

REGULAR MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO HELD IN  
THE COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL, ON  
THURSDAY, JUNE 20, 1974.

\* \* \* \*

The meeting was called to order at 8:30 A. M., by the presiding officer, Mayor Charles L. Becker, with the following members present: SAN MARTIN, BECKER, BLACK, LACY, MORTON, PADILLA, MENDOZA; Absent: COCKRELL.

- - -  
74-28 The invocation was given by The Reverend C. Robert Ryan, Highland Hills Baptist Church.

- - -  
74-28 Members of the City Council and the audience joined in the Pledge of Allegiance to the flag of the United States of America.

- - -  
74-28 The minutes of the meeting of June 13, 1974, were approved.

74-28 FIREFIGHTERS' PETITION

Mayor Becker recognized City Clerk Jake Inselmann and Captain Curtis Franz, campaign manager for Firefighters for Public Safety.

Mr. Inselmann advised the Council that the petition originally filed in the office of the City Clerk on May 20, 1974, calling for a vote on collective bargaining for firefighters in the San Antonio Fire Department and deemed insufficient, had been amended and resubmitted to the City Clerk on June 19, 1974. Upon examination, it was found that the petition bore more than the necessary 8,126 signatures of voters who voted in the last general election. Accordingly, Mr. Inselmann certified the petition sufficient for the purpose of calling an election under Article 5154c-1. (A copy of Mr. Inselmann's certificate is included with the papers of this meeting.)

Mr. Inselmann said that he and Capt. Franz had agreed that the date for holding the election should be Tuesday, July 23, 1974, and requested that the Council approve this date. He also said that this being a one proposition election, he doubted whether it would draw a heavy vote. In order to reduce costs, he felt that precincts could be combined to reduce the number of voting places from 183 to about 40 or 50 voting places.

Capt. Franz stated that he was in full accord with all of Mr. Inselmann's recommendations.

Dr. San Martin expressed opposition to the combining of precincts as he felt that this would tend to discourage voters.

After discussion, it was agreed that Mr. Inselmann would study the matter and have an ordinance prepared for consideration by the Council next week.

- - -  
June 20, 1974

el

74-28 The following Ordinances were read and explained by the Clerk, Mr. J. H. Inselmann, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: San Martin, Becker, Black, Lacy, Morton, Padilla, Mendoza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell.

AN ORDINANCE 43,918

REVISING AND ESTABLISHING ELECTION  
PRECINCTS FOR THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO,  
TEXAS.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 43,919

CALLING AN ELECTION ON THE QUESTION OF  
ADOPTION OF THE STATE LAW APPLICABLE TO  
FIREFIGHTERS WHICH ESTABLISHES COLLECTIVE  
BARGAINING WHEN A MAJORITY OF THE AFFECTED  
EMPLOYEES FAVOR REPRESENTATION BY AN  
EMPLOYEES' ASSOCIATION AND WHICH PRESERVES  
THE PROHIBITION OF STRIKES AND LOCKOUTS  
AND PROVIDES PENALTIES THEREFOR.

\* \* \* \*

74-28

HEMPHILL PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE

Mr. Robert Tamez, 5367 San Benito, said that he was acting as spokesman for several community organizations on the west side of town. The purpose of their visit was to request replacement of pedestrian bridge spanning a drainage ditch at Hemphill and Wheatfield Streets. He described the dangerous condition of the bridges and the danger of children falling into the water.

Mr. Tamez said that he had learned that money for this project had been set aside out of general revenue sharing funds. He expressed appreciation to the Council for being so responsive to the needs of the people in that part of town.

Dr. San Martin said that he, Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss and Mr. Joe Madison had met with this same group at Esparza Elementary School. At that meeting, the bridge situation had been discussed as well as the need to clean up the creekbeds and the lack of police surveillance in the area. These matters had been discussed with the City Manager and Chief Emil Peters who has already taken steps to provide more police protection. The City's crews have also begun cutting weeds in the creeks.

Mr. Sueltenfuss said that the bridge engineering will be done by City engineers and construction will probably start in 90 to 120 days.

Mr. Tamez then told the Council that he was also spokesman for a larger coalition of parishes and organizations which is known as Citizens Against Pirating and Profiteering. He asked that:

1. The Council proceed without delay with a suit against Coastal States for breach of contract and an injunction against further curtailments by Coastal States.
2. The Council provide a credit to persons who were billed retroactively for electricity.
3. The Council consider and rescind the 19% rate increase.

\* \* \* \*

74-28

TAFOLLA SUMMER HIGH SCHOOL  
ALAMO HEIGHTS HIGH SCHOOL

Mayor Becker recognized in the audience classes from both Tafolla High School and Alamo Heights High School. He welcomed them to the meeting and invited them back anytime.

74-28

ENERGY CRISIS

DR. JOSE SAN MARTIN: I would like to bring for consideration of this Council the following:

I think it would be superfluous and useless for me to mention the seriousness of the situation in which many people find themselves as a result of bills they have received from the City Public Service Board. There is no need to re-emphasize or belabor the point that some of these people will not be able to pay their bills. I asked the City Public Service Board to bring to the attention of this Council a method or a plan by which some people might be able to make their payments in either two or three payments until their budget can be adjusted to pay the bills which they were not expecting.

I would like for the Council to consider the following proposition: First, that the June 6th ordinance setting the 19% increase for the new rate structure be changed to a 10% increase. I will give the following explanations: First of all, I think the new 10% increase should take effect until July the 7th and from then on. The reason is that this gives the City Public Service Board a full cycle of 30 days so that each consumer in the community will have at least one bill under the June the 6th rate structure. That way you can compare your bills from then on.

I also propose that this be on a temporary 90 day base until September 7th. At the end of the 90 days the City Council and the City Public Service Board would be in a position to evaluate two things. First of all, the overall impact to the consumers, the size of the bills they would be getting and, secondly, that would give us an opportunity to evaluate the income and the revenue that has accrued to the City Public Service Board during this 90 days. I think that during the hot summer months we need two things. First of all, I think we need to reduce the amount of the bill people are paying because that would reflect the rates they would be paying in the winter time when the consumption of electricity for air conditioning is much less. So I would like to, at this time, move that the 19% increase of June the 6th be reduced to 10%. I would like to make a comment that in discussing

this matter with Mr. Kubik, I was not satisfied that some of the answers that he gave me were not exactly what I thought - not because I expected a favorable answer but because he has the following point here. There are only - and these are his words because he put it in his own writing - only a small fraction of consumers bills under the new rate have experienced a large increase between the month May and June. I question this and I don't know if Mr. Granata discussed this particular item. I requested that you do, Mr. Granata. But I think that it is not a small fraction of consumers whose bills were increased exorbitantly. I think it was a tremendous number of those who have already received their bills. There are some sections of the City which still have not got their bills because they are due at a later date, so without belaboring the point, Mr. Mayor, I move that the 19% be reduced to 10%.

MR. MENDOZA: I agree with Dr. San Martin on some of the points that he has mentioned. I think we need a clarification, a thorough clarification on this whole situation. Take for example the 75% consumption that has been mentioned. I don't know how in the world all the citizens of San Antonio could have the same percentage in consumption. So for that reason I support Dr. San Martin and I'd like to second his motion.

MAYOR BECKER: Any discussion?

MR. PADILLA: Several points. In the first place, I described to a group last night some of what I understand is happening. In my remarks I said, in answer to the question, what are you going to do about it, about the situation in general, City Public Service, the gas shortage and so forth? My reply was that tragically various members of the City Council see the solution lying in different areas. Some see it one way, some another. Some of us see a short term type of relief as the best thing to do. I take it, though he did not say it, that Dr. San Martin apparently feels this way. My position is this, I originally voted not to increase the rates and I did so because I happen to think that now is the time for the citizens of San Antonio to reclaim the utility system. I have said this many, many times. I think if we go into a horrendous debt that they are going to be asking us to approve for them in the next few years, and we have seen the beginning of it with this 85 million which is now pending, we will for all practical purposes continue to perpetuate the system which I feel is very, very unacceptable and a system which I feel is very, very unresponsive to the people of San Antonio. Many people that like the system, I cannot for the life of me understand why they want it and why they favor it. The biggest single argument they can give me in favor of it is we should keep political influence out of the running of the City Public Service Board system. I do not agree that political influence is illegitimate. I think political influence is probably the biggest single lever that the citizen has over the public office holder, he who exercises the public trust. I do not want to support a continuation of this type of system. I realize that Public Service needs money. For over a year I have been asking, and right now the City Manager has instructions from the Council to come back and present to us alternate methods that we may care to adopt, methods of running the City Public Service Board. I was thinking last night after I got home that we did not instruct the City Manager on when to make his report. I think he just handed me one, Al. No. I hope that the report will not be one that will be long in coming.

I'm going to say it flat out. I would vote to rescind the ordinance but I will not support cutting it to 10%. This is because I have a different viewpoint. This is because I don't want to give temporary and minor relief to the citizens. I think now is the time to move affirmatively towards taking a giant step to the solution of these problems and at least towards taking a giant step to the inclusion in a more direct way of the citizen in Public Service. Quite simply, the reason I opposed the rates was not because I deny the fact that

more money is needed in every enterprise of man in 1974 than in previous years. I recognize that we need coal plants. We have to switch to another fuel, namely, coal from oil or from gas. I know that this takes money. I'm that much of a realist. I also know that if they get this kind of money the ownership of the system continues to move away from the people of San Antonio. I also know that in spite of a year, a year and a half patience, nothing is found in the way of an alternate method of financing, an alternate way of doing business. I don't think that the powers that be - I cannot believe that people as key as Mr. Matthews, the Attorney over there will ever consider anything else until the day when the decision is something else or no money. I think they have a system right now that they like, one that they do not want to turn loose of and one that as long as we continue to fund they will not change. I think the only alternative we can hand them is change it or no money. This is why I will not support a motion to reduce the rate to 10% from 19%. I will support a motion to just cut their money off until they decide to come around and be responsive to the people of San Antonio.

