the P.S.E. money? Is that correct?

MR. CANO: No, the total amount on row 13 is available for proprietary schools. In other words, it would go - what I said earlier the \$184,000 would go to the CETA Service Centers for distribution. My general assumption is they could spend it; they will spend it at the 13, at the list of 13 that we gave you.

DR. CISNEROS: Proprietary schools.

MR. CANO: It's ten proprietary schools and three non-proprietary schools.

DR. CISNEROS: Now, assuming that I wanted to reach a total of something in the vicinity of \$500,000, non P.S.E., because of the problems that have already been stated with respect to P.S.E. There's only 184 that we've identified up to now, is that correct?

MR. CANO: That's correct.

DR. CISNEROS: Where else might it be possible to get direction that the training would be.....

MR. CANO: Row 11. Well, not even there. Row 8, 9 and 10.

DR. CISNEROS: Row 8, 9 and 10 would be A & M, and it does its own training. BCOIC that does its own training, and Project SER which does its own training, is that correct?

MR. CANO: All of that is for their own training. And we will have to spend the \$814,000 on training. The law requires that we do.

DR. CISNEROS: I don't have any problem with the training. The question is who in all cases would do the training? The proprietary schools doing the training still meets the qualifications does it not of being spent for training?

MR. CANO: Absolutely.

DR. CISNEROS: Mr. McGoon, may I ask you a question? Your proposal at a minimum of \$500,000 exclusive of other allowances be specifically earmarked for skills training and proprietary schools means you want \$500,000 non P.S.E. money is that correct?

Mr. McGOON: Basically, we're very uncertain about what P.S.E. money is, just as the staff was a moment ago. So, if it were available in day time, if it, you know were, things that were realistic, but I can't imagine too many people that are working in an office type situation are really going to want to take welding or something like that. Oh, it would probably benefit my personal school, you know in the secretarial and clerical fields, but I don't think it would meet the overall job demands of the community.

DR. CISNEROS: Mr. Cano, how can you clear up their uncertainty about the \$619,000 that is earmarked for P.S.E.? Their fears about day versus night and the kinds of training that folks would gravitate toward under the P.S.E.

MR. CANO: If the Council, well as I indicated earlier, we're going to have to spend that money on training and if the proprietary schools don't want to do it, we'll have to find somebody that does want to do it.

DR. CISNEROS: I don't think that's the point. The point is the uncertainty about that money is that they don't feel they can participate in it because of the guidelines now. In other words it's only at night time and P.S.E. people working a full day.

MR. CANO: It's not at night.

DR. CISNEROS: Well, what I'm asking you to clarify is a way in which we can, we can comply with the Council's earlier directive of that 50% split. By clearing up what they..inaudible.

MR. CANO: The way we see training being done is for some employees that may be only an hour or two a week. For others it may be as many as 20 hours per week in training. It depends on the employee more than anything else, and the type of training they desire. In those where the type of training is of the longer term nature, I think we're talking proprietary schools. Of those that are in the shorter term nature, i.e. one or two hours a week or perhaps maybe a week straight, we're talking a special seminar or a special class of some sort.

DR. CISNEROS: Alright, I would like to ask the makers of the earlier amendment if they would accept a direction to the staff that \$500,000 be spent in the proprietary schools out of buy in money under Title II which is \$184,000 and out of the Title IID City P.S.E. money which would imply then it would be spent which would direct that it be spent in proprietary and the necessary arrangements in terms of hours and in terms of day versus night and all of those sort of things would be dealt with by the staff. And I'd just like to ask if that would be acceptable to the maker of the motion and the seconder?

MR. STEEN: I believe, Joe...

DR. CISNEROS: I just need an answer yes or no, because it will influence my vote on the other things that people are asking for.

MR. STEEN: Before he, Joe, you were the maker of the motion. Bernardo took over the amendment so Henry wants to know yes or no in reference to what he just said.

MR. EURESTE: Well, why don't you have somebody second it, that's the simplest...

MR. THOMPSON: I'll second....

MR. STEEN: Alright now, Mr. Canavan.

MR. CANAVAN: I am going to support the earlier amendment but I have to disqualify myself from this portion.

DR. CISNEROS: The amendment to the amendment.

MR. CANAVAN: The amendment to the amendment. I'll have to disqualify myself.

MR. STEEN: The Manager has his light on.

MR. BRISENO: I'd like to have the amendment to the amendment clarified. Does that also include the Title VI money that's available. The \$214,000?

DR. CISNEROS: Yes.

MR. BRISENO: Okay, because you only mentioned the other two.

DR. CISNEROS: The amendment to the amendment is that the staff would be directed to allocate \$500,000 of this total money that's available in Row 23 to the proprietary schools, which implies then that it would be done in ways that could be handled from an hours point of view from a day versus night point of view and all the other present problems that prevent it from being spent at the proprietary schools. Those problems would be worked out. And \$500,000 would be allocated to the proprietary schools.

MR. STEEN: Okay and I believe that amendment to the amendment was seconded. So, I'll call on Judge Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: You almost robbed me of my train of thought when you introduced me. The amendment that Dr. Cisneros has spoken of, I second and I approve, but I've got to get some clarification. Is this totally from P.S.E.?

MR. STEEN: It's totally from Item 13 on your list and it covers all of the amounts of money listed across there from left to right under 13 on the list.

MR. THOMPSON: So it's Title II B & C and the P.S.E. funds. So, is it correct then to make some assumptions and this would be assumptions. \$184,000 or a large portion of it would be used out of II B & C. Is that correct?

MR. CANO: For proprietary schools?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. CANO: A fair amount of it. Its hard to say right now how much of it would be. See the \$184,000 also includes allowances.

MR. THOMPSON: I know. Well, how do you feel about the \$500,000 level as a floor?

MR. CANO: I have no problem with that. I would urge the Council, perhaps, not to link it to the other one. Because we have no problem with this designation, but with the prior one we do. So, I would urge you to.

DR. CISNEROS: An amendment to an amendment is the best way it can be done.

MR. THOMPSON: We can't hardly get out of this. We're in as about as deep as we can get now.

MR. CANO: Well, I would hope that the amendment, the current amendment would fail and that this amendment would be fine with us.

MR. THOMPSON: I don't know how it would stand by itself. I'm beginning to share Mr. McGoon's concern about how this, Dick as I know him as, his uncertainty about how these funds are going to actually be spent. As I look at the public sector employment is there going to be any trouble in spending these funds? Do you anticipate actually having a problem finding people that will enroll and spend these funds? Are we going to have an over abundance or are we going to have to find them?

MR. CANO: No, I think - there's no - I don't think we'll have trouble. And regardless, we're going to have to do it.

MR. THOMPSON: No, we don't.

MR. CANO: If the City wants to continue receiving Public Service Employment money we have to provide the training.

MR. THOMPSON: At the expense of my colleagues for just - if you can give me about 90 seconds of education. Public Service Employment. What are we really trying to accomplish here?

MR. CANO: Well, its changed from the introduction back in the early 70's.

MR. THOMPSON: Well, first of all, we're talking about Public Service Employees.

MR. CANO: That's right.

MR. THOMPSON: What does that entail?

MR. CANO: Those are people working for governments.....

MR. THOMPSON: Municipalities.

MR. CANO: Or government agencies like schools.

MR. THOMPSON: If they're paid with tax funds would that suffice for definition?

