REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON
THURSDAY, MARCH 7, 1968 AT 8:30 A.M.

* * * *

The meeting was called to order by the presiding officer, Mayor W. W. McAllister, with the following members present: McALLISTER, CALDERON, JONES, JAMES, COCKRELL, GATTI, TREVINO, PARKER, TORRES; Absent: NONE.

– – –

68-173 The invocation was given by Councilman S. H. James.

– – –

68-174 First heard was Zoning Case 3089 to rezone Lot 2, Blk. 15A, NCB 13776 from Temporary "A" Residence District to "R-4" Mobile-Home Residence District located on the northwest side of I.H. 35 Expressway, approximately 350' southwest of Starlight Terrace; having 557.85' on I. H. 35 and a maximum depth of 230.63'.

Mr. Burt Lawrence, Assistant Planning Director, explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

On motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mr. Jones, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Parker.

AN ORDINANCE 36,294

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 2, BLK. 15A, NCB 13776 FROM TEMPORARY "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "R-4" MOBILE-HOME RESIDENCE DISTRICT.

* * * *

– – –

68-175 Next heard was Zoning Case 3144 to rezone Lot 17, NCB 11619 from Temporary "A" Residence District to "B-1" Business District; Lot 18, NCB 11719 from Temporary "A" Residence District to "B-2" Business District located approximately 248' southeast of Louis Pasteur Drive and approximately 1300' northeast of Babcock Road. Lot 17 being 330.02' x 438.61' in size and Lot 18, 500.68' x 380.02' in size.

Mr. Burt Lawrence, Assistant Planning Director, explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

On motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mr. Jones, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Parker.

AN ORDINANCE 36,295

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 17, NCB 11619 FROM TEMPORARY "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT; LOT 18, NCB 11719 FROM TEMPORARY "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

68-176 Next heard was Zoning Case 3194 to rezone Lot 12, Blk. 3, NCB 771 from "E" Office District to "B-3" Business District, located on the northeast side of Lewis Street, 130.4' northwest of Euclid Street; having 56.2' on Lewis Street and a depth of 164.2'.

Mr. Burt Lawrence, Assistance Planning Director, explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

Mr. Carl Matthews, 96 Lewis Street, stated that the street is only about 25 feet wide and Azteca Films has a lot of deliveries and quite often block the street. He asked for assurance that additional off street parking be provided for their trucks.

Mr. Ben Bancroft, representing the applicant, Azteca Films, Inc., advised the Council that the plans first submitted were not approved because of inadequate off street parking. The plans were amended and sufficient off street parking has now been provided.

After discussion, Mr. Jones made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be approved subject to adequate off street parking being provided. Seconded by Mr. James, the motion, carrying with it the passage of the following ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James , Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Parker.

AN ORDINANCE 36,296

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 12, BLK. 3, NCB 771 FROM "E" OFFICE DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

68-177 Next heard was Zoning Case 3219 to rezone Lot 62, NCB 10615 from "A" Residence District to "B-3" Business District located on the east side of S. W. W. White Road, 150' north of Kay Ann Street; having 103.7' on S. W. W. White Road and a depth of 387'.

Mr. Burt Lawrence, Assistant Planning Director, explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

On motion of Mr. Jones, seconded by Mr. Trevino, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Parker.

AN ORDINANCE 36,297

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 62, NCB 10615 FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

68-178 Next heard was Zoning Case 3235 to rezone Lot 32, Blk. 2, NCB 13986, Lot 9, Blk. 9, NCB 14085 from Temporary "R-1" Single-Family Residence District to "R-3" Multiple-Family Residence District located south of the intersection of I. H. 410 and Rolling Ridge Drive West; having 1055.29' on I. H. 410 and 222.27' on Rolling Ridge Drive West.

Mr. Burt Lawrence, Assistant Planning Director, explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

On motion of Mrs. Cockrell, seconded by Mr. Jones, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Parker.

AN ORDINANCE 36,298

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 62, NCB 10615 FROM TEMPORARY "R-1" SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "R-3" MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT.

* * * *

68-179 Next heard was Zoning Case 3239 to rezone Lot 46, Blk. 1, NCB 11213 from "B" Residence District to "B-2" Business District located northwest of the intersection of Palo Alto Road and Wainwright Street; having 125' on Wainwright Street and 68.58' on Palo Alto Road.

Mr. Burt Lawrence, Assistant Planning Director, explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

On motion of Mr. Trevino, seconded by Dr. Calderon, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Parker.

AN ORDINANCE 36,299

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 46, BLK. 1, NCB 11213 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

68-180 Next heard was Zoning Case 3240 to rezone Lot 3, NCB 10850 from "A" Residence District to "B-3" Business District located northeast of the intersection of S. W. W. White Road and Ida Drive and 110.40' on S. W. W. White Road.

Mr. Burt Lawrence, Assistant Planning Director, explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

On motion of Mr. Gatti, seconded by Dr. Calderon, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Parker.

AN ORDINANCE 36,300

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 3, NCB 10850 FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

68-181 Next heard was Zoning Case 3175 to rezone 12.564 acres out of Lot 4, NCB 13934 from "A" Residence District to "B-1" Business District; 39.696 acres out of Lot 4, NCB 13934 from "A" Residence District to "B-2" Business District.(Described by field notes)

Lots 2 and 3, NCB 13934 from "A" Residence District to "B-3" Business District located on the south side of N. W. State Loop 410 between Callaghan Road and Babcock Road, containing a total of 74.405 acres. The "B-3" zoning being on the Loop 410 frontage. "B-2" zoning on the middle portion of this triangular tract and "B-1" zoning on the south portion of this tract.