DR. SAN MARTIN: Mr. Mayor, I would like to respond to some of the comments. Even though, Mr. Padilla, my motion, specifically is short term relief that does not mean that I am not concerned with the overall and long range plan. In fact we have specifically requested and we have in our hands since yesterday a report from O'Brien and Gere outlining the procedures which this council may engage in as far as the long range capital investment and expansion program of City Public Service. We got this yesterday and I know that you realize that this is a long range program. Some of those questions we specifically asked our consultants about six months ago. I think that this council will have to address itself to a long range solution to the energy crisis but I don't think that that can wait. That solution that I promised for the next 90 days, not only does it give some type of relief to the citizens of San Antonio but it gives this Council an opportunity to evaluate the amount of income that the City Public Service Board will need. There's no kidding ourselves that we can eliminate the increase completely because we know that City Public Service Board needs additional income. Now we know that and there's no use trying to hide that fact. How much they need, I'm not really sure because I realize that the 19% seems to be far too much. So in 90 days we would be in a very good position to find out if the 10% increase is adequate for their immediate needs. We all know that unless we go to coal generating plants and other types of energy, some of which are in the long distant future such as solar energy, which is feasible, practical, but still 10 years away, we're going to have to face the reality that there has to be some kind of an increase. Now at this time I would like to separate what I feel is the immediate or short range solution even it's temporary relief and when we decide on this motion, then I'd like to come back and suggest some items that we could tackle as a long-range solution to the problem.

REV. BLACK: May I ... I'd like to respond to this motion. I'd like to raise a question and then also to make comment. Seems to be that our vote with reference to the increase of rate was tied to a package. I voted against that rate increase, but if I understood it, it was tied to the bond sales and this kind of thing and therefore any action on our part should at least identify the kind of relationship that that change of rate will have to the bonding responsibility. Now, and here I'm not, I'm not necessarily in support of it, but, I'm simply saying that I thought I understood that when we voted on the increase, that we were voting in terms of a package and the relationship that it had to the bonding...

MAYOR BECKER: Absolutely correct.

REV. BLACK: Now, the next thing, I think that, I'm concerned

about the fact that even a vote on the increase, if I also understood the analysis that have been given, would not materially lower the price of the bill or the cost of the service. Because what they have been saying is that approximately 75% of that increase of cost has been identified with consumer use. This, of course, along with the increased cost, related that's passed on with the increase use of oil for burning. So, therefore, any decrease that we make in terms of our escalation of cost would not materially change in any large measure that bill. Now, I'm particularly interested in emphasizing that because I would not like next month to find myself facing a public that would feel that we have acted on something and really did not materially address their problem. If we're going to act on it, I think that we ought to materially address their problem and the problem is that there are bills that are excessive in terms of the incomes of the families of this community.

Now, it seems to me that Mr. Padilla has addressed an approach to this in terms of responsiveness, trying to find a way in which the City Council can be more responsive in terms of the long range action of the... It also seems that there might be another way to deal with hardship cases and that is to do in some way, as has been suggested in another major city of our community, and that is to give some consideration to people who have certain incomes for a level forgiving the cost on it. Now we, we've given that consideration to senior citizens with fixed incomes regarding their tax rate. We have been willing to give an exception to some \$3000 in terms of their tax rates. I'm anxious that we address the most critical families of this community. Now I realize that everybody, in terms of where they are, feels that their situation is critical, but, my great concern is, Mr. Mayor, is that there are families in this community who are going to find it extremely difficult to meet the response of this bill, and if we simply go along and insist that these bills be paid, and it seems to me that business judgement would say this, and not respond to their critical situation at all, that we are creating a situation of rebellion that the individuals cannot get out of. They find it impossible to do anything else but simply say, here is \$2.00 of our bill, and you'll get the other \$100.00 as I get some money, you know. This creates a real situation. Now I think that somehow we've got to deal with that, the ability to pay, as Dr. San Martin has indicated in terms of any time schedule that might be set on it. Then we've got to deal with those hardship families, those who are on poverty leveled incomes that we might give some consideration to their use of the utility and then in the final long range program I think we've got to deal with the change of the structure so that it can be responsive to these kinds of situations.

If we, and I'm saying all of this because the whole package that we voted on, that was voted on by this Council, not only indicated a relationship to the present bonding program, but also pointed out two other escalations, so we're not just talking about one situation. We're talking about, and it was under that kind of concern that I took issue and voted against the proposition. So I think we've got to do more, Dr San Martin. While I recognize the good intentions of a 10% decrease, a 10% decrease of the present rate, I think we've got to do more than simply say we're going to reduce this at a temporary level. We've got to at least examine the relationship that this has to the total package.

DR. SAN MARTIN: I'd like to respond to Rev. Black's comment. I'd be the first one to agree that we need to do more. There's no question in my mind that we need to do more, but that is gonna take a little bit more time. Now O'Brien and Gere here have told us in their memo yesterday it will probably be six months before they can come up with a recommendation as to whether it is to the advantage of the citizens of San Antonio to take over their City Public Service utility. I think they'll take some time to determine the benefits

according to them, and the study of the acquisition of our own gas gathering system. So, I don't think that we're in a position at this time to do anything else except try to minimize the tremendous impact on the community of the rate increase. Now, my reason for suggesting a 90 day temporary rate decrease to 10% is twofold. First of all, and it will try, in some way to alleviate the impact on the rate. It will also give people an opportunity to adjust to the reality that we have to use less in order to pay less. I think that it is gonna take every bit of this summer so that we can all readjust to a new way of life trying to conserve energy as much as we can, but it also gives people an opportunity to budget whatever income they have with one thing in mind, that their utilities, especially gas and light, are going to cost a little bit more. I don't think that we are in a position at this time to do anything about the long range solution to this problem, but I think that this council cannot avoid the problem and I think it's up to us to exercise the leadership that's necessary to solve this problem in a long range manner. I think that if we don't do it, nobody else is going to do it because the buck stops right here. You can't push the buck any further. So I would like to suggest that we separate the short range solution and the long solution.

June 20, 1974

cs

-7-

686

MAYOR BECKER: I would like to address myself to this question for a moment, if I may. We are dealing with a thing here that I think is as dangerous as trying to defuse a landmine. The reason I say so is because I think I have a fair appreciation of the problems of this City. I've lived here now since 1926. It's going on 50 years, you might say. I think I know the City fairly well. I think I know a lot of the reasons for the condition that it's in today. One of the reasons why we have the situation we have in this City is that we have a little or no industrial activity in the City of San Antonio. We have little or no industrial or corporate enterprises that are bringing payrolls and good salaries to this town. I have a letter here, I hadn't received my copy of these letters and so that is what I was asking Mr. Granata for, I've a letter here dated June 19, 1974, from Mr. Kubik who we all know by now is of the firm of O'Brien and Gere, the rate consulting engineers that the City hired to analyze the rate increase which was requested by the CPS board. In the second paragraph, he's referring to the meeting that we had the other day. He says, "as I listened to the proceedings, I recall the discussion which I had with you late in March on the subject of industrial development in the City of San Antonio. As many depositions before the City Council have indicated, the most practical and effective way to minimize the rising utility cost would be to improve the load factors of the CPS electric system by promoting development and location of industrial enterprise in the City and in Bexar County." and so forth.

Now, it just came to our attention recently that the Ford Motor Company was looking for a plant site somewhere in and around the City of San Antonio. I'm not going to start a name calling contest. I think we've had enough of that lately but suffice it to say for some reason or another, they elected not to locate in San Antonio and I understand they have chosen somewhere in the vicinity of Seguin, Texas as the place to locate the plant.

There are several things that contribute to this. I believe I know a little bit about corporate workings, corporate minds, and the way men who have to be responsible even though they are managers, they quite often don't own 10 shares or 100 shares of stock in large corporations. They have to view their responsibility in light of the stockholders and the lending institutions which they are committed to. This City has historically had a history of non-progressives. It's historically had a history of being a City that is difficult to work with in many areas because in the past, the utilities here seem to be bound with an obsession not to cooperate with any outside corporations that might want to come to the City. Now I think that this was the feeling that was sponsored largely by certain elements of our society that I prefer to refer to as the establishment. This dates back to the 30's, the 40's, the 50's and the 60's because I have a fair working knowledge as to what the political complexities of this City was in all those years. I was young at the time but I had a father who was on 44 different boards and agencies and in civic work up to his ears most of his life trying to bring this City to the forefront in many ways. I am sad to say that he met on most of his efforts with dismal failure.

Now, there were many reasons why the powers that he did not care to bring corporate activity to this City. The number one that I recall that seems to stand out uppermost in my mind was that they did not want to have a corporate influence here that would bring with it union activity. San Antonio in those days was almost living in an isolated condition as an island. At one time, it was the largest city in the State of Texas, and I've touched on this before. The largest city with the largest population, with the largest downtown skyline,

and all that sort of thing in the central city business district. Then came the depression and there was not another building built in the downtown area for almost 30 years until the National Bank of Commerce constructed their new building. Then there were several years that passed that before the Frost National Bank and Travis Park West buildings were constructed.

Now, one of the things that most any corporation looks for when they go to a City amongst other things is a source of energy, and a source of energy that they can call upon and depend upon because when they commit themselves to a City or an area they have a sizeable capital investment that they are generally making and it usually takes power, electricity, whatever you care to call it, to run whatever type of machinery or if nothing more, just the lights and the telephone system and all that sort of thing. Any vacillating, any hesitation in direction, anything that indicates to these various functions that we don't seem to really have a grip on where we are trying to go, and they shy away from us. San Antonio has had this history.

