

SPECIAL MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 25, 1972.

* * * *

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 A. M. by the presiding officer, Mayor John Gatti, with the following members present: HABERMAN, HILL, MENDOZA, GARZA, NAYLOR, PADILLA, GATTI; Absent: BECKER, HILLIARD.

- - -
72-47 The invocation was given by Councilwoman Carol R. Haberman.

- - -
72-47 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

- - -
MAYOR GATTI: Ladies and gentlemen, this morning we are going to have a Public Hearing on a proposed annexation of various areas that lay outside of the City. The procedure will be: "We have 17 ordinances and we will have a separate public hearing on each of the 17 areas. They are all numbered on a map that is outside in the hall and we have a map here. Now, the normal procedure for citizens to be heard at City Council is that each citizen wishing to be heard will have five minutes to express his opinions either pro or con in reference to each one of the proposed annexed areas. We feel that this is a reasonable amount of time and it has worked well in past hearings. Secondly, the Council is going to establish a rule that we want to hear from each citizen, and we will not entertain any individual giving up his time to someone else. Now, I'd like to get the input from the Council. Is this satisfactory to all of you?"

COUNCILMAN ED HILL: Yes sir. I feel like it's a reasonable length of time. I agree.

GATTI: Now, prior to each public hearing, I will call the hearing open. Mr. Davis of the City Planning Department will indicate where that area is on the map and give a very brief explanation of it. Then, we will call on the people who have registered to discuss their feelings about that particular area. After we have heard from everyone who is registered for that area, we will call that hearing closed and proceed with the next one.

The first public hearing.....well I'll let the Clerk read it so it will be official.

CITY CLERK: The first order of business is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 2759 acres of land in Area I-A.

GATTI: I will declare the hearing open on Area I-A. I have one individual signed up, Mr. Hubert Green, Attorney. Oh, first of all, go ahead Ed. Give us a little....

ED DAVIS: Thank you, Mayor Gatti. Area I-A is the area bounded by S. W. Loop 410. It is south of the Kelly Air Force Base area, and it is shown on the map on the right here in the lower left hand portion of the map it covers some 7.97 square miles with total dwelling units of 7,169 within the area. Area I-A.

GATTI: As I said, Mr. Hubert Green. Mr. Green here? You keep the time, Mr. Inselmann.

October 25, 1972

img

HUBERT GREEN: May it please the Mayor, lady and gentlemen of the City Council, I am Hubert Green, Jr. I am here today representing Ray Ellison Industries. I have handed the Clerk and the Council a written statement filed by Mr. Frank Manupelli, Executive Vice President of Ray Ellison Industries, which we will leave with you and sets forth position. What I will do in very brief remarks is simply summarize that and give you my expressions on this subject. I know you will bear in mind that, although you have 17 different hearings in 17 different areas, that the Ray Ellison Industries are interested in the question in most all of these different ordinances, however, I will not burden you with repeated statements in each hearing, but will attempt to cover our criticisms and our objections at this one time in these brief statements.

(The following is the written statement of position which was presented to the Council by Mr. Green.)

"As a concerned citizen and taxpayer, and a corporate executive of a business enterprise that forms one of the larger entities in private industry in this area, and which directly and indirectly provides employment for thousands, and consistently contributes its share of dollars into the local economy, I desire to make this statement on this vital issue before the City Council at this time.

We as Ray Ellison Industries feel a deep sense of responsibility to those thousands of people who have purchased Ray Ellison homes, and especially in view of a recent poll which indicates that 72% of them are against annexation, with 16% undecided, and only 12% for annexation - that these homeowners should receive uninterrupted and adequate services such as water, sewer, street maintenance, fire and police protection. They should not be subjected to "forced annexation" when there has been no definite commitment or enforceable assurances that they will continue to receive without delays and interruptions, these vital services after such proposed annexation. We feel that the Council is attempting to project the City into areas where admittedly there have been no feasibility studies. The actions of the past raise questions of grave doubt as to proper preparation and adequate legal and contractual assurances.

When annexation was attempted by this Council last spring, we explained in vain some of the pit falls and intricate legal problems surrounding a wholesale type annexation without the benefit of adequate feasibility studies, nor adequate preliminary steps to avoid serious legal problems surrounding privately owned utilities in these areas. We have repeatedly brought to this Council's attention, the serious legal ramifications of continuing to operate existing utility systems after annexation. The replies have consistently been, in effect, that you will annex first, and worry about these problems later. Some of you have recently raised legitimate and searching question on this issue. It is inconceivable that annexation can be seriously considered without first resolving these questions.

These are decisions affecting every taxpayer of the City, as well as every homeowner. These are not matters that can be "swept under the carpet" in the name of City progress.

It is not in the public interest to act before these serious matters have been resolved."

Frank Manupelli
Executive Vice President
Ray Ellison Industries

* * * *

October 25, 1972

-2-

img

MR. GREEN: You recall that I appeared before you at the last public hearing in April, and we expressed at that time certain objections and certain criticisms to what I said was an annexation ordinance rather than an annexation plan. I come back to you now, many months later, and being forced by the force of time and by the events that have intervened to repeat, largely, what was said at that time, because I fear that some of the mistakes that were made at that time and have been made since are likely to be repeated in the present annexation ordinances. First of all, I pointed out at that time that the original ordinance last April was punitive and discriminatory. That charge and allegation has been proven true in the intervening months. You have found out and you have known at that time and you've since found out that there were punitive features that resulted from certain lobbying activities that took place in City Hall against the Ray Ellison Industries. You know about that. I don't have to remind you. It is clear and it is unquestioned. Secondly, I pointed out at that time that the area being taken in was too large an area. It was not an area that could be serviced feasibly or legally by the City of San Antonio. That objection, that criticism has proven to be true. The original ordinance was set aside because it encompassed too large of an area. Thirdly, I pointed out that it appeared to us that the ordinance was not preceded with the proper planning, that there was not any special plan, that there was no consistent criteria offered at that time for the annexation of any particular area as compared with some other area. That criticism has proven to be true in the meantime. The City still does not have and has not adopted a consistent criterion for the annexation of any area. In these ordinances you will find fully developed areas, you find partially developed areas, you find some that can be serviced by utilities, you find some that cannot be serviced by utilities. As a matter of fact, I will appear later for another client who has 800 vacant, undeveloped acres that are to be taken into this area. So, there is no consistent criterion even to this date that has been adopted to the City.

Finally, I pointed out at that time last April that the utility question, that is, the ability of the City to service these areas with utilities, was much in doubt. The legality of the situation, the problems that arose was much in doubt and without question you have found this to be true in the intervening months. Members of this very Council have raised serious questions. You have special meetings over the problem and the questions and legal, financial and contractual problems that arise from the utilities. And I point out that the developers, the individuals who provide these private utilities, are not the enemy of the City of San Antonio. The City of San Antonio will be the first to tell these people sitting out here and these people who are absent but who are affected by this, will be the first to tell that you are depending upon these developers, these owners of private utilities to service them, to do the job for the City of San Antonio to the users of these utilities that the City of San Antonio is not able to do on its own. We are not your enemy. Therefore, without any question, without any doubt, I simply today want to cause this Council to give pause to say that it is unreasonable, it's not in the public interest. It is not in the interest of San Antonio to annex wholesale all of these large areas with all of these problems undeveloped and then sit back and say "we'll decide later what the affect of it is. We'll let some court render some judgment or some attorney general or somebody tell us later on what we've done that affects the liability that affects the finances, that affects the bonded indebtedness of the City of San Antonio." All of these things are involved in the question of the utilities, how you treat utilities, how you buy them, if you buy them, by what means you may buy them, whether you are legally entitled to franchise or not. All of these questions which, I understand, the City has been struggling with.