Mr. Burt Lawrence, Assistant Planning Director, explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

Mr. Wallace Kinest, representing O. P. Woodcock Co. of Texas, Inc., presented a brouchure to each member of the Council showing the type of development they propose. He gave a background of his firm to show its integrity in developing property. He presented a drawing showing the types of buildings proposed in each zoning district requested. He added that this represented a proposed $25 million investment on their part. He stated they had agreed with the Planning Commission's recommendation that a 150' buffer zone remain "A" Residential District to protect adjoining residences. Also there is a 5' non-access easement provided to prevent ingress and egress to the development through the residential areas. He also agreed to construct a privacy fence along the property line.

Mr. Ray McMillan, 114 W. Crestline Drive, stated that the reason there were not many people here in opposition is that they are not dealing against a shopping center and the residents felt that this development is much better than a Shopping Center later on. His concern was that assurance be given that the developers would do what they propose.

Mr. C. E. Gaskin, 902 Crestview Drive, spoke in opposition to the proposed change, as did Mr. Robert Winston, 318 Glenview, and Mr. Frank Cunningham, 323 West Glenview.

A discussion then took place concerning the best use of the land in the 150' buffer zone which remains "A" Residential District. It was the consensus of the Council that this strip of land could best be utilized for Town Houses.

Mr. Gordon Davis, attorney representing the Woodcock Company, stated that his clients were agreeable to develop the buffer strip for Town Houses which would include a road to be dedicated. This road would not have access to the residential areas. He also agreed to the 5' non-access easement and the construction of a privacy fence to protect the "A" Residential property. It was understood that they would have to make application to rezone the buffer strip for Town House development since this question was not being considered in this zoning case.

It was further understood that the road may need to be located in the proposed "B-1" Business District zone.

After discussion, on motion of Mr. Gatti, seconded by Mr. Trevino, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Gatti, Trevino; NAYS: Cockrell; ABSTAINING: Torres; ABSENT: Parker.

AN ORDINANCE 36,301

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 12.564 ACRES OUT OF LOT 4, NCB 13934 FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-1" BUSINESS DISTRICT; 39.696 ACRES OUT OF LOT 4, NCB 13934 FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-2" BUSINESS DISTRICT; LOTS 2 & 3, NCB 13934 FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

68-182 Next heard was case 3200 to rezone Lot 23, NCB 11961, Lot 23, NCB 11962 from "A" Residence District to "R-3" Multiple-Family Residence District located on the east and west side of Gault Lane, 80' north of Ridgecrest Drive. Lot 23, NCB 11961 having 520.76' on Gault Lane and a depth of 512.27'. Lot 23, NCB 11962 having 563.51' on Gault Lane and a maximum depth of 378'.

Mr. Burt Lawrence, Assistant Planning Director, explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

On motion of Mr. Torres, seconded by Mr. Trevino, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Cockrell, Trevino, Parker, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Jones, James, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 36,302

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 23, NCB 11961, LOT 23, NCB 11962 FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "R-3" MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT.

* * * *

68-183 Next heard was Zoning Case 3218 to rezone the west 100' of Lot 6, Blk. 3, NCB 6968 from "B" Residence District to "B-3" Business District located on the east side of Zarzamora Street between Thompson Place and Walton Avenue; having 245.54' on Zarzamora and 100' on Thompson Place and Walton Avenue.

Mr. Burt Lawrence, Assistant Planning Director, explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

No one spoke in opposition.

On motion of Dr. Parker, seconded by Mr. Trevino, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Cockrell, Trevino, Parker, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Jones, James, Gatti.

AN ORDINANCE 36,303

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 100' OF LOT 6, BLK. 3, NCB 6968 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

68-184 Next heard was Zoning Case 3261 to rezone Lots 1 and 2, Blk. 6, NCB 13652 from "A" Residence District to "R-2" Two-Family Residence District located north of the intersection of Callaghan Road and Kepler Drive; having 354.67' on Callaghan Road, 37.94' on Kepler Drive and having a maximum depth of 138.79'.

Mr. Burt Lawrence, Assistant Planning Director, explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be approved by the City Council.

Mr. Charles Miller, Kepler Drive, asked what restrictions there are in the size of the proposed duplexes.

It was explained that duplexes are limited to two families and the size depends on the size of the lots.

After discussion, on motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mr. Jones, the recommendation of the Planning Commission was approved by passage of the following ordinance by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, Cockrell, Trevino, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: James, Gatti, Parker.

AN ORDINANCE 36,304

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 AND 2, BLK. 6, NCB 13652 FROM "A" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "R-2" TWO-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT.

* * * *

68-185 Last heard was Case 3231 to rezone Lot 31 and the remaining portion of Lot 32, Blk. 3, NCB 6617 from "B" Residence District to "B-3" Business District located on the west side of Trinity Street, 40' north of Culebra Road; having 160' on Trinity Street and a maximum depth of 115'.

Mr. Burt Lawrence, Assistant Planning Director, explained the proposed change which the Planning Commission recommended be denied by the City Council.