I think I have had probably more troubles with the CPS board than almost anybody in the City of San Antonio in the last 10 or 15 years. It's one thing that caused me to get into politics in the first place because I resented the method of operation of those utilities and in particular, the CPS. It was unresponsive not only to the citizenry but to business, the property owners, to everybody in the whole City. It just wasn't one single group that was put upon, it was everybody. How in the world the City has made the progress it has made in all those years, is really quite a tribute to it. It has succeeded in spite of all this. We do have new management in the form of trustees at the CPS company. Mr. Tom Berg evidenced yesterday by his willingness to try to work out some type of agreement, some type of a settlement for the immediate future - some type of a rational approach to this thing with Coastal States and Lo-Vaca after all these years of head-knocking and staring at one another like a bull dog and a tom cat. He made the overtures of going and meeting with these people, and they have a meeting scheduled sometime, I hope, if not this week at least next week. For those concerned, Mr. Oscar Wyatt will not be present. It will be with the presidents of the corporations. Mr. Oscar Wyatt will not even be present. That's my understanding. This is at least the beginning of breaking a log jam that has had this City frozen in its tracks since all this unfortunate thing commenced and I have to again repeat the date of origin of commencement as of 1961 when the gas contract was taken and handed to the Alamo Gas Company. For those of you who are not acquainted with that situation, I will belabor you with these facts. We were dealing then with a corporation that was neither funded, had not one inch of pipeline laid, whose reserves were at the best questionable and later proved to be either overstated or understated by however you want to figure it, misstated to the extent of 50% to 60% by even Mr. Newman's old estimates. Mr. John Newman has told me on many occasions that at the time this transaction was consummated that he had great misgivings about it as did every oil man and gas man of repute in the City of San Antonio. The United Gas Company sued this transaction what's known as a performance suit, and with good reason. They questioned the ability of Alamo Gas Company to function and to deliver. And they were very right because it never was able to do so.

Now the City Public Service Board isn't any different from any other type of business. You may not agree with the management of it, but it's the only one we have. This company, and I'll refer to it as a company, that's the way it should be referred to because all these years it should have been run as a company. Instead of that it has been

June 20, 1974

-9-

el

688

run as something else. But I think at long last, it shows signs of being able to enter the ranks of those companies who are operated in a corporate fashion. This company is committed to the transition that must be made to the use of coal as is every utility in the United States of America. Now, in order to make this transition, it is most expensive. It must be accompanied by bonded indebtedness because no one can generate that kind of cash flow. We have right now, and this is a horrible fact of life, but it's here, we have right now two brand new power generating plants that aren't five, six, seven years old that were designed and developed to operate on natural gas as the source of energy in order to turn the turbines and the boilers and all that sort of thing, to generate the power of the electricity. I don't know what the capital investment is in both of those places, but it's considerable. If I had to pull the figure out of thin air, I guess it would probably be in the neighborhood of \$12 to \$15 million perhaps for the power generating units. That equipment must be removed, taken out, hopefully sold to some other country someplace where they do have natural gas and that equipment must be replaced with equipment that has a capability of burning coal. Texas utilities that operate in North Texas and have their headquarters offices in Dallas, if I'm not mistaken, have been on coal and lignite and various things like that for over 20 years. Why this utility down here had not foreseen the necessity for this is something that I'm at a loss to say, but the fact remains and is a very obvious one that they had not recognized the emergency and the exigence of the situation. We cannot be off one minute and on the next, when we're trying to fund an operation that's as gigantic and as important to this community as our own City Public Service is. I don't agree with almost anything that's occurred over there, but I'd be darned if I'm gonna blow the place up because I don't like it. I'm gonna try to change it. And I think a lot of change has been brought about in the more recent past.

Now, we've heard all these rate experts testify, as Reverend Black touched on, that most of the increase, 75-76 percent of it came from increased use in consumption of electricity. I recognize that it's everybody's right or aspirations, dreams, all of us in this nation of ours to have air conditioning, automobiles, fine china, or whatever it is that we happen to have a liking toward the creature comforts, the necessities of life certainly should be something that should be affordable to every citizen in the United States. But as Mr. Kubik and everybody else has tried to point out, this whole mess occurred at a very unfortunate time. I wish it could have occurred in a different fashion, but it didn't. And maybe more so than ever, it brought the realities of this situation to us even more forcibly than we have liked to have had brought to our attention. I cannot support either a change in the rate structure. I cannot support at this time an attempt to take it over for the simple reason we haven't found the way and means of doing so.

Now, for the information of some of you who may find this a rather shocking thing, some of us have actually been in consultation with certain other utilities, asking their advice, counseling with them as to what they would do with this entity if they had it. Everyone of them has pledged support to help us out of this dilemma, with either counseling or advice or any type of expertise and particular knowledge that they might have. We have explored the idea of selling the City Public Service company to another utility that has long range supplies of coal, gas, and other things which our company does not seem to have. We're not leaving a stone unturned in an attempt to bring about a resolution to this problem. And I'll say without reservation, that this board that comprises the Board of Trustees, is in my humble

opinion, the first board that we've ever had, that will open this problem up and view it before the public and examine it and deal with it in a truly objective fashion. We are neither protecting anyone, we're not trying to further the efforts or the causes of the establishment. The only thing we have in the uppermost thoughts of our minds at every time and at every moment, is the good of the people. That board composition is Mr. Tom Berg, Chairman; Mr. Eloy Centeno; Vice-Chairman; Dr. Robert West, Mr. Glen Biggs, and myself as ex-officio members. If I felt there was any reason to doubt the capabilities and all of those men, I'd tell you so right now. It's the first board that I can truthfully say that I have complete and unbounded confidence in and it's not because I'm on it. Leave me out of it and let the other four remain and I'll ride with their decisions any day, any time, anywhere.

We're not trying to sell the people down the river, but we do have a responsibility that must be dealt with. An enterprise of this type is not something that you can pull the shades down on and hope for it to survive. It must have continuity, and it must have continuity that goes beyond what happens every 30 days, 60 days, 90 days, or even a year. I'll say for the willingness for the benefit of those who might have some questions about some of the people that are involved in the operation of the Public Service Board, the general counsel, whatever it might be that you're unhappy with, none of the board members are married to any of them. If you can read between the lines there, then I think that should indicate something to you.

MR. MORTON: Mr. Mayor.

MAYOR BECKER: I'm sick to death of much of the things that have gone on over there. We're sick to death of being handled in what I would consider a cumbersome and a clumsy a fashion with respect to dealing with this energy problem as anything that I have ever seen. It reminds me of small children out in a back yard fighting over marbles or chalk, or string, or a toad frog. If that's the indication of wisdom and leadership, particularly on behalf of the law firm that supposedly has been representing this institution, and the people all these years, then I have a rather poor view of it myself and hold it in rather low esteem. I could probably go and talk for the next six days on this subject because that's all I've done this week, but I don't think it's necessary to elaborate and embellish any further on what's been said now, for countless hours recently here about this subject. I'll shut up and turn the opportunity over to the next speaker. Mr. Morton.

MR. MORTON: In listening to the proposals that I've heard from Rev. Black, Dr. San Martin, Councilman Padilla, comments that Mr. Mendoza made, I think there's - I think there's appeal in all of what you're attempting to do. I don't think there's any question about that, but I think before we take some of these steps, I think that we should look very seriously at what the consequences will be. Not only short range, but long range. I know it's been discussed countless times by this Council, the proposition that we take over the City Public Service Board directly and run it as a City department. I understand and appreciate some of the frustrations that we as Councilmen have and certainly the citizens of this community have in getting information out of the City Public Service Board. Frankly, as a management group, they're as poor at communicating with people as any group I have ever seen. I think in many cases this is not necessarily a devious attitude on their part, it's simply a matter of incapability of communicating. Well, I won't go into that, we've seen it here.

June 20, 1974  
el

-11-

Let's take up the proposition of our buying or in some way acquiring title directly to the City Public Service Board. Carl, would you step up for just a second. I want to give you a series of questions that I think would have to be answered before we would take this on. Question number one, if title were transferred from the current entity to the City of San Antonio, directly to where the management and operation of City Public Service, would evolve from being run at the direction of the Board and would be run as a City department, would it result in a recall of all the outstanding bonds?

MR. CARL WHITE: Yes, it would.

MR. MORTON: Okay, my first question, and I'm not asking you to answer this now because I'm - I would not expect you to have this kind of information, but first of all, I would like to know what is the current outstanding indebtedness that the City Public Service now has. You may have that information.

MR. WHITE: It's roughly one hundred million. It was \$125 million last time I checked but they have made some payments on their principal. So, it's an excess of \$100 million.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Not including the pending \$85 million.

MR. WHITE: Oh, no, that doesn't include what is pending.

MR. MORTON: No, I'm - I'm talking about current.

MR. WHITE: It's in excess of \$100 million.

MR. MORTON: Okay, if you would, let's find out exactly what that figure is. And then next, if we could, let's find out what the average interest rate is on the outstanding bonded indebtedness.

MR. WHITE: It's 4.6 percent.

MR. MORTON: Four point six percent, and then, could you make a projection of what the differential would be between the average outstanding interest rate, on these bonds and what it would cost today?

MR. WHITE: Now, all right, now, at today's rate, which is at the highest that it's been in many, many months, we're looking at at least 5 1/2 percent.

MR. MORTON: Okay, 5 1/2 percent, so, we're talking about a spread of one percent.

MR. WHITE: That's right.

MR. MORTON: What is the term of the indebtedness? Are we talking about.....

MR. WHITE: No, we're looking at thirty, thirty some odd years.

MR. MORTON: So, really, what we're saying is if it's \$100 million we're talking about one percent or one million dollars per year or over thirty years 30 million dollars that this move would cost us. Is that what we're saying?

MR. WHITE: That's ball park. That's about right.

MR. MORTON: Okay, I - I think we ought to be aware that there is a price tag on this move.

MR. PADILLA: Not necessarily, Mr. Morton, because there's another way of doing it. Cliff, would you mind engaging in a discussion on this thing on that point? I realize you have the floor.

MR. MORTON: Well, I - I.....

MR. PADILLA: Would you let me respond, you have the floor to your question. You see, as I see it it's this way - one avenue open to us is what you just attempted to establish. However, there's this wrong with it. That even if we wanted to take that route, even if we wanted to pay off the bonds and refinance anew at a little higher rate, we could not under state law because we would have to have a state law to permit us to refund the bonds ahead of time. Now, that's one thing. The only thing that would be practical and that is possible, though not probable, would be for the present bond holders to agree to amend the indenture. Now, herein is what I think the tactics are. Now, I realize that every other member of this Council may have a different opinion on this point, but I believe that so far they have always gotten new money when they need it. I'm talking about CPS. The CPS System is financed in a very, very ultra conservative way. One, which benefits the bond holders primarily and almost solely. Now.....

MR. MORTON: I - I.....