MR. CANO: Or non-profit organizations.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay, those people - now we're going to provide them training with these funds, for what?

MR. CANO: Public Service Employment provides jobs for, in this case, about 1900 people this next year, jobs. The law, as amended in 1978, requires that we set aside a portion of the overall money to train them, 15 percent under Title IID, 5 percent under Title VI.

MR. THOMPSON: We're getting close to the answer, now I'm getting excited as we get close. Now, you're really trying to improve the skills of these public service employees in performing public service employment.

MR. CANO: Not only that, but they have to leave after a year and a half in public service employment. They can stay no longer than 18 months. So we're trying to get these people ready to get good jobs once they leave.

MR. THOMPSON: Is a person that's not - not under, just an employee of the City, can they participate in this educational program?

MR. CANO: No, sir.

MR. THOMPSON: So they must be a CETA person?

MR. CANO: Yes, sir.

MR. THOMPSON: And the maximum term is 18 months, then?

MR. CANO: Absolute maximum.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay, and the employment goal is private employment because of the term of 18 months?

MR. CANO: In today's economy we're probably talking private, but it's not necessarily, it could be public. In fact many in San Antonio are to be commended for it, many of the people who got their start in CETA as public service employees have now been picked on the permanent payroll of municipalities, schools, and agencies.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, sir, well I feel very comfortable that the schools that provide this training but I do share their anxiety in knowing exactly when and what and how and maybe the best definition that can be given is, as Dr. Cisneros' suggested, is a level of spending which gives them some definition to their objective.

MR. CANO: As I indicated, we have no problem with that. The requirements of doing all this will mean at least that anyway.

MR. THOMPSON: Well, let's leave it right there then, that's good.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Bob. Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, we've been engaging in some parliamentary skulduggery here in case you haven't realized it yet by tying this to the amendment.

The first amendment means you either vote yes and you vote Joe's amendment in or else you vote no and you vote the whole thing down to \$500,000 for the proprietary school. Actually what it is, is a bit of parliamentary school skulduggery and under parliamentary procedures we should've voted on the amendment in the original form. So if I can and if I am in order, Mr. Mayor, I would offer to the Council a substitute motion. The substitute motion will not be in essence exactly the same as the first one because it will leave out part of the requirement of the first one.

MR. EURESTE: May I have a point of order.

MR. STEEN: All right, we'll recognize the point of order.

MR. EURESTE: A substitute motion is treated like a primary amendment and you already have a primary amendment. Well, I'm the expert on parliamentary procedure and have been here for two years.

MRS. DUTMER: That's one man's opinion. I'm also registered

MR. EURESTE: All right, let me

MR. STEEN: Let's let our legal people

MR. EURESTE: Parliamentary procedure really says that you should allow the person to present the case.

MR. STEEN: As far as I'm concerned you all are Mr. and Mrs. Roberts, but let's let legal handle it.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, I would like a clear ruling from legal and from Robert's Rules if you will please, because a motion is a clear and stated action, whereas an amendment is merely the changing of an amendment, I mean a motion, that is standing on the floor.

MR. EURESTE: May I, I don't need the book, I know this inside and out, okay? You have a main motion which was made by Mr. Alderete and he then wanted to make the amendment and you corrected him at that point and then I interjected myself and I said I will make that amendment. So that was the first amendment, the primary amendment to the motion. Then we came back and threw in a secondary amendment to that. That's right. That's all that you can amend a motion to. Now you have to work it backwards from your secondary back to your primary and then you work it from your secondary and then back to your primary and when you're back at the primary amendment you can amend again. But you have to wait till it comes all the way back down back to the basic motion that was introduced before you can do a substitute at this point because a substitute is treated as a primary amendment.

MRS. DUTMER: You still have only one motion on the floor, one stated motion on the floor, the other two are amendments and should've been voted on in single file.

MR. STEEN: Let's let Mrs. Macon rule on that.

CITY ATTORNEY JANE MACON: As I understand the question, we have a main motion, two amendments to that main motion and now there is a substitute to everything that's on the floor. Are the amendments that are now on the floor intended to perfect the main motion? All right, if that is the case then you know you can have a substitute which can also be perfected.

MR. EURESTE: Mrs, Macon, the primary amendment is on the floor, the secondary amendment to the primary amendment is on the floor also.

August 23, 1979

CITY ATTORNEY MACON: And have you voted on the - it would be best to clean up our act first and then substitute.

MRS. DUTMER: Well, but parliamentary wise it should have been voted on in singular action, but since we did not then it leaves the door open and we still have only one main motion standing on the floor.

MR. EURESTE: And we have a primary amendment, and we have a secondary amendment and we'll work out the secondary amendment first, and then the primary amendment and at that point you can do a substitute of the whole motion that is there now on the floor amended.

MRS. DUTMER: Mr. Eureste and Mr. Alderete, I would point out to you that we acceded to the City Attorney who has made a ruling that substantially the floor is open for a substitute motion.

MR. EURESTE: No, she didn't.

MRS. DUTMER: Because the amendments were merely to purify your first motion.

MR. EURESTE: She supported my position.

MR. STEEN: I think Mrs. Macon - her last words were to clean up our act, I believe Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: It should've been cleaned up in the beginning.

CITY ATTORNEY MACON: I think it would be better if this body would go along with this theory to go ahead and take care of these amendments and then that way Mrs. Dutmer could go ahead and make her substitute. Obviously, there is a difference of opinion as to whether the substitute would be germane at this time and in that situation.....

MRS. DUTMER: But Jane, it's a very - I'm sorry, Madame Attorney, it's a very fine point here because the secondary amendment that was tied to the first one means you vote up or down both questions, and we don't have the votes to vote it down. It's going to go out the window and the thing that the staff is working so very hard against was the amendment put forth by Mr. Alderete on the first motion and they definitely were for purification of the first motion and I am going to challenge the ruling of the City Attorney in this question.

MR. STEEN: I tell you what we're going to do for right now, I'm going to

MR. ALDERETE: I'll support the Chair - whatever the Chair decides.

CITY ATTORNEY MACON: Mrs. Dutmer, you can appeal the Chair's decision.

MRS. DUTMER: You bet you I can.

MR. STEEN: I'm going to have to since we're paying Mrs. Macon to render decisions around here in a legal way, I'm going to have to go along with her as much as I respect Mrs. Dutmer, at this time. I wish we could let our citizens be heard at this time and finish that up. That's why we're sort of behind on our motion and our amendments and so forth, because I was trying before we voted on anything to let the citizens speak because I hated to start voting on something when the citizens were waiting to be heard out here. So, if I could at this time - let me call on the citizens and then maybe we could get backand

MRS. DUTMER: Mr. Mayor, I haven't relinquished the floor yet.

MR. STEEN: You haven't, I'm sorry, go ahead.

MRS. DUTMER: I am going to challenge this ruling either here or elsewhere because it is not a determined ruling. It was taken on word of one Council person who is not registered and I would take exception to the - you're registered with the State of Texas, sir?

MR. STEEN: He's got his driver's license.

MRS. DUTMER: I'm talking about parliamentary procedures.

MR. ALDERETE: Point of order, Mr. Chairman, we don't want a driver's license here, let Mrs. Dutmer continue so we can finish up.