Mr. Tom Stolhandske advised that they had appealed this case from the Planning Commission on which there was a tie vote. He stated that the applicant, Southwest Tile Company of San Antonio, would construct a completely enclosed building to be used for ceramic tile works. Also there would be a four-man law office in the building. The building would be of Spanish architecture. There would be adequate off street parking available. While it was understood there is a traffic problem on Trinity Street, which is also used an an exit off I. H. 10 Expressway, he felt that this business would not generate so much additional traffic to increase the problem already existing.

Speaking in opposition were Mr. Steve Quesenberry, 110 McAllister Court, Mr. George A. Eichier, 111 McAllister Court.

After discussion, Mr. Jones made a motion that the recommendation of the Planning Commission be overruled and the property be rezoned "B-3" Business District. The motion was seconded by Mr. Torres. The motion, carrying with it the passage of the following ordinance, prevailed by the following vote: AYES: Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Parker, Torres; NAYS: McAllister, Calderon; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 36,305

AMENDING CHAPTER 42 OF THE CITY CODE THAT CONSTITUTES THE COMPREHENSIVE ZONING ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO BY CHANGING THE CLASSIFICATION AND REZONING OF CERTAIN PROPERTY DESCRIBED HEREIN AS LOT 31 AND THE REMAINING PORTION OF LOT 32, BLK. 3, NCB 6617 FROM "B" RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO "B-3" BUSINESS DISTRICT.

* * * *

68-186 The following ordinance was explained by Dr. William R. Ross, Director of the San Antonio Metropolitan Health District, and on motion of Dr. Parker, seconded by Mr. Torres, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Gatti, Trevino, Parker, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 36,306

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF LESLIE S. HUTTON CONSTRUCTION COMPANY FOR CONSTRUCTION OF ANIMAL SHELTER BUILDING NO. 3 AND MODIFICATION OF ANIMAL SHELTER NO. 1; AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT THEREFOR, AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF $90,812.00 OUT OF THE GENERAL FUND TO SAID CONTRACTOR, AUTHORIZING $2,500.00 OUT OF THE SAME FUND TO BE USED AS A CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY ACCOUNT AND $500.00 AS A MISCELLANEOUS CONTINGENCY ACCOUNT.

* * * *

68-187 The Clerk read the following ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 36,307

REGULATING THE SPEED OF TRAINS WITHIN THE CITY AND PRESCRIBING A PENALTY FOR VIOLATIONS THEREOF BY A FINE OF NOT TO EXCEED $200.00.

* * * *

Mr. Stewert Fischer, Director of Traffic and Transportation, explained that the ordinance has been amended, and with the exception of two instances, the maximum speed limit is 45 miles per hour. The two exceptions are: (1) Along the MKT Railroad line from the north City limits to Loop 410; (2) Upon the Missouri-Pacific Railroad line from Loop 410 to the City limits, 60 miles per hour. He added that this ordinance was acceptable to the railroads which was confirmed by Mr. Harper MacFarlane, attorney for the Missouri-Pacific Railroad, and Mr. Bond Davis, attorney for the MKT Railroad.

On motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mr. Torres, the ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Jones, Parker.

68-188 The Clerk read an ordinance authorizing a contract with American District Telegraph Company for installation and maintenance of fire alarm boxes and other signaling devices in the Tower of the Americas.

Fire Chief Milton Rogers stated that this service would compliment the fire protection facilities to the Tower and would give the City twenty-four supervision service. Cost of installation of the service is $775.00, plus a yearly cost of $1244.00 per year payable monthly.

After discussion, the Council postponed action on the ordinance for one week and suggested that the Insurance Advisory Committee be asked to give a report on insurance rates on this particular project. It was also felt that the fee structure of the American District Telegraph Company might be a little too high.

The City Manager was instructed to ask American District Telegraph Company to review the fee proposed for the service.

— — —

68-189 A hearing was held on the following ordinance which was read by the City Clerk.

AN ORDINANCE 36,308

DETERMINING THAT THE PREMISES LOCATED AT 1812 COLIMA CONTAINS OR CONSTITUTES A CONDITION WHICH IS DEEMED A NUISANCE, A FIRE, HEALTH AND SAFETY HAZARD, AND THE CITY MANAGER IS DIRECTED TO HAVE THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS ABATE THE NUISANCE ON SAID PREMISES BY DEMOLISHING IT AFTER TEN DAYS NOTICE TO THE OWNER.

* * * *

Mr. George Vann, Director of Housing and Inspections, advised the Council that this is a dwelling which has been 95% destroyed by fire. The owner of the property is Eulogia G. Montemayor who lives in California. Notice was sent by certified mail advising of the hearing. He reported that the Fire Prevention Bureau and the Health Department have found the premises to be a fire, health and safety hazard to the public by reason of its condition and recommended the ordinance be adopted.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Gatti, seconded by Mr. Trevino, the ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Parker, Torres.

— — —

68-190 The Clerk read the following ordinance, and on motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mr. Trevino was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Parker, Torres.

AN ORDINANCE 36,309

APPOINTING MR. J. P. FISHER AND MR. F. NORMAN HILL AS MEMBERS OF THE TRAFFIC COORDINATING COMMITTEE.

* * * *

– – –

Mayor Pro-Tem Gatti asked what the possibility was of having two lanes turning right on Houston Street from Soledad as it is difficult and time consuming because of the bus stop on Soledad.

Traffic and Transportation Director Stewert Fischer stated that this would be dangerous in that some of the buses do not turn right but continue north on Soledad.

Mr. Gatti then asked Mr. Fischer to check and see if the bus stop could be moved from the corner to the middle of the block which would make it easier for traffic to turn right without undue delay.