MR. PADILLA: Let me finish and then you can respond, Cliff. Now, well, yes, but I haven't finished my statement, I have finished that statement, if you'll permit me. There is no way that these people as long as they're faced with the choice of a very, very stable, a very, very conservative and a very, very favorable situation for themselves, I'm talking about the bond holders, as opposed to returning the system to the people. They would choose themselves, their own interest. Now, when, if their choice be, fellows, the system and I hate for this to be the choice, but it's the only one they're going to understand, the system itself is in jeopardy, and with it our money. Either that or we amend the indenture. I think then they would respond to amending the indenture. This is why I feel that we should hold the money off. We've been told by Public Service, you can't put the system in jeopardy. You don't realize what this will do to our credit rating, and I told them once you know it, cause I think you were there, Cliff, at an executive session, I do realize that this would put the system in jeopardy, but this is the only thing that in my opinion would get you to move, because short of putting the system in jeopardy itself, you have not been responsive. You insist that there's no other way. So, they have taken us to this. Now, they also share the responsibility if the system is put in jeopardy.

MRS. MARIA DOMINGUEZ: (Inaudible).....

MAYOR BECKER: That's all right, Mrs. Dominguez, all right - let me.....

MRS. DOMINGUEZ: (Inaudible)

MAYOR BECKER: Mr. Morton, excuse me, Mrs. Dominguez. Mr. Morton....

MR. MORTON: Well, I, let's just assume, Mr. Padilla, that you have your version, and I have mine. My assumption is that it would cost

roughly \$1 million a year for us to do this, and this has to be paid by the people who pay the utility bills.

MAYOR BECKER: That's all.....It's the only place it could come from.

MR. PADILLA: Do you agree, Mr. Morton, that it's theoretically possible for us to.....

MR. MORTON: I - Mr. Padilla, let me, let me say this, the realities of the financial community are there, and, as Mr. White has just pointed out, we are at an all time high, as far as interest rates are concerned. To say that bonds that you have sold over the past 25 or 30 years, if they were put in jeopardy to where the bond holders could recall them, I don't think there's any question about the fact that if you had to refinance on today's market, it's going to cost you more money. Now, there seems to be in the community an attitude of - there's some magic in all of this. There's magic in the question of, you know, taking it over. That, we're going to get this \$1 million if it's required from the sky, I guess, I don't know. I think all we have to remember is that nothing is free. That's the basic law of economics. If we'll just accept this, and realize that we could be costing the rate payers \$1 million a year, I think that we would take a long look before we would do that. Now, let's just assume that that argument isn't there, let's go the next one. I would like to specifically know, Mr. Padilla, what you would do as far as your plan is concerned, that the City Public Service Board, and I'm talking about now, not the staff, I'm talking about the Board itself, what is this Council going to do? You said each of us have a different plan, well, I'm not really for sure I have a plan. I'm trying to formulate one in my own mind. But, I would like to know what you would do or recommend to this Council that we do as far as this whole dilemma is concerned if we do take it over.

MR. PADILLA: Mr. Morton, I think I could reply this way to you. The reason why I hit so hard on the return of the system to the people of San Antonio is because of several reasons. One, the Mayor just made a statement, which I tend to agree with. That this is the first Board that has attempted to be responsive, that this is new management, that these people are trying to work toward solutions. I agree they, in comparison to any other Board that I was aware of, they're much better. I am very concerned that this not being not only the first Board, but the last Board, that has this attitude. I realize that one of the reasons why they are this responsive is because of the change in the political realities of the community. We may see a change right back and we may have the same kind of Board we've always had in the past, real quick like. Now, this is why.....

MR. MORTON: If that be the case, let's just hit on this one point, Alvin, if that be the case to where we do have a change, then if it is run by a Council where you have this change, what is the difference going to be?

MR. PADILLA: The difference is this, Mr. Mayor, the people can anytime they want to, now whether they want to or not, that's within their prerogatives, but anytime the people want to they can take this Council and in a period of days get a new one. Now you cannot do that with the Public Service Board.

MR. MORTON: I beg to differ with you. I think the Council, let's just say this morning, if we wanted to replace every member on that board I think one of the things that we could probably do is say we're going to change rates to minus X, and we are going to start giving it away. I have a feeling that we would have a new Board within a week.

MR. PADILLA: It would be their choice entirely. We couldn't do anything about it.

MAYOR BECKER: Let me, for the benefit of those in the back. I'm going to read your signs for you so you can put them down because your arms will get tired. One of them says, No more lies. Another one says, Boycott Handy Andy, another says, Recall City Council and all of you can now put your arms down and rest and enjoy these proceedings with the rest of us. You are more than welcome.

MR. MORTON: What I'm saying, Alvin, is this. I disagree with anyone on this Council who says that this Council does not have almost absolute control over any one of these utilities. You may not have the ability to appoint but I will guarantee you one thing that this Council has the ability to replace that Board if they want to. You know that is a political reality as well as I, so let's not hide behind this. I think that what we are doing here is this, we are trying to point the finger at somebody and, very frankly, I am not in favor of our doing that other than in whatever way it might be instructive in arriving at a plan for the future energy needs of this city. Otherwise it serves no good and useful purpose whatsoever. Would you agree with that?

MR. PADILLA: Mr. Morton, with that last part yes, with the first part that we can replace any member of that Board I absolutely do not agree.

MR. MORTON: Well, I believe that we can. I think we have a lot of influence over that board and we might as well....

MR. PADILLA: We have seen time after time, Mr. Morton, we have seen it demonstrated that when they damn well want us to have some influence we have some. They are always polite and civil to us and they are just as often indifferent and pay not a bit of attention to us. The Mayor and I were in an automobile with a member of the Public Service Board just a few weeks ago when he told us that the recommendation that was submitted to them by Council was irresponsible, just cold turkey, in those words, and he made it stick. Now if he can make it stick.

MR. MORTON: What recommendation was this?

MR. PADILLA: The recommendation of a Board member which is not the issue here this morning. But the fact that one of the Board members can tell us that we were irresponsible and he did make it stick, shows you who is in the driver's seat over there when they want to be. There is only one route open to the City Council and that is to stare those people down when it comes to money, because the only control we have of that board is money and as long as they get all the money they want from us, they run the show. We don't.

MR. MORTON: Now let's just assume that we are running the show. I want you to tell me what you would do differently then what this current Board is doing. Let's have your plan for solving the energy needs of the City of San Antonio

MR. PADILLA: Mr. Morton, my concern is not only what this Board is doing. The reason I propose what I do and the reason that I take the course that I do and have the attitudes that I do is because I have sat in San Antonio, and stood in San Antonio for many, many years and worked in San Antonio and one of the things I have heard for many, many years is this false pride that many members of the community, not all of them, had that these Boards we had in San Antonio, including the City Public Service Board, were structured by and were full of business men with tremendous capability and ability and foresights and all this kind of thing and that no one else was eligible to serve because the rest of us simply didn't seem to have this kind of talent and ability. We have been told recently, and often, that everybody used to be happy with Public Service because everything was fine and now that we have a problem we are all trying to hang them. This isn't the case at all. They had a blank check. They had an operation with relatively no problems. The only problem that they have had in the last 10 or 15 years was one the Mayor foresaw and one that he warned them about and one that he plead with them to take action on and they completely dropped the ball. That's the kind of Boards we've had over there. That's the only challenge they've had of any substance in the last 20 years. That and the Alamo Gas deal and we are yet to determine what that was. But apparently they dropped the ball on both of them or at least on the gas availability situation.

MR. MORTON: How many members of the current Board were there when you were making that recommendation?

MR. PADILLA: Mr. Morton, I'm concerned that we not have Boards like we used to have after this one and after this Council we could go right back to it.

MR. MORTON: If that's the case then, you're saying that the next Council might be irresponsible and if that be the case tell me what would be the difference if they were running this as a department?

MR. PADILLA: I'm saying that the next Council might not continue to exert the pressure on the Board that we have and you may see a return to the indifference we used to have. I'm concerned about that. I'm not saying that the next Council will be irresponsible. That would be very presumptuous on my part.

MR. MORTON: If it would make any difference, I would just say this—we cannot abdicate the responsibility for the direction and policy of any of these utilities whether we appoint the Boards or not. You can get people off those Boards if they are not doing the job. Previous Councils apparently either didn't care or did not want to take the time to appoint people that would be responsible. Now I still get back to this question, what are you going to do differently in solving the energy problem when this becomes a city department. I want to know what your plan is.

MR. PADILLA: Well, by having better control, more direct control, first of all you have methods that are much more direct and lend themselves much better to influence the public. Specifically, what I'm talking about is the fact that I do not believe it is a healthy situation for public servants, and that's what the members of the Public Service Board are, to be isolated from the people, and they have been. We are not. Witness the fact that a lot of people, hundreds of them over a period of days or weeks may call us on a particular problem and we've become very much aware of them, very sensitive to it. They do not have that situation.

MR. MORTON: Are you saying the present members of the Board are insensitive to responding to individual calls.

MR. PADILLA: They are for all practical purposes completely isolated, Mr. Morton.

MR. MORTON: I wouldn't believe that any member of that current Board would not be responsive to an individual that would call him about a matter concerning the CPSB. I would think they would be just as responsive as this Council, and if there isn't, I would like to know which one we are talking about because I would like to get rid of him.

MAYOR BECKER: Can we proceed with the questions. Do you think we have discussed this sufficiently?

REV. BLACK: Mayor, I would like to offer a substitute motion. That motion would indicate that we would instruct the staff to give us some information regarding the impact of this motion upon the bonding procedure of the CPSB.

MR. PADILLA: Mr. Mayor, I am concerned. If we were to pass the motion of Dr. San Martin, the points that Rev. Black made were quite well taken. In the first place, my battle, so to speak, is not that this Council become a yo yo or an accordian just going back and forth. My original position was one of cutting the rates to ten percent would give the people very little relief, it will not accomplish what I am out to accomplish, and I stated that publicly. It will jeopardize, if indeed it is absolutely essential, the \$85 million worth of proposed bonding which I will not vote for, and I said that before, but it will jeopardize it, and if the Council intends to follow that sort of financing plan to cut the funds available in half which ten percent as opposed to 19 percent would do is irresponsible. I'm not accusing him of trying to be irresponsible, but I'm saying that the effect of it would be this, we cannot proceed with \$85 million worth of bonding if we need 19 percent to accomplish it. We cannot proceed with ten percent and get it accomplished so we have to amend both ends or neither one.