October 25, 1972

-3-

img

I understand that you have task force after task force looking into this thing but it is still unresolved. To my knowledge the City is unable to tell these people out in these areas that they will be serviced by anybody's utilities, by private utilities, or by the City's utilities in many of the areas that we are talking about. Those at the Ray Ellison Industries are vitally interested in, in so far as the utilities problems are concerned includes not only Area I-A and I-B but Area III-A, Area VI and XI.

So, I simply leave with you these problems, these questions that have proven to be mighty problems in the intervening months, to know to your satisfaction that they have not yet been solved, that much of the criticism which I'm sure you did not want to hear last April, unfortunately, has proven to be true. These are facts. You can't hide them. You can't run away from them. I simply say that it is not to the City's interest, laying aside all persons and personalities, not in the City interest to procede without the determination of these problems and these questions from the City's standpoint as well as all of those who will receive the City's services. Thank you Mr. Mayor.

GATTI: Thank you Mr. Green. I have no one else registered to speak on I-A. Is there anyone else that wants to be heard in reference to the annexation proposal in Area I-A? If not, I will declare the hearing on section I-A closed.

We will now, open the hearing on section I-B.

CLERK: A public hearing on the proposed annexation of 2358 acres of land known as Area I-B.

DAVIS: The area joins the Area I-A that you just heard the public hearing on. It is south of U. S. 90, and between the Kelly Air Force Base-Lackland extension area and is primarily the corridor that falls just east of Dwyer Road. That is shown by Mr. Camargo here on the map on my right and Mr. Taylor here in the Council Chamber.

GATTI: Mr. Green, you are registered on I-B.

GREEN: I waive that, Mr. Mayor.

GATTI: Thank you sir. Is there anyone else that cares to be heard on Area I-B? Have you registered sir? What is your name? Come up here and give us your name and then you can speak.

MR. HOWARD J. LIPSEY: My name is Howard J. Lipsey, and I live at 218 Herron. I am against annexation because, as you know, you have nothing to offer me. You have no utilities. You're policemen and crime rise in the City of San Antonio is an uprising. Your whole City streets has holes in it and you also have Mitchell Lake. So, you actually have nothing to offer us in this particular area. Now, I am not against annexation if you had something to offer and be willing to vote on it. Some of the greatest people in the world live within the base ball throw or die in the base ball throw of this place. You have turned your backs on us on this annexation. But, I do agree with the Council that you have started thinking, you have begin to check and see what is wrong and this is what I like about the democracy that we live in-that people will not turn away. I have seen Mr. Mendoza and a few of the others out looking and checking to see what is wrong with the City of San Antonio. I love San Antonio and I think it is a wonderful City, but you are going at it in the wrong direction by taking the measures that you are taking. You could have changed the history of this country if had used annexation instead of wars. I am sure that Hitler could have used it, also Santa Anna could have annexed San Antonio in the same light that you are trying to annex us and we would not have these people laying over here in the church. So, I thank the City of San Antonio for having the privilege of living here. I would like for each one of you to think

seriously of why we object to being in the City of San Antonio. Now, if you had something to offer that \$15-\$30 a month, there is not one that I feel would object to being a part of the City of San Antonio. But, when we lay out \$15-\$30 a month for an imaginary line this is wrong and you know it's wrong. Because it would be the same thing if I were to come in on your street and lay out an imaginary line and say I will start by collecting so much from you each month. Now, you know that's wrong and so do I. So, I plead with you to look and see why we don't want to be a part of the City of San Antonio and we are not living on the part of San Antonio and we welcome you to come our area too. Thank you.

GATTI: Thank you, sir. Anyone else care to be heard on Area II-B? On I-B, I'm sorry. If not, I will declare the hearing on Area I-B closed.

We will now declare the hearing on Area number II opened. Will you read the caption, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK: This is the public hearing on the proposed annexation on the 125 acres of land in Area II-A - I mean Area II.

DAVIS: Area II is primarily just south of U. S. 90 and is surrounded by Lackland Air Force Base. It is basically an island within the current City limits of San Antonio.

GATTI: I have no one registered to speak in reference to Area II. Is there anyone here that would like to be heard in reference to Area II? If not, I will declare the hearing on Area II closed.

We will now open the hearing on Area III-A.

CLERK: The next hearing is on the proposed annexation of 3781 acres of land.

DAVIS: This Area III-A as pointed out here on the map on my right is north of U. S. Highway 90. It is basically just east of Loop 410.

GATTI: I have three individuals registered for III-A. Mr. Homer Zeigler is first.

MR. HOMER ZEIGLER: Your honor, Mayor Gatti and Members of the City Council, I am Homer Zeigler. I reside at 1823 W. Cloud in Westwood Village. I am here to speak against annexation because I feel that it has been very poorly planned if planned at all. There has been no indication on when the City will furnish commodity services. There have been no dollars allocated in the City Budget to cover any services that might be offered to us. The Water Board did not reflect any dollar cost in their ten year projection for the purchase of the private water company. This, in my opinion, is one of the biggest blunders any City Council can make. Your present police protection for the City of San Antonio is now 20% undermanned in accordance with the latest FBI figures and for the City of San Antonio to go out and take this vast territory in and claim that they are going to service it with the present police force is utterly ridiculous, because this only proves to me they are going to spread that police protection which is so vitally needed within the City limits we now have, thinner and we are going to have a continued crime increase. I fail to see where you have any ones's interest at heart because the current annexation plan will increase taxes for the City dwellers as well as the citizens being annexed. This being a Presidential Election year, I feel it's vitally important for everyone of you Council Members and everybody concerned with annexation and concerned with the citizens of this City and this County to take into consideration the promises of the two Presidential Candidates. Should either one, and one of them will be elected, regardless of which one will be elected, we know that if they fulfill their platform promises there're going to be cuts. There's going to be cuts in defense. This means cut in employment, if not in employment it will mean that people presently both in commercial industry and with the Government will have to take a

substantial salary decrease. This means that we are headed for a depression, and I feel that the people in the areas to be annexed are right now heavily burdened with all the fundamentals of standard living that they couldn't afford another \$15 or \$20 a month payment. I think your planned annexation is not only untimely but unnecessary until such time as all the land in the City has been developed and commodity services furnished to the citizens who now reside within the City. Therefore, in behalf of all the citizens and developers, I beg of you to dispense with the annexation until such time as the City of San Antonio can afford to furnish all the required commodity services to the citizens within the City limits now, develop all the land on developed plan within the City limits and then, when you have a need to expand, come out and let's talk a phased in plan and let's talk a sensible plan where you're going to tell us we are going to give you a police force, police service on such and such a date we are going to give you fire protection on such and such a date, we are going to give you this and that and the other thing. You haven't once told us what you're going to give us. Furthermore, the entire Council has ignored us. On several occasions we have invited you to our community to talk this situation over. We've sent registered mail, receipts requested, of which we got no return. This proves to me that the only thing that you people sitting up there are interested in is my left rear pocket and there is not very much in it right now. At our meeting last Thursday night there was one lady, God bless her, Mrs. F. Bauman got up and stated that she lived in the City of San Antonio for 40 years. She moved out to our area and she expressed the fact that within those 40 years the services she received from the City of San Antonio could be put in a thimble. Thank you gentlemen.