After discussion, the Mayor asked Mr. Norman Hill, General Manager of the Transit System, to make a report to the Council why it would not be feasible for the bus stop to be moved to the middle of the block.

– – –

68-173 At this time, the Council considered the petition of Aubrey G. Baker and James W. Langham requesting a permit to operate limousine and bus service to HemisFair for guests for the San Antonio Inn, Holiday Inn, Travel Lodge and Rodeway Inn.

Mr. James Langham, one of the petitioners, stated they would like to operate this service on a one hour round trip basis. However, the Transit System says it will provide service only on a Charter Service basis which is not what the motels are interested in and asked that the Council approve the petition.

Mr. Norman Hill, General Manager of the Transit System, reported they are prepared to provide transportation service and have the manpower and equipment. They are also prepared to provide service for specified charter groups and already have many commitments. In addition they will have bus service to be operated from the San Antonio Inn on I. H. 35 which will proceed into Broadway and then down to HemisFair.

This will service a large concentration of motels on that route. All other hotels and motels are located on regular routes or within a block or two thereof, with the exception of 10 or 12 motels. He stated that he had contacted these motels and all were interested in supplying services to patrons as long as they do not have to subsidize a service.

Mr. Hill stated a study of other Fairs show that people driving to a Fair and staying at a motel will largely use their automobile to get to the downtown area to park and then attend the Fair. Also there are private charter groups who want to go by bus and others leave their cars at motels and use other services, such as taxi cabs. He stated that he had contacted managers of the motels which the petitioner proposes to serve, and found them responsive to being serviced by the San Antonio Transit System. Service will be provided according to the demand on a charter basis, most probably in the morning and in the evening.

He explained that a study indicates that movement of people will be in the morning and they would provide the service and also accommodate them in the evening to complete the round trip. If demand for the service picked up during other times of the day, service would be increased. A round trip fare on a charter bus would be $1.00 as compared to the fare for regular bus service from the fourth zone which is 35¢ one way.

Mr. Langham then advised the Council that he had talked to the Travel Lodge Motel and they would like to have the service they propose as they felt they could fill one bus each hour and people don't want to have to wait for a bus to come out to pick them up.

After consideration, Mr. Gatti made a motion that the petition of Aubrey G. Baker and James W. Langham be denied. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Cockrell. The motion prevailed by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Parker; NAYS: Calderon; ABSENT: Torres.

- - -

67-754 The Council then considered the petition of Fair Parking and Shuttle Service Company requesting a permit for proposed peripheral parking facility within the City limits of City and direct shuttle bus service between said facilities and the HemisFair area.

Mr. P. J. Craig, representing the petitioners, stated he had discussed the matter with the Traffic and Transporation Director and he could not agree that additional parking will not be needed. He felt it is immaterial whether there was sufficient parking in the downtown area, as no harm will be done if more than sufficient parking is available. He stated his group is composed of five successful business men who are willing to risk their money because they felt this service is needed. He felt that if Mr. Fischer is wrong, the consequences would be disasterous to HemisFair.

He then discussed the question of sufficient transporation. He said the City could not guarantee they would furnish his parking facilities with regular bus service. The people parking on their lots would expect regular transportation. They proposed to furnish service on a 16 hour basis and the Transit System could not guarantee this. Without the bus service, the parking lots would be a financial failure. The Transit System charges $12.00 and $15.00 per hour for Charter Buses and they could not afford to pay that rate. He stated they could furnish buses and that they had a commitment from a firm in Austin and they would furnish all the buses they would need. He informed the Council they would like to modify the fee they proposed to charge. Instead of $1.00 per person, the fee for transportation would be $1.00 for adults and $.50 for children under 12, with children in arms free.

He then compared the cost of using his parking lot and bus service against the cost of the family of four using their car and parking in town as well as the cost of hiring a taxi and using bus service from Loop 410.

He then discussed the problem of insurance and stated he had a commitment from an insurance company to insure them in the amount of $25,000.00 per person and $100,000 to $300,000 bodily injury, and $10,000.00 property damage. He added the San Antonio Transit System is self-insured up to $25,000.00 per person.

Mr. Craig explained that as to advertising in connection with the service proposed, he agreed one hundred percent with Mr. Fischer and presented a letter showing an example of the advertising they proposed to use, stating they would not incorporate any false, misleading, or deceiving material in any of its advertising.

He asked the Council to act on his request today as any further delay would be tantamount to rejection.

Mr. Norman Hill, General Manager of the Transit System, stated they are opposed to the proposed petition because it is going into the bus business and they are already in that field. He stated they had the manpower and the equipment to take care of the transportation. He recognized the interest of the petitioners in providing the service, but they do not have the experience the Transit System has. He stated the Transit System is interested in leasing buses to petitioners at $15.00 per hour for airconditioned buses and $12.00 without airconditioning . He added that at the Wonderland and W. W. White Road parking locations, regular bus line service could be diverted to handle those facilities. The lot on Rittiman Road is isolated and not an attractive proposition.

After discussion of the proposal, Mr. Gatti made a motion that the petition of Fair Parking and Shuttle Service Company be denied. Seconded by Dr. Parker, the motion prevailed by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Parker; NAYS: Torres; ABSENT: None.

The following ordinances were explained by Members of the Administrative Staff and on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Parker, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

68-191 AN ORDINANCE 36,310

ACCEPTING THE ATTACHED LOW QUALIFIED BID OF UNITED STEEL FABIRCATORS, INC. TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH CERTAIN STRUCTURAL STEEL FOR PEDESTRIAN OVERPASS FOR A TOTAL OF $10,336.00.