MR. MORTON: Let me ask you this, if you were in the bonding business and you were watching a Council who has the ability to control these rates and we bounce around like a yo yo, like it is being proposed that we do, cutting it from 19 to 10. Put yourself in the shoes of that financial banker. Would you buy one dollar's worth of those bonds? Would you? I don't think we are talking about cutting in half I think what we are talking about doing is getting to where you can't get your money at any price. That's what we are talking about doing here.

MAYOR BECKER: Well, in addition to that, an extension of what you just said, Cliff, this Council will be perpretrating an act that will be the beginning of the end as far as power generating capability of this utility. Now, if we continue to travel in this direction either this Council or the next one or any other one and vacillate back and forth, I can assure you one thing, that in time we will be written up in history as being the Council or one of the major entities that helped to reduce this City to a state where we will be burning cow chips and corn cobs and pine knots to try to generate light and heat and those kind of things. Now, that may sound like a gross statement. I'll guarantee you it's the truth. The City of New York right now is practically reduced to a level of impotence because of the conflicts that the public, the environmentalists and many of those have had with the consolidated Edison Utility Company. It is a sad, disastrous situation. Anyone that knows of the situation knows that New York City right today is on the brink of absolute disaster for

June 20, 1974

-17-

nsr

more than one reason but the reason I'm speaking of is brought about by the inability of the utility to furnish the proper amount of power to that region.

MR. MORTON: The reason that they couldn't was because the rate makers would not give them the rates that it took to expand the system to meet the demands.

MR. PADILLA: This is what I'm concerned with. This is why I stated in my original position was more responsible. I made that statement because it occurs to me that if we had not given notice of the intent to sell \$85 million that's one situation but we have done so and now we are going to cut out the floor that it needs. This will create havoc and a crisis situation and I don't think - and in exchange for that the people are going to be getting very little relief, 10% as opposed to 19%, based on what Mr. Kubik and the other gentleman, I forget his name, Mr. Mayor, told us the other day. The key to the problem and the people have got to know is simply this, that if they were using a dozen oranges at a nickle and the price went to six cents and this month they are using three dozen oranges at six cents, the major difference in the bill is not that oranges went to six cents but that oranges went from a dozen to three dozen. That seems to be the real crux of the problem in terms of dollars on the bill.

MAYOR BECKER: That's the way it's been explained to us over there, I don't know.

REV. BLACK: Mr. Mayor, I think we are discussing the substance of it and I would like to call for the substitute motion which requires of the staff the kind of information that we are really presenting now, and it seems to me that we would be in a better position under those circumstances to vote on this motion. I would hate to be placed in a position to vote on a motion on which there is inadequate information before the Council or to make a judgement.

MR. MORTON: I would second your motion.

MR. MENDOZA: Mr. Mayor, I would like to say this, that I can appreciate most of what has been said. My problem is that when we go for information, you know, I have a suspicion that the computers at CPS are just not giving us the right information. You know, this is my problem. I just can't imagine that there wasn't a way that we could have programmed this plan a little better. I'm just not convinced of that and so for that reason, I will have to support Dr. San Martin's motion.

MR. LACY: Mr. Mayor, I would like to make one comment. I don't know what it's going to do to the motel business or tourism business because if the bills skyrocket that high, they might have to put the motel rates so high they will go on up to Austin or somewhere else, which would be even more devastating. At least for right now, I think that if we could go along with Dr. San Martin and get people some immediate relief, like Leo says, I just don't believe this 19% increase that we voted for, I voted against personally, but that was carried nevertheless, should jump the bill from \$25 to \$104. It seems like that is simply ridiculous and I would like to support Dr. San Martin in giving the people some immediate relief whatever happens down the road. This is most devastating being the way it is so I don't know how we could have anything worse happen to us.

MAYOR BECKER: Glenn, I heard a man's bill analyzed over at the hearing the other day. He happened to be the last gentleman to be heard from, Mr. Lorenzo Montgomery, if I remember correctly. I am just calling from memory but he had 788 kilowatt hours in the month of April. The month of May he had 2600 and I think it was \$83.

MR. PADILLA: That's very close.

MAYOR BECKER: Kilowatt hours and gas was a little less. One month he had, I think, 3300 cubic feet and the month of June he had 3100 cubic feet. There was a slight decrease in the amount of gas. His bill went from it seemed to me it was, what was it? \$24.82, I think, all the way to \$70 or \$80. I forget what it was. He had though almost 3½ times as much usage of kilowatt hours and well, let's first of all start. There are four elements to the bill - the basic rate, the consumption factor, the fuel adjustment costs, 14% and the sales tax.

MR. PADILLA: The 14% to the City.

MAYOR BECKER: All right. Now the basic rate is the 19% figure that we voted on. The consumption factor is controllable by the user. The fuel adjustment thing is affected by how much fuel oil they have to burn versus how much gas they burn. Of course, with all these curtailments and all that sort of thing it was just a rough month last month as we know. The sales tax, of course, is dependent upon the whole totals of the three. Now, the basic rate difference was 10%, as I recall it, the consumption factor was the difference in his bill of 76%, the fuel adjustment clause was a difference of around 10% and let's see, that's 96 and the sales tax was about a difference of four percent. Those are the figures, as I recall. That was the computation of why his bill went from whatever figure it was to 3½ times as much, but his consumption rate was 3½ times as much and when it was pointed out to him, he understood.

MR. PADILLA: Glenn, you were there when that bill was discussed. You remember I made the calculations on it very hurriedly and questioned the Public Service because it didn't seem to prove out and then when they corrected my calculations, it did prove out. Do you remember? You see, I was very much concerned about this just a couple of days ago but you will remember with this gentleman the Mayor is talking about. In the first place, from the face of his bill, the difference in the dollar amounts were accounted for. Now that left only two other things. One, either his meter was in error and that's possible. It's going to be checked but it isn't likely that half the meters in San Antonio are in error. And the other is that the person used more fuel, more electricity, than he realized. That's the only thing it can be. Either your meter is wrong or you are using as much power as they say you are if the meter is accurate and if you are using three times as much this month as you did last month, you can expect the bill three times as high and that's true at the gas company or anywhere else.

MAYOR BECKER: That's just about the thing in a nutshell. Well, are we ready to vote on Rev. Black's substitute vote? All right. All - you going to call the roll on this? Let's call the roll.

ROLL CALL VOTE: AYES: Becker, Black, Morton, Padilla, Mendoza;  
NAYS: San Martin, Lacy; ABSENT: Cockrell.

June 20, 1974

-19-

el

REV. BLACK: Mr. Mayor, I would like to further ask of the staff some proposal as to how we would deal with payments. I am greatly concerned about this. I don't know whether or not there is going to be but I would like some kind of recommendation. If there is absolutely nothing that can be done with reference to people who find themselves facing a hardship in the payment, then I would like to hear that as a matter of policy. If there is something that can be done, then I would like to have a recommendation from staff as to what kind of relief can be given in terms of the payment of the bills. Now this does not necessarily take from the original request that was made by Dr. San Martin but we are instructing the staff to bring in that information but I'd like to add to that information a policy statement regarding persons with some hardship. If there is nothing we could do, then I'd like for it to be stated here. If there is some relief that can be given, then I would like for that to be stated.

MR. MENDOZA: Mr. Mayor, I'd like to make a motion, if I'm in order. That we instruct the staff, the legal staff I guess maybe we should say, through the City Manager that we find a way that is legally possible to give the 14% back to the customers.

CITY ATTORNEY REEDER: Well, that's easy. You just amend the indenture and give away the money.

MR. MENDOZA: That's easy? I'm still not clear on that one point. You know, one day we say it's not legal and another day we say it is.

CITY ATTORNEY REEDER: I've never said it's not legal. I have always said it's illegal to wipe that out but you can amend the indenture if you.....  
00

MR. MENDOZA: Well, I am sure that there is some way that we can do it then. Is this what you are saying?

CITY ATTORNEY REEDER: Sure. See, what the bondholders think - take that 14%, then you can raise your taxes proportionately.

MR. MORTON: But you're not talking about raising your taxes 14%, you are talking about raising your taxes more than 14%.

CITY ATTORNEY REEDER: Yes, sir, a lot more than 14%.

MR. MENDOZA: We still don't have figures on that though. What we are saying is that there is a possibility that.

MR. MORTON: I could give you the figures very quickly. Gross revenue, City Public Service - \$150 million, isn't that right? About 14% - 15 times 15, what is that?

MR. MENDOZA: 225.

MR. MORTON: 225. That's \$22.5 million per year that we have been getting from CPS. What revenues do we get from ad valorem taxes?

MR. MENDOZA: 33.

MR. MORTON: 33. Okay, if you take that away, what you are talking about doing is raising your taxes 66%.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: We got a tax limit that we can't do it.

MR. MORTON: Can we amend your motion by saying let's take that away and let's raise the tax rate 66%.

MR. MENDOZA: What I'm saying is that I'd like to get something in writing, a complete report, that we can analyze and determine whether or not legally we can do this and if so, then what are the alternatives.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: If I may respond and I will be glad to do it sir. It's been in your packet where Louis Garcia made the legal opinion that we cannot. I will also call to your attention in a previous statement that if you do waive, and I presume you're speaking only of the fuel pass through or the entire 14%. We would lose \$3.8 million which is figured in next year's budget which would take about a 25¢ to 26¢ tax increase rate if you want to balance your budget. Now we are thinking of the possibility that we'd continue to get this - that we would possibly in February give consideration for the tax rate cut. Now, once you put it on the tax rate, it stays. People, if their utility bill is too high can conserve. But once it gets on the tax rate, it's there and we will be getting close to the 2.50 tax limit that's imposed on us by the legislature. It's all been discussed. It all has good meanings but we've got to keep calm heads and.....No, sir, we can't. It will be next year in February and it's very difficult and I know it's a ticklish problem but we just got to move with caution. Rev. Black put it in perspective. It is a package deal. I want to call to attention all the motions we are making. There is an open meeting so you can act next week if you want definite but not today for any action. You can instruct the staff to do anything but can't pass on the other motions.