GATTI: Thank you Mr. Zeigler. Mr. Louis E. Taylor.

MR. LOUIS E. TAYLOR: My name is Louis E. Taylor, ladies and gentlemen of the Council and I am not a lawyer or political. I've just got one thing that I want to say I'm against the annexation for one reason only - I believe this great land we live in, and one of the finest things in the world is to be an American, and that we take and vote you people into office, we tell you what to do, you don't say I'm here, now I am going to take and make all these decisions that I want to do personally. We are Americans and we got one of the finest Cities, Countries and States in the world though I was born North of here I'm a left handed Texan and I'm proud of it, my children have all been raised here. But, give us the right, ladies and gentlemen, I'm in the County I never had the right to vote a person into office. If I had that right I'd felt a lot better about that instead of you telling me now that you are going to do this. And thank you very much for your time and effort.

GATTI: Thank you Mr. Taylor. Mr. Howard L. Atwell.

MR. HOWARD L. ATWELL: I'm Howard L. Atwell, I reside at 7407 Buckboard. The area is known as Lackland Terrace-proposed Scott City, Texas. Mr. Mayor and Council persons I appreciate this chance to come to you again and speak to you on this thing called annexation and to express my views against it and the reasons why. As I said the last time I spoke to you all the reasons have really been enumerated. It shouldn't be necessary to recap them again I don't think but apparently it is. Within the last six months or so serious questions have been raised concerning the competency of the present Council that runs the City of San Antonio, based on this annexation thing. A local newspaper editorially supported this view. That in view of the fact that this Council made an attempt at mass annexation with the clear knowledge that they were exceeding the limit said by law. That it was doubtful that this City was properly run and therefore cast doubt upon this Council. That's a pretty serious indictment. It's not a pleasant one to have to make. I didn't make it. This Council flagrantly violated the statute that sets a limit of 30% of the City of San Antonio. With this knowledge this Council voted and passed an ordinance which annexed some 33% or so. Now, it appears in less than six months we have another plan equally controversial. As has already been pointed out, this Council has seen some of the problems in annexation. The water facilities, the sewage facilities which have been supplied by our developer has come in question. It has been charged by another individual, a very prominent individual, that these special interests, apparently the developers, have no right to remuneration for

their work and expenditures in these systems. Well, if he has no rights because the facilities have been paid for by the buyers if this be true and it's possibly true, then equally the City has no right to condemn that property from me and my fellow citizens expressly without a vote.

Gentlemen, this is at the very bottom of my objections to annexation by the City of San Antonio - is the right of a free people to choose their own government. The very basis of our constitution, as stated in the preamble says that we believe that the government should derive their just powers from the consent of the people. If that's not the right to vote on the government that I choose then I don't know what is. So, I would ask you to consider this primarily on the right to vote. Neither do I oppose annexation as such if done properly and to be done properly it must be voted on by the people to be annexed. Give us the opportunity to give you some just powers over us.

GATTI: Thank you, sir. There is no one else registered to be heard on III-A. Is there anyone else in the audience that would care to speak on Area III-A? If not, I will declare the hearing closed on Area III-A.

We will now open the hearing on Area III-B.

CLERK: This is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 1,394 acres of land. Area III-B

GATTI: There is no one registered to speak on Area III-B.

ED DAVIS: This area is basically the Southwest Research area bounded approximately by Loop 410 on the west and West Commerce on the south.

GATTI: As I said, there is no one registered to speak on Area III-B. Is there anyone in the audience that would care to? If not, we will declare the hearing on Area III-B closed. We will now open the hearing Area IV.

CLERK: This is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 782 acres of land. Area IV.

ED DAVIS: This area is bounded on the south by Culebra Road and straddles Loop 410, basically in the middle of it and is just north of the area that we just defined as the Southwest Research Institute area.

GATTI: There is no one registered to speak on Area IV. Is there anyone in the audience that cares to be heard in reference to Area IV? If not, I will declare the hearing on Area IV closed. We will now open the hearing on Area V.

CLERK: This is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 1,526 acres of land. Area V.

DAVIS: This area basically is bounded on the south by Evers Road, on the west by Farm to Market 1517 and Eckert Road on the north by Babcock Road in an irregular manner. It is just northeast of the City of Leon Valley.

GATTI: We have three people signed to speak on Area V. Mr. Krellwitz.

MR. GUNTER KRELLWITZ: Ladies and Gentlemen. My name is Gunter Krellwitz of 5518 Chancellor, Bexar County, Texas. I represent no special interest groups. I represent only the people, and that is a welcome change. For the second time in six months, we have come here to argue the subject of annexation. The City of San Antonio is again threatening a forceable takeover of the adjacent territory. Again, the City is denying the people a right to vote on the matter even though the City Charter, Article 11-82, page 159, paragraph 2, has the provision which may give the people a vote if the Council so chooses. I believe very strongly that a controversy of this magnitude should be submitted to the people. Otherwise it will forfeit our heritage and belief in the American democratic process.

Before going on with this argument, I want to straighten out the subject of tax reduction as presented by your City Attorney Walker. He is trying to leave the impression that the City taxes only amount to a mere \$139 for a \$21,000 house. He is deliberately misleading the people. The correct figure is \$213.14 according to your tax department. A \$40,000 house will be \$453.60. All figures are over and above the present tax rate. In addition to present taxes, further, the Mayor and City Attorney want us to believe that Fire insurance rates will drastically be reduced. False again. My investigation into these rates finds nothing to support such claims. The correct figures, a possible saving of 80 to 90 cents per month for a \$35,000 brick house within 500 feet of a threeway fire hydrant.

The real reason for the annexation is you are unable to manage your own City budget and want us to bail you out regardless of what happens to our financial situation. Last May annexation figures indicate that you will retain 75% of our anticipated taxes for other purposes. What service budget figures have you allocated this time for the

annexation areas? Are you seriously equipped to service the increased areas effectively with immediate service? The answer is you have neither. Your annexation is, in fact, an eviction notice to many homeowners who have no room in their budget to pay for the increase in tax load to take you off the hook. How do you expect families on a retirement income to pay? How do you expect other families who have saved their money to buy a larger house pay the increased load? Do you expect them all to sell their homes and move to smaller quarters or take an apartment instead perhaps? In front of you you will find my own monthly budget. I ask you where do you think I should get the additional \$40 to \$50 per month taxes from? Will you give me \$35 in savings or perhaps a job to pay for the taxes? Even though my earnings due to the economic mess which I have not created, shrank by 35% I have faithfully kept up my obligation for several years. I have cut everything to the bare minimum, but this time there is no more room to cut unless you are financial geniuses and come up with something worthwhile.

I am open for suggestion, ladies and gentlemen. My situation is not unique. It is only honest. Other families are in the same situation or will be after the hatchet comes down on Kelly, Lackland and Randolph after the election. Is not coincidental that I know of ten homes in my immediate three street area which are for sale since last month's annexation threat. These people either don't want to join you the City or are unable to pay the increased burden. And in my case the \$350 increase in taxes, the \$200 increase in social security, and the possible increase in school taxes due to the thousands of apartments going up is too much for the budget. So what will it be? Democracy or eviction by force. It's your choice. If it is eviction by force then the battle has just begun. We will fight for our freedom and survival. Thank you.

GATTI: Thank you sir. Mrs. Krellwitz.

MRS. KRELLWITZ: I am Mrs. Krellwitz, and my husband has said all there is to say and I am against annexation.