* * * *

68-192 AN ORDINANCE 36,311

ACCEPTING THE ATTACHED LOW QUALIFIED BID OF REDONDO MANUFACTURING COMPANY, INC. TO FURNISH THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO WITH CERTAIN PRECAST CONCRETE UNITS FOR PEDESTRIAN OVERPASS FOR A TOTAL OF $10,425.00.

* * * *

— — —

68-193 The Clerk read the following ordinance which was explained by Purchasing Agent Al Tripp.

AN ORDINANCE 36,312

ACCEPTING THE ATTACHED QUALIFIED BID OF SANBLON COMPANY TO SAND BLAST AND SEAL CERTAIN BRIDGES, STEPS, ETC. FOR THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO FOR A TOTAL OF $6,489.00, AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF ARCHITECTURAL FEE THEREWITH.

* * * *

Councilman Torres questioned the propriety of hiring an architect for this job.

It was explained that the architect had been hired to prepare specifications for the sandblasting and waterproofing of bridges, bridge areas and related areas so that bids could be taken for consideration by the Council.

After discussion, on motion of Dr. Parker, seconded by Mr. Jones, the ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Parker; NAYS: Torres; ABSENT: None.

— — —

68-194 The following ordinance was explained by Mr. Robert Frazer, Director of Parks and Recreation, and on motion of Mr. Gatti, seconded by Dr. Parker, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Parker, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 36,313

ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF DARRAGH & LYDA, INC. TO RECONSTRUCT THE SAN ANTONIO RIVER WALL NORTH OF COMMERCE STREET; AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT FOR SUCH WORK; APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF $19,842.00 OUT OF PARK IMPROVEMENT BOND FUNDS PAYABLE TO SAID CONTRACTOR; APPROPRIATING $500.00 OUT OF THE SAME FUND AS A CONSTRUCTION CONTINGENCY ACCOUNT, $200.00 AS A MISCELLANEOUS CONTINGENCY ACCOUNT, AND $900.00 PAYABLE TO SEIDEL & LIVESAY FOR ENGINNERING SERVICES.

* * * *

68-195 The following ordinance was explained by Mr. George Vann, Director of Housing and Inspections, and on motion of Dr. Calderon, seconded by Mrs. Cockrell, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Parker, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

AN ORDINANCE 36,314

GRANTING SAN ANTONIO INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT PERMISSION TO INSTALL AND MAINTAIN A TEN FOOT HIGH CHAIN LINK FENCE ALONG THE MAIN AVENUE SIDE OF TRAVIS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL.

* * * *

68-196 The Clerk read the following ordinance.

AN ORDINANCE 36,315

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH MR. RODERICK KROHN AND MRS. FRANCES LEVENSON, DEMISING CERTAIN FLOOR SPACE IN THE MARINA PARKING GARAGE TO BE USED TO OPERATE THE BUSINESS OF RENTING "ROLL-A-SEATS" TO THE PUBLIC.

* * * *

Purchasing Agent Al Tripp explained that the contract was for a period of one year beginning April 6, 1968. The City would get 10% of the gross up to $100,000.00 and 20% of the gross over that amount. He added that partitions were designed by the architect for this operation which will be located on the first level facing Water Street. The concessionaire will pay the cost to the City which is $2,000.00.

It was brought out that there was no minimum guarantee as part of the consideration. Based on the revenue for parking, it was decided that the contract be amended to provide a minimum payment to the City that shall not be less than $700.00 for the term of the contract.

This was agreeable to Mrs. Frances Levenson, who was present.

On motion of Mr. Jones, seconded by Dr. Calderon, the ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Parker, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

– – –

68-197 The Clerk read an ordinance authorizing the acceptance of a gift from Mr. and Mrs. Jay Lewis Rubin, through the Joseph Rubin Foundation, of six mosaic murals to be installed on the Tower of the Americas and authorizing the endorsement by the City of San Antonio of checks received by the City for the payment of Manolio D. Cavallini and Tom Stell for such murals.

Dr. Lewis Tucker, Secretary of the Fine Arts Commission advised the Council that the Commission had unanimously recommended acceptance of the murals by the City and that a proper permanent marker be placed acknowledging the donor.

City Manager Henckel advised that the murals had been approved by the City architect and that the donors requested that a plaque giving the name of the donor be placed at a central location at the base of the Tower bearing an explanation of the gift. He stated the City has received several such gifts, but to his knowledge had not allowed a plaque on any of these gifts and felt the Council should consider that it would be setting a precedent and make it difficult to turn down other donors.

The Mayor stated he felt this brings up a proposition that might be a little embarrassing later on. He expressed appreciation to the Fine Arts Commission and to Mr. and Mrs. Jay Lewis Rubin in the matter and asked that Dr. Tucker check further the matter of identification plaques.

Action on this item was proposed one week.

–

Dr. Tucker then stated he was also Chairman of the Architectural Committee of the Fine Arts Commission and said that he had consulted with representatives of the City Public Service Board and the H. B. Zachry Company and found there are no plans for trees, landscaping, or restoration of stone walls on the ground level of the Villita Parking Garage. Also it has been learned that the cost of the tile solar screen to cover the garage has not been funded, so the Commission has not approved the ornament and materials. He asked that these items be funded by the City and/or the City Public Service Board.