MRS. DUTMER: Mrs. Macon made the ruling in the first instance that it was a purification of the main motion standing on the floor. A substitute motion was permissible. The amendments by the person who seconded the amendment was certified to the legal attorney that it was a purification of the first motion standing on the floor now. Therefore that first ruling should stand that there is room for a substitute motion. I can see why they're fighting so hard because this in its essence will put across what they thought no one would recognize and that is that they tied it to the amendment so both of them go through and the staff has clearly pointed out why they do not want the first amendment put through and by tying it to an emotional issue then they figure it'll just sail right on through.

DR. CISNEROS: Mr. Mayor, if I may as the maker of the amendment to the amendment I'd be happy to withdraw it so that they could be voted on separately. I have every confidence that the amendment that I've made relative to the proprietary schools is the right thing to do. It has good support and that it will pass, it doesn't have to be attached to anything, so I withdraw it and make the amendment after this other one goes.

MRS. DUTMER: Good, there are going to be challenges.....

MR. STEEN: Okay, in order

MR. EURESTE: Another point of order, it is not proper to withdraw a motion after it has been made and seconded and you have started discuss on it.

MR. STEEN: He's right on that because we had - Henry cannot withdraw his amendment, so it's still on the floor. Mrs. Dutmer, now do you still have the floor or still want the floor?

MRS. DUTMER: No, no, I'll relinquish the floor. Go ahead, up or down I hope that you'll remember who it was that loused things up on this.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mrs. Dutmer. Now we're going back to the citizens, believe it or not. We're coming back to some of you people out there, we're going to call on Mr. Chuck Lee.

MR. CHUCK LEE: Mayor Steen and City Council, my name is Chuck Lee. I am the Director of Texas Vocational School. I have been the Director of Texas Vocational School since 1968. During that period of time

MR. EURESTE: Point of order. I found a ruling right here, a substitute offered for a main motion or resolution or for a paragraph within a

resolution is a primary amendment and can therefore be moved only when no other amendment is pending.

R. STEEN: Thank you very much. Let Mrs. Dutmer read that. I'm sorry, go ahead Mr. Lee.

R. LEE: I have been the Director of Texas Vocational School since 1968 and during this period of time our school has generated in the excess of \$2 million. This meager amount of money has gone to pay salaries and to buy services and supplies from my local merchants and if I may add also to pay various taxes. There is approximately ten proprietary schools in San Antonio, many much, much larger than Texas Vocational School. It could easily and conservatively be concluded that in excess of \$30 million are generated by these proprietary schools in the past ten years. Very little of the CETA monies has ever filtered down to our local proprietary schools to reflect on the monies that our industry has generated through private veterans and Texas Rehabilitation Commission sources. Proprietary schools are successfully providing skills, training long before many of the other schools existed. We did not evolve to grab government dollars. We have experienced facilities and proven record of many years. In addition, we are tax paying, not tax consuming institutions.

I kind of feel like I'm whipping an old dog because I think all of this type of thing has already been repeated but I think it should be mentioned again. Even though it seems like every time we try to get a point up here, it seems like nobody believes in the art of simplicity. It seems like every time that Council asks what appears to be a simple question to the planning board or to the staff that a very complicated answer comes about and consequently we don't get anything really understood.

But I do want to reflect back to that meeting that Council held July 5th of 1979, where Councilman Cisneros made the following motions of amendments to FY '80 program designed that were unanimously approved by Council. Of course, there again I think all of you are familiar with and I'm going to repeat what Mr. McGoan has already repeated. The program designated will proclude to the establishment of agencies and organizations referred to as training agencies of beginning new subject to train CETA participants where such desired training programs or courses already exist in established and recognized local schools or colleges. And number two, was the Texas A & M University facility at San Antonio formerly the Skills Center, shall be restricted from training CETA students in skills areas which are and have always been available and exist in local training schools and third and really about the most important one, is where the Council voted upon the proprietary schools sharing with training 50% of participants. Never was it brought up that it was going to be a Buy-Ins or any participants to me means that everybody that was going to train through CETA money was a participant and we were supposed to share in 50% of it.

But it now seems like this thing has gone into grays and greens and reds and blues and whatever where the 50% is now supposed to be 50% of Buy-Ins. That's a completely different story. Now, however, the program designed that you have before you where your final approval does not reflect our wishes or intent nor your direction of that meeting. And I guess I can leave it at there, because as I mentioned it's quite a bit of repetition on this type of thing, and it gets me upset because you know you come to a meeting like this and you try to use, you know, just answer and questions or questions and answers and expect to get the truth and no run around and the art of simplicity but I don't think it's practiced here very often.

R. STEEN: Thank you very much. Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Yes, sir, question to Mr. Lee. Just the amendment that has been made and that will be voted on which allocates \$500,000 of Buy-In under Title VI are available to proprietary schools that solves the problem that you hear.

MR. LEE: Yes, it certainly would, but it's becoming very complicated with the fact that maybe one Council member will say that something is trying to be railroad or whatever.

DR. CISNEROS: Well, don't worry about that because all I'm interested in is to solve your problem.

MR. LEE: That would certainly solve our problem, it sure would.

MR. STEEN: Thank you very much. The next speaker, Mr. David Lee.

MR. DAVID LEE: Mayor, City Councilmen, my name is David Lee, sir. I'm with the ENM Institute, it's been in operation since 1947. Constantly over the years we've trained an awful lot of people. We've made tax payers out of tax recipients, this is my job and I enjoy doing it. I find that since the CETA programs have come in they have been a detriment to me. I'm not able to train people because they don't send them to me. They've sent me a few but never enough and while we use to go out and beat the bushes and get students to come in and pay their own way today they get paid \$2.90 an hour to come to school and they go to skills center or some place else rather than ours. Now, I have a tremendous record in placement retention and placement.

I was asked to submit a proposal to these people and I did. Now the training that I've been doing in welding this year alone I've trained 45 welders and I'd say forty of them are working. And yet when my proposal was submitted I see where it was not accepted because it was too short and the program they said they had at the skill center would be better at A & M. That means that they'd be going 39 weeks at \$2.90 an hours or they could come to mine for 14 weeks at \$2.90 and I can guarantee you I can place them because I've been doing it for years.

Now, I'm not a public speaker so I don't want to take much of your time. I appreciate what you've done for us today in assuring us of \$500,000. I, for one, if I get any, will work hard at training them and placing them but I want you all to take notice that the program is being directed mainly at skills center or Texas A & M or ENM. I don't think that Councilmen are aware that when we submit our proposals they disqualify most of them. Mine particularly was disqualified and yet again I think I have the best record of placement in San Antonio. CRC Research has proven that I have and that by far alot harder students and anything that CETA would send. Thank you very much.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mr. Lee, very much. We'd like to call on Ms. Cathleen Voigt. Thank you, Ms. Voigt, appreciate you being here. Okay, we'll go to Mr. William from Goodwill. All right, sir. Mr. Pogue from Goodwill. All right, sir. Do all the Goodwill people pass? There are three more, do all of you pass? No one from Goodwill wishes to say anything? Thank you very much, we appreciate that. I think that covers all of the citizens that did sign up to speak. I'm afraid to be generous, but I will be a little bit generous. Is there anyone in the audience that did not sign up that wishes to be heard at this time.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, I'd like to hear from Ms. Turner, please.

MR. STEEN: All right, Ms. Turner.