MAYOR BECKER: Would you read please a brief comparison on the cost of government. Where these monies are spent these days. I think it might be interesting to know that the last or this budget that you have before the Council now.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Yes, sir. I can tell them how the money is used and proposed for FY '74, and '75 Public Safety, which is Fire and Police will get 34.5% of that. In 1968-69, the Public Safety was receiving at that time 29.3% and in millions of dollars, the combined was \$14,450,000.

MAYOR BECKER: You know, I didn't want anyone to think that we are not mindful of all the problems of the citizens. If there was a way to give you the electricity free, we'd try to do it. I wish we could do it.

MR. MENDOZA: Well, Mr. Mayor, is there any way that we....

MAYOR BECKER: We would help you with all your bills, food, rent housing and everything else but we just don't have a money tree.

MR. PADILLA: The reality of the situation is all over the world not just in San Antonio. Government cannot help the people except in some ways and we cannot channel money from here to you. We cannot exist one week as your representative running your business without getting your money and bringing it here and then dispensing it. City Hall hasn't got any money if you don't send it.

MR. MENDOZA: My question, Mr. Mayor, was going to be is there any way that City Public Service bills could be pro-rated? You know, when we talk about the poor people, in this case, we are not really talking

about the poor people, we are talking about all the people practically in San Antonio, including all of us here so what I'm saying is there any way that this could be pro-rated to make it a little more convenient.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: The Public Service has stated they will be willing to work anyone on time payments plan if they have hardship cases if they will just come in. They will just only shut off those that will not come in and try to make.

MR. MENDOZA: I'm specifically focusing on that one point because I think that we do need to bring some immediate relief to the situation.

MAYOR BECKER: Let's define the problem we have Leo. Let's see what happens first. It may be that more of them will pay than we think. Well, what else did you want to say.

CITY MANAGER GRANATA: Well, I have, of course, much has been said today and I have jotted notes and I can't - you fellows are much better at it than I am. I will try to respond in some of the things I jotted down and for example, Councilman Padilla said that he had and in fact, we are requesting a group be set up to study the possibility of finding a way to take over the self-perpetuating condition. The Council instructed that. A study group. I'm doing my best to find people who don't have their minds made up. It's very difficult to do that. Another thing I would like to say is that the Public Service has advised me that they do not have enough cash on hand to even meet our payment and I think Carl has met with Mr. Deely and either they or we are going to have to borrow money and we have to be paid by July 31st or we are in a bad financial picture. Secondly, I think that Council in its wisdom can pass any ordinance you want or any motions but I don't think you should do it until you've had a feasibility study. Anybody wants to cut to 10 to 9 because what I think is going to happen, the future brownouts that are coming are going to be blamed on this Council and not rightfully where it belongs. In this, I want you to be careful and go slow. I'd also mention the payments of bills, Public Service is willing and has told me they are willing to work out hardship deals and we will continue to see whether or not this can be done. Again, I repeat that Councilman Black has put it in perspective. It was a package deal. We just can't - it's a long range. If you will just go slow I think it will all work out. I think the approach that the attorney general took yesterday - Tom Berg about meeting with Lo-Vaca people. I know it wasn't in order but you all have talked about many things.

MR. MORTON: I would like to make one observation on this thing. Though I think it's obvious that there are differences of opinion on how to approach the problem as far as a resolution. I would like to think that each member of this Council as far as the long range objective is concerned that we're trying to achieve has the same objective.

MAYOR BECKER: No question.

MR. MORTON: And I really think that what we're saying as you look out here at this large group of young people this morning, what we're saying to San Antonio is that our objective is that when this group goes out looking for a job that we are going to have the kind of economy here in San Antonio that you won't have to move someplace else. We will have an adequate supply of energy to where not only the businesses that are here today will be operating, but also, we will have the kind of environment where we will have attracted other businesses.

Now this is a long range program in order to be able to accomplish that. We're talking about at least 10 years before we're going to be absolutely over the hump. There is a little bit of silver I think in our particular situation and I say that if you can take the perspective of looking at it not today and not tomorrow, but over the long pull. There are very few communities in the United States that are as aware of what the energy problem is going to be as this community is.

Now we can look at Oscar Wyatt and his contract and we can sit there and grumble and the things that we can say bad about previous boards and so forth but when you look at it and you look at a contract that is going to expire in 1981, regardless of what he does, he can give us gas at 23.5, all that we can use, but I think that we have to keep our eye on the ball which is after 1981, what are we going to do. This 19 percent rate increase that we're talking about is going for one thing, and that is trying to address ourselves to the energy problems after 1981. I don't want this Council to have the impression in the public eye that we are not together on what the long range picture is. If there's anyone who objects on that long range objective, I'd like to hear from them.

MR. PADILLA: On that statement we agree, Mr. Morton. We only disagree on how to accomplish it.

MR. MORTON: That's exactly right and that's fine but the long range objective we have it.

\* \* \* \*

74-28ANNEXATION PUBLIC HEARING

Mayor Becker declared a public hearing to be open to consider the annexation of a 225 acre area northeast of San Antonio.

Mr. Cipriano Guerra, Director of Community Development and Planning, said that the purpose of the annexation is to preclude the possibility of having problems with smaller cities in the area at some time in the future when San Antonio may wish to serve an area. This annexation will extend the City's extraterritorial jurisdiction beyond Cibolo. He displayed a map of the area showing it to be 300' either side of Nacogdoches Road to the county line. Then along Evans Road. Also on the map were shown the limits of the ETJ before and after the annexation. Barring unforeseen problems the annexation will be complete on August 26, 1974.

No one spoke in opposition.

On motion duly made and seconded the Council instructed the staff to proceed with the annexation routine.

Mr. Padilla pointed out that the ETJ extended from this annexation and the ETJ extended from the recent annexation south of Randolph Field converge very close to Cibolo's ETJ and may, in fact, fall in that ETJ. For that reason he suggested extending the area to be annexed on down Evans Road to the Missouri-Pacific Railroad. Doing this it would assure that there would be no conflict. At one point where the Cibolo Creek and railroad meet the area is less than 500' wide. Mr. Padilla suggested that the entire area be annexed.

After discussion, it was agreed to annex the additional area in another procedure of its own.

74-28MISS ELIZABETH MARTHA TARRADELLAS PERRIN

Mr. Padilla recognized Miss Elizabeth Tarradellas, an exchange student from Cochabamba, Bolivia. She was accompanied by Mr. Ramon Galindo and Mrs. Lloyd E. Dawson.

Mr. Padilla read a proclamation naming her an Alcalde of La Villita and presented here with the certificate.

74-28CITIZENS TO BE HEARDBASIC INDUSTRIES, INC.

Mr. George De La Garza introduced Dr. Frank J. Soday, former Vice President of Skelly Oil Company, and now associated with Basic Industries, Inc.

Dr. Soday spoke to the Council reviewing the coal gasification process and the presentation which was made to the Council in January, 1974. He also outlined the many advantages of the system.

In answer to Dr. San Martin's question, Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss said that there have been discussions concerning this project but no firm proposal has been received. The City Public Service Board has also been meeting with the Basic Industries group.

Mr. Andre Bacon, Executive Vice President of Basic Industries, said that he has been working with other groups and agencies in Washington attempting to gather information to be included in the proposal. So far it has been very slow and difficult because of other matters going on in Washington.

MR. WALTER GRINFIELD

Mr. Walter Grinfield, 7103 Remuda, asked the Council to establish an aggressive policy of conservation of energy and to take the lead in promoting conservation. He also asked that a Utility Conservation Officer be appointed.

Mr. Grinfield said that in May he had used about 30 percent more kilowatts than in April, but his bill had increased about 77 percent.

After discussing the bill with Mr. Grinfield, Mayor Becker asked Finance Director Carl White to assist Mr. Grinfield in checking the calculation on his bill. He would then have City Public Service check it also to see why there was such an increase and report back to the Council.

74-28

CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

City Manager Sam Granata reviewed the conservation plan that he had initiated for the City's facilities last year when the energy crisis became evident. Before ordering intensified effort he felt that the Council should look at the important items such as street lights for crime prevention, park lighting for recreation, et cetera. A draft ordinance covering emergency measures which could be instituted will be given the Council next week to consider. (A copy of Mr. Granata's report is included with the papers of this meeting.)

74-28

CITIZENS TO BE HEARD (Continued)

REV. R. A. CALLIES, SR.

Rev. R. A. Callies, Sr., spoke in favor of the ordinance to be considered today renaming the Nebraska Street Park and calling it the Martin Luther King Park. He said that he was pleased to know that a park is being named after Cleto Rodriguez, San Antonio's first Medal of Honor winner.

MR. STEPHEN HARVESTY

Mr. Stephen Harvesty read a prepared statement in which he urged the Council to assist the elderly with their utility bills by using the excess City Public Service payments to the City because of the fuel pass through clause and the increase rates. (A copy of Mr. Harvesty's statement is included with the papers of this meeting.)

MR. ROBERT TAMEZ

Mr. Robert Tamez, 5367 San Benito, spoke of the utility rate problem. He said that the problem has been diffused by filibuster. He felt like it was useless to say anything about it. He urged the Council to push its suit against Lo-Vaca.

MRS. RENA MCCALEBB

Mrs. Rena McCaleb, Director of National Welfare Rights, read a prepared statement asking that utility bills be frozen. (A copy of Mrs. McCaleb's statement is included with the papers of this meeting.)

MR. LANNY SINKIN

Mr. Lanny Sinkin, 318 South Texas Building, read a prepared statement outlining steps that could be used to conserve energy. He suggested also that the City's 14 percent share of the fuel pass through charge be used to subsidize the poor. (A copy of Mr. Sinkin's statement is included with the papers of this meeting.)

MR. RAUL RODRIGUEZ

Mr. Raul Rodriguez, 719 Delgado, spoke of a hate campaign against Mayor Becker. In rebuttal, he wanted to outline some of the good things done by Mayor Becker without publicity or fanfare.

MR. FRANKLIN CLEVELAND

Mr. Franklin Cleveland, representing Operation Unity, spoke in opposition to the proposed renaming of "J" Street Park. He said that his group would be pleased to provide the Council with a list of suggested names.