GATTI: Thank you very much. Mrs. Bauman.

MRS. F. BAUMAN: Mr. Mayor and Council members. I didn't come down here to speak. I'm no speaker. Mr. Krellwitz just uttered my honest opinion on the whole thing. I did live in the City for four years. The services were not what I thought I was paying for. I am happy in Glen Oaks Park and if you will give us some reason why we should go into the City I will welcome it. Otherwise, our solution is real simple, like most of the other people, we have already investigated moving to Canyon Lake or somewhere else. We made the tour to all of several of six or seven states. We will move. My neighbors said what's the use of going down. They are going to cram it down your throat. Well, this is not a pretty picture. Thank you very much for your time.

GATTI: There are no other individuals registered for Area V. Is there anyone else in the audience that would like to speak on annexation for Area V? If not, I will declare the hearing on Area V closed. We will open the hearing now on Area VI.

CLERK: This is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 7,344 acres of land. Area VI.

DAVIS: This is the area primarily bounded between the University of Texas site, this site area has already been annexed north, down to Area V on the south on which a public hearing was just held and goes over to Interstate 10 on the east and the western boundary, basically, is Leon Creek and extending on out to Loop 1604.

GATTI: There is no one registered to be heard on Area VI. Is there

anyone in the audience that cares to be heard in reference to Area VI? If not I will declare the hearing on Area VI closed. We will now open the hearing on the Area VII.

CLERK: This is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 525 acres of land.

DAVIS: This is an area known today as Turtle Creek Country Club area that is bounded on the east by Interstate 10 and on the west, basically, by Fredericksburg Road and it is currently an island within the City of San Antonio.

GATTI: There is no one signed for Area VII. Is there anyone in the audience that cares to be heard in reference to Area VII? If not, we will declare the hearing on Area VII closed. We will now open the hearing for Area VIII.

CLERK: This is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 525 acres of land.

DAVIS: Area VIII is 4,216 acres of land is basically bound by Interstate 10 on the west and is adjacent to the existing City Limits on the northern part of San Antonio between.....

GATTI: Just a minute. Jake will you redo that, please.

CLERK: Area VIII. This is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 4,216 acres of land.

GATTI: And that is correcting your first statement. Okay.

CLERK: Yes.

DAVIS: This area is an irregular shape bounded by San Pedro on the east and Interstate 10 on the west and ties in to the area known as UTSA annexed area to the northwest.

GATTI: Mr. Hubert Green.

MR. HUBERT GREEN: Mr. Mayor and ladies and gentlemen of the Council, I represent Mr. & Mrs. Max Voelcker who are the owners of some 600 acres in this Area number VIII. Mr. and Mrs. Voelcker you and your husband stand and be recognized by the council.....They have a total of about 800 acres, some 600 is included in that area aimed for annexation. This is totally undeveloped, farm and grazing land. Mr. Voelcker has lived a lifetime on this one spot of property. It is leased as a grazing area at the present time. Without question, if this is annexed under present circumstances, there are no services that can be rendered, can be of any use to Mr. and Mrs. Voelcker who are the sole possessors and residents of that particular area, that particular acreage. There is no question but what they'll be required to pay a huge tax load each year on this particular property and without the return or the receipt of any services at all, much less anything commensurate with the tax burden that they will suffer. We just simply suggest that if the Council please, if the Council ask the staff to reinvestigate this particular area to determine the feasibility of the annexation of this particular plan of program. If it lies within the path of development, if, as and when it is developed, if, as and when it is up for development, the city certainly has adequate notice when a plat is brought in for that purpose to see this fact, when it occurs and at that time to annex it. So the city will have adequate opportunity, we feel, if, as and when development is appropriate and when it is proper and when it occurs then, of course, to take it in within the city and be part of the program of the city at that time. We feel at this time that it is premature, it is burdensome and confiscatory to these elderly people to be required to pay these taxes with no return whatsoever and it

October 25, 1972
ss

-10-

should be phased in at some later annexation plan with the city. I'd like leave of the Council to file a letter with the staff and with the city at a later time within the next several days to make these objections a little more cogent at that time. Thank you Mr. Mayor and Council.

GATTI: Thank you, Mr. Green. There is no one else signed to speak on Area VIII. Is there anyone in the audience that cares to be heard on Area VIII? If not, I will declare the hearing on Area VIII closed. We will now proceed with the hearing on Area IX.

CLERK: This is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 2393 acres of land.

DAVIS: This area is basically bounded by San Pedro, U.S. Highway 281 on the west, it goes approximately distance just north of Loop 1604 and is characteristically southeast of the intersection of San Pedro and Loop 1604 and goes over to Jones Maltsberger Road on east.

GATTI: I have no one signed up for Area number IX. Is there anyone here that cares to be heard in reference to Area number IX? If not, we will declare the hearing on Area number IX closed. We will now proceed with the hearing on Area number X.

CLERK: This is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 4472 acres of land.

DAVIS: This area, as put out on the map here, as Area number X the northern boundary is known as Higgins Road and Nacgodoches Road and Judson Road being on the northeast boundary and the Austin Highway or State Highway 81 being on the southeastern boundary connecting with the existing city limits to the south.

GATTI: There is no one signed to speak on Area number X. Is there anyone in the audience that cares to be heard in reference to Area number X? If not, I will declare the hearing on Area number X closed. We will now proceed with the hearing on Area number XI.

CLERK: This is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 2179 acres of land.

DAVIS: The area basically is east of Interstate 35. It is between the cities of Windcrest to the north and the City of Kirby to the south.

GATTI: There is no one signed to speak in reference to Area number XI. Is there anyone in the audience that cares to be heard in reference to Area number XI? If not, I will declare the hearing on Area number XI closed. We'll now proceed with the hearing on Area number XII.

CLERK: This is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 69.11 acres of land.

DAVIS: This area is basically just east of Loop 410 and just south of US Highway 87, known as Green Acres area. This would complete the annexation of that particular subdivision.

GATTI: There is no one signed to speak in reference to Area number XII. Is there anyone in the audience who cares to be heard in reference to Area number XII? If not, we'll declare the hearing on Area number XII closed. We now proceed with the hearing on Area number XIII.

CLERK: This is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 7.672 acres of land.

DAVIS: Basically, this includes the remaining portion of Mission Espada grounds south of the city, south of Loop 410.

GATTI: There is no one signed to be heard in reference to Area number

XIII. Is there anyone in the audience that cares to be heard in reference to Area XIII? If no one is interested in speaking, we will now declare the hearing on Area XIII closed. We will now proceed with the hearing on Area number XIV.

CLERK: This is a public hearing on the proposed annexation of 144.90 acres of land.

DAVIS: The area known as Villa Coronado just south of Loop 410 and just east of US Highway 281.

GATTI: There are five people signed to speak in reference to Area XIV. Tresa Camarillo.