MS. TURNER: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council. Of course, I missed the earlier discussion that went on between you but I did want to express our wishes at this time. And if I'm premature out of order as it relates to ABEESELGED, Texas A & M University, Texas Extension of Service cannot okay Adult Basic Education. We cannot operate the program on \$262,000 so we will pull our proposal at this time. What that will do if you take 42% of allowances that will cut back the instructional staff to two people. It will only allow you to maintain maybe a staff of 5 to train 5, staff of 5 to train 100 people, therefore, I do not feel like that it would be indicative of the type of things that we're trying to do for San Antonio.

I will share with you, we are the only agency in town that has been approved by the Texas Education Agency to do the industrial start up training. We have met with the approximately five new industries within the last 30 days. I know that a lot of money, time and effort has not only been expended by Texas A & M, it has been expended by the City as well, but if Texas A & M University is to remain in San Antonio then we do have to have the financial support to maintain the programs that we have been asked to do. We have with the San Antonio trained division, there's 9 training clusters, we have been asked to delete approximately five of them. We have been asked to upgrade and we have been asked to implement training to replace those training divisions or training clusters. The three training clusters that are to be phased out cost us \$72,000 last year. The training that we have been asked to implement is much more costly.

Now we are here at the request of the City. We have an application in - in conjunction with the City to build a building. We need to know what you all want training for because we are at the point of designing the building and we cannot build a building - design a building and change the program design every two years. It just will not work, it's not economical feasible, it's not cost effective. So I think at this point we want to do - we want to provide the training that the City wants, so just let us know what you want and how you want it and we'll try to do it if the money is there and if it's not then we'll have to make our decision. Thank you.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mrs. Turner. Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, I would like to ask Mr. Cano a question right now. Under the Adult Basic Education the 262-201 that Ms. Turner was talking about does that necessarily have to be earmarked to adult basic education?

MR. CANO: We think so. I think we need this type of training to bring people who are functions at the sixth grade level up to a point where they can at least benefit from some harder type skills training which we're trying to move the whole program toward.

MRS. DUTMER: Well, that's what I said at the inception and with A & M having 300 successful GED's with a 95% success and the other agency having 60 with a 90% success rate, I just can't for the life of me understand why we scuttle a good program and leave the one that's not doing the job aboard. I simply cannot understand it. I have nothing against programs if they are doing their jobs but apparently the records show they're not doing their jobs. Now, if it has to remain if by law, by law does it have to remain in basic education?

MR. CANO: No, it doesn't have to be by law.

MRS. DUTMER: This is not - this is not something that is mandated by the act?

MR. CANO: No.

MRS. DUTMER: All right, then I would ask Ms. Turner and then I'll get to my colleagues. Ms. Turner, if we took the 200, and see I have an indication from you that the \$786,253 also is deficient, right for a good program?

MS. TURNER: Well, you take 42% of that for allowances, then you take - which leaves you \$400,000 plus then you add the placement and follow up which will be quite costly if you do a good job, leaves very little to implement the new program. Now a program can operate and run 4 or 5 training divisions but I'm not sure what you really have.

MRS. DUTMER: Well, I agree with you wholeheartedly, Ms. Turner, that we asked Texas A & M here to solve a very bad problem within the City and that is unskilled labor. We cannot attract industry, we can't do anything else until we start training some of this labor and have some skilled labor here. Would it help you any if we took your \$262,000 and added it to your \$786,000 for strictly for skills and make that a million and quit worrying about the adult basic education?

MS. TURNER: Well, the money would be helpful but I have got to agree with staff that that training is needed. When we get prople for electronics technology, and we get the people for production machines and they can't function at a fourth grade level in their basic skills that training is needed, somebody needs to provide that training. What we had envisioned was putting the two together so we could give them the basic and movement of the skills and you have the total program, total package. Somewhere in this City someone needs to provide that training and I have been working with Texas Education Agency to get additional funds and for that program but you take 42% of 259 for a \$100,000 and you just cannot do a quality job. We can't do it, nor can any other agency unless they have the funds coming in.

MRS. DUTMER: If it were added into your Skills Program and skill classes could you blend the two and that way , you could put it all under Skills.

MS. TURNER: That was the long term plan when we got into the new building was to combine the two, have one administrative cost, have one rent cost. We have a job-related training component on Commerce Street and to combine the two, then you would have a total program. Because as it is now, with the new plan, the students are going to have to go to four places before they are to be placed in training. And then if they have to go to one place to get the basic and then go to another place to get the skills, I would think that it would be rather discouraging.

MRS. DUTMER: If you can do it, if we blend the two together, and you can make it all one program. You'll given them the basics and then pass them into the skills. You can accomplish that?

MS. TURNER: That was the long-term plan.

MRS. DUTMER: On the combination monies you can accomplished it?

MS. TURNER: We thought it would be, would not be economically feasible to move the training component on Gibbs Street and then hopefully, when the new building was built, move them again. But that you know at this point, I really don't know, I mean you really have to go back to the drawing board and shorten the pencil.

MRS. DUTMER: Would the City, would the staff have any problem with that, Mr. Cano, blending the two and letting them go with the Adult Basic Education along with their skills of training. Would you have any problems with that? You wouldn't? Well, then, all right, Mr. Parliamentarian, how are we going to do this? Just so we can eliminate some of this - that we had before.

MR. EURESTE: I need about five minutes to think this through.

MR. STEEN: Henry could include that maybe in his second amendment. If you want to combine the two monies. That's the one on the floor right now.

DR. CISNEROS: I have an idea, but it's not exactly what Mrs. Dutmer is talking about. And it would be incorporated within roughly the way that . . . INAUDIBLE . . . since I'm on the Board as the next speaker.

MRS. DUTMER: Mr. Mayor, can I first point out one thing. That if it is attached to the first amendment then they won't have this amount of money because Joe's proposition is to take part of the money away from A&M for somebody else. And I can't go with that.

MR. STEEN: Okay, let's call on Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Well, it's a compromise. It's not exactly what Helen has wanted, but, and it's not exactly what Joe's motion was, but it can be done. A&M gives out Skills Classes \$786,000. Miss Turner, the 42% allowances are required by law?

MS. TURNER: That is the figure, that is a working figure that staff has advised us . . . INAUDIBLE.

DR. CISNEROS: After you've spent the 42% what new programs are you going to do with the rest of the money?

MS. TURNER: Very little, very little.

DR. CISNEROS: What is the substance?

MS. TURNER: The program that would be okay. The programs we could, we would maintain production machines. We would maintain automechanics but we would have automotive electronics. We've got to upgrade that. Irregardless of what the Council does tonight, we have a lot of monies from our funds to implement an electronics technology training division here. But, this is not subsidized by the City. Now, but we might be able to go ahead and to do either the heavy construction equipment which the counties donated the land for or and or the electric lineman training, but we can't do both.

DR. CISNEROS: But that's what you're going to head toward with this \$786,000 out of the Skills Training money is that correct?

MS. TURNER: Yes.

DR. CISNEROS: Now you also had \$262,000 which is under the motion split to one half which would be something on the order of \$131,000 to do Adult Basic Education. And SER would have \$131,000 to do Adult Basic Education.

MS. TURNER: But you take 42% of that . . .

DR. CISNEROS: Let me finish. You're saying that you're not all that interested. You can't do, you can't do Adult Basic Education.

MS. TURNER: We can't do it. You can't run a total program for it.

DR. CISNEROS: But you can begin to apply some of that money to your skills training and do Adult Basic Education as a feed in to the skills training program.

MS. TURNER: What we would have to go ahead and look at . . .