The Mayor stated that this would be taken under consideration.

-

Councilman Torres asked why the matter of the bid submitted by the H. B. Zachry Company to construct the parking garage has not been submitted to the Council for consideration.

Assistant City Manager Ancil Douthit advised they had been working with a representative of the H. B. Zachry Company and hoped to have a recommendation ready for the next Council meeting. He further advised that they were considering going back to the original plan rather than the City issuing the Bonds.

Mr. Torres then stated that this meant under the original plan the City Public Service Board would sell the property to the H. B. Zachry Company. However, construction of the garage is progressing rapidly and without any arrangements having been made as to how Mr. Zachry is going to be paid for the work done, or whether the City is going to pay him.

The Mayor stated that the City has no obligation to Mr. Zachry at the present time.

- - -

68-198 Mayor Pro-Tem Gatti introduced the following ordinance which was read by the City Clerk.

AN ORDINANCE 36,316

DECLARING THE INTENTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, TO DESIGNATE A COMMUNITY ACTION AGENCY TO RECEIVE ASSISTANCE UNDER TITLE II OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT WITHIN THE AREA COMPRISING THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS, AND THE COUNTY OF BEXAR, TEXAS.

* * * *

Mr. Gatti stated that Congress had passed a law in 1967 known as the "Green Amendment" giving counties and cities the right to designate the existing agency, take it over themselves, or designate another agency. He stated he had met with the County and the City Attorney and it was his recommendation to keep the existing agency as the designee to carry on the poverty program in San Antonio.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Trevino, seconded by Mr. James, the ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: McAllister, Calderon, Jones, James, Cockrell, Gatti, Trevino, Parker, Torres; NAYS: None; ABSENT: None.

- - -

68-199 The following discussion took place regarding the Community Relations Commission:

MR. HENCKEL: Just as a preface, there is a question that has arisen as to the authority and power of the Community Relations Commission that was created by City ordinance; also concerning the powers and duties of the Director. I appeared before the Community Relations Commission and advised them I would recommend a joint meeting with the Council in order that the City Attorney could give a legal opinion on the matter in question. Mr. Walker has prepared an opinion, of which you already have copies, and of which he will give verbally today.

MR. WALKER: I have been requested to render an opinion with reference to the powers and duties of the Community Relations Commission under the ordinance that was adopted by the City Council. Under your Charter provision the City Council does not have authority to name any Commission or Board except those that are established in the statutes, such as planning, zoning, that type of thing, and give it any power other than that of an advisory capacity. The Charter precludes it. In your Community Relations ordinance, Section 1, giving to the present Commission authority considerably over and above advisory natures. You have given them broad powers of investigation. I personally don't see how they would operate without such powers. But you have also given them authority in the nature of a greviance committee, that is certainly not advisory in nature and the thing that I am primarily concerned about, you have given them the authority, in case they are not able by persuasion, coercion, etc., to resolve a complaint, to go into Corporation Court and file a complaint. That is not advisory. In our opinion it violates the Charter.

REV. BAUGH: You have being circulated here the background information whereby the Community Relations Commission was established. As you know we were established in 1964 and we have been operating in this area for a period of four years. There have been times when we have been a little confused and what our lines of communication were. There were times when I felt the City Council was a little confused because if you will read the material you will see the sub-committee appointed by the Council, I believe served on by Mrs. Cockrell, Chairman, Mr. Torres, Mr. Trevino and Mr. James met with the joint commitee of the Commission, myself, Mr. Teniente and Mr. Jennings and I believe that we have tried to come up with some ground rules. Each time we met we came up with a different set of rules.

REV. BAUGH: Today, we received this legal opinion from the City Attorney which raises some very interesting questions. First of all this, in his opinion, this would seem to overrule the legal opinion of the city in the past that passed and wrote the ordinances that are now on the books. This makes me wonder if the Legal Department is going to get just as confused as everybody else in these matters. Very frankly also, it seems a little strange that after four years of operating, and I think most effectively, and certainly we have received commendations from the Department of Defense, from the City as a whole and on many occasions from this body on the effectiveness of what we were doing. Now, when we are engaged in the most important hearing we have ever had, w e suddenly find we have no right to really exist and we have no powers that do exist. This seems more than coincendence. I am more confused now than when I got here and was handed this opinion. I am not sure that we have the right to exist or whether the City has the right to be involved.

MR. TORRES: If what Mr. Walker says is true, if the Council gives merit to his opinion, and I am perturbed over this opinion, the Community Relations Commission may as well disband. This is really what it amounts to and it would indicate as you have intimated that in coming up with recommendations on the City Public Service Board is the most effective project that your Commission has ever got involved in, that you may have written your coup de grace . I have a question here Mr. Walker. What about the facts that Rev. Baugh indicated, the historical precedent that we have established in having a Commission working for four years, the fact that we were given legal opinions that justified our setting up the Commission. Are we disregarding those things? Second, doesn't the power to advise also carry the power to investigate and to hear complaints and greviances?

MR. WALKER: This opinion raises this question. Those functions which the Commission engages in presently which are advisory under the Charter, and which I think you should be highly commended for your activities, please keep in mind I am not attacking your Commission, your activities, if you do not attempt to take the position of complainant and go to Corporation Court and file a complaint. I see nothing wrong with the existance of the Commission and do not contend the Commission is not a legally appointed and legally operating Commission. That is not what the City Attorney's office was asked to do. The City Attorney's office was told to give an opinion as to what its power and authority is. Now you have whatever powers and authority you would have as an advisory committee and that could include alot of things.