TRESA CAMARILLO: Mr. Mayor and Members of the Council. My name is Tresa Camarillo and I live at Villa Coronado Community and I recommend and I would like to talk a little bit of this. I don't speak very good English but I will try to do my best and tell you what has happened in Villa Coronado. This community has been forgotten. Nobody knows that we exist over there. We need a lot of help. I am for the annexation. We need it. This place is just awful. We have to ask the boys or teenagers to help us clean up or pick up the trash from the streets or vacant lots nobody cares about. We have already talked to somebody to pick up the vacant lots - the owners. I wonder if you can help us to find the owners of these vacant lots to clean those places. There is some people that goes by there and the people throw trash in the streets. They throw dead animals in the streets. Now people that live in the city are buying out there and do you know what they do with the lots that they buy? They go and buy some cows, chickens. They don't care about us. They go and take them out there. Nobody cares about Villa Coronado. They can do whatever they want with Villa Coronado. Why? Because the people there don't care about it. But we are still there and we still care about Villa Coronado. We want that place cleaned up. We want a place that somebody would know somebody still lives in. We've got a lot of children and I think that people....my parents, your parents, they were not rich when they were annexed to San Antonio. I've got folks that lives on Balboa Street near Las Palmas, they were not rich but still they sacrificed themselves to be annexed and they have everything they need. Why? Because they care. They care for their children and I think we can do the same thing. We can work hard. We can help in anything. You just tell us what we have to do and we will work hard to see that we are still there so you can help us. We would like to have Villa Coronado annexed. We need a lot of help from you people. I hope that everybody from Villa Coronado will understand and will do whatever they can. That is all I have to say, Mr. Mayor.

GATTI: Thank you very much. Gloria de Leon.

GLORIA DE LEON: I want to talk in Spanish because I can't talk English.

GATTI: You sound real good.

GLORIA DE LEON: But I can't say the words that I have to say. (Translation from Spanish as follows:) Well, I want to say, to ask you to fix up or repair Villa Coronado because there are a lot of children going bad. The City hasn't been by to see us either. One can't see anything because of all the trash that has been thrown around. I say that even the police cannot protect us from the wicked and malicious ones. I'm not saying they are all bad. Even mine are becoming bad, but why? Because the police don't do anything. And I don't want you to laugh at us. I want you to visit and see Villa Coronado and annex us into the City and I know it isn't important to you or the people. But someone has to do all that he can to keep this place clean. Take us into the City. That's all I have to say. Thank you.

October 25, 1972

-12-

ss

ANITA YANEY: I'm Anita Yaney and I live in Villa Coronado. I'd like to tell you all that we need some help over there in Villa Coronado too. We need some protection from policemen. There are lot of guys, you know, boys in the car with guns and everything. We called the police but they don't listen. One of these days they are going to kill little kids running in the streets. We call the police to tell them these people that the car they run real fast. They don't care. They just... they killed the other day dogs and cats and next time they going to be some kids. We called the police and they just don't listen. We need some help in Villa Coronado and we hope you can listen and help us out. That's all I have to say.

GATTI: Thank you very much. Josephine Garcia.

JOSEPHINE GARCIA: (Translation from spanish as follows:

I am going to speak on what everybody has to say. That Villa Coronado, (I reside in Villa Coronado), is falling. We need to raise it up a little... we need for you to clean it up. Because there are a lot of things that are thrown around Villa Coronado. We need your help, so that we may be able to help too. There are many animals that are just thrown around, from which deceases then attack us and much illness surrounds Villa Coronado. We also need all the utilities that are necessary. That is what I have to say this morning. Thank you.

GATTI: Thank you. Mr. Morales. Ricardo Morales.

RICHARDO MORALES: That is the first time I raise up my hand because I mean to speak to the Council about the tracks in Villa Coronado, about everything like that. We have no law over there. They have so many problems, children and cutting, and things like that. We have to need of all your help because I have some kids of my own. I got six children. I have to give them the best education. We need to clean up Villa Coronado and stop these young kids from driving fast. They will kill a little baby or something. They don't care. We need somebody to help us clean up Villa Coronado. That's all I can say because I don't know how to explain very good.

GATTI: Thank you, sir. Is there anyone else in the audience who cares to be heard on Area XIV.

MRS. HELEN DUTMER: I am Helen Dutmer. I reside at 739 McKinley Avenue of this City. I purposely saved my remarks for the southern section of the City. We are just only too happy that you finally found us out there and you want us. I have only one question in my mind this morning and that is, I would like to ask why have the developers of these large areas of land not incorporated these Cities before this? They knew that some day the City of San Antonio would, of necessity, have to reach out and encompass them within the City government if they did not incorporate. Could it be that they found out that to establish City government is a costly and prohibitive figure and in due course when the areas were run down and financially a burden to the developer then would they throw their citizens to the big bad wolf known as the City? Meanwhile, enjoying the good points of our City's facilities until their areas do reach this point of burden. Most people are pretty reasonable and this Council, I feel, is rather remiss in not publicly telling these people that they will be invited into the governing body that will be their City government when and if they are annexed. We fight our problems on this basis and not as we have settled them in other times when there have been a very definite split faction.

If you use your imagination now, if we would build a huge fence around these areas and deny these people the right to use our facilities, our streets, our shopping areas, then imagine the hue and the cry and you probably find yourself back in court again hollering discrimination and denial of the better things of life for all people. Now, as pointed

October 25, 1972
mg

-13-

out by one gentleman, the buyer or the citizen of the property is ultimately the bearer of the cost of utilities installed in these areas. Well, I'm not against development or developments, per se, and it's hard for me to believe that a developer is in dire straits by reason of installation of these utilities. It also seems strange that the developers are in the arguments behind the scene not fighting for the citizens within this area but, in reality, the big question is recovery of the cost and the ownership of the utilities—a strictly dollars and cents question. Not dollars and cents of the pocket book of the citizen of the area but the cold hard fact that a developer develops and builds because it is financially lucrative and a business. I've not always agreed with this Council. There's been times when I felt just like these people—that I'd like to just get the heck out. However, if you think that the City of San Antonio has problems then you first, before leaving, should investigate the problems of other areas and you will see that ours are small in comparison. Now, I am not running for nor against anything. I have nothing to gain and nothing to lose except the good faith of these people and I think when they stop and think about the situation that we'll not even lose that. I realize that it's an emotional appeal but the emotions stem from facts that when our State of Texas was annexed to the United States there was just such a bitter fight as we have now, and I don't know of anyone of us that are not proud today to stand up to say we're Texans.

GATTI: Thank you Miss Dutmer. Would you care to be heard, sir.

MR. GENE CASANOVA: My name is Gene Casanova and I work out in the south side. I am the Executive Director of the Mexican American Neighborhood Organization. The only reason I come up here to talk today is to let you know how bad Villa Coronado is. They are adjacent across Loop 410 to a sewage treatment plant. They are getting all the smells and all you want to get—sicknesses or whatever—from that sewage plant but one important thing, the services. They are getting all the other stuff from Mitchell Lake at the same time. They have no police protection, no City services other than light, water from Bexar Metropolitan District, if I'm not mistaken. Yet they have two streets in Villa Coronado that are being annexed or have been annexed and are part of the City of San Antonio. The rest of these people have nothing. No sewage treatment, no services inside the homes, they have outside toilets, and that's a hang-up, that's a drag for these people. They have no police protection like we've said. There are no medical services. They have been researched and researched and investigated but nothing has ever been done. They've been out there, people go over there and poke on their ribs and say who are you what do you need this time but nobody ever helps them. They give them 2, 3 dollars out of a government grant. O. K. appease yourselves. You got something now. These people need help. They have already gone into this. They are finding out what would happen if they were annexed. We have meetings with them. They've found out that lot of the housing will have to be remodeled. They are willing to go through this. They know that a lot of the housing, like we say, is substandard, but they would much rather go through this and get all the services that are needed then just to sit out there like a eye sore and be looked at as something that doesn't grow—that is dead. They are not dead. These are all human beings that want to better themselves. They can be given a chance if you people would do your job and get them annexed. Thank you very much, Mayor and City Council.