MR. STANLEY EGNEW

Mr. Stanley Egnew, 405 Terrell, spoke in opposition to the utility rate increase and asked that another public meeting be held. He urged that the Council speed up action against Lo-Vaca.

MRS. HELEN DUTMER

Mrs. Helen Dutmer, 739 McKinley Avenue, spoke concerning the proposed election on Charter revision. She said that districting would fail in San Antonio if the question of pay increase for Council members was not passed also. She felt also that a person should be required to have two years residency in a district before being eligible to run in the election. She said also she would have additional comments on this subject at another time.

MRS. MARIA DOMINGUEZ

Mrs. Maria Dominguez, 250 Freiling, asked that the garbage fee be rescinded.

MR. JOSE F. OLIVARES

Mr. Jose F. Olivares, 332 W. Commerce Street, spoke to the audience accusing members of the Council of having conflicting interests.

LACKLAND CITY WATER

Mr. Douglas McDonald, 5518 Beech Valley, submitted a petition bearing 78 names asking the Council to assist them in getting water into their area at Lackland City. He compared Lackland City Water Company rates and City Water Board rates to illustrate how out of line they are.

City Manager Granata said that he has a committee checking on the independent water companies in the area.

MRS. HELEN R. WALTER

Mrs. Helen R. Walter, 5286 Roundtable Drive, asked the Council to appoint a committee to audit CPSB and to verify utility bills. She felt that an impartial committee should take a hard look at their figures.

Mayor Becker asked that the City Manager have a team of auditors go to City Public Service and determine the facts regarding the high bills. If necessary, he could call on an outside auditing firm.

MR. HENRY MUNOZ, JR.

Mr. Henry Munoz, Jr., 812 South Presa, again protested the use of aliens by contractors performing work for the City. He said also that the "little people" should be considered in the utility rates.

MR. MARIO CANTU

Mr. Mario Cantu protested the high utility bills.

MR. JOE BERNAL

Mr. Joe Bernal, Executive Director of the Commission for Mexican-American Affairs, read a resolution which was recently passed by his organization concerning the energy crisis and urging that the Council take immediate steps to sue Coastal Gas Corporation. (A copy of the resolution is included with the papers of this meeting.)

Mr. Bernal was advised by Mr. Padilla that Council has instructed that legal steps be taken with regard to Coastal States. City Attorney Crawford Reeder said a suit should be filed early in July..

MRS. ESTHER TIJERINA

Mrs. Esther Tijerina, 23839 Fielding, spoke regarding the utility bills and expressed regret that Mrs. Rena McCaleb was not given more time to make her presentation.

74-28

MRS. LILA COCKRELL

Mr. Padilla read to the Council a memorandum received from Mrs. Lila Cockrell who was attending a meeting of the Greater South Texas Cultural Basin Committee. She said that San Antonio's energy problem had been discussed there with Governor Dolph Briscoe as well as a number of State Representatives. She said that Governor Briscoe would ask the House Energy Committee to meet in San Antonio to have a hearing and to determine whether any legislative remedies would be appropriate to assist the City. ( A copy of Mrs. Cockrell's memorandum is included with the papers of this meeting.)

74-28 The meeting was recessed for lunch at 2:00 P. M., and reconvened at 3:15 P. M.

74-28 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Winston Martin, Executive Director of the Urban Renewal Agency, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Morton, seconded by Mr. Mendoza, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Morton, Padilla, Mendoza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Lacy.

AN ORDINANCE 43,920

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE  
A QUITCLAIM DEED OF PROPERTY VALUED AT  
\$457,500.00, FROM THE CITY TO THE URBAN  
RENEWAL AGENCY OF THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO  
AND AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER  
INTO A LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY  
OF SAN ANTONIO AND SAID AGENCY COVERING  
SAID PREMISES.

\* \* \* \*

74-28 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Mike Kutchins, Assistant Director of Aviation, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Morton, Padilla, Mendoza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Lacy.

June 20, 1974  
nsr

AN ORDINANCE 43,921

ACCEPTING GRANT OFFER FROM THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION FOR STINSON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT, PROJECT NO. 8-48-0194-01, CONTRACT NO. DOT-FA-74-SE-1276 AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS TO COVER THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO SHARE OF SUCH PROJECT.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 43,922

AUTHORIZING TWO PROJECTS DESIGNATED INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT LANDING AREA IMPROVEMENTS - 1974 AND STINSON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT LANDING AREA IMPROVEMENTS - 1974, ESTABLISHING A FUND AND APPROVING A BUDGET FOR THE PROJECTS, AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF CONTRACTS PREVIOUSLY AWARDED FOR CONSTRUCTION OF SAID IMPROVEMENTS TO MEADER CONSTRUCTION CO., AND ALTO FENCE CO., AND ACCEPTING A GRANT OFFER TO THE CITY ON THE INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT PROJECT BY THE FEDERAL AVIATION ADMINISTRATION.

\* \* \* \*

74-28

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 43,923

RE-ACCEPTING THE LOW QUALIFIED BID OF J. M. LERMA CONSTRUCTION CO., INC., TO PERFORM THE SITE DEVELOPMENT JOB AT CUELLAR PARK IN THE MODEL NEIGHBORHOOD AREA, FORMERLY KNOWN AS THE 28-ACRE PARK BOUNDED BY 36TH, SAN FERNANDO, AND LANCE STREETS, FOR THE AMOUNT OF \$567,100, AUTHORIZING PAYMENT TO THE CONTRACTOR FROM MODEL CITIES PROGRAM FUNDS AND FROM A DIRECT GRANT FOR THE PROJECT FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING & URBAN DEVELOPMENT AND AUTHORIZING A REVISION IN THE PROJECT BUDGET.

\* \* \* \*

The Ordinance was explained by Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss, Director of Public Works, who said that on May 30, 1974, the Council authorized the award of this contract for the amount of the base bid of \$537,300. On the date of the award, Mr. Lerma discovered that he had made a mistake in the amount of his base bid. The mistake has been verified through his work sheets and he recommended adoption of the Ordinance.

June 20, 1974  
nsr

-29-

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Padilla, seconded by Mr. Morton, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Morton, Padilla, Mendoza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Lacy.

74-28 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Ron Darner, Director of Parks and Recreation, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Morton, Padilla, Mendoza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Lacy.

AN ORDINANCE 43,924

ADOPTING NAMES FOR CERTAIN CITY PARKS.

\* \* \* \*

CURRENT IDENTIFIER

OFFICIAL NAME

Model Cities "28 Acre Park"

Patrolman Richard Cuellar  
Community Park

24th Street Park

Jose Antonio Navarro Park

Mira Vista Park

Gilbert Garza Community Park

Hutchins Park

Hendrick Arnold Community Park

Sutton Park

Sutton Park

Town East Park

Nicolaus Copernicus Community  
Park

Nebraska Street Park

Martin Luther King Park

"J" Street Park

Cleto Rodriguez Park

Fort Sam Houston Park

John James Park

Denton Park

Virgil T. Blossom Park

NE Community Park

Lady Bird Johnson Community Park

Recreation Center at NE Community  
Park

Lou Hamilton Community Center

Sports Complex at NE Community Park

Alva Jo Fischer Sports Center

Camp Bullis Park

Dwight D. Eisenhower Park

Meroga Park

Morrison Kallison Park

Central Park

Euretta Kate Fairchild Park

Northeast Preserve

W. W. McAllister Park

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 43,925

ACCEPTING THE LOW BID OF WALTER BUCHHORN,  
GENERAL CONTRACTOR, TO PERFORM FOR \$366,287.00  
A JOB IN THE LA VILLITA RESTORATION - PHASE II -  
LA NACIONAL PLAZA, PROVIDING FOR AN ADDITIONAL  
CONTRIBUTION TO THE PROJECT FROM PARK BOND  
FUNDS AND APPROVING A REVISION IN THE BUDGET  
FOR THIS PROJECT.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 43,926

DECLARING THAT CERTAIN TRACTS OF LAND  
ACQUIRED BY THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO FOR  
DEVELOPMENT FOR OPEN-SPACE PURPOSES MAY  
NOT BE TRANSFERRED OR OTHERWISE DISPOSED  
OF WITHOUT THE PRIOR APPROVAL OF THE  
SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT  
AND DIRECTING THAT THIS ORDINANCE IS TO BE  
PLACED OF RECORD IN THE OFFICE OF THE COUNTY  
CLERK.

\* \* \* \*

74-28 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained  
by Fire Chief Bart T. Mulhern, and after consideration, on motion of  
Mr. Padilla, seconded by Mr. Mendoza, was passed and approved by the  
following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Morton, Padilla, Mendoza; NAYS:  
None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Lacy.

AN ORDINANCE 43,927

AUTHORIZING PLAYLAND PARK CORPORATION  
TO PRESENT A FIREWORKS DISPLAY ON JULY 4,  
1974.

\* \* \* \*

74-28 Item 9 of the Agenda being a proposed ordinance amending  
Chapter 40 of the City Code was withdrawn from consideration at the  
request of the City Manager.

74-28 The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 43,928

APPROVING A BUDGET FOR EXPENDITURE OF  
FEDERAL GENERAL REVENUE SHARING FUNDS  
FOR THE FIFTH ENTITLEMENT PERIOD (1974/75),  
AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS IN ACCORDANCE WITH  
SUCH BUDGET.

\* \* \* \*

The Ordinance was explained by Mr. Roy Montez, Assistant Director of Planning and Community Development, who said that this Ordinance adopts officially the general revenue sharing budget as adopted by the Council at its meeting on June 17. All of the adjustments, additions and deletions have been made as agreed upon by the Council.

Members of the Council then reviewed the individual items of the budget and the adjustments requested and found them all to be in order.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Padilla, seconded by Mr. Morton, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Morton, Padilla, Mendoza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Lacy.

74-28 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and explained by Members of the Administrative Staff, and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Morton, Padilla, Mendoza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Lacy.