DR. CISNEROS: What I'm suggesting is a compromise that we vote on Joe's motion, which does the split. And that gives A&M the latitude to take its \$131,000 and build it into the skills program. In other words, you're taking on top of \$786,000 that you got, and you can use it as you see fit to take Adult Basic Education and feed it into the skills program.

MS. TURNER: Do you know what you're doing to a total training, I don't know that, I don't know that, but I guess I'm out of order, but there is a total training program in the Gibbs Building.

DR. CISNEROS: For Adult Basic Education.

MS. TURNER: Adult Basic Education, and they operate on bare minimum as it is. And so what you're doing is you're tearing up a training program. It really needs to go, it really needs to stay intact and go with one, you know, we assume sponsorship, we took it over at the request of the City and Texas Education Agency from Bexar County Superintendent's Office. That money needs to stay. I just don't feel like that we can do very little, Adult Basic Education for \$100,000 and then turn around and take 42% of that for allowances.

DR. CISNEROS: Well, you're right, we'd be making the decision to basically phase out the Gibbs Building operation. SER would do \$130,000 worth of Adult Basic Education, and you would do under A&M auspices whatever Adult Basic Education you could do along with your regular skills training program. That's what the motion . . . that's what we'd do if Joe and Ben would agree to modify their motion such that A&M had latitude instead of being locked into Adult Basic Education. Helen, was that a compromise?

MRS. DUTMER: Well, very frankly, no. For the very simple reason that SER has not proven themselves in this program. And all you're doing is giving them some money. And I can see the reasons for giving them some money, but nevertheless, they have a 50%, I mean a 90% with 50 successes. A&M has three hundred successes for a 95% success. And we're going to split up a very good program, phase it out in favor of a program that's not doing the job.

MR. STEEN: Okay, Judge, it looks like you're about to light up down there. You're recognized.

MR. THOMPSON: Thank you, Mrs. Dutmer, the second statement that SER is not doing the job, that's not true. The figure that you look at, both of them have comparable in the deviation of percentages insignificant in my opinion, and the percentages is the figure to look at not the total, the quantity, the success rate if we're discussing the numbers, then we need to know why there's 301 or 50 in the other. I don't know why the numbers differ, but if we speak of success percentages that are indicative, and they're relevant; they're something to consider. I don't think that the difference in those two percentages are wide enough to be indicative to be an indicator to be sufficient to draw a conclusion of success or failure. I can't reach that conclusion. In fact, I'm thrilled with both conclusions. At 90 percent, that is a very good success ratio considering the population groups we're working with. It's a difficult job at ninety percent, my hat goes off to both, and at 95, I think that between 90 and 95, I really consider it luck.

MRS. DUTMER: You would say, though, that 95 percent of 300 is more than 90 percent of 50, right?

MR. THOMPSON: The 300 is a total representing 95. The 50 is a total representing the 55, or whatever that started . . .

MRS. DUTMER: INAUDIBLE On conclusion, but I asked the question you would say that 95 percent of 300 is more than 90 percent of 50, right?

MR. THOMPSON: I would, but that is not the equation that is to be looked at. Three hundred represents the population group of which 90 percent of. That's right. So, I think both of them are commendable figures of success. SER is not in any way to be condemned or looked as a failure.

MRS. DUTMER: I'm not condemning them, I just say that they're not doing their job.

MR. THOMPSON: Given the opportunity, I'm confident they can and will, given the opportunity. At 90 percent that figures is certainly for me to give my recommendation, and I will.

MRS. DUTMER: Well, that's your prerogative. But, I think you're INAUDIBLE

MR. ALDERETE: I would just point out that if SER had the same number of clients 90 percent ratio success would still hold true. So, if you raise the absolute number you would still have 90 percent of that total figure. Be it 10 be it 100, be it 1000, be it 5000.

MRS. DUTMER: Joe, I don't need lessons in mathematics. I can add, and subtract and do percentages.

MR. ALDERETE: Well, I thought at first there was a misunderstanding there with what Mr. Thompson was saying. Ninety percent holds true no matter what the number may be. The other point is that to say that they're not doing their job is like picking at random every University System in this City of San Antonio and looking at their ratios of success in either graduation or whatever and I would guarantee you that they would be different, and they would probably be a tolerance there anywhere from ten to twenty percent, and to say that UTSA is not as good as O.L.L., is not as good as SAC, is not as good as St. Phillips, is improper because they're all educational institutions that are contributing to a specific goal of educating the community. When one may fall short as compared to the other, doesn't mean that UTSA may be a lousy institution, if SAC falls short to O.L.L. in percentages doesn't mean that SAC should be removed from the community.

SER has been in the community for a long time. They're a nationally recognized organization, and they have proven through their performance that they are effective, and that they can do their job. And they should not be shunned or thrown out or separated or ostracized simply because they came only five percentage points lower than A&M, a well-established university. So, you know, I don't think that that's a proper view or perspective to take on an agency that's performed so well on the west side of town.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Joe. Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: I would just say that I think, what Mr. Alderete has said is exactly what I would have said. So, that not to - he did very well. I'm going to give him an A for that. Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Some of your observations, then, take us back to the question of where would people rather get their education from Texas A&M or from SER. All right, the figures then, you can't deny that 300 people went to A&M, 50 people went to SER, and you cannot deny that 95 percent of 300 people puts more educated people on the street than 90 percent of 50 people, Right?

MR. ALDERETE: Agreed.

MRS. DUTMER: Right.

MR. EURESTE: Well, so does 20 percent of 300. Twenty percent of 300 would put 60 people on the street, and I don't think you would be commending an institution that turns out 20 percent of a total number. Well, we're talking about A&M and SER, and Mr. Alderete was right, that the 95 and the 90 are not that far apart. One has more students than the other, that's obvious, it's here on the paper. The success ratio of each of the institutions though is not that far apart. It is five percentage points separation, and I don't think that five percent separation is indicative that any one of them is any better than the other.

MR. STEEN: Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: With due respect, the last sentence, statement, Mr. Alderete made in his commentary, I wouldn't expect you to say anything other than what you said, Mr. Eureste.

MR. STEEN: All right, thank you Mrs. Dutmer. Mr. Archer.

MR. ARCHER: Well, I'm a little confused, but you mean for this - you're talking about all these percentages because I'm not very good at mathematics, but for \$50 million, this is last year's program we trained 300 people?

MRS. DUTMER: No, no.

MR. EURESTE: This is one program, this is E.S.L., G.E.D., A.B.E.

MRS. DUTMER: No, Van, what it boils down to, this is one phase of the thing, and this has to do with Adult Basic Education, getting their GED and where the problem comes in is that Texas A&M has run a successful program, and now we're going to chop it in half whereby they will have to phase out this successful program in favor of another program, and what

(Everybody talking at once) Well, that's what I'm pointing out to you. That they're going to have to withdraw the program, if we go this route.

MR. ARCHER: Mrs. Dutmer, I think everybody knows that a degree from a major university, even though if it's a training program counts for a substantial amount.

MRS. DUTMER: If we hadn't asked A&M to come down here, practically got on our knees, spent a \$1000.

MR. ALDERETE: Point of order, Mayor.

MRS DUTMER: State your point. It's taken precedence, John.

MR. ALDERETE: I just didn't know that we allowed debate between Council persons. I thought we had an order of procedure.

MR. STEEN: I think that they were just holding a nice conversation. Mrs. Dutmer, are you finished?

MRS. DUTMER: We might as well be finished, period.