GATTI: Thank you, sir. Is there anyone else who cares to be heard in reference to Area number XIV. If not we will declare the hearing on Area XIV closed, and open the hearing on area number XV.

CLERK: This is the public hearing on the proposed annexation of 6.632 acres of land.

DAVIS: This Area is immediately across U. S. Highway 281 from the Villa Coronado Subdivision and is a small portion of subdivision just south of Loop 410.

GATTI: There's no one registered to be heard in Area XV. Is there anyone that cares to be heard in Area XV?

MRS. WILLIAM B. LECZNAR: Mr. Mayor and members of the Council. I am Mrs. William B. Lecznar of 2731 Castonnet and I am vice-chairman of the City Planning Commission. At the previous hearing we presented to you a resolution in favor and in strong support of the annexation program. The Commission has received copies of the proposed annexation plan that was presented. We have reaffirmed our position unanimously in support of the annexation program. I will not read the annexation-I mean the resolution in it's entirety that you have copies and it's actually the same content that we presented to you before. It is basically that we feel an on going positive annexation policy is necessary to the orderly growth of the City and we support you and urge you to pass the program as presented by the staff.

GATTI: Thank you Mrs. Lecznar. Is there anyone else here who cares to be heard in reference to Area XV? Are you in reference to XV, all right.

MRS. CAMPBELL: I am Mrs. Campbell and I live in Oak Hills Terrace but I notice that, after hearing everybody's view point from all the areas, the annexation is sort of one sided on the north side and if these people on the south side need help why don't we annex some more south side and start building there a little bit.

GATTI: How do you spell your last name.

CAMPBELL: Campbell.

GATTI: What is your address?

CAMPBELL: 5543 Merkens.

GATTI: 5543 Merkens. And you reside in Area XV? Well, go ahead.

CAMPBELL: Well, I just want to speak on annexation in general. I would like to say that it looks like this is a democratic country which is wonderful to be able to come here and have a voice in government but we should put this up in a vote for each area to decide and let each area have a choice as to whether they want to be annexed. Gradually people lose their voice in our government and I think that its nice to keep government by and for the people. If this could be done I think we could keep something that is very valuable that was fought for many years ago. We did this by having a vote and representation. So, may I ask that we might consider putting all this annexation up to a vote. Thank you.

GATTI: Thank you very much. Is there anyone else that cares to be heard in reference to Area XV? If not, I declare the hearing on Area XV closed? We have some... that finishes the specific areas that have been called for annexation. We have, however, some people who either were late or wish to speak just generally for or against annexation. The first is Ruth Carter.

MRS. RUTH CARTER: Mayor Gatti and Members of the City Council. My name is Ruth Carter. I live in Rainbow Hills.. though my area is not included in the annexation at this time. Some man out in the hall told me I was privileged whatever that means. I feel that if you annex this area at this time you will include us at a later date so I feel like I'd like to speak today. I have been here twice before to speak on this and brought out all of my views on this and I still feel the same way for myself and, if I'm not included in it, I feel that way for the other people. I'm still a Texan and an American citizen. I was noticing as we were pledging allegiance to the flag, particularly in reference to liberty and justice to all, and I believe we all said this although I sometimes wonder if we do have liberty and justice for all. It sounds good but where is it. Now, often times I hear our City compared with Houston and Dallas. This comes up quite frequently. I lived in Dallas a very short time but I lived in Houston for quite a long while and San Antonio does not have the salaries, the incomes that Houston and Dallas does. So how can we expect to do everything that Houston and Dallas does? Besides, we are San Antonio. Why should we be Houston or Dallas? I am still against annexation for the same reason that I was before. We were annexed for a short time. During that time I didn't see you folks out there doing anything for us. The only thing I saw was a lot of policemen out on streets handing out tickets. Well, I wasn't one of them that got one. It rained a lot during that time and every time it rained our area, just like the City of San Antonio, holes come into the streets. I didn't see anybody out there repairing any of them. As we are now, when we have holes in the street we call up and they send someone out there to repair them. We appreciate that. I spoke with the lady that works over in the courthouse in an office and she lives in the City and she called one day about Callaghan Road and she said she was talked to disgracefully. She told the lady that she had to answer complaints all day, and if she talked to people like that she wouldn't have a job very long. When we bought our homes, we bought them with the modern conveniences and paved streets. I feel this was included in the price of our home. Why should we come now and pay the City of San Antonio for the same thing again? I don't really feel the City has anything to offer us. I feel like that if we could all sit down together, which our people in our area have tried to do but you folks don't want to listen. All you want to do is tell. So my husband has five more years before retirement. But, so many of our neighbors have been fed up with this. We lost one just two or three weeks ago, two weeks ago I believe it was. He said I am through with San Antonio. He sold his home and moved back to Virginia where he originally came from. He retired from the military and intended to stay here, but he left and we had several others leave. My husband plans to take an early retirement and we are going to leave here too. We can't afford such as this. That's all I have to say.

GATTI: Thank you very much. Letha Frances.

LETHA M. FRANCES: Members of the City Council. My name is Letha M. Frances. I am a citizen of Bexar County. I lived here twenty-five, twenty-six years, and I am here to talk on annexation. My opinion on it that we all are human beings and we are all here together. We all may be different in skin but we still human beings. I do think that whatever for the better to help the San Antonians or Bexar County I am for it. Because I do know that against things is not so good. I know many times when people are against things that it will not work. I can call out several things that people was against and it didn't work. I think that if we would be more for anything, I believe we come out better. I think doing against the things that it won't work because I do know sometimes if we are for ourselves too much and if we would think about other people then I believe God would be pleased at this. Like I said, we are the people, just like the banks are different banks here. They make decisions. The people are making. That's why we are up here today, because they want us hear our voice. We have a voice. We all have a voice. And I think the City, the Council

October 25, 1972

-16-

ss

of the Bexar County wants to hear this. I suggest on things that we should need, we should have, no other than the City Council what he wants us to suggest to him so he can go on and do the things for the people. But, how can he do things for the people if the people is going to be against. He can't do nothing. If we all be against, nothing would happen. So I think it's good everybody have a suggestion today. As I said, the City Council, my suggestion is for the water concerning the City of San Antonio, the better the San Antonio, yes, you see, I think the people got a job to do. I think they know what they are doing. I think they know what they are asking for. If they didn't they wouldn't be up here today. So, I suggest that we peoples here, we are the ones run by San Antonio and I think we should have a suggestion for the Council. I suggest that Bank of the People, we are the people about all banks for the people, we the people, are the people, my suggestion to the bank when the people overdraw, when the checks bounce back and take \$3.00 out of the check. I suggest that they pay the bills and the people pay the bank. And I've heard they said they are trying to find something to kill this here bill about checks bouncing back. And I thought this would be a suggestion on that. Now, since the annexation, that's in our favor. That's why we look in for ourselves. Now, let's look out for somebody else. We are the people. This suggestion would be for all of us well let's be first. We don't know if it's for us or not. We just look at the way we feel about it. We feel like it is against us. We don't want it. We wouldn't have it over here in this area. Why? Because we are looking out for nobody but ourselves. Now, let us take into consideration. Let us try something. It's not going to hurt us. And then when we see it's not working, let's all get together and let's see if we can throw it out. Let's try always to make a step up. Let's don't keep the things missing at all times. I say I think we should I'm for it. I thank you.

GATTI: Thank you. Mr. Mal Majors.