REV. BAUGH: Does that include investigating.

MR. WALKER. I certainly think so.

REV. BAUGH: We can't very well advise without investigating.

MR. WALKER: Absolutely. That would carry that with it.

DR. CALDERON: I'd like to point out that the Council just got this opinion.

MAYOR: I haven't read it. I don't think any of the members of the Council have.

MR. TORRES: Reverend Baugh, would it be any inconvenience to the members of your Commission if the Council, in order to study this opinion and your Commission might reflect on it, agreed to put this off for a week?

REV. BAUGH: It will of course be an inconvenience because we have 14 of our 16 members here today. But I think this is very, very important. The whole crux of whether this City wants to be involved in solving its problems is on trial here. Even if it means an inconvenience on our part. I think it merits this. In going back, I feel that this legal opinion overrules the previous opinion of the legal departments because they did help to pass and help to write the ordinances that are now on the books. It also makes me wonder about ordinances we have on public accommodations, apartment houses and this sort of thing as to whether or not the present legal department feels that these are not valid laws too. If this is true, I think the Military will want to know about it because they have been using this as a lever in solving their problems. Their backs are against the wall, the Pentagon has got them there. I feel this merits the attention and the study and we will be glad to come back, as inconvenient as it may be, because the whole thing is on trial.

MRS. COCKRELL: I want to say one thing here as Chairman of the subcommittee, and I want the record to state that we did invite our former City Attorney, Mr. Wolf, to sit in on our meetings, and that I personally spent many, many hours with studying the law books and his opinions and his comments on it. Just for the record, I would like for it to be known that our subcommittee did investigate to the best of our ability our legal position and in fact modified one recommendation that we had considered making due to the legal situation.

REV. BAUGH: Which one was that?

MRS. COCKRELL: That was when we were discussing the aspects of the police community relations. When we revised our position on that.

MR. GATTI: Just exactly what is the problem?

MAYOR: I don't think there is any question in the minds of the Council in regard to the fine work that this Commission has done or the desirability in having such a Commission. I feel perhaps this has come about because of some of the trends in which your operation is proceeding. I haven't read the opinion and I haven't read your reply.

REV. BAUGH: On page 3, paragraph 3, it specifically speaks of the City Public Service Board, and this would make me feel that perhaps this, our activities, investigations, which incidentally came at the request of several members of the City Council and which we feel we did a commendable job, if this didn't percipitate a restudy of our position.

MR. GATTI: I still would like for somebody to tell me what is the point of issue.

MR. TORRES: Recommendations were made by the Community Relations Commission. In reply the City Public Service Board in effect stated they would comply with two of them, other recommendations were ignored. The Community Relations Commission has asked for a definition of its particular position and this is the reply we get from the City Attorney and which in effect removes the very foundation of their existance.

MR. HENCKEL: Perhaps I can clarify why we are here today. Last week I was requested to appear before the Commission and that they would question me about some action taken by the City. As I came into the room, there was considerable discussion on the report of the CPSB and the question that arose as a result of the discussion was whether or not the Commission had enforcement and administrative powers. I told the Commission that I did not want to answer the question, that I felt this was something they had to get from the City Attorney. Some members of the Commission stated they had never been informed of what their powers, duties and authority was. This is the purpose of the meeting today.

REV. BAUGH: All we have are the policy statements, this background material which we gave you.

MR. GATTI: As I understand one thing, the Community Relations Commission is an agency of the City Council and right here in your minutes which you pointed out, the City Council through the City Manager is qualified to select a staff and can be perfectly objective. To remove this responsibility from the City Council would not be the right thing to do. When this thing was set up and the ordinance was passed this thing was made clear. It is my feeling that the final responsibility on your recommendations to the City Council, that it is the City Council's responsibility to act on them to accept them or not to accept them, or to accept them in total or to accept them in part, however they so decide. This was my understanding of this whole program and I think this is what it was.

MR. TREVINO: One of the precepts here in this opinion is that it is strictly prohibited to look into any governmental agencies, as the City Public Service Board. I remember specifically at that meeting we had with the committee that we asked to look into every situation, regardless of where it exists, whether in our own house or where. Because now we are telling them they don't even have the right to go and investigate a problem.

MR. WALKER: No, I'm sorry, you are not interpreting the opinion correctly. The state law which was not passed until last year and which now makes a definite distinction with reference to the authority of any commission, with reference to public employees or public officers. That is the only way the CPSB gets into this thing at all, because it happens to fall in that category. When I was asked to give an opinion as to what the rights of this commission may be, I covered every aspect of it I could think of. The CPSB just happens to be a political subdivision. Now what the state law provides is simply this: that where you have discrimination by a state officer or employee with reference with your whole civil rights concept that it shall be handled under that particular law. In other words, Texas has not legislated in the civil rights field insofar as it pertains to state officers or its employees or those of its political subdivisions.

MR. WALKER: Now one thing it points out, and you can readily see you have no jurisdiction, as a matter of fact the City Council has no jurisdiction in matters of this kind. It points out where you have this violation under this new state law, the fine for same is up to $1000.00, the maximum imprisonment is up to one year in jail or both. That point alone takes this subject matter from an enforcement standpoint, out of the hands of the City of San Antonio or any commission it may have. First of all, you do not have penal jurisdiction where the offense is in excess of $200.00 and the state law comes in and purposely said we don't want the cities messing in this. Obviously this is what this means because they take away your jurisdiction to enforce same. Now also in that same section it says where you do have such a violation the criminal district attorney is the one to whom the notice shall be given, not your corporation court. So you can't act under your ordinance in this respect under any circumstances whatever because the state law has preempted the field with reference to this particular part of civil rights enforcement.