MR. ALDERETE: Call the question, Mayor.

MR. STEEN: Let me call on Bob Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: No, I call the question. I'm anxious to vote.

MR. STEEN: Okay, we've come around to where we're going to vote. We haven't spent but several hours on this, so I don't know, that's not too long for this City Council. We're going to come around and we're going to vote on the second amendment which was made by Dr. Cisneros. Do you all, all of you remember the amendment, or shall we have him repeat it, Henry?

DR. CISNEROS: I don't remember it.

MR. STEEN: Well, here it's written down somewhere.

DR. CISNEROS: Yes, the amendment was the \$500,000 be allocated from Row 13, the Buy-In Training from Titles IIBC, Title IID, and Title VI, of the proprietary schools and that it be arranged in such a way that it's possible to deal with those daytime, nighttime problems, with the hour problems and the rest. In other words, \$500,000 proprietary schools. That's the motion.

MR. THOMPSON: Okay, and I second it.

MR. STEEN: Okay, that's the motion. Now any discussion on that second amendment. If not, all those in favor, say Aye.

MRS. DUTMER: I'd like a roll call vote, please.

MR. STEEN: All right, we'll have a roll call vote. You want to say something, Gene?

CITY CLERK: Dr. Cisneros.

MR. GENE CANAVAN: I disqualify myself.

DR. CISNEROS: Yes.

MR. STEEN: Yes, Gene is disqualifying himself. Okay. We'll call on the roll and Henry said, "Yes."

MR. WEBB: Absent.

MRS. DUTMER: Because it's tied to the first amendment, No.

MR. WING: Yes.

MR. EURESTE: Yes.

MR. THOMPSON: Yes.

MR. ALDERETE: Yes.

MR. ARCHER: Yes.

MR. STEEN: Yes.

MAYOR COCKRELL: Absent.

CLERK : The motion carried.

MR. STEEN: Okay, and now we have Dr. Cisneros.

DR. CISNEROS: Just a question to the maker of the motion in dealing with the motion that we're about to vote on. Would you incorporate the notion of flexibility with respect to A&M share of the ABE money so they can do, ABE or ABE tied into skills training or allocate the skills training, the money to skills training, whatever they think is the best way to allocate.

MR. EURESTE: I'll agree.

MRS. DUTMER: That would leave them a hundred and something.

DR. CISNEROS: No, \$786 plus 131.

MR. STEEN: That leaves nine hundred.

MRS. DUTMER: \$931,000.....

DR. CISNEROS: But if they don't want to do ABE, they can apply it to the skills.

MRS. DUTMER: Is that agreeable?

MR. STEEN: That gives them a total of \$917,253.00 altogether.

MRS. DUTMER: Is that agreeable with Texas A&M, that's all I'm concerned about.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: I have an intelligent question to ask our people, here. Mr. Cano, how much - what will be - how much did we have in Adult Basic Education, ESL, GED of those categories that we have been discussing here? How much did we have this year?

MR. CANO: In FY'79?

MR. EURESTE: Yes.

MR. CANO: \$424,649.00

MR. EURESTE: And we are slipping down to - if we only have SER doing ESL, etc?

MR. CANO: Regardless of who does it, we're down to \$262,201.

MR. EURESTE: \$262,201. And then SER is going to be doing one half of that. So, it's very possible that we have - if A & M cannot do any Adult Basic Education, it's very possible that the only amount of dollars that will be going to that ...(inaudible) effort would be \$131,000. Is that correct?

MR. CANO: It's possible.

August 28, 1979
cg

MR. EURESTE: I'm just saying assuming -

MRS. DUTMER: That's right and you can't do a job with it.

MR. EURESTE: Do you have a comment?

MR. CANO: We think that \$262,000 is too low as it is. And to split it in half just makes it worse. But, ...

MR. EURESTE: Well, what is happening here is that we are reducing the E.S.L. money -

MR. ALDERETE: Not E.S.L., GED.

MR. CISNEROS: E.S.L. is on another ...

MR. ALDERETE: E.S.L. is already ...

MR. EURESTE: Okay, GED, okay. This amount - Where is E.S.L.?

MR. CANO: Under Innovative Programs.

MR. STEEN: 14.

MR. EURESTE: Okay, so it's still there, then?

MR. ALDERETE: Yes, ESL is still there.

MR. EURESTE: Oh, okay. No problem, then, I withdraw my objections.

MR. STEEN: Are you finished?

MR. EURESTE: Yes, sir.

DR. CISNEROS: You're incorporating it into the motion?

MR. EURESTE: Yes, it is incorporated.

MR. STEEN: I want to call on Judge Thompson.

MR. THOMPSON: In support of this mix of ideas, I think the notion of letting A & M provide the basic education that is necessary, that is required to advance the participant through the program. If it's needed, it's used; if it's not, they run into the advanced skills they came in the first place for. If it's not, they'll have to step back and provide those basic tools to equip them to get into the advanced training. Separate and apart from that SER will provide this as a separate entity which they have said they can and will. I disagree, I think they've been successful. They've said they can with this amount of money. And I think we should proceed. I think that this is the best mix that we could possibly have with this money.

MR. STEEN: Are you finished, Bob?

MR. THOMPSON: Yes, thank you very much.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Alderete.

MR. ALDERETE: No, I was going to state exactly the same thing Mr. Thompson stated.

MR. STEEN: Okay, we're back to Bernardo.

MR. EURESTE: I just want to make sure that A & M does not put aside the Adult Basic Education objective that's here and does nothing in this area.

Is that a possibility, Mrs. Turner? Is it a possibility that you will direct \$132,000 or \$131,000 in skills training and will leave zero dollars for Adult Basic Education?

MRS. TURNER: I'm not sure that's the way the motion or recommendation that Dr. Cisneros -

MR. EURESTE: It gives you that flexibility.

MRS. TURNER: It gives us the flexibility to do...

MR. EURESTE: Yes, it gives you the flexibility to go from applying it all to Adult Basic Education or applying it all to Skills Training or a mix. What do you think might be the case?

MRS. TURNER: Well, I think you're what? Take \$131,000 -- 42% of that you're going to do very little Adult Basic Education. We're going to do very little with that amount and I - and so will Project SER. When you split it up; you can split it again and that all the money you've got for training. And I mean, that's just the facts of life.

MR. STEEN: Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: It's just a basic fact of life to recognize quality. And what you have done is put up two very poor programs for Adult Basic Education. You are not going to achieve anything and you have, in effect, squandered two hundred and sixty-two thousand dollars. Because you are not going to be able to accomplish the goals set forth for this money. It's that simple, and I really can't understand some of the - Now, I can see why you would vote for the first go-round, the \$500,000, but when you tied it to the second, the first amendment, then you - I know that SER said they could do a good job. But, we have qualified people up; you had four of them tell you it can't be done. And yet you went ahead with it. All right, we've taken to vote, and I'll abide by the vote and but what you have done is injure the people who need the education.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mrs. Dutmer. Mr. Cano.

MR. CANO: We would request that rather than split it, give it all to SER as was the initial proposal.

MR. STEEN: Well, if we're going to do that, we'll have to change the motion to read it. Let me - we'd better to leave it as it is right now, unless somebody wishes to do that. We'll call on Judge Thompson again. Let me say this. We've kind of gone back and forth in our debate here, and I think we should proceed, if we can.

MR. THOMPSON: This is going to be my final word.

MR. STEEN: All right.