MR. MAL MAJORS: Mr. Mayor, I am Mal Majors, I live in Area XI. 5238 Prince Valiant. When I moved down here from Dallas about three years ago I decided I wanted to become a member of the GGL. I just kept putting it off and I never did. Now I feel that I am being used by the GGL and everybody who is being annexed is being used by it because....I keep a file on everything I go to....On February 25, 1970 at a Precinct 3 meeting of the GGL Board of Directors, Mrs. Hamlin, I don't know her first name, stated that "We are losing many votes that would normally be ours due to the fact that many, many of the people who are potential GGL voters live in our bedroom cities." She further suggested that GGL look into the possibility of combining these small cities with the City of San Antonio which is being done. I think that GGL will be very unpopular and there might be an additional party better than the GGL. I think it was great at one time. Now, also I have here, when you get the bond issue passed you were talking about central police headquarters, this is a quote "is no longer satisfactory as the only police center in a city this size. We must have substations." This was two years ago and nothing has ever been done. Now you promise, as in table II here, that you will have one patrol car for each square mile and you promise a lot of things that you haven't even done for the citizens of San Antonio. For instance, here in 1970 you said "as the city grows so must the Fire Department. Many areas are too far away from the fire station. Present fire stations are under equipped and under staffed." This is what GGL said in 1970. I don't believe there are any new fire stations been established. And here you are promising us three to five minute service. I feel we are being used as political pawns and thank you very much.

GATTI: Thank you, sir. We have no one else signed up to be heard. Is there any one else in the audience that cares to be heard on annexation? We'll take you one at a time.

October 25, 1972
ss

-17-

MR. G. A. PARKER: I am G. A. Parker, I live, I believe in IIIA which is the so called Valley Hi.

GATTI: What is your address please?

PARKER: 7618 Stagecoach. I came to San Antonio the same year as the Good Government League and I've watched the City progress under the Good Government League. It seemed like it was about to pull us out of the mud and I hope that this morning you're not - we're not witnessing the suicide of the Good Government League. I hope that you're not creating the monster that will turn and eat you up. For ten years you have failed to build one expressway and when we are annexed, without our permission, will this not create a block of voters who will oppose every bond issue that comes up? You don't suppose that we might write to HUD and oppose any federal grant that you might ask for. I think you missed reading the signs. I think you're misjudging the mood of the people. Now, in our small area, we wouldn't have that much power, but you have built in our position. When we join the Sierra Club and the little old ladies in tennis shoes, our voice will be heard and as an old veteran here that's been around a long time, I'd like you to think this over. And besides that we can already see the Good Government League splitting apart, and don't think that these people are not upset enough that they would drive a wedge into this organization just as hard as they can and I have a question or two that I'd like to ask.

I sat in this hearing for four hours the other day and heard you talk about the Medio Watershed. That's expensive. I know that's going to be expensive but you're offering us something so why don't you give it to Rainbow Hills? You talked about the Meadow Cliff Subdivision. The tax base there is very weak. I live adjoining there and we've been trying to assist them in getting a water system over there for years. I just wondered, now I've heard this feeble excuse that it would jeopardize their federal grant out there. If the City of San Antonio is so eager to improve that community out there, why don't you improve all of it. Now, just give it a little thought if you want to survive well, that's fine! I hope you do. I've admired the work until somebody, some city council tried to convince the federal government that the Tower of the Americas was a work of art. I begin to lose faith right then because anybody could look at that horrible structure that'll never pay for itself and tell that that's not a work of art. Now the Chilled Waterplant, I suppose is, because it'll never be worth anything for anything else and if you're going to declare something a work of art and sell it to the federal government, I think you ought to start with the Chilled Waterplant, because otherwise you'll have that thing hanging around your neck from now on. I am not going to thank you for your time because you owed me this time. I am not even in debt to you.

GATTI: Anyone else? Two others? Mr. Langley.

MR. RALPH LANGLEY: Mr. Mayor and Members of the Council. My name is Ralph Langley. My office is at 1800 Milam Building. My residence is at 7500 Callaghan Road. I am here as an attorney representing the following named developers: Lloyd Denton, Bruce Shepherd, Graham Burris, John Shaefer, George Condis, Jesse Baker, Jerry Smith, Mel Hughes, Elkin McGaughy, Tommy Saunders, Edgar Von Scheele, Jim Uptmore, Quincy Lee, Cotton Jaroszewski, Jack DeVore, Tommy Smith and Cliff Morton. These developers are responsible for developing more than 65% of the lots produced in San Antonio and Bexar County. The homes, apartments and commercial buildings constructed on sites developed by this group directly or indirectly employ more than 30,000 people in this community annually.

Amid all of the strident voices that you have heard here this morning, I would like to express in a calm and, I hope dispassionate way, a plea in behalf of annexation, but a plea in behalf of a rational, logical, evenhanded annexation program that would deal

October 25, 1972

-18-

ss

with one and all in an identical manner. The people whom I represent are for annexation. They are for an annexation policy which will contribute to the orderly growth and development of this city. They believe that that program of orderly growth requires an annexation policy that, number one, does not favor any individual or any given developer or any area over any other group of individuals or any other area. Secondly, they believe that the plan and the policies when and where the areas are going to be annexed, not only in Phase I but in Phase II and subsequent annexation phases envisioned by the Council should be specified. Thirdly, that prior to the passage of Phase I they request this Council that they resolve the confiscatory policy of on site water mains by the City Water Board through the enactment of a franchise agreement which was submitted to the Mayor approximately six months ago.

Now I want to say in all candor, that that matter has been confused by many and I think by many well intentioned, well meaning people, but nonetheless misguided people, to feel that that is a refund contract, which it is not. We ask this Council and we ask the media to refrain from indulging in that type of false reason. It is not a refund policy. I cannot over-emphasize that. It is simply a proposal which will allow the developer to recover the cost of the main he installs within his subdivision out of the revenues generated from the sale of water in the subdivision. After he has recovered his cost, the mains will be turned over free and clear to the City Water Board. The ability to recover cost for installing the water main would result in a decrease in the sales price of approximately \$400 per house to the new home buyer. This is an effort on the part of the developer to reduce the cost of housing. How severe this situation has become can be forecast by extending the inflationary rate of the cost of housing which is currently at 8% annually. If this rate of cost increase is continued, it means that by 1980 a home that sells for \$18,000 today will cost in excess of \$30,000. Today in San Antonio we take for granted an ample supply of housing which can be purchased by the average individual. Unless all agencies of government as well as members of the housing industry do everything they can to reverse this cost spiral housing will no longer be available to the average citizen in this community without a subsidy. I want to thank you for hearing me.

GATTI: Thank you, Mr. Langley. That gentlemen there.

MR. GORDON VAN WINKLE: Mr. Mayor, Members of the City Council. My name is Gordon Van Winkle. I live adjacent to Area VI.

GATTI: What is your address sir?

VAN WINKLE: 117 South Verde Drive.

GATTI: South Verde?

VAN WINKLE: Right.

GATTI: When you say adjacent, just where?