AN ORDINANCE 43,929

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO EXECUTE A LEASE AGREEMENT WITH DAVID P. CARTER FOR LEASE OF SPACE AT 140 MAIN PLAZA, TO BE USED FOR OFFICE SPACE FOR CERTAIN ALCOHOL SAFETY ACTION PROJECT ACTIVITIES, AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF \$351.00 PER MONTH AS RENTAL.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 43,930

ACCEPTING AN ADDITIONAL \$300,000.00 GRANT FROM THE U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PERTAINING TO THE CITY OF SAN ANTONIO ALCOHOL SAFETY ACTION PROJECT; APPROVING A BUDGET COVERING SUCH GRANT AND APPROPRIATING NECESSARY FUNDS.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 43,931

APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$55,295.00 OUT OF VARIOUS FUNDS, FOR THE PURPOSE OF ACQUIRING TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS AND EASEMENTS OVER CERTAIN LANDS, ALL TO BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH THE 24TH STREET IMPROVEMENT, WEST COMMERCE STREET IMPROVEMENT, SALADO CREEK SEWER EXTENSION AND LONE STAR BLVD. OUTFALL PROJECTS; ACCEPTING THE DEDICATION OF TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS AND EASEMENTS OVER CERTAIN LANDS, ALL TO BE USED IN CONNECTION WITH

THE WEST COMMERCE STREET IMPROVEMENT,  
THOUSAND OAKS UNIT 4 SUBDIVISION DRAINAGE,  
AND THE BOYER STREET EXTENSION PROJECTS;  
AND AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A WARRANTY  
DEED, CONVEYING TITLE TO CERTAIN LANDS TO  
JAMES P. FISHER ET AL, AS PARTIAL CONSIDERA-  
TION FOR ACQUIRING TITLE TO LANDS TO BE USED  
IN CONNECTION WITH THE LONE STAR BLVD.  
OUTFALL PROJECT.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 43,932

CLOSING AND ABANDONING A PORTION OF PINEBROOK  
DRIVE IN NEW CITY BLOCK 13267 AND A PORTION OF  
BRIARIDGE DRIVE IN NEW CITY BLOCK 13627 AND  
AUTHORIZING A QUITCLAIM DEED TO QUINCY LEE  
COMPANY FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF THE DEDICATION  
OF RIGHT-OF-WAY FOR REALIGNMENT OF BRIARIDGE  
DRIVE AND CHERRY RIDGE DRIVE, BY UNRECORDED  
PLAT OF GREENBRIAR, UNIT 13, DATED DECEMBER 11,  
1973.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 43,933

AUTHORIZING SUBMISSION OF AN APPLICATION  
TO THE U. S. CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION FOR A  
GRANT UNDER THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PERSONNEL  
ACT FOR USE IN STUDYING PERSONNEL SELECTION,  
TRAINING, AND PROMOTION PROCEDURES.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 43,934

AMENDING SECTION 119 OF THE MUNICIPAL  
CIVIL SERVICE RULES TO COMPLY WITH THE  
FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1974.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 43,935

APPROVING THE PROJECT ENTITLED "CARPOOLING  
MATCHING PLANNING PROJECT"; APPROVING A  
BUDGET AND PERSONNEL COMPLEMENT FOR SAID  
PROJECT; APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR;  
AND ACCEPTING A GRANT IN THE AMOUNT OF  
\$260,000 FROM THE TEXAS HIGHWAY COMMISSION  
FOR SAID PROJECT.

\* \* \* \*

## AN ORDINANCE 43,936

APPROVING A BUDGET FOR TOPICS - FREDERICKSBURG ROAD AT MEDICAL CENTER IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT, APPROPRIATING FUNDS AND AUTHORIZING TEMPORARY LOANS TO THE PROJECT PENDING RECEIPT OF GRANT FUNDS FROM THE STATE HIGHWAY COMMISSION.

\* \* \* \*

## AN ORDINANCE 43,937

EXTENDING THE RIGHT GIVEN TO THE BEXAR COUNTY NATIONAL BANK TO OPERATE A CURB TELLER WINDOW ON TRAVIS STREET FOR AN ADDITIONAL 10 YEAR PERIOD.

\* \* \* \*

## AN ORDINANCE 43,938

ACCEPTING A GRANT FROM THE TEXAS SAFETY ADMINISTRATION FOR THE CONTINUATION FOR A THIRD YEAR OF THE PROJECT ENTITLED "PHOTO-LOGGING OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS"; APPROVING A BUDGET OF SUCH CONTINUATION AND APPROPRIATING NECESSARY FUNDS.

\* \* \* \*

## AN ORDINANCE 43,939

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF AGREEMENT REGARDING ASSIGNMENT OF GRANT BY U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT TO CITY OF SAN ANTONIO, TEXAS.

\* \* \* \*

## AN ORDINANCE 43,940

AUTHORIZING PAYMENT OF \$4,420.10 TO GUARANTY FEDERAL SAVINGS & LOAN AS REIMBURSEMENT FOR DUPLICATE PAYMENT OF TAXES ASSESSED TO DAVID AND GOLDA SCHARFF.

\* \* \* \*

## AN ORDINANCE 43,941

APPROVING THE ERECTION OF A SOLID SCREEN FENCE SIX FEET IN HEIGHT WITH BRICK COLUMNS AND TWO SEVEN FOOT RADIUS BRICK WALLS TO BE USED AS AN ENTRANCE WAY BETWEEN POWHATAN AND STONEHAVEN DRIVE IN THE COLONIES NORTH AREA.

\* \* \* \*

74-28

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 43,942

AUTHORIZING THE CITY MANAGER TO ENTER INTO AN AGREEMENT WITH THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL SURVEY COMMISSION FOR PERFORMANCE OF AN ARCHEOLOGICAL SURVEY, APPROPRIATING \$15,498 FROM FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING FUND #720-01 AND AUTHORIZING PAYMENT FOR SUCH SURVEY.

\* \* \* \*

The Ordinance was explained by Mr. Cipriano Guerra, Director of Planning and Community Development, who said that the Antiquities Code of Texas requires that this survey be made by the City when working in a State Landmark Area. The Mission Parkway area is under this designation. Under this survey, potential areas for archeological digs will be identified.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Padilla, seconded by Rev. Black, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Morton, Padilla, Mendoza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Lacy.

74-28 The following Ordinance was read by the Clerk and explained by Mr. Mel Sueltenfuss, Director of Public Works, and after consideration, on motion of Mr. Padilla, seconded by Mr. Mendoza, was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Morton, Padilla, Mendoza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Lacy.

AN ORDINANCE 43,943

AUTHORIZING EXECUTION OF A STANDARD PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT WITH W. H. MULLINS, INC., PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS, FOR ENGINEERING SERVICES AND PREPARATION OF PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR THE BRUNSWICK STORM DRAINAGE PROJECT; APPROPRIATING THE SUM OF \$46,425.00 OUT OF DRAINAGE BOND FUNDS, WITH \$40,425.00 PAYABLE TO W. H. MULLINS, INC., PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS, AND THE SUM OF \$6,000.00 TO BE USED AS A MISCELLANEOUS CONTINGENCY ACCOUNT IN THIS PROJECT.

\* \* \* \*

74-28

The Clerk read the following Ordinance:

AN ORDINANCE 43,944

AUTHORIZING AN AGREEMENT WITH THE COUNTY OF BEXAR PROVIDING FOR OPERATION OF THE NIGHT MAGISTRATE PROGRAM FOR A FIVE YEAR TERM, COMMENCING JULY 1, 1974.

\* \* \* \*

The Ordinance was explained by Mr. Robert Fisher, Administrative Assistant, who said that it is an agreement between the City and County to continue the Night Magistrate program for five years. For the last three years the program has been funded by grants through the Criminal Justice Council but those funds expire on June 30, 1974. He explained the mechanics of the program and its purpose.

The City is assuming the cost of the magistrate, court clerk and the patrolman working in the identification section. The cost to the City for the year is estimated at \$55,000. The County's cost is about \$102,000.

After consideration, on motion of Mr. Padilla, seconded by Mr. Mendoza, the Ordinance was passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Morton, Padilla, Mendoza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Lacy.

74-28 The following Ordinances were read by the Clerk and after consideration, on motion made and duly seconded, were each passed and approved by the following vote: AYES: Becker, Black, Morton, Padilla, Mendoza; NAYS: None; ABSENT: Cockrell, San Martin, Lacy.

AN ORDINANCE 43,945

APPOINTING DR. THOMAS URIBE A MEMBER  
OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE ECONOMIC  
OPPORTUNITIES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.  
(FOR A TERM EXPIRING JUNE 20, 1975.)

\* \* \* \*

Dr. Thomas Uribe is replacing Mr. Roberto Garcia.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 43,946

APPOINTING MRS. HARRY MEYER A REGULAR  
MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT AND  
APPOINTING MR. RALPH RICH AN ALTERNATE  
MEMBER OF SAID BOARD.

Mrs. Meyer is appointed for a term expiring July 31, 1975, and is replacing Mr. Gerald Holston.

Mr. Rich is appointed for a term expiring July 31, 1975, and is replacing Mrs. Harry Meyer.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 43,947

APPOINTING MR. ROBERT MOCZYGEMBA A  
MEMBER OF THE ELECTRICAL EXAMINING  
AND SUPERVISING BOARD.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Robert Moczygemba is appointed for a term expiring July 31, 1975, and is replacing Mr. Robert Boubel.

\* \* \* \*

AN ORDINANCE 43,948

APPOINTING MR. ROBERT L. DUNN TO THE  
BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE URBAN  
RENEWAL AGENCY OF THE CITY OF SAN  
ANTONIO, FOR A TERM EXPIRING MARCH 19,  
1976.

\* \* \* \*

Mr. Dunn is appointed to replace Mr. Wilbur Fite.

\* \* \* \*

74-28

The Clerk read the following letter:

June 14, 1974

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

Gentlemen and Madam:

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

June 14, 1974

Petitions submitted by Mr. Larry K. Newell,  
of Ralph C. Bender and Associates, Inc., in  
behalf of Mr. Charles A. Kuper and United  
Methodist Mission Board, requesting the  
annexation of 369.248 acres of land and  
5.000 acres of land located northwest of  
the City of San Antonio on Babcock Road.

/s/ J. H. INSELMANN  
City Clerk

\* \* \* \*

There being no further business to come before the Council,  
the meeting adjourned at 4:10 P. M.

A P P R O V E D

M A Y O R

ATTEST:

C i t y C l e r k

June 20, 1974  
nsr

-37-