MR. THOMPSON: The great benefit that Project SER has is that it is on the west side; it's there for the people to use. It's a splitting-up of a benefit that's needed there. And if it's not there it will not be utilized. If I don't, if District 6, 5 & 4 don't have, we don't have that Project located in our vicinity, and it's required that our citizens or our kids or our young people go all the way down to that center, they're not going to go. And I want it in the location. I want it where it's usable, it's as easy as possible, and it's made accessible to them. And that's the reason I want it over there. Now, I think that the split that we have made, I think the logic is sound. I think the benefit is reached from Texas A & M's side by having that as a needed money to provide basic education if it's needed. If it's not needed, then press them right on to the advanced training school. But, if it's needed, take the time to provide that. Hopefully, every student that walks in there will not need it. I hope they won't. But some will.

Provide that for those that need it. Now, if there's a doubt, if there's going to - if we're going to shelter these programs and such, we're only going to take people that do not need basic education, and I think that's wrong. We're going to have some that come through there that are going to be provided those skills so that they can get into the advanced school. And I want to make sure that program is in place there. But, that's the balance that I think we need. And unless we have Project SER working on the west side, you can just say that GED is not going to be accomplished on the west side of San Antonio. And I'd ask for a question.

MR. ALDERETE: I second it.

MR. STEEN: Well, I feel like we have to recognize everybody on the board, if you want to continue to debate the issue. I wonder if we could get our speeches down to a few seconds instead of a few minutes so we can get going here. Let me call on Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, he said that was his final statement. This is my final statement. I recognize that it's on the West side and I recognize that you and some of the others here have to vote that way. I don't.

MR. STEEN: Okay, Mrs. Dutmer. Bernardo, this is your final statement.

MR. EURESTE: I can't believe what's going on. That's my last statement.

MR. STEEN: Okay, now. Joe has about a five-minute first amendment.

MR. ALDERETE: I'll go through it very quickly.

MR. STEEN: If he will, shorten it. Make it your final statement.

MR. ALDERETE: I think it's clearly understood that SER is going to get 50% on Project Detour. Did the staff understand how we've come to that one percent reduction per category? Or do you want me to repeat it?

MR. STEEN: I think they understand.

MR. ALDERETE: And the other is the MITP to be pro-rated from the other skills training courses or agencies. And that's the motion built in with it, as well as all the amendments that have passed?

MR. STEEN: All right, let's vote on the motion. We'll have a roll call vote.

MR. WEBB: Absent

MRS. DUTMER: no

MR. WING: yes

MR. EURESTE: yes

MR. THOMPSON: yes

MR. ALDERETE: yes

MR. CANAVAN: yes

MR. ARCHER: no

MR. STEEN: yes

MAYOR COCKRELL: absent

DR. CISNEROS: yes

CLERK: The motion carried on the amendment also.

MR. STEEN: Okay, now we'll vote on the original motion.

MR. EURESTE: As amended.

MR. STEEN: As amended, right.

MR. ARCHER: You mean the original motion of the -

MR. STEEN: Yes, this right here. Item 45.

MR. ARCHER: Before you do that, I'd like to make my last statement. Is that all right?

MR. STEEN: It sure is. Mr. Archer has the floor.

MR. ARCHER: And this is my last statement. I'm going to vote against the whole thing. I know it doesn't do any good and it's strictly, you know, it's not a City program or anything. I know it's sent down here by Washington. But, here we are talking about an amount of money that nobody nor the staff even knows exactly what the amount is. But it comes to around \$14 billion nationwide. And I know, that I went around last week and I visited with some of the different agencies, and there are a lot of wonderful people that are really dedicated to what they're doing that I met. But on the other hand, every department head that I've talked to that works for the City has laughed about the program. They might not laugh up here, but everybody says it does the morale problem to the other workers that are employed there full time. I noticed by looking down here on the sheet that we got last week where you fund all of these other different non-profit agencies and so forth. Well, most of them I've never heard of and don't know what all these initials stand for, but I don't mean to pick on anyone in particular, but you've got down here the S. A. Ballet Co. for \$204,000, and I don't know how in the world anybody could say that you're training somebody to dance ballet, that you're training them for anything in the future. I mean it's nice to take dancing lessons. I tried myself. I took ballroom dancing and didn't do too hot at it, but for 25 people to pay \$204,000 I don't see where that does one lick of good. And as far as these training programs are concerned, I was kind of disturbed a little bit to tell you the truth to visit several of them, and I think they all do it. But I noticed a lot of foreigners that are being trained with United States taxpayers' money. And I noticed people from Japan, from Cambodia, from Thailand...

August 28, 1979
cg

MR. EURESTE: From Mexico?

MR. ARCHER: From Mexico, too. But I wanted to mention these other countries first because it's not just people from Mexico. They're people from all around the world and it's fine to help people but I think we need to help people here in the United States first. And people are having a very, very hard time.

When you think that their money is going for things like this - and then I see so many of these agencies around that happen to be national in scope and franchise locally to just get money. And I believe that you all know this, that when they talk about and it's not just this program, but so many of these welfare programs, they talk about aren't you going to help the poor. Well, I'm a little tired of hearing that, too, because most all of these programs and you all know this, they're interested first, their number one concern is helping themselves. Number two, they're trying to build themselves a political base, and the third thing is then they try to help the poor a little bit. But the whole program, to think that we're spending \$14 billion nationwide and have the type of inflation that this country's going through and

MR. WING: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. ARCHER: What is it?

MR. WING: I would suggest that if it's a national program, Mr. Archer wants to talk to, he should make an appointment with Mr. Carter. And it's not germane to the subject.

MR. ARCHER: Well, it is very germane to the subject. I beg your pardon.

MR. WING: Not the national level, not the national level.

MR. ARCHER: Well, it is though, because they send it down here for us to administer. And for us to pour down a rat hole is what they're doing. And so, I'm just going to register my protest to the whole thing, and I think the Congressmen who vote for this type of program ought to be ashamed of themselves.

MR. STEEN: We let Mr. Archer get a little bit off the subject, but after all he's been very nice and quiet all afternoon. I think he deserves a little time. I want to call on Mr. Eureste.

MR. EURESTE: I just wanted to say that I'm - if department heads, you said every department head laughed at this program and its participants. You know, if I ever find out who that department head is

MR. CANAVAN: You're going to get him fired?

MR. EURESTE: No, I'm not going to get him fired. I won't fire him, I'm not going to get him fired, okay? And I don't think this is as light, I think this is very serious because these are people, these are human beings you're talking about. And if this is the attitude of department heads about their own employees and employees that work under them, I don't like that kind of attitude. You know, all workers whether CETA or whether on City payroll or that come out of our local dollars, they're employees of the City and they should not be treated differently and should not be laughed at simply because they are CETA. Many of them are learning. We've seen wonderful things done by CETA people here in the City. A lot of the work that was done in front of the Alamo was done by CETA people. A lot of the curb cuts that are going to benefit the

handicapped people are done by CETA people. Whatever department head is laughing at that type of work, you know, ought to have his head examined. A type of person like that doesn't belong in the City. A department head like that doesn't belong in the City to laugh and mock and make fun of people who are under this program. And this type of money helps people buy bread, butter and shoes and clothing and pay for the rent. It provides money for this economy. That money circulates and it winds up at Joskes and it winds up at Sears and at Montgomery Wards and at Handy Andy and HEB and some of it winds up right here in the City because some of that is tax money that comes right back to the City. It circulates. This is one way to deal with the massive unemployment that we've got in this country. And if it were not for this money there would be, in this City about 3,700 people that would not have a job, or that would have to look elsewhere.