VAN WINKLE: I live right off Bandera Road. I've listened to arguments pro and con on this annexation issue. I've kept up with it somewhat because it will eventually concern me. I'm not against living in the city. I lived in the City of San Antonio for some 20 years or more, and I love the City of San Antonio. I'm like some of these people that are here today. They are concerned. They are concerned about their families. They are concerned about their income and their financial status and you can't blame them. I think we should all be concerned about these things. My heart goes out to people that are reaching out for your help because they need

October 25, 1972
ss

-19-

your help and they're reaching out for your help because they need it bad. I am very fortunate as God has blessed me bountifully. I don't have the need that some of these folks in here have expressed today. They want to be annexed. I am not particularly in favor of being annexed myself because I chose to move out of town and build out of the city. I am not against being taken in if I can see that I am going to get something from what my tax dollar will buy, or will pay for and I think each one of you gentlemen and ladies will do well to consider that when someone is being offered something or is, as one of the persons put it, having it crammed down their throat. I think that if you could sell them on the idea that they are being given something for their money, that they are being listened to, then I think the issue of annexation will be made a lot easier. The thought that Houston and Dallas was or is ahead of San Antonio in size and income I think is common knowledge to all of us. There is not a person in this room that's against moving forward, being better, being bigger. Building, expanding that's what our nation is founded on and I think if we would put our heads together and use the resources and the brain that God gave us and give the people something for their money you would have no opposition to annexation and at the same time you'd be solving the problems of the people that need your help by being taken in. You don't go out and buy a car and 4 or 5 years later pay for it, which is what some of the areas have experienced because they were taken in and it was 4, 5 or 6 years before they were given something for their money. The dealer that sells you a car is not going to wait four or five years for his money. He wants it then. This is the case of all business transactions and what we are talking about today is really a business transaction. It is the expansion of San Antonio. We don't like to be thought of as a third or a fourth or a fifth rate city in the State of Texas. With your help, with our help I think we can make a greater San Antonio.

GATTI: Thank you, Sir.

MR. SYLVAN LANG: If it would please, Mr. Mayor and Commissioners, my name is Sylvan Lang and I have lived here since 1900.

GATTI: Would you please give us your address, Mr. Lang?

LANG: 1540 Milam Building.

GATTI: Your home address?

LANG: 700 Alda. My family and I have owned a tract of 220 acres on Prue Road, if I might refer the commission to Area VI. I have owned this tract of land for 35 years. Under the plan of your excellent Planning Department, and I wish to express my appreciation to the City Attorney's Office for their courtesies, there is nothing on the drawing board which would in any manner aid the property that I represent. If the commission would look at Area VI they'll see a wide, white space there. Now, the City Planning Board in a letter to me of October 7, 1971, acknowledged that this property, which fronts about 4,000 feet on the Prue Road, would not be benefited so far as multi-unit apartments are concerned by the erection of the University of Texas at San Antonio. But that possibly, or probably it should best be used for single unit apartments. We are not in the Edwards recharge area. The property is not on any proposed revised highway. It is only on the present Prue Road which is narrow, so narrow that at times one can only pass another car. It is not accessible to any water company. There are no services available. It is about 1 1/2 miles from any proposed water or sewer main and I maintain that it is unjust to expect a taxpayer to pay City taxes if City facilities cannot be furnished to him.

October 25, 1972

-20-

ss

If this Council in its wisdom saw fit to pass an ordinance that by 1974 all property taken in will have adjacent thereto water and sewer mains then it would be fair to take the property in. It would be a binding ordinance on the City Council, but I don't know whether it can bind future councils to the expenditure of funds. This letter from the Director of Planning points out that the southwestern portion of our property is subject to the Heubner Creek influence and there's nothing in the plans which have been developed to protect us from the floods which come when Leon Creek and the Heubner Creek, which is, I think, a branch of same, overflows. This plat shows that there are, 1,206 people Area VI of 11 1/2 square miles. None of this property, which is so white here, has any residences on it at the present time. Don't need police or fire protection. There are some fine residences there. A Mr. Judson and his family. Mr. Judson and I approached the former City Manager and we are assured that this would be taken into consideration. Mr. George Judson and I, and he was to have been here with me this morning, but it has been completely ignored. I have written letters to each and every member of the Council. I have sent them a plat and my suggestion would be that if in the wisdom of this Council, it desires to annex property and desires to improve this Area VI then, in all justice and fairness, we would be entitled to have the following excepted: Commencing at the point where Prue Road intersects U.S. Highway 87 continuing westwardly on Prue Road to Babcock Road.

GATTI: Mr. Lang we had a five minute limit. Are you ready to wind up?

LANG: I'll be through in a moment. Winding up going north....

GATTI: Some of the people did go over, so we'll let you go ahead.

LANG: Thank you, I didn't know that. North on Babcock Road a distance of 2700 feet, then due east to the U.S. Highway 87 and then continuing down Highway 87 to the place of beginning. You would have a tract there which will not be served by the City. We cannot have sewer or water connections. I think there is much merit when I heard Mr. Ralph Langley saying just when I came in that by annexation and putting this property or these properties as a part of the City of San Antonio with our building codes will deter building and add to inflation insofar as the building constructors. I hope the Council will consider the elimination of that tract which I have mentioned.

GATTI: I have no one else signed up. Is it on annexation? Come on up. Give us your name and address please.

MARIA DOMINGUEZ: My name is Maria Dominguez. My address is 250 Freiling. I am against annexation for the reason that I think - I mean I have my beliefs - that a man of the City should be judged not for the amount of people or the amount of children he has or the City for the amount of citizens it has but by the quality of life they can give to their children or their citizens. Because if a man cannot provide for one child he should be forbidden to have 12. And I think it is the same with the City. (Inaudible.) One of my boys got sick and I can't pay for this hospital I took him there to the Bexar County but he was sent to the Robert G. Green. Of course, I didn't let anybody touch my kid, but one of the City employee's baby, she works for the Parks and Recreation, said what I don't know is why they are working the salaries are so low that we even have to pay the taxes to get those things and then use them for the employees as charity cases. Why the City don't pave our street, you can just see our streets - our parks is not enough land. The planning has been so poor that there is no land for a place where the kids can play. There is no land

October 25, 1972
ss

-21-

for anything because nothing has been taken into consideration but the profit of the real estate, the banker, the investor, and all those things, and I don't think it should be a reason to annex more people until you can give better lives for the citizens you have - when you can provide better services. You have lost to the development of downtown. It is a very dangerous place to go. That Green Hospital. Where is the money that has been for Urban Renewal. You know there is not facilities for anything. It is a very swamp with not enough parking space or anything. They even charged 25 cents for that parking that little while that I was there and I told them that I haven't had anything out of my taxes so send it to (?) but I don't know if they did discount it from my taxes because I feel that don't have absolutely no benefit from my taxes. So why annex more people and more land when downtown is rotten. The rest of the city - the neighborhoods are getting so bad that (inaudible)... a city that you can be proud of because we are not -- well maybe next council we will have representation for the people because every branch of the business is represented here but not of the people - not the people. The people is just exploited to pay the taxes. I'm sorry but I'm

GATTI: Is there anyone else who cares to be heard on annexation? If not, I declare the meeting adjourned.

* * * *

There being no further business to come before the Council the meeting adjourned at 11:20 A.M.

* * * *

A P P R O V E D

John Gatti
M A Y O R

ATTEST:

A. J. Sulman
City Clerk

Documents in connection with the foregoing meeting are filed with the papers of this meeting and are as follows:

1. Call of Special Meeting by Mayor Gatti.
2. Acknowledgement by Council Members of Notice of Special Meeting.
3. Affidavit of Publication on October 13, 1972 of the San Antonio Express of Notice of Public Hearing on proposed annexation of 17 areas.
4. Notice of special meeting posted on City Hall bulletin board on October 20, 1972.

* * * *