MR. TREVINO: You say this is a new statute?

MR. WALKER: I think July, 1967.

MR. GATTI: If the Community Relations Commission, after making a study of any operation, would make the same recommendations to the City Council, the City Council with its own agency could under this act, under the ordinance that formed this, could instruct that agency either accept these and show action on these or not, could they not?

MR. WALKER: My opinion does not affect any of your penal provisions of this ordinance. The only thing that I have raised here in this opinion is the right, the responsibility, the authority of your commission to institute criminal action which your ordinance gives them the right, you can't do it.

MR. GATTI: Take one point, whatever point that was recommended, what I am asking is does the City Council have the right to follow this recommendation to this particular agency and say now you stop doing this or you start doing this, even though it is an independent board?

MR. WALKER: Absolutely. This board is advisory to the City Council.

REV. BAUGH: At the next meeting, if we come back, would you all be prepared to tell us what we are, what are the limitations, what our perrogatives are and what the flow of communications is, to whom do we report in specific situations so that we know whether we are to be dealing with the City Public Service Board or with an apartment house that is discriminating, or is it a matter of reporting to the City Council and asking that you deal with them? I think these are the things that we need to know. Pursuant to these things and since we have established the fact that we are responsible to you at this point, in the report on the findings, the hearings of the CPSB, there is one item there and I would like to read this "in regard to the Community Relations Commission recommendations that the CPSB employ a full time equal employment opportunity director, it has been frequently suggested by members of the City Council, as well as the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the City Public Service Board that the recommendation should be broadened to the effect that

the City of San Antonio employ such an officer to function in connection with all the municipal operations of the city. As Chairman of the Commission, I would concur in this and I hope the Council will give it favorable consideration. We will come back next week.

A copy of the City Attorney's opinion is on file with the original of these minutes.

– – –

Mayor McAllister was obliged to leave the meeting, and Mayor Pro-Tem Gatti presided.

– – –

67-173 Mr. Anthony Pons, representing Lulac Council No. 2 read the following resolution.

WHEREAS, the Community Relations Commission of the City of San Antonio, a body of citizens broadly representing the entire community and created by the City Council to deal with greviances and other matters having to do with relations between different ethnic groups in our city, after an exhaustive and lengthy investigation into City Public Service Board employment practices, has found "serious" and "grave" conditions existing regarding opportunities afforded to Mexican-American and Negro citizens and recommended ten specific steps be taken by the CPSB to correct said conditions, and

WHEREAS, this City Council, after studying the Commission's findings, did accept in principle the Commission's report and asked the CPSB for its plans and intent regarding the implementation of these ten corrective steps, and

WHEREAS, the CPSB, a city-owned utility, has to date persistently ignored both the Community Relations Commission and this City Council by steadfastly denying the existence of any discriminatory practices and by refusing to implement all the Commission's recommendations,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: that Lulac Council No. 2, once more seeking positive solutions to conditions that easily might deteriorate into a far more serious problem for the entre community, does request this City Council to demand the immediate implementation by the CPSB of all ten Commission recommendations.

* *

Mr. Pons then stated the action requested by Lulac Council No. 2, if taken, will prove to Mexican-American and Negro citizens that this City Council is sincere in its efforts to resolve peacefully anygreviances brought forward by these groups. Such action is vitally needed in light of President Johnson's anti-riot commission findings which pinpointed several conditions common to the present situation in this city that also preceded acts of violence in American cities last year. Among these are unemployment and underemployment; ineffectiveness of the political structure and greviance procedures; and discriminatory administration of justice.

He further stated that Lulac Council No. 2 feels that good, fair and just solutions to problems aggravating the peaceful relations between the various ethnic groups of our community will do more toward assuring a successful and troublefree HemisFair than the passage of ordinances and the amassing of forces designed to meet violence with violence. We feel such violence is useless and can be avoided. We earnestly hope that this City Council will prevent it by its action here today.

— — —

67-173 Reverend R. A. Callius, Chairman of Community Projects, James Whitcomb Riley School, thanked the Council for its active interest in their area and for the concrete evidence that the City is in sympathy with them. He added that ill conditions make them feel bad, and then good conditions make them feel good. He stated they are convinced that the black citizens and white citizens of our community can come together to straighten out some of the crooked ways.

Mayor Pro-Tem Gatti thanked Reverend Callius for his remarks and promised to continue to work with his group.

— — —

67-173 The Clerk read the following letter.

March 4, 1968

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

Gentlemen and Madam:

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

2-28-68 Petition of Paul Markey, 102 W. Rampart, requesting the City to grant a permit to erect a sign on San Pedro Avenue right-of-way in front of a building being constructed on Lots 8 and 9, Block 1, NCB 10048 in accordance with City specifications.

3-1-68 Petition of Mr. Earl C. Hill, et al, residents of Willow Wood, Meadow View North and Meadow View Subdivisions requesting installation of traffic control signals on Colisiem Drive at its intersection with Gembler Road and Belgium Lane.

/s/ J. H. INSELMANN
City Clerk

— — —

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned.

— — —

A P P R O V E D:

M McAlister

M A Y O R

ATTEST: H H Buchman
City Clerk

MAR 2, 1988