MR. ARCHER: That's what you call socialism.

MR. EURESTE: Well, Mr. Van Archer, Chrysler is asking for the same thing, okay? Lockheed got the same thing. That's not socialism. That's helping out a business. This is not socialism, this is helping out people.

MR. STEEN: Thank you very much. We'll go to Mr. Alderete.

MR. ALDERETE: Yes, Van, just very briefly, one of the comments that you made is that these people are looking out for themselves. I assume that you're saying it about proprietary schools, the agencies and A & M also. You're including all of them because they're all looking out for themselves.

MR. ARCHER: You know what I mean.

MR. ALDERETE: Well, that's what I thought you meant, you meant everybody. I thought you meant that, Van. I wasn't too sure.

MR. ARCHER: No, I said, you know, exactly what I mean.

MR. ALDERETE: Well, okay, if that's what you're saying. Then what I'm saying is that everybody out there is looking out for themselves and that's not only the way they operate. You go to the private sector that's exactly the way they operate. They look out for themselves.

MR. STEEN: Okay, thank you, Joe. We'll go to Mrs. Dutmer.

MRS. DUTMER: Yes, I'm going to speak to the motion, strangely enough.

MR. STEEN: Great, appreciate it.

MRS. DUTMER: All right, what you have on the table now is we have cut this Adult Basic Education from Texas A & M in half already and now you're coming back and taking one percent more from them. Another 13,500 so that you can go into your basic motion to accept the whole thing. I'll just emphasize once again, I think you're doing a disservice to the community, and I think you're doing a disservice to the people who are hopefully looking to these programs for some education.

MR. STEEN: Thank you, Mrs. Dutmer. We'll now vote on the original motion as amended with a roll call vote.

AYES: Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Steen, Cisneros

NAYS: Dutmer, Archer

ABSENT: Cockrell, Webb

CLERK: The motion carried.

79-40 The Clerk read a proposed resolution supporting investigation of legal steps needed to declare the abandoned postal site (GSA Site) bounded by S. Flores, Guenther, Main, and Sheridan as an Urban Renewal Area.

Mr. Archer expressed concern about the fact that the Council had not previously been given a copy of the subject resolution. He stated that he was not given an opportunity to read it.

The Council agreed to hold this item for a while.

79-40 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 51161

REAPPOINTING ELIAS REYNA AND JOSEPH RAY KAISER AND APPOINTING PETE CORTEZ, BILL DODDS AND KAY BROWN TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION FOR A TWO (2) YEAR TERM EXPIRING JULY 31, 1981.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51162

REAPPOINTING LUPE TORRES VENEMA AND L.C. RUTLEDGE TO THE HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO FOR A TWO YEAR TERM EXPIRING APRIL 6, 1981.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51163

REAPPOINTING DR. PRENZA L. WOODS AND APPOINTING DORA SALINAS AND DR. TUCKER GIBSON TO THE MUNICIPAL CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION FOR A TERM OF TWO (2) YEARS EXPIRING APRIL 30, 1981.

* * * *

AN ORDINANCE 51164

REAPPOINTING JESSE OVIEDO AND CELESTINO RODRIGUEZ TO THE ZONING COMMISSION FOR A TWO (2) YEAR TERM EXPIRING APRIL 30, 1981.

* * * *

79-40 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51165

APPOINTING DR. ROBERT HILLIARD TO THE FIREMEN'S AND POLICEMEN'S CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION FOR A THREE (3) YEAR TERM EXPIRING MAY 31, 1982.

* * * *

Mr. Raul Rodriguez spoke to the Council against the appointment of Dr. Hilliard to this Board. He said that Dr. Hilliard cannot devote the needed time to serve on this Board since he has such a busy practice. Mr. Rodriguez stated that he, in turn, can devote all the time needed to serve on the Board.

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

79-40 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Canavan, seconded by Dr. Cisneros, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Dutmer, Wing, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Webb, Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 51166

APPOINTING GLORIA S. MARTINEZ, LILI ESPARZA, HELEN MADLA, COOKIE BELINSKI, PAULINE SABALA, GLORIA CHAPOY MANAVI, CINDY BARRETT, RHODA PHILBY, DOROTHY PICKETT, AND LT. COL. MARY DIGGS TO SERVE ON THE MAYOR'S COMMISSION ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN FOR A ONE (1) YEAR TERM.

* * * *

79-40 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 51167

AMENDING THE ANNUAL BUDGET SO AS TO CHANGE THE TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT PARKING FACILITIES DIVISION ESTIMATED REVENUES, EXPENDITURES, AND PERSONNEL COMPLEMENT.

* * * *

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

Mr. Archer spoke against the motion. He felt that the parking charges at El Mercado will defeat the purpose which the Council has worked for in trying to bring people back downtown to shop.

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

79-40 The following Resolution was read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Alderete, seconded by Dr. Cisneros, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Cisneros, Eureste, Thompson, Alderete, Canavan, Archer, Steen; NAYS: Wing; ABSENT: Webb, Dutmer, Cockrell.

A RESOLUTION
NO. 79-40-92

SUPPORTING INVESTIGATION OF LEGAL STEPS NEEDED TO DECLARE THE ABANDONED POSTAL SITE (GSA SITE) BOUNDED BY S. FLORES, GUENTHER, MAIN, AND SHERIDAN AS AN URBAN RENEWAL AREA.

* * * *

CITIZENS TO BE HEARDMR. PAT SEMELSBERGER

Mr. Pat Semelsberger, 8107 Clegg Drive, spoke to the Council regarding the status of the Hillside Acres Water and Sewer Project. He stated that the project is ninety percent completed, however the streets have again been torn up. He said that gravel is loose on the street and oil is showing through.

Mr. Thompson stated that he personally investigated the site and described the condition of the streets. He asked through the City Manager that the staff investigate and report to the Council on the street work being done in this area including the change in width and street material.

MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ

Mr. Raul Rodriguez stated that past City Councils and City Managers have been intimidated by the Police. He spoke against the granting of pay raises to police officers.

MRS. KAY BROWN

Mrs. Kay Brown, representing V.O.I.C.E., stated that the residents in the Valley Hi area are very concerned about the lack of police service. They suggested that \$3 million be allocated for 150 police officers out of returned State Revenue Sales Tax.

A discussion then took place among the Council and Mrs. Brown about the current police protection in the Valley Hi area as well as other parts of the City. Mr. Thompson suggested a realignment of shifts and redesigning of police districts.

Several Council members stated that they would take Mrs. Brown's suggestion under advisement.

MRS. REATHA NEWTON

Mrs. Reatha Newton presented a proposal to the Council on a beautification program she had developed. She explained the proposal to the Council and asked them to consider it. (A copy of Mrs. Newton's proposal is on file with the papers of this meeting.)

79-40 The Clerk read the following letter:

August 17, 1979

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

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

August 10, 1979

Petition submitted by Pete Enriquez requesting investigation of his grievance.

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

GVJ:mb
August 23, 1979

-60-

There being no further business to come before the Council
the meeting was adjourned at 7:00 P.M.

A P P R O V E D

Lela Cockell

M A Y O R

ATTEST:

G. V. Jackson
C i t y C l e r k

August 23, 1979
nsr

-61-